

## **DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE ANNUAL REVIEW OF GRADUATE STUDENT PERFORMANCE**

The Graduate School and OSU's Department of Human Resources require all programs to conduct an annual review of each graduate student's progress towards completion of their graduate degree and their work performance when supported as a GRA or GTA. Thus, the annual review now includes both elements, and this document outlines these processes for the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife.

The objectives of the review are to:

- Provide students and faculty with feedback on the student's progress towards a graduate degree;
- Provide students and faculty with an evaluation of the student's performance on assigned duties, such as their graduate teaching assistantship;
- Identify students who may need additional mentorship or academic assistance;
- Identify major professors or committee members who may need assistance with advising; and
- When appropriate, provide a framework for the student and their major professor to develop a specific plan of action to facilitate degree completion.

The annual review is designed to facilitate positive communication between the student, their academic committee, and their Graduate Assistantship supervisor (if different than their major professor) and to maintain a high-quality graduate education program within the Fisheries and Wildlife Department. *All students enrolled in a FW graduate program must complete a review, including first year students and those scheduled to defend.* For students supported on Graduate Research Assistantships, the review of work performance will be captured in the review of academic performance. Review of Graduate Teaching Assistantship performance will be captured in a process that is independent of the academic progress review. Students who are supported on fellowships, are paying their own tuition, or are not OSU employees are only required to complete the academic progress component of the review.

### **Timing of Review**

*Annual reviews are due by May 1<sup>st</sup> of each year and should cover the terms included in the prior calendar year (e.g., reviews completed in the Spring of 2018 should cover the Winter, Spring, Summer and Fall terms of 2017).* The Departmental Graduate Committee oversees the process and ensures that reviews are completed in a timely manner. Students should consult their major professor and graduate committee during their first year of enrollment to establish how the student's research and course work will meet the standards and expectations of the FW department.

## **Process for Conducting Academic the Progress Review**

### **Student Self-Evaluation Form and Written Narrative**

In March of each year, the FW graduate program coordinator will notify graduate students via email about the need to complete their review. Information about how to complete the review will be provided in this email and will be maintained in the FW Graduate Student Guide. ***Every graduate student in Fisheries and Wildlife will fill out the 'Graduate Student Annual Self-Evaluation' form and attach a written self-assessment that includes the information requested on this form.*** The student may want to meet with their major professor to discuss their expectations for various categories of progress or professional development prior to writing the self-assessment. The self-assessment for first year students is expected to be brief.

## OSU Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Graduate Student Annual Self-Evaluation Form

**Graduate Student:** This evaluation will serve as part of the annual review of your progress towards completion of degree requirements. You should respond to each part and send a copy to each of your committee members requesting their review and comments. You should hold a full committee meeting or meet with committee members one-on-one as part of this process. Compile the fully completed review, including your self-assessment, the signed form from your major professor and forms/feedback received from the committee members into a single PDF and send to [fw.annualevaluation@oregonstate.edu](mailto:fw.annualevaluation@oregonstate.edu).

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Term admitted:** \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., Fall 2018)

**Number of Quarters Enrolled:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Indicate the number of quarters that have elapsed since beginning your program, including the current quarter, but not counting any quarters on leave of absence)

**Degree Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ (MS, PSM, or Ph.D.)

**Major Professor:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Committee Members:**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Department</u>

**Completion of Milestones:**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Milestone</u>
_____	Assembly of Graduate Committee
_____	Program of Study Filed with Graduate School
_____	Research Review
_____	Course Work Completion (or percent currently complete)
_____	Preliminary Exams Completed (PhD only)
_____	Defense (or submission of final project for non-thesis students)

**Written Narrative:** On an attached sheet, provide a summary of the activities undertaken since beginning the program (if this is your first review) or since your most recent review. The total length should approximate one single-spaced page.

