Faculty Development, Workplan, and Evaluation

Each faculty member meets annually with her/his appropriate Program Director, Department Chair or Dean to identify long-term goals and a workplan for the next academic year, and an evaluation of the previous academic year. The plan encompasses teaching, research/scholarship, service, administration, and any other responsibilities identified by the faculty member and appropriate Program Director, Department Chair or Dean. The plan may be updated, as necessary, throughout the year. The evaluation includes a self-evaluation by the faculty member and the evaluation by the appropriate Program Director, Department Chair or Dean; it is signed by both parties and maintained in the program files and human resources. This workplan evaluation is the basis for merit salary increases. (See Faculty Development, Workplan and Evaluation Form)

Faculty Performance Evaluation

This document summarizes the standard procedures that were developed by the Academic Council to be used by all Programs to evaluate faculty members.

Timeline

March 8  Performance evaluation forms and instructions distributed to all academic programs

Each school Dean is responsible for developing an internal timetable and communicating it to their respective faculty to assure that adequate time is allowed for the faculty evaluation process.

May 18  Deans submit completed performance evaluations to Heather Easter in the Office of the Provost.

May 25  Academic Program performance evaluations forwarded by Office of the Provost to Human Resources.

Process:

The “Faculty Development, Work Plan and Evaluation” (FDWPE) shall be used as the primary basis for conducting the performance review. In most cases, performance review involves the first three categories on the FDWPE (teaching, research/scholarship, and service); smaller number of faculty members may also be evaluated for additional responsibilities in administration, the fourth category on the FDWPE.

The process assumes that the FDWPE is already in place for every faculty member that is eligible for performance review. Adjustments to the standard process due to special
circumstances may be made if adequately justified. However, the common endpoint must
be the submission of a completed Faculty Development, Workplan, and Evaluation Form
for each eligible faculty member.

The FDWPE already includes “Faculty Self-Assessment” for each category, so
supervisors should instruct faculty to use the process described here in carrying out their
self-assessments.

Please refer to the Faculty Scholarship Statement as evaluations are prepared.

Performance Rating System:
Each category on the FDWPE for which a faculty member has some responsibility is
given a Performance Score. Each of the Performance Scores is then weighted according
to the percentage of total effort that is assigned to that area of responsibility. The simple
sum of the Weighted Performance Scores is the Overall Performance Score (see attached
Faculty Development, Workplan, and Evaluation Form).

The scoring system is based on an equal interval 5 point scale, where 5 represents
“extraordinary performance” and 1 is “below expectations”. Below are the qualitative
definitions for the five scale factors in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and
service. A comparable set of qualitative terms has been added to this system for the
administration category. Scores may be given in 0.5 increments. All Performance Scores
must be accompanied by explanatory comment.

Please review enclosed documents carefully, as you prepare your materials:

- Qualitative Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
- General Guidelines for Assigning Workload Credit
- Faculty Development, Workplan, and Evaluation Form
Qualitative Definition for Use in Faculty Evaluation

This rubric assumes a “best fit” approach and the exercise of one’s professional judgment. Given these choices, and realizing that not every phrase may necessarily apply in every case, ask: “Which of the five qualitative levels best describes this candidate’s work in each category?”. Points can be given in 0.5 increments.

Most importantly, these definitions are built around the assumption that a score of 3 is considered the expected level of excellent performance, and defines a faculty member who fulfills all job responsibilities well, and is an excellent professional. This is the standard we expect of all faculty. In the self-assessment, faculty must provide clear documentation and rationale to justify any score above 3.0.

**Teaching (Teaching Effectiveness)**

1. **Below Expectations:** Problematic classroom or other teaching performance; unreliable advising and frequent unavailability; indifference toward or unreasonable resistance to meeting teaching standards.
2. **Meets Minimal Expectations:** Fulfills all teaching responsibilities; meets minimal qualitative expectations in the classroom. Little or no curricular development; minimal efforts at improvement; one or more problematic elements in teaching.
3. **Expected Excellence:** Fulfills all teaching responsibilities well. Evidence of overall excellence in teaching, advising, and student mentoring.
4. **Above Expectations:** Fulfills all teaching responsibilities very well. Demonstrable overall excellence in teaching, advising, and student mentoring; mentoring faculty; unique contributions to curriculum or program development; unique contributions to the effectiveness or efficiency of teaching and student evaluation.
5. **Extraordinary:** Exhibits extraordinary leadership in curriculum and program development, mentoring students and faculty.

