

# **Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group**

## **Final Report**



**December 15, 2022**

## Contents

Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group Members .....	3
Introduction .....	4
Work Group Process .....	4
Current State Analysis .....	4
Outside Examples .....	5
Analysis and Deliberation to Meet the Charge .....	6
Required Practices .....	6
Recommended Practices .....	8
Practices for Further Exploration .....	9
Annual Plan of Work .....	10
Schedule for Dissemination of Guidance .....	10
Proposed Faculty Handbook Revisions .....	11
Appendix 1: Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group Charge .....	12
Appendix 2: Example Summaries from George Mason .....	13
Appendix 3: Outside Example Summaries .....	19
Appendix 4: Proposed Faculty Handbook Revisions .....	25

## Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group Members

### Work Group Members:

- Kim Eby, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development, Office of the Provost (Co-Chair)
- Lisa Billingham, Director of Choral Activities, CVPA (Co-Chair) and Faculty Senate
- Guadalupe Correa-Cabrera, Professor, Schar School
- Martin Ford, Senior Associate Dean, CEHD Administration
- Geraldine Grant, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Biology
- Jaime Lester, Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs and Strategic Initiatives, CHSS
- Elise Miller-Hooks, Professor and Bill & Eleanor Hazel Chair in Infrastructure Engineering, CEC
- Rachelle Holmes Perkins, Associate Professor of Law, Scalia
- Melissa Perry, Dean, College of Public Health
- Kevin Rockmann, Professor of Management and Program Director, SBUS
- Solon Simmons, Associate Professor, Carter School

### Project Management Support:

- Kaithlyn Kayer, Director, Project Management and Operations
- Noel Dickover, Transformation Manager

### Ex-Officio and Executive Sponsors:

- Mark Ginsberg, Provost and Executive Vice President
- Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Professor and the Basic Course Director, CHSS and Chair of the Faculty Senate

## Introduction

The Faculty Annual Evaluation (FAE) Work Group was formally charged on October 7, 2022, to review both current Mason and national best practices for FAE guidelines and to propose guidance for practices and policies, an implementation process, and associated language changes for the *Faculty Handbook* ([Appendix 1: Work Group Charge](#)). This charge and need emerge from concerns surrounding varying practices within the Mason Local Academic Units (LAUs) for FAEs; a desire for consistent, transparent, fair and equitable process across all LAUs; and a return to a performance-based culture tying evaluations to merit salary increases. It is the aim of the Work Group to provide high-level guidance that creates greater consistency, transparency, and equity across Mason, while maintaining flexibility on the details and criteria at the local level.

The FAE Work Group engaged in the following activities to meet our charge:

- Examined current FAE practices and procedures in place at Mason.
- Gathered and reviewed examples of promising practices from peer institutions and conducted interviews with subject matter experts.
- Held meetings (10/7, 10/27, 11/3, 11/10, 11/17, 12/1, 12/8, 12/14) to review and discuss collected data and provide recommendations.

The intent of the FAE Work Group was to produce recommendations and guidance that, as LAUs evaluate their current practices, will result in positive improvements to Mason's FAE practices. The Work Group acknowledges the diversity of approaches across Mason, and that culture and context matter in tailoring an effective FAE process that meets the needs of a particular LAU. The Work Group strived to provide structure and guidance where it is needed, while continuing to allow flexibility for LAUs that have robust evaluation practices, ensuring greater consistency, transparency, equity, and accountability.

## Work Group Process

**Current State Analysis:** The Work Group solicited documentation from across Mason, setting a baseline goal of collecting at least one example from each college. The Work Group reviewed documentation provided by a total of four departments within the CHSS, one department within the COS, and one department within CEC, as well as college-level guidance from nine colleges. The Work Group created a document summarizing the unit's process, identifying specific approaches to transparency and formative evaluation practices, and highlighting key points of interest to our work ([Appendix 2: Example Summaries from George Mason](#)). During our sessions, Work Group members shared practices from their LAUs, highlighting successes, challenges, and changes adopted by their units.

Additionally, the Work Group reviewed the Faculty Handbook section 2.6.1 "Annual Review of Faculty." The Faculty Handbook states that "the bylaws or standing rules of each local academic unit (LAU) will include:

- The method by which faculty will be evaluated (e.g., by a faculty work group recommendation to the local unit administrator, or directly by the local unit administrator);
- The requirements for the evaluation materials submitted by faculty; and

- A statement of standards for overall “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” annual performance. Satisfactory performance means performance that meets the standards of the unit. Unsatisfactory performance means performance that fails to meet the standards of the unit.

The Faculty Handbook further states that the criteria used for the Faculty Annual Review are the same as the Criteria for Evaluation of Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Term Faculty (see Section 2.4).

The Work Group found considerable variability in LAU practices, ranging from undetermined (undocumented, inconsistent or unidentifiable) to extremely robust and transparent. Key takeaways include:

- Several LAUs use a quantitative approach to summative ratings, including detailed scales and criteria for rationale. Other LAUs use a qualitative process involving a summary of accomplishments.
- Many LAUs have adopted evaluation categories beyond the baseline “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” required by the Faculty Handbook.
- Several LAUs employ faculty self-assessments or reflections in their processes, although the criteria and guidance vary.
- Few LAUs address formative evaluation practices in their documentation.
- Stated dependence on student evaluations for teaching assessment varies across LAUs.

**Outside Examples:** Based on an examination of recent research articles on FAEs, several topics emerged (the importance of providing faculty feedback and recent findings about concerns with student evaluations are good examples of this). The Work Group searched for similar institutions that addressed those topics, giving preference to identifying practices at R1 research institutions. Additionally, the Work Group sought out expert advice from institutions in Virginia undergoing similar efforts. Work Group members engaged with peers, reviewed publicly available documentation, and held interviews with colleagues to compile sufficient data to evaluate and consider options for Mason to adopt. The mix of schools included explicit merit-based approaches for faculty evaluations, various options for providing scaffolded support for faculty and evaluators, and innovative formative feedback processes (most of which were disconnected with an annual merit review process). A total of seven institutions were considered, including:

- Cornell University
- James Madison University
- Loyola University of Chicago
- Texas A&M University
- University of Kentucky
- University of North Carolina
- Virginia Tech

The Work Group engaged in a similar review methodology, summarizing the institution's process, considering specific approaches to transparency and formative evaluation practices, and highlighting key points of interest for consideration. The Work Group also identified if the university employs a performance-based process, if available ([Appendix 3: Outside Example Summaries](#)). During our sessions,

Work Group members reviewed the summaries and compared external practices with Mason’s current state.