All students should include the following information in their self-assessments:

- Coursework taken and grades received,
- Coursework planned for the upcoming year, if any,
- A description of what you plan to emphasize in the coming year,
- Participation in professional development opportunities, and
- Any other relevant information, such as any impediments to progress in earning the degree

First-year self-assessments should detail

- Progress towards selecting a thesis or project topic and forming a committee,
- Documentation of having completed the program of study or plans for completing this requirement, and
- Date of having completed the Research Review or plans for completing this requirement

For students in the second year and beyond, the self-assessment should include information on

- Progress towards completing departmental and graduate school benchmarks, such as the Research Review and qualifying exams (PhD students only),
- Field work (if the thesis or project involves a field component),
- Data collection and analysis,
- Progress on writing the thesis or final project, and
- Expected timeline to completion of academic degree and if this differs from any timeline established during the Research Review.

You may also include information on service to the department, university or profession, honors and awards received. Service and honors are not required for a satisfactory evaluation, but will count favorably towards consideration for departmental scholarships and can contribute towards a satisfactory evaluation.

## Graduate Committee Review of the Student

*The student will send their self-assessment to their major advisor and committee for review and must then meet with the major advisor and committee members as a group or one-on-one to discuss and review the year's progress and to obtain the required signatures.* These meetings are for information exchange and discussion of future plans.

*Students must request written feedback on the student's progress, which should be included in the annual review from all members of the committee, and all members of the committee are expected to respond.* The department prefers that committee members provide this feedback following discussion with the student, which can be conducted remotely if necessary. The Department encourages major professors to communicate this expectation to all committee members, particularly those who are not employed by OSU.

Committee member feedback can be provided using the Review of Graduate Student Progress form, or by addressing the questions outlined on the form in an email to the student. If there are extenuating circumstances that prevent a committee member from participating in the annual review, the major advisor should determine the reason for the lack of the response and document recent interactions with that committee member with the overall goal being to determine if committee function is compromised. If a committee member does not respond to requests for feedback, the student should document the fact that he/she made a good faith effort to get feedback from that committee member in a timely fashion, including a copy of the original email and any reminders, with a date and time stamp.

It is critical that the student allow sufficient time for their major professor and committee members to participate in the review. Students should provide their self-assessment to their major professor and entire committee at least two weeks prior to the due date for the review (i.e., no later than mid-April). This is a bare minimum; ideally students should provide their materials to their committee by early April. If some committee members are not on campus during the term that the review is conducted, students should allow additional time to get their feedback.

## OSU Fisheries and Wildlife Review of Graduate Student Progress Form (Committee Members)

(A separate copy to be given to each member of the student's committee. A review by the GCR is not required)

**Committee Member:** Please review the student's attached Self-Evaluation, which summarizes the past year's activities. If the student has scheduled an annual committee meeting, complete this form at its conclusion. If the committee does not meet as a group, the department prefers that you complete the form following a one-on-one discussion with the student, which can be conducted remotely if necessary. An email response to these questions from your work account is an acceptable alternative to the physical form. Electronic signatures are also acceptable.

Student's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ (please print)

Committee Member's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ (please print)

Committee Member Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please address the following points below. Specific comments are encouraged.**

**Basis for this Evaluation:**

Attended Committee Meeting\_\_\_ Met Individually with Student\_\_\_ Reviewed Student's Self-Assessment\_\_\_

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Is the student making satisfactory progress in completing their course work?			
Is the student making satisfactory progress on data collection, analysis or writing for their thesis?			
Is the student making satisfactory progress on completion of Departmental and Graduate School requirements (e.g., Program of Study, Research Review, Qualifying Exams)?			

If your rating for any criterion is needs improvement or unsatisfactory, please specify what the student can do to improve. You may attach a separate page if necessary.

OPTIONAL: Do you have additional recommendations for professional development opportunities that will enhance the student's graduate training in the coming year?

OPTIONAL: What other recommendations or suggestions do you have for the student?

## **Student-Major Professor Interview and Annual Evaluation**

After the review is complete, the major professor will evaluate the student's self-assessment narrative and committee feedback and then complete and sign the Review of Graduate Student Progress form. If the major professor is off campus during the term that the review is conducted, an electronic signature on the form is acceptable as long as some type of meeting was held (e.g., Skype, Zoom). The major professor's comments should address any questions or concerns that committee members raised about the student's progress, and explain any concerns that the student or major professor may have with the participation of any of the committee members. If desired by either the student or the major professor, the major professor will write a detailed, one-page written evaluation of the student's performance.

