

Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, March 3, 2026, 3:30PM

Senators Present: Anna Muenchrath (SAC), Yanek Mieczkowski (SAC), Nakin Suksawang (MCE), Patrick Converse (SOP), Marcus Hohlmann (APSS), Marshall Jones (SOP), Robert Weaver (OEMS), William Bowman (Library), Jessica Wildman (SOP), Tom Marcinkowski (MSE), Chris Bashur (CCE), Alan Brown (CCE), William Arrasmith (MSE), Tim Muth (COB), Gary Zarillo (OEMS), David Wilder (SOBA), Robert Joel Deacon (SAC), Spencer Fire (OEMS), Angel Otero (COB), Thomas Eskridge (EECS), Charles Bryant (COB), Melissa Borgen (BES), Ratan Jha (APSS), Adam Prinkey (MSE), Mehmet Kaya (BES), Shawn Scott (COA), Csaba Palotai (APSS)

Proxies: Michael Splitt serving as proxy for Matthew Taylor (COA)

Senators Absent: Madhur Tiwari (APSS), Georgio Anagnostopoulos (EECS), Chiradeep Sen (MCE), Felix Delmonte (MCE), Adam Aboueid (COA), Wanfa Zhang (SAC),

Other attendees: Jessica Vinson (Human Resources), M. Mine Subasi (Associate Provost), John Nicklow (President), John Z. Kiss (Provost), Tolga Turgut (COA), Lisa Steelman (SOP), Tristan Fiedler (BES), Nancy Garmer (Library), Liana Kreamer (SOP), Kaylee Erdos (Library), Chelsea Carroll (Library), Jason Martin (Library), Rudi Wehmschulte (CCE), Penny Vassar (COB), Raymond Bonhomme (Emeritus), Rian Mehta (COA), Amanda Thayer (SOP, Research Council), Suzanne Kozaitis (Library), Ted Richardson (COB),

Call to Order

President Nicklow

- The State of the University address will be on March 11th at 9am.
- The new copyright policy has been announced. The ad hoc committee that worked on that is now working on an IP policy.

VP of Human Resources Jessica Vinson, Associate Provost M. Mine Subasi, President Nicklow, and Provost Kiss presented the new Faculty Evaluations

- President Nicklow says that several edits have been made in response to the feedback provided by faculty. Staff advisory council has also given feedback.
- VP of Human Resources Jessica Vinson then provided context for the creation of this evaluation. The board mandated a merit-based salary raise program and human resources saw this as an opportunity to improve the evaluation process. All evaluations will launch on April 1st. Nine-month faculty will have from April 1st until the end of the spring semester to complete the self-evaluation. The rest of the process concludes the first week of October, with merit raises going into effect on January 1. The evaluations are transitioning from a calendar-year evaluation to a fiscal-year evaluation.
- President Nicklow reminded the Senate that it is a SACSCOC requirement that faculty be evaluated. He also said that the Board deemed the prior evaluation process to have been insufficient for the purposes of merit-based performance evaluations.