**Research/Scholarship (Research, Scholarly Activity)**

1. **Below Expectations:** No scholarly or creative activity or activity of a quality below expectations given rank and position.
2. **Meets Minimal Expectations:** Scholarship or research productivity not commensurate with rank and position.
3. **Expected Excellence:** Scholarly activity and productivity commensurate with rank and position; evidence of future plans with high likelihood of successful completion.
4. **Above Expectations:** Substantial scholarly achievement relative to rank and position; completion of important research/scholarly projects in accordance with long term plans.
5. **Extraordinary:** Significant and rigorous scholarship in prestigious venues. Major research or scholarly achievements relative to rank and position.
Service (to the Program, Institute and Profession)

1. **Below Expectations:** Little or no meaningfully or useful activity in serving the program, School, or Institute in important ways; behavior of a professionally unacceptable kind or harmful effect.
2. **Meets Minimal Expectations:** A minimal level of useful activity, relative to rank and seniority, in serving the program, Institute or profession.
3. **Expected Excellence:** Consistently useful and effective service appropriate to rank and seniority, in serving the Institute, program and profession at the regional or national level.
4. **Above Expectations:** Initiative and leadership with consistently excellent results on important projects, appropriate to rank and position, at regional and national level.
5. **Extraordinary:** Recognition for exceptional service to the Institute or profession at national or international level.

Administration

1. **Below Expectations:** Failure to carry out assigned administrative tasks.
2. **Meets Minimal Expectations:** A minimal level of attention or inconsistency in assigned administrative tasks.
3. **Expected Excellence:** Performance of all assigned administrative tasks in an excellent and highly effective manner.
4. **Above Expectations:** Significant administrative accomplishments that enhance administrative function of the unit.
5. **Extraordinary:** Outstanding administrative accomplishments that go well beyond what is expected in performing the assigned tasks; taking initiative and a leadership role resulting in outstanding outcomes of benefit to the program and Institute.

**Weighting System and Overall Performance Score:** For each category on the FDWPE that is rated (teaching, research/scholarship, service, administration), the Performance Score is multiplied by the decimal equivalent of the percentage of total effort to produce the Weighted Performance Score. Then the Weighted Performance Scores are summed to produce the Overall Performance Score. The Performance Scores and the Overall Performance Score should be rounded to one decimal place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance Score</th>
<th>Weighting (% total effort)</th>
<th>Weighted Performance Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5 (50%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2 (20%)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.3 (30%)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 = Overall Performance Score
General Guidelines for Assigning Workload Credit

The following guidelines have been developed for assigning faculty workload credit (WLC). These guidelines provide a common framework for all programs where reasonable, but may not be equivalent across programs because of different curriculum configurations and accreditation requirements. Therefore, these guidelines are flexible and may be adapted for individual department or programs. Each department or program will establish internally consistent guidelines.

- Teaching workload accounts for 50% of a 1.0 FTE workload, which is equal to 18-21 workload credits. This percentage of teaching workload may vary depending on other responsibilities of faculty. The expected workload is prorated for faculty who have less than 1.0 FTE, or for those who have portions of their FTE allotted to research or administration.

- Service and scholarship account for the remaining workload, with some faculty also having administrative FTEs assigned. The workload associated with scholarship should generally be 20% and service 30%, but these can be adapted to individual responsibilities.

- Workload credit will generally equal course credit, with the assumption of 1 course credit = 1 workload credit; WLC for lab hours shall be determined by programs based on programmatic and accreditation requirements/guidelines.

- Workload for a course will be increased by 1 credit to account for first time teaching a course, and for extra large classes (>50 students). The increased WLC for a large class will account for increased time for student advising and evaluation, and adapting the course to meet students learning needs. If a co-instructor or teaching assistant is provided to help cover increased student responsibilities, the extra WLC may not be assigned to the faculty member but may be assigned to the teaching assistant. For online courses, enrollment above 30 students shall warrant the assignment of a co-instructor or teaching assistant.

- Extra service pay shall be provided when assigned workload exceeds FTE expectations. Extra service does not qualify as merit, and this is subject to approval by the Provost’s Office. In general, when faculty take on extra teaching assignments it may be that their other responsibilities are reduced. This is the preferred practice, as opposed to paying extra. Extra service pay should be viewed as an extraordinary, rather than routine, decision.

- Workload credit may be increased by 0.5 credit coordinating a course, with appropriate justification of that individual's increased responsibilities for a course.

- Contact hours may be factored into the teaching workload when the credit assignment does not adequately reflect the number of hours spent in class.

- Thesis will be given one workload credit for the primary reader per student for the entire thesis experience. Workload credit for other committee members may be negotiated with the Program Director or Department Chair based on expected responsibilities on the project.
Clinical practice or consulting positions outside the framework of a faculty workload or scholarship are not counted towards the faculty FTE. Faculty may engage in outside activities up to the equivalent of one day per week or 20% of appointment (applies only to full-time faculty provided to COI or COC). However, they are still responsible for full teaching, scholarship and service relative to their faculty FTE.

Many faculty provide guest lectures in courses taught by other faculty. These are not counted in the faculty workload, but are instead considered part of their service to the Institute. The workload associated with guest lecturing should be considered in determining the faculty member’s scope of responsibilities.

Faculty are expected to participate in program, Institute and professional service activities. The extent of service responsibilities shall be negotiated with the Program Director or Department Chair each year. Faculty may be given workload credit for administrative responsibilities that are related to program or Institute goals.

Faculty who have administrative responsibilities, such as associate directors or clinical coordinators, shall be assigned a portion of their FTE toward their administrative role. The remaining FTE will be assigned to teaching and/or research. The faculty member’s expected teaching workload shall be prorated to their teaching FTE. The workload associated with service and scholarship will also be developed proportionately.
Faculty Development, Workplan and Evaluation Form

Name: 
Rank: 
Program: 
FTE: 
Assessment for Academic Year: 11-12 
Goals for AY: 12-13

LONG TERM GOALS/FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2012-2013)  
(please include goals and expected timeline for promotion, if appropriate)

1. Teaching (classroom and/or clinical)  
   _____% of total effort

RESPONSIBILITIES & GOALS FOR AY 11-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Teaching Responsibilities for AY 11-12</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>WLC</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOALS & EXPECTED OUTCOMES/Deliverables for AY11-12:

1. 
2. 
3.  
(please include plans for working towards promotion, if appropriate)

Extraordinary □ Above Expectations □ Expected Excellence □ 
Meets Minimal Expectations □ Below Expectations □

FACULTY SELF-ASSESSMENT:

SUPERVISOR ASSESSMENT:
Performance Rating for Teaching ______

RESPONSIBILITIES & GOALS FOR AY 12-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Teaching Responsibilities for AY 12-13</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>WLC</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOALS & PROJECTED OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES for AY 12-13
1. 
2. 
3. *(please include plans for working towards promotion, if appropriate)*

Strategies and Resources Needed to Achieve Goals:

2. Research/Scholarship ______% of total effort

GOALS & EXPECTED OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES FOR AY 11-12
1. 
2. 
3. 

Extraordinary ☐ Above Expectations ☐ Expected Excellence ☐ 
Meets Minimal Expectations ☐ Below Expectations ☐

FACULTY SELF-ASSESSMENT:

SUPERVISOR ASSESSMENT:

Performance Rating for Research/Scholarship ______
GOALS & PROJECTED OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES FOR AY 12-13

1.
2.
3.

(please include plans for working towards promotion, if appropriate)

Strategies and Resources Needed to Achieve Goals:

3. Service (to Program/Department/School, Institute, Profession and Community) _____ % of total effort

GOALS & EXPECTED OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES FOR AY 11-12

1.
2.
3.

Extraordinary □ Above Expectations □ Expected Excellence □
Meets Minimal Expectations □ Below Expectations □

FACULTY SELF-ASSESSMENT:

SUPERVISOR ASSESSMENT:

Performance Rating for Service: _____

GOALS & PROJECTED OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES FOR AY 12-13

1.
2.
3.

(please include plans for working towards promotion, if appropriate)

Strategies and Resources Needed to Achieve Goals:
4. Administration

GOALS & EXPECTED OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES FOR AY 11-12

1. 
2. 
3. 

Extraordinary □ Above Expectations □ Expected Excellence □
Meets Minimal Expectations □ Below Expectations □

FACULTY SELF-ASSESSMENT:

SUPERVISOR ASSESSMENT:

Performance Rating for Administration: _____

GOALS & PROJECTED OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES FOR AY 12-13

1. 
2. 
3. 

(please include plans for working towards promotion, if appropriate)

Strategies and Resources Needed to Achieve Goals:

FACULTY MEMBER’S SUMMARY SELF-EVALUATION:

SUPERVISOR SELF-EVALUATION: (Chair, Dean, Director please be sure to comment on the individual’s progress toward next appointment and also progress toward promotion, if appropriate).
1. Teaching

Performance Score: ______  Weight (% total effort):______  Weighted Performance Score:______

Comments: 

2. Research and Scholarship

Performance Score: _____  Weight (% total effort):______  Weighted Performance Score:______

Comments: 

3. Service

Performance Score: ______  Weight (% total effort):______  Weighted Performance Score:______

Comments: 

4. Administration

Performance Score: ______  Weight (% total effort):______  Weighted Performance Score:______

Comments: 

OVERALL PERFORMANCE SCORE:_____

Faculty Member: _______________________      Date: _______
Dean: _______________________________   Date: _______

Provost: ______________________________   Date: _______

☐ Current CV submitted electronically to appropriate Program Manager

Date:_____

☐ Please list new degrees and credentials below