Finally, the student signs the form and is responsible for submitting the self-assessment, the signed and completed Review of Graduate Student Progress forms, and any other materials that are part of the review (e.g., committee member emails) to [fw.annualevaluation@oregonstate.edu](mailto:fw.annualevaluation@oregonstate.edu) for inclusion in the student's record by May 1<sup>st</sup> of each year.

Annual reviews remain in the student's file until seven years have elapsed after graduation.

## OSU Fisheries and Wildlife Review of Graduate Student Progress and Performance (Major Professor)

**Major Professor:** This form evaluates the student's progress towards program completion and their performance as a GRA. Please complete this form at the conclusion of the annual committee meeting (if the student has scheduled one), or following a one-on-one discussion with the student, after the other committee members have provided their feedback. An email response to these questions from your work account is an acceptable alternative to the physical form.

**Student's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ (please print)

**Student's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Major Professor's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ (please print)

**Major Professor's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer the following questions below. Specific comments are encouraged, and required in the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation.

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Is the student making satisfactory progress in completing their course work?			
Is the student making satisfactory progress on data collection, analysis or writing for their thesis?			
Is the student making satisfactory progress on completion of Departmental and Graduate School requirements (e.g., Program of Study, Research Review, Qualifying Exams)?			
If your student served as a GRA, are you satisfied with the student's performance in that capacity? Note: Students funded on fellowships such as NSF-GRFP do not need to be evaluated as GRAs.			

If your rating for any criterion is "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory", please specify what the student can do to improve. You may attach a separate page if necessary.

OPTIONAL: Do you have additional recommendations for professional development opportunities that will enhance the student's graduate training in the coming year?

OPTIONAL: What other recommendations or suggestions do you have for the student?

**Number of Committee Members (not including GCR)** \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of Committee Members Participating in this Review** \_\_\_\_\_

OPTIONAL: Do you have any concerns about how this review was conducted? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_

**Overall Evaluation:**

Satisfactory\_\_\_ Needs Improvement\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory\_\_\_

In cases where the major professor believes the student has performed below expectations or that the student's goals and plans for the coming year are inadequate or are not consistent with the professor's expectations, the major professor will work with the student to develop a written Graduate Education Performance Plan for improving the student's performance.

The plan will become part of the student's file and will contain tangible mileposts or benchmarks for improvement. The plan will also be reviewed and signed by the Department Head and filed in the student's permanent record. The major professor and student will review and monitor progress of this plan on a quarterly basis, and report progress to the Department Head. Concerns about whether or not the plan is being met should be brought to the Department Head by either party. In cases where the Department Head is the student's major professor, they should report progress and concerns to an associate dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences.

Graduate Education Performance Plans remain in a student's file until seven years have passed after graduation.

## **Student's Evaluation of Major Professor and Graduate Committee (Optional)**

*If the student wishes to provide a written evaluation (positive or negative) of their major professor or committee members, or if the student would like to provide a rebuttal to the annual review, the student can submit a confidential or non-confidential letter to the Department Head.*

The student may request to meet with the Department Head to discuss the review and evaluation of his or her progress (both positive and negative) by their major professor or committee members. This allows students an opportunity to provide input to the Department Head concerning any problems, which may compromise successful completion of the degree, or an opportunity to recognize special efforts of a major professor or committee member(s). The Department Head will keep this meeting strictly confidential if requested by the student.

Non-confidential evaluations can be read by the major professor upon request, confidential evaluations cannot. Students should note that according to University policy, the contents of a confidential letter cannot be used in a formal evaluation of the professor's performance. Confidential evaluations must explicitly state that they are confidential.

## OSU Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Graduate Education Performance Plan

This form is intended to monitor a student's performance towards degree completion or job performance **resulting from an unsatisfactory evaluation** at an annual review. This form should outline mutually agreed-upon (between the student and major professor) benchmarks of performance.

