In the eyes of many faculty and department chairs, the annual faculty review is a task that is impossible to do right. There are many reasons for this opinion, for example (a) the appearance of subjectivity (b) the lack of clarity on what is being evaluated (c) the uncertainty of the weight of the evaluated variables (d) evaluations are just "lip service" to professional development(e) the distinct possibility of bias, or (f) the simple perception of administrative airs, have all been cited as reasons for the discontent (Andrews & Licata, 1991; Elmore, 2008; Redmon, 1999;).

Notwithstanding the above, faculty annual evaluations at the college and university level are necessary and done for a variety of reasons. These typically include (a) merit pay (b) building a case for promotion and/or tenure(c) awards (d) salary adjustments (e) improving teaching and (f) retention/dismissal, just to name a few (Cherry et al., 2017; Elmore, 2008; Licata, 1986; Miller, 1974; Schwartz, 1988; Whitmore, 1984). While the crux of the annual faculty review lies within the annual activity report, it typically is followed by an administrative review, from within the particular unit. From a generalizable standpoint, it appears this is where any commonalities end. A quick glance at the literature on the annual faculty review indicates that the focus is either with the perceptions of the review or the purposes of the review. The logistics or process of the annual faculty review has received very little scholarly attention. In fact, it does not appear that there are a set of easily identified generally accepted practices about this type of review.

In the school that I chair a department under, there was a recent and substantive change in both school structure and the deanship that fostered an opportunity to re-think traditions and procedures; again, particularly at the department level. As it related to the annual faculty review, the Dean determined that the traditional annual faculty review as led by the school administrative team would not be a part of the process moving forward. Each department chair would complete the annual faculty reviews and this review would be the basis of the Dean's merit pay determination. This was exciting as the traditional top-down method that resulted in a letter placed in each faculty members' mailbox was viewed as a compulsory event that was a checkbox and condition of employment. In sum, it was dreaded as it approached and quickly forgotten when completed.

Consequently, I did not want to continue with a process that was viewed as a lowlight of faculty life. Hence, I took advantage of this opportunity and fully re-cast the annual faculty review process. This session will reveal the methods, and resulting impact, of flipping the annual review away from the traditional administrator-centered procedure toward a more faculty-centered experience. Additionally, resultant faculty perceptions will be highlighted, with commentary on the implementation process.

References:
Andrews, H.A. & Licata, C.M. (1991) Administrative perceptions of existing evaluation systems. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, (5)69. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117287

Bell, T. B., Frecka, T. J., & Solomon, I. (1993). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: Empirical evidence for accounting educators. Accounting Horizons, 7(4),

33. Retrieved from http://ulib.iupui.edu/cgi-bin/proxy.pl?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/208896201?accountid=7398

Blumenthal, R. A., (2015). Working with faculty to develop a system for annual faculty evaluation. The Department Chair, 25(4), 19-21.

Buckingham, M. and Goodall, A. (2015). Reinventing performance management: How one company is rethinking peer feedback and the annual review, Harvard Business Review, 93(4), 40-50.Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2015/04/reinventing-performance-management

Cherry, B.D., Grasse, N., Kapla, D., and Hamel, B. (2017). Analysis of academic administrators' attitudes: Annual evaluations and factors that improve teaching. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 39(3), 296-306. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2017.1298201

Connelly, M.T., Inui, T.S., Oken, E., and Peters, A.S. (2018). Annual performance reviews of, for, and by faculty: A qualitative analysis of one department's experience. The Journal of Faculty Development, 32(2), 5-13. Retrieved from http://ulib.iupui.edu/cgi-bin/proxy.pl?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/2169205603?accountid=7398

Elmore, H. W. (2008). Toward objectivity in faculty evaluation. Academe, 94(3), 38-40. Retrieved from http://ulib.iupui.edu/cgi-bin/proxy.pl?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/232312360?accountid=7398

Greenfield, R. (2015). What's after annual performance reviews? Retrieved from: http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-10-12/whats-after-annual-performance-reviews-never-ending-performance-reviews

Hiltner, A.A. & Loyland, M.O. (1998). The Effectiveness of Annual Faculty Evaluations: Accounting Faculty Perceptions, Journal of Education for Business, 73(6), 370-375. doi: 10.1080/08832329809603837

Licata, C.M. (1986). Post-tenure faculty evaluation: Threat or opportunity? AHSE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1, Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education

Manakyan, H.T. and Tanner, J.R. (1991). A survey of finance faculty on the relationship between research productivity and perceived teaching effectiveness, Journal of Financial Education, 27-39.

Miller, R.I. (1974). Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Redmon, K. D. (1999). ERIC Review Faculty Evaluation: A Response to Competing Values. Community College Review, 27(1), 57–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/009155219902700105

Schwartz, D.F., (1988). Annual faculty activity reports: An example and comment, ACA Bulletin, 39-45.

Whitmore, J. (1984). Faculty evaluation: Communicating the criteria and expectations. ACA Bulletin, 50, 27-28.