

College of Arts and Humanities Annual Faculty Evaluation Policies

A. Purpose

The University *Handbook of Operating Procedures* (Section 6.2.2) specifies that each year all full-time faculty employed during the preceding year should undergo an annual evaluation of their performance in Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement (Research/ Scholarship/performance/exhibition), and Professional Service. Specific procedures and criteria for this annual evaluation are to be determined in each College.

It is the purpose of this College policy to provide procedures for such annual evaluation in the College of Arts and Humanities.

Although the results of annual evaluations may provide useful information in decisions regarding tenure and promotion, separate and independent procedures and requirements exist for promotions review as well as annual, final, and post-tenure reviews. (Note: Tenure-track faculty should especially remember that evaluations and guidance toward tenure are made available through the tenure review process and not through the below procedures.)

B. Objectives

1. To provide all full-time faculty with an objective and fair appraisal of their job performance.
2. To provide all full-time faculty with information on their job performance which can be used as a basis for future professional growth and achievement.
3. To provide a basis for possible merit salary increases for faculty on continuing appointment and to determining merit-based factors for re-employment of faculty not on continuing employment.

C. Department Guidelines

1. All departments in the College of Arts and Humanities will develop department guidelines for the specific purpose of evaluating faculty job performance in the Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement and Professional Service.
2. All departmental guidelines must have been approved by the Dean and by a College Annual Evaluation Committee, composed of representatives from departments in the College of Arts and Humanities.
3. Department guidelines must meet the following requirements:
 - a. Each department will develop evaluation criteria which must be approved by the Department Chair and the majority of voting faculty (as defined in the *College Governance Policy*, Section E,2). Evaluation criteria may allow for differences in faculty ranks and assigned job responsibilities;

criteria may also include itemized numerical rating equivalencies.

- b. The evaluation process must include an elected Department Evaluation Committee for peer review at the department level. The Department Evaluation Committee will also include the Department Chair and will select its own Chair.
- c. Each department must have procedures for maintaining records of the evaluation results.
- d. Each department will use a four (4) point scale based on five (5) categories to rank performance within each category of Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement, and Professional Service. The scale will be based on the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Value</u>
Outstanding	3.26-4.00
Very Good	2.76-3.25
Good	2.26-2.75
Poor	1.76-2.25
Unsatisfactory	1.00-1.75

- e. The percentage emphasis allowed for each of the three performance areas will be determined by weighting performance according to faculty assignments using the guidelines and suggested percentage weightings below. Under special circumstances, a faculty member could meet with her/his department chair (or Dean, in the case of department chairs) to determine an alternative scale subject to the departmental evaluation committee's approval.

Baseline

The “baseline” for all full-time faculty should be: Teaching (T): 40%; Professional Achievement (PA): 20% Service (S) 20%, and the remainder or reserve (R) 20%. These weights should be applied to all faculty members with a workload equivalent of 24 semester credit hours (4/4) of teaching (including equivalencies for special courses established in the *HOP* section 6.5.7 D). The Reserve percentage points should be applied to whichever category has the highest ranking for the individual in question.

Overloads

In cases of Departmental need, faculty may be assigned a five-course load. For faculty teaching a 4/5 or 5/4 load, 5% is shifted from Professional Achievement and Service to the Teaching category for a T 50%, PA 15%, S 15%, R 20% distribution (which would allow up to 65% weight in teaching).

Faculty on Research Intensive Load or on 25% release time.

In the case of Faculty on 25% release time, the “reserve” 20% is automatically added to the relevant category.

Faculty on the adopted 18 semester credit hours (3/3) of teaching load to encourage research would have the following percentages: T 35%, PA 45%, S 20%.

A lecturer on release for service (as an undergraduate advisor, for example) would have the following percentages: T 40%, PA 20%, S 40%.

Faculty on 50% Release Time

In cases where faculty are on 50% release where the release comes from a single category (i.e. Teaching, Professional Achievement, or Service), the weights of the other two categories are reduced 10% and the relevant category is increased by that 20%, plus the “reserve” 20% must also be assigned to that category. For example, a department chair on 50% release would have the following weights: T 25%, PA 15%, S 60%.

When faculty are on 50% release where the workload adjustment comes in two different categories (for example, Research and Service), the third category is reduced by 10% and that 10% and the “reserve” points are divided equally between the two relevant areas. For example, a tenured/tenure-track faculty member who is receiving release time for research and to serve as the departmental graduate advisor would have the following weights: T 25%, PA 40%, S 35%.

Faculty on 75% Release Time

Faculty who are on a 75% workload adjustment where the release comes in a single area (usually service) have a 15% in the other two areas of review, and the relevant area is increased by 50% (the 30% deducted from the other two categories and the 20% “reserve”). For example, a department chair on a 75% workload adjustment would have the following weights: T 20%, PA 10%, S 70%.