**Student's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ (print)

**Major Professor's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ (print)

**Plan:** *(Identify deficiencies and outline a plan to remedy them)*

**Benchmarks:** *(List criteria that will be used to evaluate progress)*

### Signatures:

Student \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Major Professor \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Definition of Satisfactory Academic Progress

Satisfactory progress toward completing a graduate degree in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife requires:

- Maintaining a GPA of 3.00 or better across all courses taken as a graduate student.
- Annual submission of a written self-assessment report.
- Annual assessment by the student's major professor and committee that the student's progress, as outlined in the self-assessment, is satisfactory,
- Passing relevant exams outlined by the Graduate School and the Department, and
- Complying in a timely fashion\* with all Graduate School and Departmental requirements for committee formation, completion of a program of study, development of a project proposal, conduction of a research review\*\*, completion of qualifying exams (for Ph.D. candidates), submission of forms and information, participation in seminars, and other activities expected of a student, scholar, and university citizen.

*\* Students who are working towards their degree part time may negotiate a longer time frame to complete benchmarks, such as the Departmental Research Review and qualifying exams, in consultation with the program director and their major professor. Part-time students must still complete the annual review process on the same schedule as full-time students. The self-assessment portion of a student's annual review should articulate the negotiated time frame.*

*\*\* Professional Science Masters students complete a final project report and do not require a research review. All other degree-seeking students in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife are required to complete a thesis and a research review.*

### Suggested Timeline\* for Thesis-based Masters students

<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>By end of:</b>
Assembly of thesis committee	First or second quarter of enrollment
<i>Program of study filed with graduate school</i>	<i>Second quarter (before completion of 18 credits)**</i>
Identification of thesis topic	Second or third quarter
Completion of thesis proposal	Second or third quarter
Completion of Research Review	Second or third quarter
Completion of coursework	Approximately sixth quarter; Dependent on project
Submission of thesis to committee	Eighth to tenth quarter; Dependent on project
Thesis defense	Eighth to tenth quarter; Dependent on project

### Suggested Timeline\* for Professional Science Masters students

<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>By end of:</b>
Assembly of thesis committee	First or second quarter of enrollment
<i>Program of study filed with graduate school</i>	<i>Second quarter (before completion of 18 credits)**</i>
Identification of project topic	Third quarter
Completion of coursework	Approximately sixth quarter
Submission of final project	Eighth quarter

### Suggested Timeline\* for Doctoral Students

<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>By end of:</b>
Assembly of thesis committee	Ideally year one, and absolutely by the end of the fifth quarter**
<i>Program of study filed with graduate school</i>	<i>Ideally year one, and absolutely by the end of the fifth quarter**</i>
Identification of thesis topic	Ideally year one, acceptably year two
Completion of thesis proposal	Ideally year one, acceptably year two
Completion of research review	Ideally year one, acceptably year two
Completion of coursework	During year three or four; Dependent on project
Completion of comprehensive exams	Upon completion of course work; year two or three; as negotiated with your graduate committee
Submission of thesis to committee and defense	Three to six years; Dependent on project

\* Based on assumption of full time attendance. Part-time students may negotiate extended deadlines with the program director and major professor.

\*\* Denotes graduate school deadlines. The graduate school now enforces the deadline for the program of study or Ph.D. candidates with a registration hold

## **Annual Review of Work Performance**

This is a two-step process, with the first step targeted at identifying conflicts, challenges, or disagreements towards which we can direct attention and resources to assure student success and successful delivery of the FW curriculum.

Step one in the process involves soliciting feedback from a student's supervisor about student work performance. For the purposes of this element of the annual review, a supervisor is either the student's major advisor or the faculty or instructor who supervises the course being taught by the student. In some cases, students will have a single supervisor during a year, in others they will have several.

In all cases, the initial data collection process will be short and intended to identify if follow up discussions or additional information are needed.

### **Supervisor's assessment of GTA/GRA:**

The annual review of work performance includes two separate processes, an annual review of student performance as a GRA and a quarterly review of a student as a GTA.

#### Annual Assessment of GRA performance

Major advisors will provide a broad assessment of GRAs at the same time they are providing feedback on "Academic Progress." In most instances, GRAs are being paid to work on their research, so carrying out both evaluations at the same time makes sense. However, it is possible that assessments for both do not match. For example, a student could be making adequate progress on their research while not meeting deadlines for academic progress (e.g., submitting the Program of Study). Specifically, major advisors of GRAs will be asked:

"If your student served as a GRA, are you satisfied with the student's performance in that capacity?"

This question is included on the Review of Graduate Student Performance form for major professors (see above). You will be given the option to provide comments in support of your answer to this question, if you select "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" you will be required to provide some explanation for your answer before you can complete the survey.

#### Quarterly Assessment of GTA performance

Unlike the review of GRA performance, reviews of GTAs will occur at the completion of each quarter to guarantee that student and faculty input are based on recent memory. At the end of each term, both Graduate Students and Course Supervisors will receive an email that requests they complete a short, online survey. Supervisors will receive an email for each section of each course that you supervise each term. Questions that course supervisors will answer are:

1. What is your assessment of the student's performance as a GTA during the previous term? satisfactory, needs improvement, unsatisfactory

2. Did you meet or do you plan to meet with your GTA at the end of the term to discuss Student Evaluation of Teaching data? yes or no
3. I met or corresponded with the GTA during this term. weekly, irregularly, not at all

Students and their GTA supervisors are encouraged to meet at the end of each term to discuss these questions, but that is not a requirement for completing the survey.

### **Graduate Student self-assessment:**

#### Self-assessment of performance as a GRA

The graduate student self-assessment for the GRA element of the annual work performance review is the narrative that the student creates and shares with their major advisor and committee members. Major professors will consider that narrative when they answer the GRA assessment question on their form.

#### Self-assessment of performance as a GTA

Students will not generate a narrative about their performance as a GTA, rather they will complete a short survey at the end of each term, answering the following questions:

1. What is your assessment of your performance as a GTA this term? satisfactory, needs improvement, unsatisfactory
2. Were you satisfied with the feedback, guidance, and mentoring you received from your course supervisor?" extremely satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, extremely dissatisfied
3. How often did you meet or correspond with your course supervisor during the term? weekly, irregularly, not at all
4. Did you meet with your course supervisor at the end of the term to discuss Student Evaluation of Teaching data?" Yes or no
5. Have you taken FW 502 (yes or no) or complete other training related to teaching (yes or no)?"
6. Are you aware of the FW Teaching Resources site in Canvas (yes or no); if yes, did you make use of this site this term (yes or no).

**Student Evaluation of Teaching Data:** GTAs and course supervisors are expected to review Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) data. Everyone acknowledges that such data are variable for many reasons, but they can be instructive, and as such data are used in evaluation of tenure track faculty and instructors they will also be considered during annual reviews of GTAs. As with faculty and instructors, there are no specific criteria applied when making an evaluation of SET scores. Rather SET scores will be used in conjunction with the other data during the overall annual assessment. Both GTA and course supervisor should consider SET scores when

answering their respective surveys. GTAs will be asked to enter their scores for questions 1 and 2 of the SET survey into the Qualtrix survey. The Associate Department Head will also review SET data quarterly and consider scores when reviewing quarterly feedback on performance by GTAs and their supervisors.

## **Work Performance Review Outcomes**

The complete review of work performance for the previous year will include the combination of GRA/GTA evaluations submitted for a student during that year, which could vary from 1 to 4 depending on the nature of a student's position as a GRA or GTA throughout the year. The Associate Department Head will review survey results at the end of each term and will collate and review these data during the annual review process each spring. If all forms of input from student, faculty, and course supervisor indicate agreement and a generally satisfactory assessment for the year, the review is complete.

If either the student, major professor, or course supervisor's answers to the short survey suggest disagreement or an unsatisfactory assessment, there will be a second step in the review process. The form of that step can vary depending on the nature of input provided. For example, one "needs improvement" among the four terms of combined GRA and GTA evaluations submitted by supervisors would not be treated the same as consistent "unsatisfactory" ratings. Similarly, the reason for an unsatisfactory rating might influence step two. In all cases, the follow up process would start with a conversation between the supervisor, student, and Department Head or their designee (e.g., Associate Department Head). The intent of the follow up conversation is not to be punitive; rather it is intended to gather additional information about the issue that was identified during the first step of the process. ***Importantly, no student will become ineligible for renewed or new GTA or GRA support from the Department based on a single review period.***

If after additional conversations, the major professor or course supervisor believes the student has performed below expectations, the major professor (in conjunction with the Associate Department Head if GTA performance is involved) will work with the student to develop a Work Performance Plan that would outline a clear process for helping student performance and making it clear what constitutes "satisfactory" performance (see form above). The plan will become part of the student's file and will contain tangible mileposts or benchmarks for improvement. The plan will also be reviewed and signed by the Department Head and filed in the student's permanent record. The major professor and student will review and monitor progress of this plan on a quarterly basis, and report progress to the Department Head. Concerns about whether or not the plan is being met should be brought to the Department Head by either party. In cases where the Department Head is the student's major professor, they should report progress and concerns to an associate dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences.

***At any time during the annual review process, students are welcome to ask for a meeting with the Department Head to discuss either the process, the outcome of the initial review, or the direction of any follow up conversations in step two of the process. If the student wishes to provide a rebuttal to the annual work performance review, the student can submit a***

***confidential or non-confidential letter to the Department Head.*** This allows students an opportunity to provide input to the Department Head concerning any problems or an opportunity to recognize special efforts of a major professor or course supervisor. The Department Head will keep this meeting strictly confidential if requested by the student.

Non-confidential evaluations can be read by the major professor upon request, confidential evaluations cannot. Students should note that according to University policy, the contents of a confidential letter cannot be used in a formal evaluation of the professor's performance. Confidential evaluations must explicitly state that they are confidential.

All annual performance reviews (and Work Performance Plans, if necessary) will remain in the student's file until seven years have elapsed after graduation.

### **Ramifications of the Review Process**

- A completed annual review for the most recent review period must be on file for students to be eligible for reappointment as a graduate assistant (GRA or GTA). ***Importantly, eligibility is not necessarily contingent on a satisfactory evaluation.***
- Only students who have completed annual reviews (satisfactory or unsatisfactory) are eligible for departmental scholarships and/or nomination for graduate fellowships. ***Students in their first year who have not yet been required to complete an annual review can still be considered for these types of support.***
- Instances of continuous unsatisfactory reviews and failures to achieve milestones outlined in Performance Plans created following the first unsatisfactory review can lead to a student becoming ineligible for additional GRA or GTA support or dismissal from the program. .

### **Accountability and Oversight**

The members of the Departmental Graduate Committee ensure accountability and oversee the annual review of Academic Progress. Their specific responsibilities include:

- (1) Documenting the timing and completion of Annual Reviews;
- (2) Recording dates of Research Reviews;
- (3) Sending reminders to students whose reviews are past due;
- (4) Reviewing and discussing documents produced during each student's review;
- (5) Identifying any red flags or potential problems/issues and notifying the Department Head; and
- (6) Archiving documents in each student's departmental file.

The Departmental Graduate Committee shall report annually to the Department Head all issues concerning graduate students' program completion, including any unsatisfactory performance evaluations and faculty competence issues.

Every two years the Departmental Graduate Committee will review the Graduate Student Assessment process outlined above to determine whether it is meeting its intended goals. Faculty and graduate student feedback on this process is welcome.

The Associate Department Head is responsible for oversight of Graduate Teaching Assistantships and, therefore, of the annual review process for GTAs.

The Department Head is responsible for review of any unsatisfactory progress reports, and for providing unbiased facilitation of discussions between major professors and their students, as needed. The Department Head should be available to both students and faculty for any needs or advice related to the annual review process.