

PROCEDURES FOR THE ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

Purpose of the Annual Evaluation Process

To provide the faculty member with an opportunity to take the initiative in determining the direction of their performance. As part of the Faculty Annual Evaluation, the Department Chair will provide feedback related to performance in areas of research, teaching, and service as well as progress toward promotion and/or tenure (as appropriate).

Work Plan and Annual Evaluation

Step 1 Formulation of the Initial Work Plan

For department faculty, from early February to mid-March as a part of the Annual Review process, department chairs will discuss with the faculty members proposed Initial Work Plans. Department chairs may suggest revisions to the submitted Work Plans. If there is disagreement with the proposed revisions, the faculty member may submit a rejoinder that will be attached to the department chair's suggested revisions of the Work Plan.

By mid- to late March, department chairs will submit to the Dean all Initial Work Plans with any proposed rejoinders by the faculty. The Dean will review all submitted documentation and will approve Initial Work Plans by mid April. Any changes made by the Dean will be discussed with the department chair and the faculty member.

Any requests by faculty for differentiated loads must be submitted to department chairs. Department chairs will discuss the load request with the faculty member in accordance with the Workload Policy. Department chairs may also recommend a differentiated load to a faculty member. If the faculty member disagrees with the proposed differentiated load, the faculty member may submit a written response to the chair's recommendation. The request for differentiated loads will be submitted by the department chair to the Dean and will include the initial request, the department chair's recommendation, and, if applicable, the faculty member's response to the department chair's recommendation. The Dean will review all requests and will assign differentiated load based upon how the differentiated load will assist in meeting Department and School goals.

Step 2 Re-Evaluation of the Approved Work Plan (As Needed)

1. By December 1, a conference will be held if either the faculty member or department chair desires one for the purpose of re-evaluating the approved Work Plan. The department chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will schedule the time for the meeting.
2. Any changes in Approved Work Plans will be submitted to the Dean for approval by December 15.

Step 3 Final Activity Report and Annual Review

1. Faculty will develop a Final Activity Report and Initial Work Plan for the next academic year for submission to the department chair by mid January of each academic year.
2. The department chair will meet with the faculty member from early February to early March regarding the Annual Review and in preparation for formulating the Annual Evaluation.

Following the conference, the department chair will develop a narrative that addresses the extent to which the faculty member met work plan goals and objectives. ; the department chair's narrative will be framed in the context of the faculty member's overall contribution, including the achievement of department, school and university goals.

The narrative will be a concise overview of the faculty member's performance for a single year.

3. By mid March, the department chair will submit the Annual Evaluation to the faculty member for a signature of acknowledgement. The faculty member, if desired, may comment in writing on the department chair's assessment. Such comments must be filed within one week of receipt of the department chair's evaluation. The Annual Evaluation and any written response by the faculty member will be included in the faculty member's professional file.
4. The Approved Work Plan (for the current year), the Final Activity Report, the department chair's Annual Evaluation, and any written comments by the faculty member will be submitted to the Dean by April 15.

Step 4 Recommendations for Merit Salary Increases and/or Bonus Pay

Merit raises and/or bonus pay, when authorized by the University, is awarded based on annual evaluation ratings using a formula developed by the Finance office in accordance with university-level merit.

Policy for Revising Faculty Annual Criteria and Rubrics

Updating Faculty Annual Review rubrics and evaluation criteria necessarily impacts faculty status decisions and faculty welfare. When a revision of the Faculty Annual Review rubrics is needed, faculty shall have meaningful input on the revision process and outcome. This shall include faculty involvement in the revision preparation, discussion at Faculty Organization meetings, and an advisory vote of the faculty. In the event that the Dean implements a rubric that the advisory vote did not support, the Dean shall provide written justification for that decision to the School of Education Faculty. Rubrics should not be changed mid-year, and changes may only be implemented on or before January 1st for the next evaluation cycle. Mid-year changes can be made in exceptional circumstances, but only if those changes will not result in any faculty being evaluated less favorably.

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 09/20/2024

CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY

PURPOSE

The overall purpose of annual evaluation of faculty is to assess the performance and advance the growth and development of each faculty member and the mission of the department, school, and university. The ultimate goal is to build and sustain a culture of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. To that end, the annual faculty evaluation provides two opportunities: 1) faculty self-assessment on the accomplishment of approved work plan goals; and 2) evaluation of the faculty member's work in the context of meeting the missions of the department, school, and university as well as the appropriate academic discipline. Evaluation of faculty is grounded in each individual's work plan (see Workload Policy) and based on the Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service Rubrics that align with the individual's effort across each area. The following more specific purposes provide direction for the annual evaluation of faculty:

- To enhance faculty development by promoting self-assessment that:
 - ◆ Assists faculty in understanding the contribution of their work to the achievement of personal and department goals
 - ◆ Provides opportunity for the faculty member to evaluate work and place a value on the work accomplished
 - ◆ Gives an opportunity for the faculty member to communicate goals to be accomplished over time and to determine the fit of work accomplished with longer-term goals
- To provide evaluation and feedback to enhance faculty development that:
 - ◆ Acknowledges and supports faculty work and contributions
 - ◆ Offers constructive feedback
 - ◆ Informs the faculty member of progress in meeting promotion and/or tenure guidelines
 - ◆ Gives narrative feedback on work accomplished
 - ◆ Provides an opportunity to review faculty work over time and to provide feedback on the continuity of the faculty member's work and progression
 - ◆ Offers opportunity for mutual understanding of faculty member's work from the evaluator's perspective and from the faculty member's perspective
 - ◆ Targets resources to support faculty improvement and progress toward promotion and/or tenure

- To place the faculty member's contributions in the context of the mission of the department, school, university, and the individual's academic discipline
- To assess and evaluate the faculty member's activities and performance
 - ◆ Provides a rating of the faculty member's annual performance
 - ◆ Informs salary merit determinations
 - ◆ Gives information concerning progress for advancing in rank and/or for obtaining tenure
 - ◆ Informs, when appropriate, post-tenure review
 - ◆ Offers information to shape the formation of subsequent year goals and professional activities

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The general criteria established in each area of faculty responsibility are intended to guide the faculty member's annual activity and to clarify value placed on work products. The SOE criteria are grounded in standards of excellence that consider the difficulty of accomplishments, the quality and innovation of activities reported, and the scope and impact of those activities on the academic discipline, the department, and the school. The criteria in each area of responsibility are not intended to be an exclusive list of activities, nor are faculty expected to address every criteria. Instead, the criteria are intended to assist faculty members in defining effective ways to develop professionally, taking into consideration evolving interests, faculty rank, additional administrative responsibilities, and long-term goals. While the criteria below are intended to be illustrative, Department Chairs must use the approved and appropriately scaled rubrics for each category when engaging in evaluation.

CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

Four distinct categories as they contribute to teaching are presented: Delivery of Instruction; Advising; Program Development; and Externship, Thesis, and Dissertation Guidance. Each category may be assessed by considering preparation, implementation activities, and documentation. The descriptors under each heading are meant as exemplars.

General Principles: The following are valued highly.

- Instruction that reflects best practices
- Technology that is an integrated part of course delivery
- Instructors who are successful at meeting program and course objectives
- Advising that leads to the retention and graduation of students
- Involvement in student research activities
- Programs that are nationally accredited and state approved

Delivery of Instruction

- Course syllabi are current, systematic, and reflect best practices Expectations of students are clear, and appropriate assessments of student learning are utilized
- Text and reference materials provide both historical and contemporary perspectives where appropriate
- Technology is infused in course activities to enhance instruction
- Assignments enable students to apply new knowledge and skills and reflect on dispositions
- Course syllabi reflect curricular and program enhancements
- Narrative reflection indicates efforts to improve the quality of teaching and/or clinical supervision
- Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and other documents and/or artifacts reflect a high level of satisfaction with the instructor's preparation, instructional delivery, and attention to student concerns
- Clinical supervision reflects successful efforts to improve the clinical competencies of students and to foster quality working arrangements with partnering schools and/or agencies
- Graduate student teaching assistants are mentored to enhance teaching effectiveness

Advising

- Advising is accurate, timely, and reflects current department, school, and
- university policies
- Advising is professional and sensitive to the unique needs of all students
- Advising assists students in the timely completion and submission of required forms
- Advising is available and accessible through office hours, e-mail, and telephone

Program Development

- Significant contributions are made to curricular and program development
- Meaningful participation in accreditation activities is demonstrated

Externship, Thesis, Dissertation, and Capstone Guidance

- Externship, thesis, and/or doctoral committee participation is demonstrated and discussed in terms of one's role in the process
- Significant support is provided for student research initiatives

Documentation

As with all evaluative processes, the evaluator will look at teaching holistically. Primary consideration is given to the narrative, student evaluations, and other documentation. Examples of documentation may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Syllabi
- Student evaluations
- Course assignment explanations
- Teaching narrative or section of narrative addressing recent innovations
- Sample student work products
- Faculty - peer observation letters of comment

CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship includes activities and products that demonstrate the faculty member's contribution to an appropriate discipline, field of study, and/or practice. There are many appropriate types of scholarship, e.g., scholarship of discovery of new knowledge; applied and action empirical research (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method); practice-based and integrative, theoretical; grant proposal writing, and policy analysis.

General Principles: The following are valued highly.

- Products that undergo peer review, the fundamental premise of scholarly endeavor
- Products that create or extend knowledge for the disciplines
- Products that are related to the writing and research agenda of the faculty member
- Products that provide scholarship to inform practice
- Products that attempt to capture monies for external funding
- Products that reflect individual and/or collaborative work
- Funded research projects

Scholarly Activities: Works in Progress

- Conducting empirical research
- Conducting theoretical analyses
- Researching literature
- Writing documents, books, book chapters, journal articles, grant proposals

- Documents submitted for publication

Scholarly Products (products disseminated to peers)

- Professional and discipline articles in press
- Published professional and discipline articles
- Books
- Book reviews
- Book chapters
- Monographs
- Electronic papers
- Research Reports
- Funded or highly rated grant proposals (research, training, service)
- Professional presentations and conference proceedings
- Journal issue(s) resulting from editorship
- Papers, reports and other manuscripts

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING QUALITY AND QUANTITY

- Nature, rigor, and results of peer review
- Prestige of publisher
- Citation of work by others
- Location of dissemination of product (university, local community, state/regional, national/international)
- Contribution of the faculty member to the product
- Contribution to the profession and/or discipline
- Originality, degree of innovation, complexity, and overall scope and importance
- Time and effort needed for different scholarly activities and products

Documentation

The narrative portion of the Final Activity Report provides the faculty member with the opportunity to describe and clarify the quality and quantity of scholarly products. Examples of documentation may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Published scholarly products
- Grant proposals
- Professional presentations (e.g. papers, PowerPoint notes, galley proofs of poster presentations)
- Keynote lectures
- Scholarly products submitted for peer review
- Letters of acceptance from book editors
- Chapter reviews from book editors
- Journal issues from editorship

CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

Performing service is an essential responsibility that provides for sustaining, improving and continuing positive development in three distinct categories: 1) university, school, department and program area contributions; 2) professional discipline contributions; and 3) community contributions. Each faculty member must clearly delineate whether a specific activity is considered service or scholarship.

General Principles: The following are valued highly.

- Leadership provided at any level
- Service related to one's primary academic discipline
- Demonstrated depth of service contribution
- Faculty citizenship related to meeting department and school goals

University, School, Department, and Program Area

- Contributes

Examples:

- ◆ Advisor to student organization
- ◆ Provides requested reports
- ◆ Provides requested information for program area, department, school
- ◆ Active membership on committees

- Provides leadership

Examples:

- ◆ Committee chair

- ◆ Program area coordinator
- ◆ Presents university workshop
- ◆ Mentors new faculty
- Provides administrative duties
 - Examples:
 - ◆ Department chair
 - ◆ Grant administration
- Accreditation leadership

Professional Discipline

- Holds membership in professional organizations
- Holds committee membership in professional organizations
- Provides leadership to professional organizations
- Delivers service presentations and workshops to professional organizations
- Provides consultation to professional organizations

Community

- Contributes to community groups in areas related to the faculty member's discipline
 - Examples:
 - ◆ Presentation to relevant agency or organization
 - ◆ Membership on relevant community groups, councils, and agencies
 - ◆ Involvement with other related agencies or groups
 - ◆ Provides leadership to community groups and agencies
- Provides leadership
 - Examples:
 - ◆ Chairs local council or committee
 - ◆ Membership on community boards
 - ◆ Delivers invited or keynote presentation
- Provides paid or unpaid consultation

Documentation

The narrative portion of the Final Activity Report provides the faculty member with the opportunity to clarify and relate the depth of service contributions and their relevance to the department, school, university, community, and/or academic discipline. Examples of documentation may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Service presentations and reports
- Keynote lectures
- Workshop proceedings or handbooks
- Committee reports
- Program area products such as accreditation reports
- Documents delineating the extent and/or significance of service contributions

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional development generally refers to the continued growth and vitality of the individual faculty member through participation in programs and opportunities that assist in meeting the performance expectations of the university and that advance the faculty member's personal and professional goals. The ultimate goal is to assist faculty members in continued learning and engagement that is mutually beneficial to both the faculty member and the institution. The most common focus of faculty development is the improvement and expansion of instructional skills and the advancement of expertise in the discipline.

Professional development activities may include but are not limited to:

- Membership in professional organizations
- Attendance at professional conferences
- Attendance at workshops, seminars, conferences
- Attendance at workshops related to continued development of probationary faculty
- Participation in specialized training programs
- Enrollment in courses related to advancement of discipline-related knowledge
- Participation in faculty mentoring opportunities

Research leave