- Sen. Weaver noted that COES has been doing merit raises based on performance evaluations. In fact, it had been going so well that they were beginning to automate the process by pulling information that was readily available regarding teaching and publications from the relevant sources to alleviate the burden on faculty. Provost Kiss responded that the process that Sen. Weaver is describing was internal to COES and was not shared in the other colleges. The Provost's office has been looking into automating some of the process, particularly as it pertains to reporting research and publications. Associate Provost Subasi mentioned that one of the problems with the COES process was that it asked faculty to complete a pdf evaluation, rather than filling out the individual competencies in workday, which is what is required. The actual content of the evaluation should be the same. Workday is not able to pull teaching information from Banner, so faculty will need to enter the information themselves; however, it may be possible in the future to automate the input of publications and grants.
- Sen. Arrasmith asked if there will be template to fill out for the self-evaluations. VP of Human Resources Jessica Vinson responded that the self-evaluation through Workday will work the same way that it has in the past. There will also be end-user training sessions to discuss additional questions that faculty or staff have about how to best complete the evaluations. President Nicklow added that if faculty have feedback after this initial cycle it will be welcomed.
- Sen. Zarillo asks whether this evaluation is intended to cover all faculty including tenure track, teaching track, and instructors, and how it can be effective at measuring the performance of faculty who are expected to do different things. VP of HR Jessica Vinson responded that the competencies themselves have not changed, although there has been the addition of the professionalism competency. All faculty will have a consistent evaluation, as it has been in the past. If research, for example, is not part of your job requirement, then that would be indicated in the form, the competency would be rated "not applicable," and it would not count against the faculty member in the evaluation process. Sen. Zarillo said that it seems like the department heads will be key to the process since they know what is expected of each faculty member. Associate Provost Subasi said that this is correct and they are the primary evaluators. Sen. Zarillo also pointed out that the language that the examples "include but are not limited to" opens the door for an evaluator to unduly increase the criteria without notice. Provost Kiss said that the intention is to allow faculty to achieve these competencies in many different ways. Sen. Wildman, who was on the committee that reviewed this evaluation, stated that the intention of that statement was, for example, to count the publication of an album by a music faculty member, without having to list everything that counts in every discipline. Provost Kiss says that he does want to empower department heads in these evaluations, and he doesn't think this language precludes that. Sen. Zarillo said that he remains concerned that some department heads may use this as a checklist and that the efficacy of the evaluation will come down to department head training.
- Dr. Turgut remarked that it is unusual for the board to request such a dramatic change to the faculty handbook and that these evaluations are used during the promotion process, which is outlined in the faculty handbook in sections 2.8.1 and 2.8.2. Dr. Turgut asked whether the board was aware that the performance evaluation process had been updated and approved by the Senate, administration and board, including evaluation criteria from each college, in 2019, and pointed out that section 1.6 of the handbook has not been followed because the Senate was not made aware of the proposed changed until February 3rd, 2026 on the day of the Senate meeting. His second question was whether the administration has considered the

legal implications of evaluating faculty on a criterion that they did not know they were being evaluated on during the evaluation period. President Nicklow responded to the first question that the board does not approve management activities, so the claim that they approved the previous evaluations in 2019 is incorrect. The board approves salary increases, and they will not approve a salary increase unless the administration implements a sufficient merit-review process (but they do not approve the process). Associate Provost Subasi also responded saying that this is not a revision to the faculty handbook, because nothing in the faculty handbook needs to change in order to accommodate the proposed changes. Dr. Turgut responded that the competencies have changed and a new competency has been added, which requires a revision to the handbook. Associate Provost Subasi responded that the nature of the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service are the same, with some wording changes in Workday. The Provost agrees that this is not a substantive change.

- Sen. Zarillo asks whether enough funds have been allocated in case everyone receives a positive evaluation. Sen. Muenchrath followed up on this question by asking about the distribution of the pool of merit raises: since there will no longer be cost-of-living adjustments, is it possible that a faculty member could “meet expectations” and face a decreasing salary since their raise is not commensurate with inflation? VP of Human Resources Jessica Vinson responded that raises always require board approval. The manager training indicates that anyone who receives a rating of 1 or 2 will receive a 1% raise. The manager has a pool of money to distribute to the faculty who receive a rating of “Meets Expectations” or above. The training will focus on making sure this money is distributed consistently. Sen. Muenchrath reiterated the question: can a faculty member meet expectations and receive a raise that does not meet a cost-of-living increase standard? VP of HR Jessica Vinson indicated that this was correct.
- Dr. Michael Splitt asked about the term “expected level” in the description of the ratings. How will faculty know what the expected level is? Will this vary across different types of faculty appointments? Jessica Vinson responded that the expected level should be clarified in conversation with the manager. The expectations come from within the unit and are not standardized across campus. Provost Kiss responded that these decisions should be made at a local level, and while some of these decisions (referring to Sen. Muenchrath’s questions) are unpopular they should be made in the interest of fairness with adequate training for managers.
- Sen. Marcinkowski asked if the evaluation opens April 1, when would faculty need to complete the submission. Jessica Vinson replied that faculty can submit at any time until the end of your nine-month appointment. If you are working over the summer, you can submit it as late as July 31st. The first-level manager review is due on August 31st. Sen. Marcinkowski approves of the reversion to the four-point rating scale, but has suggestions about the criteria. What are being called competencies are really domains, and the examples are really a mix of criteria and examples. He suggests that clarifying the distinctions and making the criteria specific to colleges or fields would remove some of the guesswork about how this is presented and deployed across campus.
- Sen. Suksawang said that some of the examples aren’t performance metrics. For example, if you design a course that aligns with program outcomes, you either do it or you don’t do it. It’s not clear how you could exceed expectations, when many of these items read like a checklist. Provost Kiss responded that it is possible to have good courses and bad courses, so there are degrees within the examples of how well they are accomplished. Sen. Suksawang

then asked how the person evaluating the faculty member would know if the course was good or bad. Provost Kiss responded that the answer would be multiple evaluation techniques including evaluations from colleagues and students. Associate Provost Subasi explained that faculty members should not be trying to fit themselves into these examples, and department heads should not be evaluating faculty on only these examples, because faculty members have different loads. The department heads should be evaluating based on the load assigned. If one article per year meets expectations, then ten would exceed expectations. Associate Provost Subasi acknowledged that it would be difficult to show how teaching the assigned load would exceed expectations unless a faculty member creates new programs or designs new courses.

- Sen. Kaya asked about the weighting of the competencies. Does professionalism have the same weight as research, teaching, and service. Jessica Vinson responded that yes, all of the competencies should be treated equally. Sen. Kaya's second question was whether there is an appeal process if a faculty member disagrees with a Professionalism rating. Jessica Vinson said that if you believe there are inconsistencies or bias in the evaluation, you should first have a conversation with your supervisor. If your concerns aren't ameliorated, you should have a discussion with the Provost and human resources.
- Dr. Michael Splitt asked how some of the professionalism criteria will be evaluated. How will the supervisor know if the faculty member responds promptly to emails? Will our emails be monitored? President Nicklow responded that when faculty members don't respond to emails he, the Provost's office, and HR hear about it from students and colleagues; emails will not be monitored. The concern was raised that this constitutes an evaluation based on gossip. Provost Kiss and President Nicklow deny this and say that the faculty member would be confronted with the complaints.
- President Nicklow says that his intention was to bring this evaluation process to the Senate in an effort of shared governance. The current process has been deemed insufficient, and the faculty's feedback has been heard. President Nicklow says he is attempting to create a process that ensures that faculty receive raises in the future.
- Sen. Marcinkowski provided an example of work he has done on a promotion committee for teaching track faculty that came up with criteria and examples for promotion. This laborious work of coming up with evaluation structures has already been done in different contexts around the university.
- Dr. Nasri Nesnas asked whether the board was aware that prior to COVID, Florida Tech did in fact give merit-based raises. VP of HR Jessica Vinson said that they were and they want us to go back to that while improving the evaluation process.
- Dr. Tolga Turgut said that our last merit raise was in 2022–23, which was a 4% pool. He also commented that he is an expert in professionalism and finds the presentation of professionalism in the new evaluation very vague and subjective. He is also concerned that there is not much buy-in among the faculty. Evaluating faculty based on a criterion that they didn't know was part of their evaluation will cause confusion and possibly legal implications.
- Provost Kiss said that faculty feedback was taken very seriously, and that the 5-point scale was changed back to a 4-point scale based on this feedback. He also made the point that other universities aren't getting raises at all, so we should be pleased that we are able to discuss raises at all.
- Sen. Hohlmann asked if department heads are being empowered to evaluate faculty locally, how is this reconciled when untenured department heads are evaluating tenured faculty.

Provost Kiss says that in an ideal world it would probably be better to have tenured department heads. President Nicklow says that it shouldn't affect the evaluation.

- Sen. Arrasmith asked whether cost-of-living adjustments would now be done separately or whether they would be rolled into the merit raises. Jessica Vinson responded that going forward there will only be merit raises, no cost-of-living increases. If you receive only a 1% raise, then that means that you are underperforming.
- Sen. Weaver mentioned that this was a concern he heard from his faculty: that it would be unfair if a satisfactory performance in one department led to a different raise than the same performance in a different department. He suggests providing a minimum percentage of raise so that people performing at the same level across the university receive similar raises. VP of HR Jessica Vinson responded that they thought about this but felt the discretion should be with the colleges.

Old Business

Committee Chair Elections

- There were no new nominations from the floor.
- President-elect Marshall Jones was in charge of tallying ballots.
- Election for Administrative Policies Chair: Jessica Wildman (23 yeases; 2 abstains)
- Election for Academic Policies Chair: Anna Muenchrath (23 yeases; 2 abstains)
- Election for Scholarship Committee Chair: Alan Brown (23 yeases; 2 abstains)

Approval of Minutes

January minutes were approved with two emendations.

Reports

President - Sen. Wildman: nothing to report

Secretary - Sen. Muenchrath: nothing to report

Academic Policies - Sen. Jones

- The Academic Affairs Committee is looking to move from two one-hour meetings to one two-hour meeting per month. It is also looking to move back to keeping minutes and having more formalized agenda

Administrative Policies - Sen. Kaya

- The committee met recently in order to discuss shared governance in the faculty handbook. While the handbook lays out the Senate's role, it doesn't fully lay out the process such as when consultation should occur, how proposals from outside the Senate move through committees and how academic- or faculty-related task forces connect with Senate processes. Our goal is to clarify these processes so everyone including faculty and administration alike know how consultation happens and what to expect. The committee has started to draft ideas for discussion and will bring those to the Senate for feedback. The committee welcomes feedback from anyone who would like to contribute.

Faculty Excellence - Sen. Wilder

- The winners have been chosen and prizes will be awarded on March 11th at the State of the University meeting. The teaching category winner was Dr. Gary Burns from COPLA; the research category winner was Dr. Michael Keene from COES; the service category winner was Dr. Lars Jones from COPLA.

- There were fewer nominees than in previous years. All faculty are encouraged to apply for next year's awards.

Scholarships - Sen. Brown

- Members of the Scholarships Committee are Natalie Dorfeld (SAC), Mike Splitt (COA), Aaron Welters (MSE), Sen. Bryant (COB), Hamid Najafi (MCE), and Sen. Brown (CCE). Sens. Brown and Bryant put the committee in compliance with respect to Senate by-laws about committee composition. The committee also had representation from all Colleges.
- The scholarships procedure was developed by the previous Scholarships Chair, Dr. Nezamoddin Nezamoddini-Kachouie. First, the committee asked the Registrar for a list of true freshmen with GPA of at least 3.50, which produced candidates from all colleges. This list of over 200 students was then cut down by the Financial Aid office to those eligible for Financial Aid and who don't already have full scholarships: this second list comprised 55 students.
- The committee sought to identify students to whom this Scholarship would make a real difference through a two-page application form. 17 eligible applicants applied. All six Committee members read and ranked the applications; the Financial Aid office has informed the committee that the Senate Scholarship Fund has yielded enough interest to again issue three new Scholarships at \$2000 annually.
- The Senate Scholars for 2025–26 are Kirsten Clarius, Manchester, Maryland (Business Administration), Joseph Orost, Jeffersonville, Vermont (Aeronautical Science with Flight), and Blake Valley, North Royalton, Ohio (Ocean Engineering)
- These students will be recognized at the Honors Convocation in April.
- Sen. Brown is grateful to the Committee members, to Caroline Johnston (Registrar), to Eroica Davis (Financial Aid Office), and especially to Dr. Nezamoddini-Kachouie.

TRI - Sen. Bowman

- The Committee received no complaints this month. Please do forward your concerns to the committee.

Welfare - Sen. Arrasmith

- A faculty member voiced concerns about the sabbatical process, which currently has no faculty oversight and occurs only at the Provost level. After some research, Sen. Arrasmith found that at other universities there is usually faculty involvement in the awarding of sabbaticals. The faculty handbook on sabbaticals as updated in 2016 has no language about the process. This is an opportunity for us to add language that ensures shared governance in the handbook.

Research Ad Hoc Committee – Sen. Hohlmann

- The Research Committee met twice in February. The committee is compiling questions to ask the Office of Sponsored Research and the new Chief Research Officer. The committee has been discussing the research incentives and DGRATS in particular.

New Business

Official call for nominations for: Secretary, President-Elect. These will be elected in the **April** meeting. Reminder: President-Elect nominees submit statements to be distributed prior to the election.

- Sen. Brown was nominated for President-Elect.
- There were no nominations for secretary. Nominations can be accepted electronically, so if anyone wants to nominate someone or self-nominate to the position, please do so. New senators elected in the coming weeks are also eligible. Sen. Muenchrath also offers to talk about the role with any interested parties.

