Section III. Faculty Performance, Development and Evaluation

This section of the Handbook covers professional expectations of COS faculty. Because different faculty positions have different expectations, not all sections below apply to all faculty. Faculty and administrators should use this section as a guide to faculty performance, development, and evaluation.

An outline of this section is:

- III.1, Performance Criteria: Lists general college-level guidelines used for evaluation in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service.
- III.2. Promotion (all faculty) and Tenure Timeline
- III.3, Promotion and Tenure (P&T) for Tenured and Tenure-Track (T/TT) Faculty: Includes important definitions, specific college-level expectations for promotions to Associate and full Professor, and the college P&T process. Departments have more detailed expectations; see Appendix XXX for these.
- III.4, Promotion for Fixed-Term Faculty: Lists college-level expectations and process for promotion of Professional, Research, and Clinical faculty. Departments may develop more detailed explanations.
- III.5, Faculty Annual Evaluation: Describes the college annual evaluation process, as well as minimal college-level criteria for annual evaluation. Again, departments may have more specific criteria.
- III.6, Pre-Tenure (Midterm) Review: Describes the process for the midterm review of tenure-track faculty.
- III.7, Post-Tenure Review: Describes the process and criteria for post-tenure review.

III.5 Faculty Annual Evaluation

College Faculty Annual Evaluation Process

Faculty shall be evaluated annually for performance. The result of the annual evaluation provides evidence for recommendations on merit salary increases, promotion, and tenure. All college and departmental policies and procedures shall be consistent with University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C0.06 (Performance Reviews of Full Time Faculty Members). The dean of the college is responsible for assuring that all eligible faculty members are evaluated. However, the evaluation process is the responsibility of the chair of the department with which the faculty member is associated.

The three areas of evaluation are teaching, research activity, and service/department citizenship and other duties as defined in University Handbook of Rules and Procedures 12.01.99.C0.03 “Responsibilities of Faculty Members”. Faculty members will be evaluated based upon their assigned job duties and overall contributions to a productive department working environment. Should there exist any instances in which the faculty member was cautioned by the chair for non-collegial or other negative behavior, was the subject of a formal grievance, or other reprimands, those records must be included and addressed in the chair’s annual evaluation.

Evaluations are based on the data provided in Interfolio (or other university database approved subsequent to this revision). Scores will be weighted based on the workload profiles and/or ranking systems developed by each department. Rating levels used in evaluating a faculty member (Procedure 2.01.99.C0.06) are as follows:

- Exceeds Expectations:
    - Exceeds performance expectations for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit.
- Meets Expectations:
    - Meets performance expectations for full-time faculty members of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit.
- Unsatisfactory:
    - Performance is below expectations for a full-time faculty member of comparable rank and workload in the department and/or academic unit.
    - The faculty member must improve performance in any area of teaching, research, and/or service that is scored unsatisfactory in the annual review, and a professional development plan will be created as descried in section 5 of Procedure 2.01.99.C0.06.

Faculty evaluation letters will include a rating for each area, as well as an overall rating for the review period. Each department in the college will share the department specific criteria for these ratings. In addition, the evaluation letters will explicitly discuss the faculty member's progress towards their next promotion and/or likelihood of a successful post-tenure review.

New full-time faculty will be asked to identify draft goals and objectives for the coming year (or portion of the academic year if assuming duties within the year). The chair and faculty member will mutually agree on goals and objectives. The final goals and objectives of new faculty members will be documented in Goals and Accomplishments section of Interfolio. Each continuing full-time faculty member will review the past year's goals and objectives, generate a self-evaluation of accomplishments and, in consultation with the chair, identify goals and objectives for the coming year. Faculty should complete annual updates of Interfolio by **February 15th**. An electronic or hard copy of current C.V., as reported from Interfolio, along with goals and accomplishments and any additional supporting document should be submitted to department chair prior to the evaluation meeting. Faculty evaluation meetings with the chair will be completed no later than April 1st. Results of the evaluation meeting will be recorded on annual evaluation forms (see templates in Appendix B).

The faculty member will be given a copy of his/her annual evaluation and will have five working days to reply to the evaluation in writing. The evaluation and response, if any, will be discussed and signed by the faculty member and chair and forwarded to the Office of the Science Dean for placement in the faculty member's personnel files in the Office of the Science Dean by **April 15th.**

When the faculty member requests, there shall be a meeting between the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean. Following such a meeting, the dean's written review and comments will be placed in the personnel file and a copy will be given to the faculty member. Unsatisfactory annual performance reviews may lead to termination of appointment of untenured faculty. Two Unsatisfactory annual reviews since the last post-tenure review or subsequent promotion will lead to a post-tenure review of tenured faculty.

All non-tenure track faculty members will be evaluated annually using the standard faculty review processes. The review will include an examination of all the requirements established in the original letter of appointment and all other requirements that may be added during annual reviews. Evaluations will be filed in the dean's office and will accompany any subsequent recommendations for re-hiring.

III.5.a *Guidelines for Annual Evaluation in Teaching*

Teaching is a professional activity that requires meeting deadlines, engaging with students in classes as assigned, and meeting other basic criteria. Departments are encouraged to elaborate on the following standards.

How to Meet expectations

Set of minimal requirements in three main categories listed below, which, if applicable but not met, could lead to a rating of Unsatisfactory in an annual evaluation or denial in promotion and/or tenure, regardless of performance in other requirements**.**

Preparation for effective teaching

- Provide a complete syllabus for each course that includes appropriate course objectives, student learning, outcomes, and assessment, and other required information to meet university and college requirements.
- Meet college, university, and state deadlines for items such as syllabi and textbook orders; utilize learning management systems
- Attend and hold scheduled class sessions except for extenuating circumstances, providing adequate notification to department chairs and students if that's not possible
- Maintain appropriate office hours
- Administer appropriate exams and other assignments

Performance of effective teaching

- Maintain currency in course content and methods.
- Provide timely and constructive feedback to students on exams and other assignments
- Provide timely estimates of midterm grades.
- Provide feedback via Starfish or other student notification system.

Outcomes of effective teaching

- Student evaluations and student success are not substantially and consistently below departmental means for similar courses.
- Perform effective assessment activities as required by the department, college, or university.

How to exceed expectations

There are two areas of teaching that must be demonstrated to exceed expectations:

- Student evaluations and student success are substantially and consistently **above** departmental means for similar courses
- A faculty member must provide evidence of substantial activity in the Other Requirements (listed below) according to departmental rubrics

A faculty member must exceed expectations in both to exceed expectations for teaching.

Other requirements
The categories listed below represent different aspects of effective teaching. Examples for each category are shown; departments are encouraged to elaborate on these categories.

Preparation for effective teaching: examples include complete DELA (formerly ODELT) "Best Practices in Online Instruction" course within the last three years; teaching at least one stacked undergraduate/graduate course; developing a new course or program; teaching three or more preparations in the calendar year; participate in specific and significant professional development activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness; generating curricular material for multi-section classes
Performance of effective teaching: examples include receiving at least one satisfactory peer evaluation for a course as assigned by the department chair within the last two years and meeting department/program-defined expectations for student learning in key courses for the major.
Significant course modifications: examples include developing and delivering a High Impact Practice (as described in a college or university document) new to the course; course revision based on assessment of student learning outcomes; significant modification of course format (e.g., converting a face-to-face course to either a hybrid or fully online course); teaching in a learning community, honors, or innovative course (as designated by the department chair and/or Dean).

Recognition of effective teaching: examples include developing and delivering a teaching-related conference presentation or workshop (if not counted as a research activity); being nominated by a committee for a college, university, or external agency award (e.g., A&M System, Case, Minnie Piper); receive within the last three years a university or an external agency award
Teaching activities outside the classroom: examples include supervising internships or DIS courses; mentoring the students; engaging in additional activities outside of normal class periods and office hours to ensure students master the subject matter (e.g., tutorials, labs, review sessions, case consultation, problem-solving session); Supervise Teaching Assistants/Supplementary Instructors without Service Reassignment; Participate in departmental activities focused on teaching - e.g., writing a common final exam for a multi-section, multi-instructor course

Determination of Overall Teaching Score
A faculty member not meeting the minimum requirements should receive a score of Unsatisfactory. A faculty member will Meet or Exceed expectations based upon their departmental scoring rubric.