Faculty who are on a 75% workload adjustment where the release comes from two areas have the third area reduced by 20%, and those points and the “reserve” 20% are divided between the two areas, with the area where there is a 50% workload adjustment receiving an extra 25% and the area where there is a 25% workload adjustment receiving 15%. For example, a department chair on a 50% workload adjustment who is also receiving a 25% workload adjustment for research would have the following weights: T 15%, PA: 40%, S 45%.

Faculty on 100% Release Time

In cases where faculty are on 100% release time where the workload adjustment comes from a single category, they receive 80% of their merit weight in the relevant area and 10% each in the other two areas.

If faculty are on 100% release time where the workload adjustment comes from 50% release in two areas, the third category is reduced to 10% and those points and the reserve points are divided between the two relevant categories. For example, a faculty member on 50% release for research and 50% release for service would have the following weights: T 10%, PA 47.5%, S 42.5%.

In cases where faculty are on 100% release with workload adjustments in all three areas, they revert to the “base” formula (T 35%, PA 25%, S 20%, R 20%), with the “reserve” 20% automatically assigned to the area where there is a 50% workload adjustment.

- f. Each department will develop guidelines for the merit evaluation of Non-Tenure Track faculty that reflects the scope of their work.
- g. Teaching: Teaching performance will be evaluated by multiple means that are both quantitative and qualitative. Department Chairs, in consultation with their faculty, will develop a teaching assessment process for their department/college.

Non-Tenure Track faculty should be evaluated by at least 50% of all courses by students and by classroom observations of teaching by appropriate departmental procedures each year.

- h. Research: Departments shall establish the definitions of major intellectual activity/publication/accomplishments based on national standards for their discipline(s) and submit those definitions, with a rationale, to the Dean for approval. All tenure/Tenure Track faculty shall maintain an active research or creative activities agenda that is reviewed at the departmental level on an annual basis. Publications or other creative works may be counted either in the year of their acceptance or when they were published, but no publication may be counted more than once.
 - i. Service to the University and Profession: The number of service commitments will not be the sole criteria for ranking a faculty member’s performance in this category. The quality, as well as the quantity, of the faculty member’s contribution will be considered. Faculty should provide an assessment of their committee performance with their review materials. Documented service to the community that is based on a faculty member’s expertise should be considered for its effectiveness and level of contribution.
4. All part-time faculty will be evaluated only by Department Chairs or their designees.

5. Faculty on leave-of-absence are eligible for annual evaluation consideration; faculty who were on leave-of-absence during the year under review area are also eligible for annual evaluation according to the same guidelines as other faculty.
6. Other full-time faculty not employed the previous year will not be evaluated.

D. Department Evaluation Procedures

1. To be eligible for merit, faculty must file an annual report and a current, dated, curriculum vitae. The report should follow the format provided by the Office of the Dean and should include activities for the previous twelve month period defined as September 1 to August 31. The faculty member will submit the relevant information and documentation for merit reviews on November 1, and the Department Chairs will be available to meet with any faculty member who requests a discussion regarding the results of their reviews by March 1 of each year.
2. Only faculty who earn an overall average of Good, Very Good, or Outstanding will be awarded Merit. There are no restrictions on the number of faculty who may be ranked at Good or above.
3. Department Evaluation Committees will review the submitted annual evaluation folders and will deliver to each faculty member his or her performance evaluation, using the format provided by the Office of the Dean, on or before the working day following the date established by the Dean for the conclusion of departmental deliberations.
4. Faculty who are not in agreement with their departmental evaluation should appeal, in writing, and within five (5) working days after having received the departmental evaluation, for a reconsideration from their Departmental Evaluation Committee. The Department Evaluation Committee must finalize a recommendation and deliver it to the appellant within ten (10) working days of receipt of the appeal. If the appeal is denied, the committee must provide the appellant with a written rationale for the denial.
5. Each Department Evaluation Committee will provide the Office of the Dean with a copy of the Department Annual Evaluation Recommendations for eligible faculty and with a list of faculty evaluated to have had outstanding performance records and are being recommended for additional merit consideration at the College level. No department may recommend more than twenty-five percent (25%) of its faculty for additional merit consideration at the College level. Departments may also recommend fewer than the allowed maximum. There are no limitations on the number of years the same individual may be recommended. In departments where applying the twenty-five percent (25%) formula results in a figure which includes a fraction, the maximum number of eligible faculty in that department will be rounded up to the next highest whole number.