Discussion

- Sen. Marcinkowski said that the administration was in a tough position regarding the evaluations. They had a board mandate to change the evaluations, but being relatively new, did not have the institutional knowledge to understand how things have changed over time with different presidents. They are trying to create an evaluation process that will allow some degree of flexibility across colleges, types of appointments, ranks of faculty, and still allow for some commensurability. Sen. Marcinkowski suggests that the administration needs the help of the faculty to accommodate the mandate with the flexibility required by the configuration of faculty that we have today. We should work, collectively and individually, with the administration to figure out what works and what doesn't work, because they need the faculty's help. Sen. Muenchrath agreed with Sen. Marcinkowski, but asked if this type of institutional knowledge is so important to the administration's implementation of the evaluation, then why wasn't the Senate as a body involved in its development since August, and only heard about it the day it was rolled out? Sen. Marcinkowski responded that he can't say why the administration chose not to involve the Senate, but that the faculty should nevertheless work closely with the administration to refine the new policy. Sen. Jones said that this goes back to the question of shared governance and for what issues the Senate should be consulted and at what stage. Sen. Muenchrath said that this will be a part of the Administrative Policies Committee recommendation. Furthermore, she articulated that there is an important distinction between consulting a faculty member, or a group of faculty members in a task force, and the faculty through its representatively elected body. Dr. Turgut added that this is the problem with the phrase "in the spirit of shared governance," which appeared on the roll-out of the new evaluations. There should be actual shared governance, not shared governance in a spiritual sense. The information from the board meetings should be available to the Senate president, who is allowed to attend. Board meeting minutes and Senate minutes are also an important repository of institutional knowledge. Sen. Muenchrath responded that the research of the Administrative Policies Committee showed that the process of consultation happens differently at other institutions. Whereas at Florida Tech, if the Senate wants a new academic policy, they suggest it to the Provost's office who develops it and then may bring it to the Senate for consultation at their discretion, at other universities, an outside body brings the idea for a policy to the Senate, who uses a standing or ad hoc committee to review and write the policy, which is then reviewed and voted on by the Senate, before it is brought to the administration for their review and approval. It is in questions of process that shared governance can be made integral to campus politics. Sen. Turgut suggests that some of this language already exists in FH 1.6. but is not being practiced. The faculty evaluation, for example, was not brought to the Senate in accordance with FH 1.6. Sen. Wildman suggests that this was because it wasn't clear that this was a change to the handbook. Sen. Arrasmith says that we should focus on the faculty handbook, as Sen. Jones proposes to do, and focus on

processes where we can institute shared governance, such as with the sabbatical review process.

Announcements/Reminders

- The [Faculty Senate handbook](#) with all AY24-25 changes made is available on the [Senate website](#). If there are any corrections or revisions needed, please bring those to our Administrative Policies Committee Chair, Dr. Mehmet Kaya, at mkaya@fit.edu.
- Sen. Marshall Jones is seeking those available and interested to workshop handbook revisions, including looking back over the changes that were recently made. The aim is to have an updated handbook that can be approved next year.

Adjournment

Appendix

Faculty Performance Evaluation Redevelopment

Taskforce team: Dr. Jessica Wildman, Dr. Meredith Carroll, Dr. Christian Sonnenberg, Dr. Brian Lail, Dr. Mark Archambault, Dr. Amanda Moske, Melissa Huggins, Pat Francois, Jessica Vinson

1. Performance Areas/Competencies

Current Competencies	Recommended Competencies
Teaching/Librarianship	Teaching and Student Mentoring
Scholarship	Scholarship
Service	Service and Institutional Engagement
Administrative	Administrative Responsibilities
	Professionalism

Competencies	Examples include but are not limited to
Teaching and Student Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs and delivers effective courses aligned with program learning outcomes • Integrates research, industry practices, and/or evidence-based teaching methods • Stays current with educational technologies and innovative practices • Creates learning environments supportive of all students • Contributes to curricular development and program assessment • Promotes student development and career planning through scholarly and professional opportunities • Connects students with industry and academic networks • Mentors undergraduate, graduate, and/or postdoctoral scholars effectively
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducts research and scholarly work that advances the field • Seeks and secures external funding from appropriate sources (recognizing that funding availability varies by discipline) • Publishes in peer-reviewed venues and presents at conferences • Builds collaborations with industry, government, and/or academia • Supports technology transfer, patents, and commercialization where applicable • Upholds research integrity and ethical standards • Provides student research opportunities
Service and Institutional Engagement	Internal Service