III.5.b *Guidelines for Annual Evaluation in Research*

COS expectations for scholarship for the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor are detailed in section II.E.1.b of this handbook. Faculty members with research responsibilities are expected to:

- Maintain research activities as required by university and academic unit guidelines and in accordance with their appointment and discipline.
- Demonstrate sound and ethical oversight in the use of funds.
- Maintain awareness of and adhere to all university, system, and federal requirements related to ethics and compliance in Research.

Because expectations vary widely across the college, it is not possible to state a uniform definition for the minimal requirements for annual evaluation of Research. The research expectations are further elaborated at the department level in the respective departments' annual evaluations criteria. Those criteria should follow the standards below.

- Faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor should receive an annual rating of "Meets Expectations" in Research if they are making adequate progress towards meeting the standards for Research for tenure and promotion, as appropriate for their workload and departmental expectations. A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" should indicate they are clearly exceeding the standards for promotion to Associate Professor.
- Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor should receive an annual rating of "Meets Expectations" in Research if they continue to meet the standards for Research associated with promotion to Associate Professor, as appropriate for their workload and departmental expectations. A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" should indicate they are clearly exceeding the standards for promotion to Professor.
- Faculty at the rank of Professor should receive an annual rating of "Meets Expectations" in Research if they continue to meet the standards for Research associated with promotion to Professor. A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" should indicate they are clearly exceeding the standards for promotion to Professor.

III.5.c *Guidelines for Annual Evaluation in Service*

Faculty members with service responsibilities are expected to:

- Engage in service in alignment with their rank.
- Participate in commencement ceremonies in accordance with university procedure 12.99.99.C0.02, Faculty Attendance at University Commencement.
- Actively participate in service activities as required by university and academic unit guidelines, including but not limited to:
    - department, academic unit, and university committees,
    - department, academic unit, and university meetings,
    - assessment activities, department and academic unit recognition ceremonies.

Definitions of service for T/TT faculty may be found in section II.E.1.c, while expectations of service for promotion and tenure may be found in sections II.E.2.b and II.E.2.c. The service expectations are further elaborated at the department level in the respective departments' annual evaluations criteria.

In the standards noted below, three kinds of service are distinguished:

- Service to the department and degree program. Examples include but are not limited to participation in departmental committees, recruiting efforts, mentoring program-related student organizations, and program development.
- Service to the college and university. Examples include but are not limited to participation in college/university committees and college- or university-level student organizations.
- Service to the profession and community. Examples include but are not limited to service for professional organizations, reviewing for and editing journals, professionally related service in community or government-based organizations, and communication of Science to the general public.

Faculty who have an allocation for service should have the resulting expectations in writing from the department chair, and their annual evaluation should be based on their fulfillment of these expectations.

Departmental rubrics will be provided by the department chairs.

III.5.d *Evaluation of Part-Time, Adjunct and/or Temporary Fulltime Faculty and Teaching Assistants*

Adjuncts or other faculty with semester-long appointments are evaluated after each semester in which they work. Supervision of individuals who have been hired as part-time/adjunct faculty is the responsibility of the corresponding chair or his/her designee. The primary component of the evaluation of these part-time/adjunct faculty members is teaching. The chair shall seek various inputs to identify the quality of teaching by these individuals. The inputs should include (but are not limited to) student and peer evaluations, class visits, and other factors that measure teaching performance. Due to the short-term and non-permanent nature of the employment relationship, any problems that arise should be addressed with the part-time/adjunct faculty member as quickly as possible. Evaluation forms for adjunct faculty and teaching assistants are currently located on the I:/ drive.

Teaching assistants, part-time and temporary faculty with annual contracts are evaluated using the Annual Evaluation procedures above. Unsatisfactory evaluations may lead to dismissal or non-renewal of contract.