**Analysis and Deliberation to Meet the Charge:** Through analysis of the practices identified at Mason and outside exemplars, a list of potential items for inclusion in the final report was developed for Work Group deliberation. Potential items for consideration were grouped into three categories:

- **Required Practices:** These practices were determined as necessary to be in place for meeting the Work Group charge. Furthermore, the Work Group decided that these items likely would aid those LAUs needing to strengthen their current processes.
- **Recommended Practices:** These practices should be strongly considered by Mason leadership and LAUs for broad implementation in order to enhance outcomes. In some cases, they likely would not be applicable for all Mason LAUs, but, depending on the context of the LAU, they should be reviewed when making changes or updates to existing FAE processes.
- **Practices for Further Exploration:** These practices may have potential applicability for Mason, but more exploration, discussion, and clarification are needed prior to being considered for implementation across Mason.

A consent-based voting process was used to gain agreement on item grouping. During the deliberations, the Work Group took potential implementation considerations into account, including the likelihood of widespread adoption for required practices. In some cases, items were moved to recommended practices or practices for further exploration in order to gain a group consent-based agreement.

### Required Practices

The Work Group determined that the required practices below would lead to improved outcomes to Mason’s FAE process in a way that can be considered transparent, and merit based. The majority of these enable the summative evaluation process to be applied in a way that informs merit-based raises. Other requirements concern the formative feedback process or provide approaches to improve some aspects of the FAE process.

- All faculty must be evaluated annually. The details of this process are determined by the LAU, including the depth of the evaluation and criteria applied, but all faculty members shall receive an annual evaluation each year.

*Rationale:* Necessary for merit-based pay decisions, and a requirement for the FAE to be considered “performance-based.”

- There should be no fewer than three categories of evaluation and the rating of “unsatisfactory” must be included. The LAU evaluation process must be able to recognize performance at all levels, as such evaluations will be tied to merit-based pay decisions.

*Rationale:* Necessary for merit-based pay decisions, and a requirement for the FAE to be considered “performance-based.”

*Process Note:* We did not have 100% consent for this item as one work group member preferred to keep the current Faculty Handbook language.

- Each LAU must establish written procedures and criteria for the FAE decision making process that are developed with faculty input and approved by the LAU faculty.

*Rationale:* Addresses the concern for Mason to have a transparent, fair and equitable process, a requirement of the Work Group charge.

This aligns with the Faculty Handbook language in section 1.3.3, Colleges and Schools that states *“The faculties of colleges/schools, together with their Deans, determine the processes and procedures of governance they will employ, consistent with the provisions of the Faculty Handbook. All colleges/schools, and if so sub-divided, each of their academic subdivisions, must act in accordance with the best traditions of the academic profession and within the following guidelines, which prescribe that they...*

*c. adopt bylaws or standing rules that are published and made available to all members and that undergo periodic review and that include procedures and define eligibility for faculty participation in the activities specified in this Handbook;”*

- Faculty should be evaluated on the work they are asked to do. Specification of workload rubrics, percentages and/or assignments used for evaluation, which are aligned with college or school workload guidelines, should be included in written procedures.

*Rationale:* Addresses the concern for Mason to have a transparent, fair and equitable process, a requirement of the Work Group charge. Also aligns with the goals of the Task Force for Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards Report.

This aligns with the Faculty Handbook language in section 2.6.1, Annual Review of the Faculty that states, *“Faculty are evaluated on the quality of their performance over the entire scope of their contributions during the year and in the context of their goals, assignments, and other responsibilities. Performance expectations should recognize differences in faculty assignments within the same LAU.”*

- All FAEs must include a faculty self-assessment and a written response provided by the evaluator(s) as specified in the LAU bylaws and/or standing rules.

*Rationale:* Addresses the concern for Mason to have a transparent, fair and equitable process and reduces confusion around the FAE process.

This aligns with the Faculty Handbook language in section 2.6.1, Annual Review of the Faculty that states *“The results of and rationale for the evaluation must be given to the faculty member in writing, and the faculty member must be afforded the opportunity to discuss the results of the evaluation with the local unit administrator before it is sent to the Dean.”*

- Written LAU guidance must clarify what constitutes performance at various levels.

*Rationale:* Addresses the concern for Mason to have a transparent, fair and equitable process, a requirement of the Work Group charge.

- The Faculty Handbook should clarify the role and purpose of the FAE in the LAU Renewal, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) process, including an explicit disclaimer that a favorable rating on the FAE does not indicate success in the RPT process. See Work Group language for proposed additions to section 2.6.1 of the Faculty Handbook in Appendix 4.

*Rationale:* Addresses the concern for Mason to have a transparent, fair, and equitable process; also addresses identified communication gaps and misunderstandings about how the FAE relates to the RPT process.

- Each LAU should provide detailed guidance on the roles of the participants and evaluators with respect to the evaluation process and context.

*Rationale:* Addresses the concern for Mason to have a transparent, fair, and equitable process and reduces confusion around the FAE process.

- Administrative work and leadership roles must be accounted for in the annual evaluation.

*Rationale:* Faculty need to be evaluated on the job(s) they are tasked to perform. Administrative roles (e.g., Local Unit Administrator/ Department Head, Program Coordinator, Graduate Director, Associate Chair, etc.) can take significant time and should be evaluated along with research, teaching and service.

This aligns with the Faculty Handbook language in section 2.4.4, Administrative Responsibilities: *“Many faculty assume administrative responsibilities as part of their terms of employment. Evaluation of faculty performance of these responsibilities must be included in the annual review and any consideration of change of faculty status. The criteria for successful performance must be given to the faculty member in writing.”*

- Student evaluations of teaching should not be used as the sole basis for FAE; rather, student evaluations are part of a comprehensive set of evidence to determine teaching effectiveness.

*Rationale:* Research on bias in course evaluations shows challenges with the use of student evaluations above a satisfactory level. Fully online evaluations have especially low response rates that call into question the validity of the data.

This aligns with the Faculty Handbook section 2.4.1 Teaching, *“Effective teaching is demonstrated through a combination of course and curricular materials, learning outcomes, assignments, and assessments designed to promote student learning; through review of those materials, outcomes, assignments, and assessments by knowledgeable peers and colleagues; through student evaluations of their learning experiences; and through engaging in professional/teaching development activities.”*

## Recommended Practices

The recommended practices below should be strongly considered by Mason leadership and LAUs for broad implementation in order to enhance outcomes. In some cases, they likely would not be applicable for all Mason LAUs, but, depending on the context of the LAU, they should be reviewed when making changes or updates to existing FAE processes.



- The Office of the Provost, along with College/School and LAU leadership, should provide additional guidance for evaluators and mentors, including training opportunities and resources.

*Rationale:* Addresses the concern for transparency and reduces tension around the FAE process. It may also improve outcomes through support and training for faculty and evaluators.

- The Office of the Provost should provide examples to LAUs for developing their FAE processes.

*Rationale:* Allows for potential best practices to be highlighted and adopted, particularly by LAUs who need more concrete support, and may improve consistency in FAEs across Mason.

- LAUs should consider using the annual feedback process for career development and performance management.

*Rationale:* Addresses charge for inclusion of formative feedback that will support faculty in their professional development. This also potentially addresses the request for the formulation of an annual faculty plan of work, including goals and specific measurable objectives.

- LAUs should consider how they are providing mentoring and support for all faculty. Specialized mentoring and feedback processes for pre-tenure faculty, tenured associate professors on track to full professor, and instructional and clinical faculty on track for both levels of promotion are key areas. Mentoring support is recommended to be implemented broadly.

*Rationale:* Addresses a specific need at Mason, particularly for associate professors and instructional and clinical faculty. It could also address the charge for inclusion of formative feedback that will support all faculty in their professional development.

### Practices for Further Exploration

The practices below may have potential applicability for Mason, but more exploration, discussion, and clarification are needed prior to being considered for implementation across Mason.

- Inclusion of a peer review process in FAEs. The Work Group is aware that this is being applied in some of the larger LAUs, but there was some disagreement on whether it should be applied more broadly.

*Rationale:* Peer review better aligns with the RPT process and can be effectively implemented with appropriate training and support.

This aligns with the language in the Faculty Handbook in section 2.5.1 Teaching, “*Local academic units must regularly evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their faculty. In doing so, they are expected to incorporate data from both peers and students... Peer evaluation is expected to include, at a minimum, data on the development and implementation of new courses and programs, the appropriateness of course materials currently used, the level and quality of student advising, and learning outcomes. Additional forms of peer evaluation are expected. These may include, but are not limited*

*to, peer observation of classroom teaching, evaluations by mentors, assessments of teaching performance by colleagues, and teaching portfolios.”*

- Inclusion of departmental citizenship as a criteria or dimension of FAE. The Work Group debated whether this might be considered as part of the service category, or its own stand-alone area.

*Rationale:* Departmental citizenship as a dimension could provide a method for LAUs to reward faculty members who go above and beyond. Moreover, it may help LAUs in addressing behavior that does not comport with our values as a university and complies with the Virginia Department of Human Resource Management’s Policy 2.35 “Civility in the Workplace.”

- Inclusion of options for addressing pay equity, beyond the FAE process, in written LAU guidance. The Work Group disagreed on how best to implement this item and whether pay equity was within the charge, but all agreed that addressing this issue is important.

*Rationale:* Increases options for addressing pay equity within the School/College/LAU, in addition to rewarding high performers.

## Annual Plan of Work

The FAE Work Group acknowledges the charge’s call for “the formulation of an annual faculty plan of work, including goals and specific measurable objectives.” However, ongoing discussion within the Faculty Senate and responses to the Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards report that was delivered during our period of activity suggests that this idea requires additional research and conversation beyond the scope and timeframe allocated for this Work Group.

## Schedule for Dissemination of Guidance

The schedule for dissemination of guidance should consider that the required and recommended practices in this report may require significant time to be fully implemented within some LAUs. The Work Group recommends the following:

- LAUs should review the required and recommended practices outlined in this report.
- LAUs should write a brief summary about how their practices will align with the required practices and include a plan to address any current gaps.
- LAUs should review recommended practices and adopt, if applicable.
- Local unit administrators should submit their summary to the Dean for review.
- Deans should review the summary(ies), assure that it/they comply with the required practices, and forward all materials to the Office of the Provost by the end of the spring 2023 semester.

In order to have better alignment between the FAE process and potential merit-based raises, the Work Group recommends that the FAE cycle be completed by the LAUs in the spring semester. Given that faculty and LAUs just completed a FAE cycle in fall 2022, the Work Group proposes that the next FAE cycle take place in the Spring of 2024, evaluating the period from the most recent FAE cycle through fall

of 2023. Moving forward, the FAE cycle would be based upon the contributions of the preceding calendar year to include summer, if applicable.

All LAUs are expected to review their applicable bylaws or standing rules on a regular basis to promote continuous improvement. LAUs are also expected to provide faculty with their bylaws or standing rules for faculty annual evaluation to ensure transparency. If the LAU does not have bylaws or standing rules, they should defer to their school/college bylaws or standing rules.

### Proposed Faculty Handbook Revisions

The Work Group's proposed Faculty Handbook changes ([Appendix 4: Proposed Faculty Handbook Revisions](#)) all concern section 2.6.1: Annual Review of Faculty. The changes that impact Faculty Handbook language include:

- Change in the timing of the FAE cycle to be completed in the spring semester.
- Inclusion of a required self-assessment for faculty as part of the FAE.
- Inclusion of no fewer than three categories of annual performance evaluation, keeping the rating of "unsatisfactory."
- An expansion to review all job components that are a part of a faculty member's assigned workload instead of just research and scholarly activities.
- New language explaining that FAE and RPT processes have distinct functions.

**Annual Evaluations and the RPT Process Have Distinct Functions:** Although the Renewal, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) and faculty annual evaluations focus on the same general criteria (teaching; research, scholarship, creative activity; and service), they have distinct functions. The primary function of the faculty annual evaluation process is to provide ongoing feedback to support continuous improvements in faculty performance as it relates to the University's mission. Faculty annual evaluations also inform merit-based raises.

The primary function of RPT evaluations is to assess whether a change in faculty status is appropriate. Such evaluations lead to a dichotomous judgment about whether a faculty member's employment contract should be extended in time for a specified term—or without term—and/or escalated to a higher academic rank.

Because faculty annual evaluations and RPT evaluations are distinct, it is important not to assume that faculty annual evaluation results will predict RPT outcomes at the level of an individual case.

## Appendix 1: Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group Charge

### Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group

#### Executive Sponsors:

Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Ph.D.  
Chair of the Faculty Senate

Mark R. Ginsberg, Ph.D.  
Provost and Executive Vice President

#### Charge:

The evaluation of faculty members at our university is an important annual process that assesses performance, and provides formative feedback and constructive recommendations for continuous performance improvement. These evaluations are also necessary for establishing a performance-based culture at Mason that will reward faculty for the work in which they engage and the achievements they attain.

In order to reach these objectives, it is critical that the evaluation of faculty be well conceived, contemporary, timely, transparent, and applied consistently and equitably across our university. Moreover, the annual faculty evaluation process should be aligned with each unit's workload and R, P & T guidelines.

The purpose of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group is to inventory and review current annual faculty evaluation guidelines, policies, and practices at Mason; identify national best practices for annual faculty evaluations; and develop a proposed plan for implementing consistent, reliable, valid, and transparent annual faculty evaluation processes at our university.

Consequently, the Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group is charged with the following:

1. Collect current annual faculty evaluation guidelines, policies, and practices from across the university and both catalog and summarize the range of existing approaches.
2. Identify best practices and exemplars for annual faculty evaluations.
3. Develop proposed guidance for faculty annual review policies and practices that include: (1) a summative evaluation that can be used in the process that informs performance-based faculty salary increases, (2) formative feedback that will support faculty in their professional development, and (3) the formulation of an annual faculty plan of work, including goals and specific measurable objectives.
4. Propose a process for disseminating the annual review guidance to all academic units, ensuring that all academic units develop annual review processes that align with both the updated guidance and future annual evaluation processes that are consistent with merit-based salary increase cycles.
5. Draft proposed *Faculty Handbook* language reflecting these proposed annual evaluation changes for the consideration of the Faculty Handbook Revisions Workgroup, the Faculty Senate, and university leadership.

It is anticipated that the work of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Work Group will take place during the fall 2022 semester with a report prepared for the Executive Sponsors by December 15, 2022.

Appendix 2: Example Summaries from George Mason

GMU Exemplar Name	Summary of Approach	Transparency Approach	Key points of interest	Formative Evaluation?	Publish Date
Antonin Scalia Law School	Involves expectations for reaching satisfactory level in three areas. There is also a robust mentoring approach that supports new faculty.	No explicit evaluation criteria for how a decision made is provided.	The Law school is the only example at Mason that has provided details of a mentoring program. The Law school assigns a senior faculty member to new tenure track faculty to assist on a wide range of topics.	Yes, devoted to tenure track faculty.	no date provided.
Carter School	<p>The Carter School does not have an explicitly quantitative process, but provides clear guidance on the criteria applicable for "Satisfactory", "Advanced" and "exemplary". Numerous examples are provided in each category. A detailed self-evaluation is initiated. The Dean's review follows this up with a written response.</p> <p>Dean Özerdem provided the following for background: "It has recently been re-designed, and this is the first time we have used it in its current format this academic year, but so far, the feedback from our faculty is overall quite positive."</p>	There are no explicit statements indicating how the evaluation process happens after the faculty member has provided a detailed self-evaluation. But the criteria for each of the three categories are laid out in detail for Research and Scholarship, and Service.	<p>Significant portion of the evaluation deals with self-reflection in the three key areas. These questions exist in each area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide supporting details for evaluation of teaching (or research, or service)</li> <li>2. Where would you rate yourself on this criterion?</li> <li>3. Explain the basis for your self-evaluation</li> <li>4. Where would you aspire to be on this criterion next year?</li> <li>5. What can the school do to help you achieve that?</li> </ol>	Not present in documents provided.	2022
Civil, Environmental, and Infrastructure Engineering	This department applies a quantitative approach in requesting an "Annual Activity Report" with detailed sections for teaching, student supervision, research and scholarship, and services and awards. Faculty are also supposed to provide a personal reflection statement that covers major accomplishments and objectives for the following year.	No explicit evaluation criteria for how a decision is made is provided.	Like many departments, the faculty have the option of providing a COVID 19 impact statement.	Not present in documents provided.	2022

College of Education and Human Development	CEHD gives clear guidance on the criteria for achieving high competence and genuine excellence in the three key areas. A CV and narrative are required.	There is detailed guidance on criteria for achieving high competence and genuine excellence in research and scholarship. There is no explicit evaluation criteria how a decision is made.	CEHD has a straightforward process which gives faculty a clear understanding of how to achieve high competence and genuine excellence in terms of meeting the clear requirements described.	Not present in documents provided.	2022
College of Engineering and Computing	Quantitative approach with an option to provide details on the impact of COVID on performance.	Example of satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance levels are provided. Details on what is involved in evaluation are provided.	5 performance ratings are applied but are then translated into faculty handbook approved satisfactory/unsatisfactory ratings.	Not present in documents provided.	2022
College of Public Health	<p>Changed their faculty evaluation process for 2021. This included an extensive feedback from faculty over a proposed new process. Previously, their process was "unwieldy to use" but included goal setting, a long list of activities and a very short reflective statement. The updated approach removes the list of activities to leave a highlighted CV, clarifies the categories of goals and provides a template for a more comprehensive reflective statement.</p> <p>The list of activities used to be the centerpiece of the evaluation process, but now the self-assessment and reflective statement is considered the most useful source of data.</p>	This largely qualitative process has enough details and documentation on how the process will be carried out, with multiple avenues for feedback prior to submittal to be seen as closer to a transparent evaluation process than most qualitative approaches.	<p>Public Health provides flexibility in the materials used for self-assessment and the reflective statement. This is in the context of their yearly goals process. Specifically, guidance states, "Materials selected should depend heavily on the previous year's goals and proposed goals for the upcoming year while taking into consideration departmental, school/college, and university goals and needs."</p> <p>Public Health has 5 categories including "Teaching/Mentoring", "Research/Scholarship", "Service", "Leadership/Administrative", "Practice/Clinical".</p> <p>Public Health also requires "Goal Reflection", "Performance Goals" and "Professional Development Goals". This focus on yearly performance goals enables CHHS' process to be termed "Performance-based." This looks similar to many businesses outside of academia in its focus on a yearly process.</p>	There are a number of feedback processes built into the annual evaluation processes. The self-reflection on yearly goals and the goal writing for the following year set them up for enabling formative feedback sessions during the year, but these are not explicitly cited.	April, 2022

College of Science	The College of Science provides an annual evaluation process with high level overview of the process, the timing and the procedures to be followed, such as requiring that faculty "MUST be afforded the opportunity to complete a self-evaluation AND discuss the performance evaluation with their supervisor."	No explicit evaluation criteria for how a decision is made is provided.	The College of Science uses a self-evaluation form that provides tables for courses taught, student advising, research, service, and other contracts and obligations.,	Not present in documents provided.	2019
College of Visual and Performing Arts	CVPA provides a template for a "listing of creative and scholarly activities" template that is connected to their faculty performance plan. This is combined with a CV, with a write-up of their activities in anti-racism and inclusive excellence, international/Global activity, a self-assessment and professional development trainings.	Does not provide details on how the evaluation will be conducted, nor the rating categories available, but does reference the Faculty Performance Plan as the basis of their responses. This isn't included in the documentation provided.	Explicitly lists anti-racism and inclusive excellence activities as part of their evaluation process.	Not present in documents provided.	May, 2022
Criminology, Law and Society	From James Willis who submitted the exemplar: "We moved away from a summative score, preferring to take a more qualitative and fine-grained approach. The PRC report goes to the Chair. They change as they see fit and then send to the faculty member (the evaluation is ultimately from the Chair). There is then a 1-on-1 to discuss the evaluation, address concerns, before submitting to CHSS."	No explicit evaluation criteria for how a decision is made is provided. This links up to Dept Chair Willis' position that they have moved to a fine-grained, qualitative approach.	Student Evaluations (along with other things like peer evaluations) are included as core evidence of teaching performance.  Effort in terms of time is calculated as "very high", "high", "medium low", and "none/rare".	Not present in documents provided.	1-Jun-22
Department of Biology	Recently modified their approach from COS to better fit faculty needs. Provides faculty with separate worksheets for categories for publications, student supervision, service, and advising, along with a self-evaluation template and a "tell me more" for additional information to consider.	No explicit evaluation criteria for how a decision is made is provided.	Recently changed approach from using 3 worksheets in 2019 to capture "Self-Evaluation", "Publications" and "Student Supervision", to a 6-worksheet approach that also captures "Service", "Advising" and a "Tell Me More" category.	Not present in documents provided.	2021

Dept of Communications	The Dept of Communications takes a quantitative approach in listing out detailed requirements with examples for "Meets expectations," "Above expectations" and "Significantly above expectations". Two documents provided.	Detailed quantitative approach. Answers add up to different ratings categories.	4 different areas are evaluated including the distinction between "Service" and "administrative service".  There is an explicit non-research set of requirements for "Instructional Faculty".  "Strong student evaluations" can be used as evidence of teaching capability.  Tenured faculty reviewed every 3 years for to whether assess research productivity is appropriate to teaching load.	Not present in documents provided.	Spring 22
Department of Physics and Astronomy	This department leverages and extends the College of Science self-evaluation form, along with a research metrics worksheet with different tabs for assistant, associate and full professors.	No explicit evaluation criteria for how a decision is made is provided.	The Department Chair applies the self-assessment form to create a written self-assessment narrative as the annual evaluation: "After the Faculty Self-Evaluation forms are collected, the Chair is responsible to write a Faculty Evaluation for each faculty based on their research, teaching, and services activities in the previous year. The traditional format for the PA Faculty Evaluation is in a narrative form with a summary evaluation ranking of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, and Unsatisfactory Performance"	Not present in documents provided.	2022



<p>Dept of Psychology</p>	<p>Very detailed quantitative process called Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS), which was originally developed by faculty back in the early 2000s. It was adjusted in 2007 and 2015. The Dept of Psychology is currently considering additional changes. From Chair Keith Renshaw, the potential changes center around:</p> <p>1. "The possibility of providing ranges of weights that faculty can assign to different areas, to allow them to focus more on certain domains (still within an acceptable range). For instance, rather than saying tenured Associate Professors are rated based on 35% teaching, 45% research, and 20% service, we might allow tenured Associate Professors to choose between 30% and 50% for teaching, 30% and 50% for research, and 15% to 25% for service. This is not a definite example or finalized – but an idea that has a lot of support so far within the department, so worth mentioning."</p> <p>2. We started toying with updating our criteria and getting more explicit (that's the final document). I'm not sure it's the right way to go – it might be getting TOO detailed and making things worse.</p>	<p>Very explicit quantitative approach for transparency.</p>	<p>This is a long-used process developed by Mason faculty over a decade ago which has been updated twice over time. The first update expanded the set of candidates for evaluation (initially it was targeted primarily for associate level professors).</p> <p>Part of the appearance of significant complexity is due to having different tables for each rank and teaching load. Each faculty member only has to look at their specific circumstance.</p> <p>Dept. Chair Renshaw is reviewing UMD's psychology approach for new ideas, in response to a concern BARS has become too detailed:  <a href="https://psyc.umd.edu/sites/psyc.umd.edu/files/Policy_Documents/Merit_Review_Policy_UMD_Psychology_2022.pdf">https://psyc.umd.edu/sites/psyc.umd.edu/files/Policy_Documents/Merit_Review_Policy_UMD_Psychology_2022.pdf</a>.</p>	<p>Not present in documents provided.</p>	<p>Aug-15</p>
---------------------------	---	--	--	---	---------------

Sociology and Anthropology (SOAN)	SOAN takes a quantitative approach in adding up scores in scholarship, teaching and service. From Dept Chair Daniel Temple: " Faculty scores in teaching, research, and service, are used to allocate a comprehensive yearly rating. The Chair is then responsible for evaluating the scores and ratings allocated to each faculty member and writing a report for each case which is submitted to CHSS. There is some flexibility built into the final scores as faculty are given the opportunity to report on important achievements that are part of ongoing research projects but may not be represented as a final product."	Point totals with specific examples are provided for all 3 categories. The Chair has final responsibility for assignment of points for each category.  Faculty members are provided the opportunity to question, discuss and appear their evaluations with the Faculty Matters Committee and Chair.	There are four categories used: "Exceptional merit", "High merit", "Satisfactory", and "Unsatisfactory".  Student evaluations are explicitly used as the basis for evaluating teaching.  SOAN is adamantly against annual performance plans. Their quantitative approach identifies the performance in the period.	Not present in documents provided.	2021
School of Business	A very detailed annual evaluation process that applies the Sedona application, along with an Impact Statement that shows specific benefits to a specific population. Detailed descriptions of each area of their "Contribution model" are provided.	Weights and guidelines are provided for each area and each level of performance.	The School of Business applies a "contributions" model with 5 broad categories: 1. Knowledge Creation and Dissemination (Research) 2. Student Development (Teaching) 3. External Outreach and Engagement (Service) 4. Institutional Engagement (Service) 5. Professional Engagement (Service).	Not present in documents provided.	2022
Schar School	Very short summary request that includes a categorization of activities and outputs, along with a CV and bio-sketch.	No explicit evaluation criteria for how a decision is made is provided.	Four ratings levels are used, with a phrase "as required by the Provost.": Superior/Exceeds expectations, Positive Contribution/Meets Standards, Room for Growth and Improvement, Unsatisfactory. Two of the four levels are below satisfactory.	Not present in documents provided.	2022

Appendix 3: Outside Example Summaries

Outside University	Summary of Approach	Transparency Approach	Key points of interest	Performance-based?	Formative Evaluation?	Publish Date
Cornell University	<p>Cornell has a "Mentoring, Performance and Evaluation" process that " is intended to provide guidance and support in regard to the context in which they work, peer and college expectations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and the ways in which they may have a successful and satisfying career in the department, the college and the university."</p> <p>Within 6 months of employment, a mentoring committee is organized for untenured faculty that can assist the faculty member in numerous ways, including preparing for promotion and tenure to grant writing guidance.</p>	This process only dealt with the mentoring and formative feedback process.	The yearly meeting of the mentoring committee provides input to the annual review process. "The unit chair/director meets annually with the untenured faculty member, after which they will write a formal evaluation letter of the professor's performance."	N/A	Yes	No date listed

James Madison University	<p>From John Burgess, Associate Vice Provost of Effectiveness and Evaluation - "JMU is working with the academic units to get their faculty evaluation and governance documents into alignment with the expectations presented in our Faculty Handbook. Part of this process is reevaluating the mechanisms we use for evaluation of teaching for faculty members. We're looking to move units to develop methods of evaluation that don't rely on student evaluations of teaching."</p> <p>This process was initiated by findings in a report from their task force on Racial Equity and Justice. The task force report highlighted JMU's need for more consistent practices that match the processes laid out in the Faculty Handbook. Roughly only 5% of their departments follow all the guidance laid out in the handbook. This prompted the concern of increased challenges both due to potential bias in a non-transparent process, and because faculty can successfully challenge a department not following established guidelines. The goal from John's perspective is that all academic units need to define their performance levels and how each level will be evaluated – what constitutes "excellent" over a "satisfactory" rating should be explicitly spelled out.</p>	<p>From the handbook, "Each academic unit must establish written procedures and criteria for initial, annual, promotion and tenure evaluations."</p> <p>All academic units need to define their performance levels and how each level will be evaluated – what constitutes "excellent" over a "satisfactory" rating should be explicitly spelled out. This approach can be considered transparent assuming it is followed.</p>	<p>In reviewing all faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure documentation from across the university, John is creating a "best practices super exemplar" document made entirely from JMU content for guidance to JMU faculty. This has a number of potential benefits:</p> <p>---John is creating an exemplar of a fictional academic unit with actual credited content from JMU. This provides an exemplar from JMU that departments can copy, which hopefully leads to similar processes in academic units from the same school, for instance.</p> <p>---The JMU exemplar gives explicit recognition to those academic units that developed the best approaches for evaluation. This hope is that this super exemplar from JMU content will help in generating faculty buy-in for a process many currently view with suspicion. John says it sends the message that JMU is valuing its most important resource (faculty) by leveraging their existing work for guidance.</p>	<p>John's current approach involves evaluating how well the current processes meet the handbook requirements. Performance-based is not included.</p>	<p>This process does not currently focus on formative evaluation</p>	2022
--------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	------

<p>Loyola University</p>	<p>Loyola University of Chicago is taking a more prescriptive approach at the University level on how LAUs evaluate the three key areas of research, teaching and service. They are looking in the percentages for the majority of the faculty, and require waivers to change the percentages. They are categorizing all faculty into three potential categories: Teaching Intensive, Research Active, or Research Intensive.</p> <p>A 5-point scale is instituted for each LAU as well, but the LAU is charged with developing guidelines regarding expectations for the 3 areas consistent with guidance from the University.</p>	<p>The LAUs are responsible for taking the top-level guidance to develop guidelines for each of the 5 levels. "Each academic unit will develop and adopt metrics or guidelines to (1) clarify what constitutes satisfactory performance on each dimension; and (2) provide indicators of better-than-satisfactory and worse-than-satisfactory performance. These guidelines must be communicated to the provost."</p>	<p>Three main areas causing confusion are workload percentages for the three areas, specific contributions and overarching narrative statements. They are providing additional guidance for the annual reviews for these three areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They have 3 categories of faculty - 1) Teaching Intensive, 2), Research Active (most Tenure line faculty), and Research Exceptional (Gets a course release for more research). This is set at the university level instead of the LAU. Course release and course buyouts (with research funds to hire assistance for the course) are the only ways to shift the percentages.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p> <p>"When a pool of funds is available for salary raises, deans consider the aggregate scores when determining how to allocate the raise pool, with higher raises typically being allocated to those with higher scores. When a pool of funds is not available for salary raises, the faculty member's score for the year will be averaged with the score for the next year in which a raise pool is available."</p>	<p>This process does not currently focus on formative evaluation</p>	<p>2014, with updated guidance in the form of a webinar and ppt presentation from 2022.</p>
--------------------------	---	---	--	--	--	---

<p>Texas A&amp;M University</p>	<p>"Texas A&amp;M rules mandate that all faculty, regardless of rank and title, be evaluated annually for their performance according to job descriptions with expectations that are set a priori. The rules specify that the annual evaluations must be provided in writing and that they encourage faculty and their department heads to discuss past achievements and shortcomings, as well as expectations for future performance. The purpose of the evaluation is multifaceted. Evaluations are the main source of information to determine merit-based salary raises."</p> <p>There is some mandatory guidance in creation of College faculty evaluation documents. There seems to be a detailed template that different schools follow in providing their faculty evaluation guidance. The College of Liberal Arts, the College of Geosciences and Department of Performance Studies go into similar details on what is required for each merit step, and provide detailed guidance on how the evaluation reports will be crafted. Both documents seem to have the same template numbering scheme for similar sections.</p>	<p>Texas A&amp;M takes a qualitative approach and has similar challenges to transparency that qualitative approaches encounter. Their use of a shared template with key areas such as "Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness" provide shared processes for communicating expectations for top performance.</p> <p>While there is detailed guidance how to craft evaluation reports, there is less guidance on the context, setting or training on how to deal with tough concerns. It still involves subjective decisions, such as where the guidance for the Department of Performance studies states, "Salary recommendations shall be based on the three criteria of research or creative work, teaching and service. Other considerations may include salary inequity, compression, and inversion."</p>	<p>For the Dept of Performance Studies "The Department Head shall conduct annually a review of each faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service."</p> <p>The Department of Performance Studies assess faculty annually for the purpose of determining eligibility for uses three separate reports in annual evaluations prepared by review subcommittees, one for each of the 3 main areas (Research or creative work, teaching and service). A Discussion and Recommendation Report is then drafted by the chair of the review subcommittee.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>"Evaluations are the main source of information to determine merit-based salary raises."</p>	<p>The annual review process's purpose is to provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty members performance. Formative feedback is not discussed in the documents I've reviewed so far.</p>	<p>2021</p>
---------------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	-------------

<p>University of Kentucky</p>	<p>This seems to be a long-standing faculty review process. The guidance is at a high level and it is not very directive toward academic units. The Provost is assigned the role to develop the performance review procedures, the Deans are responsible for the exercise of the procedures, and the colleges are the "focus points to which review procedures are delegated."</p> <p>Specific guidance includes the following:          "A written agreement is to be developed annually between the educational unit administrator and the faculty employee on the distribution of effort expected of the faculty employee in major activities during the succeeding year."</p> <p>The guidance does require that at least 3 evaluative groupings are to be used "whether letter, numerical or descriptive designations". There also needs to be an appeals process.</p>	<p>There is little to no transparency guidance in Kentucky's approach.</p>	<p>"...all full-time faculty employees across all title series shall undergo faculty performance evaluation, except tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers in those colleges that conduct biennial reviews of those faculty. "</p> <p>Faculty reviews include a "COVID Pandemic Impact Statement"</p> <p>Updated guidance in the form of a Memorandum but very old handbook language (2000).</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>This process does not currently focus on formative evaluation</p>	<p>Actual annual review policy is dated 2000          RPT Policy is from 2016          An updated Memorandum on faculty performance reviews is dated 2021</p>
<p>University of North Carolina</p>	<p>UNC's Center for Faculty Excellence's Faculty Annual Reviews Guide is dedicated to assist faculty development throughout their career trajectory. It spends significant time describing the context from both the faculty member and the reviewer's perspective. It lays out the different roles in the process in three stages (preparation, meeting and follow-up). It prioritizes the faculty self-assessment as one of the most useful data points for evaluation.</p>	<p>The details of the process are laid out in significant detail. In this sense, there should be no surprises at the top level in terms of how faculty are evaluated. The specifics of the LAU approach may impact this.</p>	<p>Development goals are listed for the Individual faculty, the department and the university.</p> <p>A top-level checklist is provided for Chairs for their annual preparation.</p> <p>Mason's College of Public Health has largely benchmarked this guide for their own revised guide to Faculty Annual Reviews.</p>	<p>Merit pay is not discussed as a part of the faculty annual reviews.</p>	<p>UNC is explicitly tying feedback into the annual review process. Nearly 20% of the guide is spent providing guidance on feedback. While it does not link to a yearly performance-management feedback process, it does provide significant guidance on envisioning "Feedback as fuel, not friction". Guidance includes sections on giving constructive feedback in a non-judgmental way, handling difficult situations, the listening process and seeking other perspectives in seeking feedback.</p>	<p>No date, but includes recent resources and references.</p>

<p>Virginia Tech</p>	<p>Virginia Tech uses a faculty activity report process to collect and manage information about faculty contributions including research and scholarship, creative works, teaching, extension, outreach, administrative and service activities. Each college or business unit is responsible for managing their own faculty performance management process. <a href="https://www.hr.vt.edu/performance-management/Evaluations.html">https://www.hr.vt.edu/performance-management/Evaluations.html</a></p> <p>Professor Madeline Schreiber from the Geology Department is working on a smaller project, focused on pre-tenure faculty review. Specifically, she is looking to identify best practices to share for feedback across campus. This includes a review of “things that currently seem to be working well.”</p> <p>VT is concerned with faculty consistency in conducting pre-tenure evaluations. Currently there is significant variability across campus. The context is also similar in that VT is very decentralized in their approach to operations.</p>	<p>VT provides some guidance to the setting for the evaluation and provides tips for evaluators and faculty. It does not dictate that the LAUs detail specifically how they will conduct the evaluations.</p>	<p>VT would like to have consistent language applied to written feedback. The rationale is it's easy to either sugar coat concerns for fear of leaving a negative impression, or the opposite, where the feedback is overly negative. This is especially problematic with “post-tenure reviews” which is often considered a negative event. Striking the right balance is extremely difficult, and likely could benefit from explicit guidance provided to faculty evaluators for more consistency and better outcomes.</p> <p>VT uses the following ratings in their performance management system: Model Performance, Strong Performance, Developing Performance, Unacceptable Performance.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Feedback is an important part of Professor Schreiber’s work but is explicitly associated with the tenure decision pre-tenure, and with full professor status post tenure. The formative feedback is required on yearly basis in many departments, both for pre-tenure and within 3-5 years in a path toward promotion to full professorship. A perception on campus is many faculty after receiving tenure and often “wallow directionless” with no clear path to get full professor status.</p>	<p>2022</p>
----------------------	--	---	---	-----------	---	-------------



## Appendix 4: Proposed Faculty Handbook Revisions

Current Faculty Handbook 2022	Proposed Revisions	Rationale
<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b> All faculty are evaluated annually in their local academic units (LAU). The evaluation is based upon the contributions of the preceding academic year and, where applicable, the following summer. Normally, evaluations are completed by the LAU during the Fall semester.</p>	<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b> All faculty are evaluated annually in their local academic units (LAUs). The evaluation is based upon the contributions of the preceding <u>calendar year, to include summer if applicable, academic year and, where applicable, the following summer.</u> Normally, evaluations are completed by the LAU during the <u>Spring, Fall</u> semester.</p>	<p><i>The charge of the Faculty Annual Evaluation (FAE) Work Group was, in part, to provide guidance that would facilitate better alignment between the annual review process and potential merit-based raises.</i></p>
<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b> The bylaws or standing rules of each local academic unit (LAU) will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The method by which faculty will be evaluated (e.g., by a faculty committee recommendation to the local unit administrator, or directly by the local unit administrator);</li> <li>• The requirements for the evaluation materials submitted by faculty; and</li> <li>• A statement of standards for overall “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” annual performance. Satisfactory performance means performance that meets the standards of the unit. Unsatisfactory performance means performance that fails to meet the standards of the unit.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b> The bylaws or standing rules of each local academic unit (LAU) will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <u>process and criteria method</u> by which faculty will be evaluated (e.g., by a faculty committee recommendation to the local unit administrator, or directly by the local unit administrator);</li> <li>• The requirements for the evaluation materials submitted by faculty <u>to include a self-assessment</u>; and</li> <li>• A statement of standards <u>or criteria that differentiates for at least three categories of annual performance developed in consultation with the LAU faculty. LAUs are expected to be able to distinguish annual performance that is “satisfactory” from annual performance that exceeds that standard. One of these levels must be “unsatisfactory.” overall “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” annual performance. Satisfactory performance means performance that meets the standards of the unit. Unsatisfactory performance means performance that fails to meet the standards as defined by of the unit.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>All LAUs are expected to review their applicable bylaws or standing rules on a regular basis to promote continuous improvement. LAUs are also expected to provide faculty with bylaws or standing rules for faculty annual evaluations to ensure transparency.</u></p>	<p><i>The FAE Work Group recommends that self-assessment be a mandatory component of materials submitted by faculty as part of their materials to be evaluated.</i></p> <p><i>The FAE Work Group recommends that the LAU should be able to recognize performance at all levels.</i></p>

<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b>  The criteria for the annual faculty review are the same as those listed <a href="#">Section 2.4</a>. Faculty are evaluated on the quality of their performance over the entire scope of their contributions during the year and in the context of their goals, assignments, and other responsibilities. Performance expectations should recognize differences in faculty assignments within the same LAU. The local unit administrator has a specific responsibility to review annually the research and scholarly activities of tenure-track faculty and to discuss both the strengths and weaknesses with them on an individual basis. The local unit administrator also has the specific responsibility to advise term faculty individually regarding their progress toward achieving reappointment or promotion.</p>	<p><b>2.6.1 Annual Review of Faculty</b>  The criteria for the annual faculty review are the same as those listed <a href="#">Section 2.4</a>. Faculty are evaluated on the quality of their performance over the entire scope of their contributions during the year and in the context of their goals, <u>assigned workload, assignments,</u> and other responsibilities. Performance expectations should recognize differences in faculty assignments within the same LAU. The local unit administrator has a specific responsibility to <u>ensure the annual review of annually all job components that are part of a faculty member's assigned workload during the evaluation period are included.</u> <del>the research and scholarly activities of tenure-track faculty and to discuss both the strengths and weaknesses with them on an individual basis.</del> The local unit administrator also has the specific responsibility to advise <del>term</del> <u>all</u> faculty individually regarding their progress toward achieving reappointment, <u>renewal, tenure,</u> or promotion.</p>	<p><i>The FAE Work Group recommends that annual reviews evaluate the full complement of work that faculty actually perform as part of their job.</i></p>
<p>New language proposed to be added to the bottom of 2.6.1</p>	<p><b><u>Annual Evaluations and the RPT Process Have Distinct Functions.</u></b></p> <p><u>Although the Renewal, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) and faculty annual evaluations focus on the same general criteria (teaching; research, scholarship, creative activity; and service), they have distinct functions. The primary function of the faculty annual evaluation process is to provide ongoing feedback to support continuous improvements in faculty performance as it relates to the University's mission. Faculty annual evaluations also inform merit-based raises.</u></p> <p><u>The primary function of RPT evaluations is to assess whether a change in faculty status is appropriate. Such evaluations lead to a dichotomous judgment about whether a faculty member's employment contract should be extended in time for a specified term—or without term—and/or escalated to a higher academic rank.</u></p> <p><u>Because faculty annual evaluations and RPT evaluations are distinct, it is important not to assume that faculty annual evaluation results will predict RPT outcomes at the level of an individual case.</u></p>	<p><i>Annual review and RPT are different processes. There is no guarantee that a positive annual review leads to tenure. There appears to be significant confusion over this point. This language addresses this concern.</i></p>