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves on departmental, college, and/or university committees • Engages in faculty governance and collaborative decision-making • Mentors junior faculty and supports faculty development • Supports development and institutional advancement initiatives • Actively contributes to the advancement of the campus community, department, and academic programs <p>External and Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves as a reviewer for publications, funding agencies, and/or professional organizations • Serves on editorial boards, society committees, or advisory panels • Evaluates programs, accreditation, or tenure/promotion cases externally • Organizes conferences, workshops, or professional development events • Consults for government, industry, or non-profit organizations <p>Public Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participates in outreach, public education, and research communication • Serves on community advisory boards or professional organizations
<p>Administrative Responsibilities</p>	<p>Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides strategic direction for department, center, or program • Builds cross-departmental and external partnerships • Supports faculty development and fosters a positive work environment • Represents the unit within the institution and externally <p>Management (if applicable)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manages budgets, personnel, and facilities effectively • Ensures accountability for unit outcomes • Coordinates operations and resource allocation <p>Administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops departmental or college policies and procedures to advance unit goals that align with the university policies and procedures. • Manages required documentation and compliance processes • Balances administrative responsibilities with ongoing scholarly activity
<p>Professionalism</p>	<p>Professional Communication and Collaboration</p>

- Communicates, collaborates, and problem solves professionally and respectfully with colleagues, students, and staff
 - Contributes to a respectful, supportive work environment
- Responsiveness and Accessibility**
- Responds to colleague and student inquiries in a timely manner
 - Maintains appropriate accessibility consistent with role expectations
 - Participates in scheduled meetings or provides advance notice when unable to attend
- Professional Growth and Feedback**
- Receptive to constructive feedback from colleagues, supervisors, and students
 - Demonstrates commitment to continuous improvement
- Compliance**
- Completes required institutional training by established deadlines
 - Adheres to institutional policies, procedures, and deadlines, e.g., grades and assessment reports
 - Reports compliance concerns appropriately
 - Maintains required certifications/credentials (if applicable)

2. Rating Scale - UPDATE

- a. Current rating scale will remain in place.

Current Rating Scale (4-point scale)
Exceeds Expectations
Satisfactory
Needs Improvement
Unsatisfactory
Not Applicable

Rating Scale (4-point scale)	Rating Value	Description
Exceeds Expectations	4	Faculty member's performance reflects a level of accomplishment that exceeds the expected level.
Satisfactory	3	Faculty member's performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.
Needs Improvement	2	Faculty member's performance reflects a level of accomplishment that needs improvement. Faculty receiving ratings

		in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.
Unsatisfactory	1	Faculty member's performance reflects a level of accomplishment well below the expected level. This is the sole category that constitutes unsatisfactory progress. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement during the following academic year.
Not Applicable	-	This is not an aspect of the faculty member's job.

3. Evaluation Period

- a. July 1 to June 30

4. Evaluation – Timeline

April 1, 2026	Self-evaluation due July 31, 2026
August 1, 2026	First level manager reviews due Aug. 31, 2026
September 1, 2026	Next level manager reviews due Sept. 25, 2026
October 2, 2026	All approvals due and evaluations finalized

5. Approval Flow

- a. Approval flow
 - i. Faculty member completes self-evaluation
 - ii. Department Head or Dean evaluates faculty member
 - iii. Faculty member acknowledges evaluation
 - iv. Department Head or Dean approves evaluation
 - v. Dean or Provost approves evaluation
 - vi. Evaluation complete

6. Additional Key Details

- a. Performance evaluations will launch on April 1. Faculty on 9-month appointments should complete their self-evaluations before their appointment period ends. There is no expectation for faculty to work during the summer when they are not on appointment.
- b. The performance evaluation includes a section where faculty, together with their manager, can set goals that are tracked from year to year.
- c. As part of the acknowledgement step in the performance evaluation process, faculty have the opportunity to add any final comments in the designated comment section.