E. College Evaluation Procedures

1. Each year the Dean shall provide the College Evaluation Committee with a listing of the Merit Awards given at both the department and College levels for faculty in each department for the previous two academic years.
2. It shall be a function of the College Evaluation Committee, comprised of the Chairs from all Department Evaluation Committees, to review appeals of faculty who are dissatisfied with their departmental appeal results.
 - a. Faculty who have appealed for a reconsideration from their Department Evaluation Committee and who are not in agreement with the results of this appeal should request, in writing and within five (5) working days of receipt of the results of the departmental appeal, that the College Evaluation Committee review their job performance evaluation and make a final decision whether to sustain or deny the appeal. A copy of the departmental appeal recommendation must accompany the request.
 - b. It shall be the right of the appellant, or his/her chosen faculty representative, to appear before the College Evaluation Committee to represent the appeal.
 - c. When the College Evaluation Committee sustains the appeal, thereby reversing the Department Committee's recommendation, or denies the appeal, the Chair of the College Evaluation Committee must provide to the appellant and to the Department Evaluation Committee in writing the results of and rationale for that decision within ten (10) working days.
3. It shall be a second function of the College Evaluation Committee to review the annual evaluation folders of those faculty deemed by their departments to have had outstanding performance in the year of review and, therefore, who have been recommended from departments for additional merit consideration beyond the department level.
 - a. The College Evaluation Committee will evaluate comparatively and competitively the comprehensive performances of the recommended candidates.
 - b. The College Evaluation Committee will award College merit points, in units no smaller than half-point increments, to those faculty evaluated as having had relatively outstanding performance years. No individual candidate may receive more than five (5) such College merit points, no more than a total of thirty (30) College merit points may be awarded to all of the candidates in aggregate.
 - c. Faculty serving on the College Evaluation Committee who have also been recommended for additional merit consideration at the College level must recuse themselves from deliberations concerning their own possible

recommendations for merit considerations beyond the department level.

- d. In accordance with the calendar provided by the Dean, the College Evaluation Committee shall provide each faculty recommended for additional merit consideration with the results of its deliberation and provide such information to the Office of the Dean.
 - e. Faculty who are dissatisfied with their ratings from the College Evaluation Committee may appeal to the Dean in writing within five (5) working days after having received the committee's recommendation. The Dean is the final level of appeal within the College.
4. The College Evaluation Committee must keep a record of all decisions. The Chair of the committee should deliver a copy of this record to the Dean within fifteen (15) working days of the conclusion of deliberations.

F. Responsibilities of the Dean

1. Faculty who have exhausted the appeal process at the department and College Committee levels and who are still dissatisfied with the results of their department review may appeal to the Dean for an additional review. The Dean is the last level of appeal within the College.
2. The Office of the Dean, in cooperation with the Chair of the College Evaluation Committee, will be responsible for informing those faculty recommended for College-level review, in writing, of the recommendation of the College Evaluation Committee.
3. The Office of the Dean will keep and maintain all records pertaining to the College evaluation policy approval procedures. Those procedures require that the College evaluation policy receive a formal approval by the Dean, The Vice President of Academic Affairs, The College Council, and a simple majority vote of Arts and Humanities voting faculty.
4. The Office of the Dean will be responsible for ensuring the initiation of the evaluation process in accordance with the calendar produced by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
5. Should merit monies become available, the Office of the Dean will be responsible for calculating the value of each merit point in each department and the value of each merit point awarded by the College Evaluation Committee in accordance with section G below.

G. Merit Distribution

In any year when the College is allocated money for merit distribution, the merit salary increases for faculty who participated in the annual merit evaluation process will be determined in the following manner:

1. The Dean will set aside five percent (5%) of the total amount of money allocated to the College. This set aside money will be used for distribution of merit awards at the College level.
2. The remaining funds – ninety-five percent (95%) – will be used for merit awards at the department level.
3. The Dean will calculate the amount of money available to each department for merit awards at the department level by prorating the funds available for departmental distribution to each department according to its FTE percentage of merit-eligible faculty within the College.
4. The Dean will then calculate the amounts which merit units are worth in each department in accordance with the following formula: Fifty percent (50%) of the funds allocated to a department will be used to determine the dollar amount of the first merit unit awarded to each faculty member who scores at least the minimum necessary under the category of “Good”; the monetary value of each merit unit above the minimum one will be determined by dividing the remaining number of units awarded in each department into the remaining 50% of funds allocated to that department.
5. The Dean will determine the amount which each College-level merit point is worth by dividing the total number of College-level merit points awarded into the money set aside for such distribution (five percent of the total funds available).
6. The Dean will be responsible for informing each faculty member who receives a merit award of the dollar amount of his or her departmental merit award; the Dean will also be responsible for informing those faculty who receive an additional award at the College level of the monetary value of that award; this information will be provided through the appropriate department Chairs.

H. Policy Review

This policy shall be reviewed by the College Council one year after its implementation and every three years after the initial review.

Revised: May 8, 2006

Approved by COAS Faculty: