

DALTON STATE COLLEGE

FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

MANUAL OF PROCEDURE

**Revised
Fall Semester
2008**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Section I: The Faculty Evaluation Process

1.1 Description

1.1.1. Rationale

1.1.2. Governance

1.1.3. Timetable

1.1.4. Special Cases

1.1.4.1 Exclusion of a current year for reason of unforeseen hardship

1.1.4.2 Probationary credit toward tenure

1.2 Tenure and Promotion

1.2.1 Tenure

1.2.2 Promotion

Section II: Procedures

2.1 Workload Components

2.1.1 Weighting of Components

2.1.2 Evaluation of Components

2.1.2.1 Teaching

2.1.2.2 Service

2.1.2.3 Professional Development

2.1.2.4 Release Time

- 2.1.3 School Committees for Faculty Evaluation Standards
- 2.2 Rating of Faculty Performance
- 2.3 Evaluation of Temporary and Part-time Faculty
 - 2.3.1 Full-time Temporary Faculty
 - 2.3.2 Part-time Faculty
- 2.4 Appeals
- 2.5 Compilation of Information for the Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Appendices

Appendix 1: Faculty Evaluation Process Flow Chart

Appendix 2: Forms

- 2.1: Annual Evaluation: Preliminary Statement of Goals
 - 2.1.1: Sample Preliminary Statement of Goals
- 2.2: Faculty Annual Evaluation: Sample Assessment of Goals
- 2.3: Chair's Summary
- 2.4: Campus-Wide Student Evaluation
- 2.5: Faculty Evaluation Process Appeal
- 2.6: Review of Faculty Evaluation Appeal
- 2.7: School Annual Report: Numerical Summary Faculty Data

INTRODUCTION

In the Spring semester of 2002, the faculty of Dalton State College adopted a new model for the annual evaluation of individual faculty performance and the use of such evaluations in making recommendations for awarding tenure and promotion. This action resulted from an undertaking begun at the Fall Faculty Retreat in 2000, when the faculty expressed its desire for more clarity and consistency than was apparent in the existing process, while at the same time attaining more flexible accommodation of faculty members' diverse circumstances. For the next two years the Faculty Evaluation Process Committee worked on developing the new faculty evaluation process.

To prepare the new process for implementation at the beginning of the calendar year 2003, the Division Chairs met several times in the Fall 2002 semester to determine procedures necessary for making it operational. Many of these required more specific details than were contained in the proposal adopted by the faculty, and the Chairs, with the assistance of the President of the College and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, spent well over twenty hours in meetings devoted solely to this task. Every effort was made to preserve and strengthen the "cooperative spirit" of the original proposal, and at the end of their discussions the Chairs met with members of the committee that had designed the proposal and asked for their suggestions. All agreed that a manual or handbook fully describing the new evaluation process and its operation should be made available at an early date to all members of the faculty and administration. This document results from that concern. Drawing on both the original proposal and on the minutes of the subsequent meetings of the Division Chairs, it integrates these two sources of information about the process (from which all quotations are taken) to provide a single point of reference.

In the Spring Semester of 2005, the faculty evaluation process was revised in an attempt to improve it and return the evaluation schedule to the academic year calendar. Recommendations for revision of the process were reviewed and modified with input from the Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Chairs, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President of the College.

I. THE FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

1.1 Description

The Faculty Annual Evaluation Process at Dalton State College is collaborative and goal-centered. Calling for "a cooperative spirit, whereby each faculty member in consultation with his or her department chair or dean sets individual goals which will result in continuous improvement toward accomplishing the mission of the College," the design has a four-point rationale.

1.1.1 Rationale

- a) It allows faculty members the flexibility to conduct their annual evaluation based on their own goals, within the established evaluation structure, such that a newly hired first-year faculty member could have completely different objectives than a 25-year veteran.

b) It is streamlined such that there is no need for excessive narrative, yet it is also not completely quantitative so it is not unduly complicated by weights/percentages, and the performance of each faculty member is not represented by an assigned numerical score.

c) It utilizes the newly created Faculty Evaluation Committee in conjunction with the Department Chair or Dean of the School to create an evaluation process with checks and balances.

d) It includes a direct link between yearly annual evaluation and progress toward tenure, as well as promotion. In this way, not only will faculty members be aware of their yearly progress toward tenure and promotion, but those faculty members who consistently perform at an exemplary level may receive both tenure and promotion at an accelerated rate.

1.1.2 Governance.

Although the Faculty Annual Evaluation Process is based on the academic year rather than the calendar year (see Appendix 1), to provide a full twelve-month period of data collection within the framework of the semester system, student evaluations and other information (i.e., service and professional development) gathered after the submission of the annual report will be included in the faculty member's following annual evaluation. Information from the summer session prior to the academic year being evaluated may also be included.

Operation of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Process falls under the general supervision of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, with procedural oversight provided by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This body is made up of one tenured senior faculty member elected for a two-year term by each of the academic departments and/or schools offering credit-based instruction; if a school or department has no tenured faculty it may be represented by a non-tenured faculty member. Deans and Department Chairs are not eligible to sit on the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee performs the following functions:

a) Provision of oversight for the faculty evaluation process, recommending modifications in structure and/or implementation as the need arises to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for faculty consideration.

b) Service as a mediation group on an as-needed basis on matters related to faculty evaluation in the event that a faculty member and his/her department chair or dean cannot agree on annual goals or the degree to which those goals have been achieved

c) Service as a mediation group on an as-needed basis on matters related to tenure recommendations and/or recommendations for promotion in rank in the event that a faculty member and his/her department chair and dean cannot agree on the extent to which the faculty member has met the requirements for tenure and/or promotion.

Membership terms are staggered, and members of the committee may succeed themselves when their terms expire. The committee chair will be elected by the members at the first meeting of the committee held in each Fall Semester. All decisions reached by the Faculty Evaluation Committee will require a two-thirds majority to be considered official and will be rendered in writing to all parties involved. A record of all proceedings will be maintained, and all discussions within committee meetings are considered private and confidential. With the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, official decisions of the committee will be considered binding on all parties. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will provide a written record of his or her decision to the faculty member, Dean of School, Department Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee chair. The decision of the Vice President for Academic Affairs can be appealed to the President.

1.1.3 Timetable

On or before September 1st each Fall faculty members will formulate and submit specific, measurable goals for the current academic year and submit them to their respective Department Chairs or Deans. Goals should be devised for each of the three areas on which faculty members are evaluated, i.e., teaching, service (both to the College and to the community), and professional development. By September 15th, all goals will be discussed between a faculty member and his or her Chair, with agreement being reached on whether the faculty member's goals during the coming year rate a high or standard level of professional performance. The signatures of both the faculty member and his or her Chair on the Preliminary Statement of Goals form (see Appendices 2.1 and 2.1.1) will indicate consensus. If agreement cannot be reached on any part of the goal-setting process, the matter will be referred to the Dean of the School and then to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Any modifications required from the faculty member will be negotiated in the same fashion with his or her Department Chair or Dean. Moreover, by agreement between a faculty member and his or her Department Chair or Dean, a faculty member's goals may be expanded, contracted, or otherwise modified during the evaluation period should unforeseen circumstances arise, with unresolved disagreements being referred to the Faculty Evaluation Committee on or before October 1st.

On or before March 1st, faculty members will submit written reports to their Department Chair or Dean assessing their progress toward fulfillment of the goals set for the current academic year, using the Assessment of Goals form (see Appendix 2.2). Faculty members are responsible for providing documentation that goals have been met. The Department Chair or Dean will evaluate the reports, decide whether faculty members have fulfilled their goals and also fully discharged the obligations listed under the heading of "Standard Faculty Responsibilities" (see Appendix 2.3), and in conferences with their faculty determine whether overall performance has been at the high or standard level. For tenure-track faculty, high performance in a given year will earn two points toward consideration for promotion, and standard performance will earn one promotion point. When in agreement, both the Department Chair or Dean Chair and the faculty member will sign the Assessment of Goals document; differences between a faculty member and his or her Department Chair or Dean Chair concerning goal fulfillment or allocation of promotion points will be referred to the Faculty Evaluation Committee on or before April 15th. ***

****Does Dean of School add another layer here that would change the dates ??***
This would affect above paragraph and chart below.*

Timetable for Faculty Evaluation Process
April 1 through March 31 Evaluation Period

Components of Faculty Evaluation Process		Deadlines *
A. Submission of Goals for Annual Faculty Evaluation		
A1	Faculty submit preliminary goals to chair for upcoming academic year	On or before April 21
A2	Faculty member and Department Chair/Dean sign an agreement of proposed goals for upcoming academic year.	On or before April 28
A3	Deadline for faculty member to submit appeal to Dean if disagreement on proposed goals	April 30
A4	Deadline for faculty member to submit appeal to VPAA if disagreement on proposed goals	May 2
A5	VPAA charges the Faculty Evaluation Committee to review appeal on proposed goals.	On or before May 4
A6	Faculty Evaluation Committee will forward its appeal decisions to the VPAA.	On or before May 9
A7	The VPAA will communicate his decisions to the faculty member, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair.	On or before May 11
B Submission of Goals for Annual Faculty Evaluation by New Faculty		
B1	Faculty submit preliminary goals to chair for upcoming academic year (August 1 through March 31).	On or before Sept. 1
B2	Faculty member and Department Chair/Dean sign an agreement of goals for upcoming academic year	On or before Sept. 15
C. Assessment of Goals for Annual Faculty Evaluation		
C1	Faculty member submits assessment of goals. (Activities from April 1 through March 31).	On or before April 1
C2	Faculty member and Department Chair/Dean sign assessment of goals during evaluation conference.	On or before April 21
C3	Deadline for faculty member to submit appeal to Dean if disagreement on assessment of goals	April 28
C4	Deadline for faculty member to submit appeal to VPAA if disagreement on assessment of goals	April 30
C5	VPAA charges the Faculty Evaluation Committee to review appeal.	On or before May 2
C6	Faculty Evaluation Committee will forward its appeal decisions to the VPAA.	On or before May 9
C7	The VPAA will communicate his decisions to the faculty member, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair.**	On or before May 11

*If any deadline falls on a weekend, it will be changed to Friday if the deadline falls on Saturday or to Monday if the deadline falls on Sunday. If the deadline falls on a holiday, it will be changed to the 1st working day following the date listed.

** Faculty member has one week to appeal the decision of the VPAA to the President.

1.1.4 Special Cases

1.1.4.1 Exclusion of a current year for reason of unforeseen hardship. If in the course of a calendar year extenuating circumstances or hardship should arise and the faculty member feels that the current year should be excluded from the evaluation process for tenure and/or promotion consideration, the exclusion may be negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Chair or Dean and, if necessary, the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Application for exclusion of a current year and its acceptance by all parties must be in writing and must be made during the year in which the extenuating circumstances or hardship occurs; retroactive exclusion is not allowed. If a hardship exclusion is granted during a calendar year, that year's exclusion will have no effect on the consecutive sequence of years accrued to that point; it is as though the excluded year did not occur. An exception to this provision is the seventh year of credit toward tenure, because Board of Regents policy makes no allowances for hardship exclusion of an employment year.

1.1.4.2 Probationary credit toward tenure for new faculty. For purposes of determining eligibility for tenure, new faculty members who are awarded credit toward tenure will be assumed to have satisfied the requirements of "High Professional Performance" for each year of probationary credit they receive. Promotion points, however, will be awarded only for years of service at Dalton State College.

1.2 Tenure and Promotion

Promotion and tenure are specifically linked to the faculty evaluation process. At Dalton State College, a faculty member will receive one of three overall ratings each year. These are:

"High Professional Performance"

"Standard Professional Performance"

"Improvement Needed in Professional Performance"

These overall ratings reflect faculty performance which consistently exceeds, consistently meets, or consistently does not meet the professional standards of Dalton State College. Some faculty may be performing at an exemplary level; for those faculty, tenure and promotion are possible on a faster time scale.

1.2.1 Tenure

The following criteria lay out the standards by which tenure will be recommended. It is specifically noted that faculty who meet these criteria are not guaranteed tenure, but rather that a faculty member will be recommended for tenure by his or her chair to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, for consideration and possible recommendation to the President.

Criteria for Tenure

Tenure is normally awarded after seven years of continuous, meritorious service at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher at Dalton State College. However, a faculty member whose annual evaluations consist of **five consecutive years of “High Professional Performance”** and who has at least five years of continuous service at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher at Dalton State College will be considered by and recommended for tenure by the Tenure Subcommittee of the faculty member’s School Peer Review Committee. The tenure Subcommittee will then make recommendation to the Department Chair or Dean, who will, in turn, make recommendations to the Campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee for tenure consideration. The Campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee will make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and possible recommendation to the President. A faculty member whose annual evaluations consist of at least **five years of “Standard Professional Performance,” and who is completing his/her seventh year of continuous service** at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher at Dalton State College will be considered by and recommended for tenure by the Tenure Subcommittee of the faculty member’s School Peer Review Committee. The tenure Subcommittee will then make recommendation to the Department Chair or Dean, who will, in turn, make recommendations to the Campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee for tenure consideration. The Campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee will make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for consideration and possible recommendation to the President. A faculty member who does not meet the listed standards will be considered for tenure on an individual basis. (Refer to the Tenure and Promotion Review Policy, Revised April 2008)

1.2.2 Promotion

The following criteria lay out the standards by which promotion will be recommended. It is specifically noted that faculty who meet these criteria are not guaranteed promotion, but rather that promotion will be recommended by the faculty member’s School Peer Review Committee to the Department Chair or Dean. The Department Chair or Dean will then recommend promotion to the Campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee for promotion consideration. The Campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee will make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for consideration and possible recommendation to the President. (Refer to the Tenure and Promotion Review Policy, Revised April 2008)

Criteria for Promotion

In all fields, promotion is a recognition of the faculty member’s fulfillment of the Regents’ minimum criteria for all professional ranks:

- 1) superior teaching
- 2) outstanding service to the institution
- 3) academic achievement and professional growth and development

The criteria for promotion depend on a faculty member’s current rank. Faculty members who meet the criteria for promotion will be recommended for promotion by the faculty member’s

School Peer Review Committee to the Department Chair or Dean. The Department Chair or Dean will then recommend promotion to the Campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee for promotion consideration. The Campus-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee will make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for consideration and possible recommendation to the President. The conditions for promotion take into consideration level of performance and length of service in current rank. The conditions for a recommendation of promotion are listed in the table below.

Faculty members can earn points toward promotion each year. For each year of "High Professional Performance" a faculty member will earn two points. For each year of "Standard Professional Performance" a faculty member will earn one point. A rating of "Improvement Needed in Professional Performance" will earn zero points. Accumulation of points begins anew with each new rank.

A faculty member will be recommended for promotion by his/her chair from:

Rank	Promotion Points	BOR Minimum Service in Rank **	Degree Requirements
Instructor to Assistant Professor	After earning 6 points within three years	3 years as Instructor	Master's*
Instructor to Assistant Professor	After earning 7 points within four to ten years	3 years as Instructor	Master's*
Assistant Professor to Associate Professor	After earning 8 points within any four consecutive years	4 years as Assistant Professor	Master's ⁺ *
Assistant Professor to Associate Professor	After earning 10 points within six to ten	4 years as Assistant Professor	Master's ⁺ *
Associate Professor to Professor	After earning 10 points within any five consecutive years	5 years as Associate Professor	Doctorate ⁺ *
Associate Professor to Professor	After earning 14 points within eight to ten years	5 years as Associate Professor	Doctorate ⁺ *

⁺ Within the Technical Education Division degree requirements may vary based on training and experience.

* Those whose primary responsibility is for junior/senior level course work will be expected to produce a scholarly record in their discipline.

** Completed years of service

If a faculty member has accumulated sufficient points since their last recommendation for promotion or initial appointment, they will be recommended by the Division Chair for further promotion after completing the minimum number of years of service as required by the Board of Regents and shown in the table above.

During an academic year, a faculty member recommended by his or her Department Chair or Dean but not receiving promotion will receive written notification stating why promotion was not granted and outlining what specific steps the faculty member needs to take in order to be considered for promotion the following academic year(s). That year's promotion points will be applied to the faculty member's current rank. If a faculty member is recommended for and does receive promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor, or from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, that year's promotion points will be applied to the first year in the faculty member's new rank. ✓

II. PROCEDURES

The foregoing description of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Process and its relationship to the awarding of tenure and promotion is largely derived from the document describing the process which was adopted by the faculty in Spring 2002. To make the process operative, the following procedures have been developed as elaborations of the basic structures described in the original proposal.

2.1 Workload Components

Faculty workload at Dalton State College consists of three principal components—teaching, service to the College and community, and professional development. Of these, teaching is beyond question the most important, given its central place in the College's mission. This is recognized in the Faculty Annual Evaluation Process proposal's prefatory statement that "Dalton State College functions primarily as a teaching institution; therefore, the annual evaluation of all teaching faculty focuses on the quality of education the college provides for its students." Excellence in teaching, continuing professional development, and service to the college constitute the criteria for the annual evaluation.

2.1.1 Weighting of components

The primacy of teaching in the evaluation process necessitates the definition of workload components, with teaching receiving the heaviest emphasis. At the same time, it is desirable to allow a degree of flexibility and to insure that all three components receive consideration. In addition to the time a faculty member spends in contact with students and in preparation for class, to obtain "Standard Professional Performance" or "High Professional Performance" for an academic year, significant goals must be set and fulfilled in the area of teaching. Also, to earn "High Professional Performance" for an academic year, significant goals must be set and fulfilled in either service or professional development, but *some* goals must be set and fulfilled in all three areas. Activities intended to enhance student success and retention will be particularly

valued. Any divergence from this workload distribution requires documented justification and advance agreement in writing between the faculty member and the Department Chair or Dean.

2.1.2 Evaluation of components

2.1.2.1 Teaching. The evaluation of a faculty member's teaching accomplishments during a particular year will rest on the following resources common to all divisions:

- Stated faculty goals for improvement of course substance or classroom presentation
- Course syllabi
- Student course evaluation ratings
- Other student comments received (both positive and negative)
- Applicable professional development activities

Student evaluation ratings will be derived from responses on Questions 7 through 13 of the standard Dalton State College Campus-Wide Student Evaluation Form (see Appendix 2.4) for all full-time faculty, both permanent and temporary. For returning faculty, these ratings will be based upon the average of the three required student course evaluations for the academic year. Student evaluation averages can be weighted upon faculty request. The rating from a faculty member's student course evaluations will be placed into one of the following categories:

- 5.00 - 4.60 High performance on course evaluations
- 4.59 - 4.00 Standard performance on course evaluations
- 3.99 - zero Needs improvement on course evaluations

If a faculty member's rating falls within the range of "needs improvement on course evaluations," specific goals for improvement in teaching for the following year must be set in consultation with the Department Chair or Dean (Appendix 2.1). A student course evaluation rating falling within the range of "high performance on course evaluations" is not a requirement for earning a rating of "High Professional Performance" on the faculty annual evaluation and earning 2 points toward promotion. Faculty members whose student course evaluations fall within the "standard performance on course evaluations" may earn a rating of "High Professional Performance" if a "High" rating is supported by substantial evidence from written comments on student evaluations, noteworthy (or reasonable) faculty goals for improvement, and applicable professional development activities.

Student comments on the student evaluation forms, when divergent in content from the numerical ratings, may be used by Department Chair or Dean to make appropriate adjustments in the overall evaluation.

2.1.2.2 Service. Faculty service may be rendered in both academic and non-academic settings. While non-academic service within the wider community is laudable and to be encouraged, academic service--in campus, University System, or disciplinary settings—is more directly pertinent to the faculty evaluation process.

Academic service will commonly include two principal elements, advising and committee work. The advisement process itself is undergoing change at Dalton State College, and a reliable and consistent method for evaluating faculty members' work as advisors is not yet in place. Committee work is more readily incorporated into the faculty evaluation process. Allowance must be made, however, for the greater demands that some committees make on their members' time and energy than do other committees. In recognition of these variations, the following illustrative (not prescriptive) three-part scale has been applied to the College's committee structure, with the A-level comprising the most demanding committees and the C-level the least.

A-level Committees

- Admissions Appeal
- Faculty Evaluation
- Pre- and Post-Tenure Review

B-level Committees

- Academic Council
- Committee on Committees
- Faculty Enrichment
- Fine Arts and Lectures
- Human Subjects
- Library
- Literary
- Multicultural Advising
- PREP
- Retention
- Strategic Planning
- Student Activities Council

C-level Committees

- Athletic
- Calendar
- Discipline
- Environmental Affairs
- Financial Aid Appeals
- Grievance
- Intellectual Property
- Marketing
- Residence
- Traffic
- Web Site Advisory
- Who's Who

A particular committee may change status--going, for example from the C-level to the A-level--as a function of the matters brought before it. In addition to these campus-wide

standing committees, faculty members may also serve on internal divisional committees or special ad hoc campus committees. The chair of such a committee may be asked, as part of his or her responsibility, to provide Department Chair or Dean with a description of the committee's work and a performance assessment of each of the committee's members for use in the faculty evaluation process.

As part of the annual evaluation process, faculty members will document the committees on which they have served and their levels of participation. Department Chair or Dean may request corroborating information from committee chairs. To insure equal access to the more demanding (and hence meritorious) committees, terms of succession on standing committees will be limited, with committee assignment records being maintained by the Committee on Committees.

Apart from committee work, other forms of academic service may be divided into two categories, Standard (expected as part of a faculty member's normal discharge of responsibilities) and Significant (going notably beyond standard expectations). An illustrative classification of some typical service activities follows:

Standard:

- Academic advising
- Advising/sponsoring an inactive student club
- Grading RTP essays
- Membership of a divisional search committee
- Membership on a Regents' Academic Advisory Committee
- Membership in a service and/or professional organization
- Representing the College in recruitment and visibility activities

Significant:

- Advising/sponsoring an active student club
- Chair of any search committee
- Chair of a Regents' Academic Advisory Committee
- Chair of a Standing Committee of the Faculty
- Conducting a program review
- Hosting a conference
- Organizing/participating heavily in Science Olympiad, College Bowl, etc.
- Preparation of funded grant proposals
- Service as a chair or other officer in a discipline-based organization at the national, regional, or state level
- Service as a chair or other officer in a service organization at the national, regional, state, or local level
- Service on a campus-wide search committee

These definitions are congruent with those approved by the faculty in 1997 as part of the evaluation standards used in the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Process. In accordance with its own particular circumstances, each academic school may develop its own list of

Standard and Significant service activities in addition to those which are applicable on a campus-wide basis.

2.1.2.3 Professional Development. Like certain forms of faculty service, faculty members' professional development activities may be classified as Standard or Significant. An illustrative list of some typical activities follows:

Standard:

- Licensure in a professional affiliation
- Membership in a service and/or professional organization
- Revising courses

Significant:

- Achieving/maintaining vendor certification (Cisco, Microsoft, Novell, etc.)
- Creation of a new course
- Presentations at conferences
- Publications, especially in refereed journals or similar settings

These definitions are congruent with those approved by the faculty in 1997 as part of the evaluation standards used in the Pre- and Post-Tenure Review Process. In accordance with its own particular circumstances, each academic division may develop its own list of Standard and Significant professional development activities in addition to those which are applicable on a campus-wide basis.

2.1.2.4 Release Time. When a faculty member receives release time from teaching in order to pursue a special project, he or she will submit a written, documented report to his or her Department Chair or Dean describing how the time was used and what was accomplished. The Department Chair or Dean will evaluate the contents of the report and incorporate it into the annual evaluation for the faculty member. This policy will be applied to any release time scheduled or occurring after January 1, 2003.

2.1.3 Divisional Committees for Faculty Evaluation Standards

This Faculty Annual Evaluation Process Manual provides the overarching guidelines for faculty evaluation. However, each academic school may be held to unique standards for accreditation purposes. Therefore, guidelines for the criteria that must be met to earn either Standard Professional Performance or High Professional Performance for the faculty member's annual review should be created within each academic school. In this way, each academic school of the college will be responsible for creating a set of standards that will guide the goal-setting and annual evaluation process within that school. This process involves several steps.

1. Each school will vote for tenured and non-tenured faculty members to serve on their School Committee for Faculty Evaluation Standards.
2. In the first year, the committee members will develop a guide that will clearly define the ways in which the faculty in the specific school can set goals that will meet the criteria for either Standard Professional Performance or High Professional Performance.
3. After the committee members are satisfied with their product, they will present these standards to the school, and the school members must be afforded the opportunity to vote for or against the recommendations of the School Committee for Faculty Evaluation Standards.
4. If the majority of the members of the school do not vote for the guidelines, then the committee will make suggested adjustments or begin the process anew.
5. If a majority of the school votes for the guidelines, these guidelines will be submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee for their approval. Upon approval, the guidelines will be incorporated into the Faculty Evaluation Procedure Manual.
6. In subsequent years, each School Committee for Faculty Evaluation Standards will meet to review the standards, edit the standards, and propose changes to the school members for a vote.

2.2 Rating of Faculty Performance

For each academic year of service, faculty members will be rated on the following scale:

- 2 = High Professional Performance
- 1 = Standard Professional Performance
- 0 = Improvement Needed in Professional Performance

These ratings will be used in deciding whether to award tenure and will be converted into promotion points which accumulate toward promotion to a higher rank. The rating, and thus the number of promotion points assigned, for a particular year will be determined by agreement between the faculty member and his or her Department Chair or Dean, or in case of disagreement by the Faculty Evaluation Committee with the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Although a rating will be recorded for each year of service, the accumulation of promotion points begins anew with each promotion. Promotion points will not be assigned to those holding the rank of Professor (or other appropriate terminal rank), or to other faculty members for the year in which they are promoted to rank of Professor or retire, who are in the terminal year of a temporary appointment, or who otherwise are not in tenure-track positions.

To receive a rating of 2 for a given year, a faculty member must demonstrate High Professional Performance in the area of teaching and in at least one other area, as well as fulfill all of the

“Standard Faculty Responsibilities” on the annual evaluation summary document. A faculty member who fails to meet two or more of the obligations listed as “Standard Faculty Responsibilities” will not be considered to have achieved minimally standard performance requirements for that year and will receive a rating of 0.

Supervision of faculty should be developmental. If a faculty member does not meet a Standard Faculty Responsibility, the *Department Chair or Dean* will notify the faculty member of a lack of compliance. Failure to meet a standard responsibility may be grounds to list the behavior as "Not Acceptable"; however, in most cases this initial communication will serve as a sign for the faculty member to become more diligent in fulfilling his or her Standard Faculty Responsibilities. If the faculty member continues to fail to meet a Standard Faculty Responsibility and is informed of the repeated noncompliance, the noncompliance will result in a "Not Acceptable" rating on the yearly review.

When agreement regarding meeting Standard Faculty Responsibility cannot be reached, the faculty member may submit an appeal to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. With the exception of appeals submitted in the summer, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will render their decision within ten working days of the submission of the appeal and the VPAA will communicate his decision to the faculty member, the Department Chair or Dean, and the Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair within fifteen working days of the submission of the appeal. Appeals submitted during the summer session will be processed by the faculty evaluation committee within fifteen working days of the beginning of fall semester.

2.3. Evaluation of Temporary and Part-time Faculty

2.3.1 Full-time Temporary Faculty

Persons serving as full-time members of the faculty on a temporary basis will be evaluated on the same basis as permanent full-time faculty, and their ratings on student evaluations will be included in the computation of school averages. Although the workload of a temporary faculty member is likely to consist very preponderantly of teaching, accomplishments in the areas of service and professional development may be considered when deciding whether to extend a temporary faculty member's employment or to offer permanent employment.

2.3.2 Part-time faculty

Unless specific arrangements have been made, part-time faculty members have no non-teaching responsibilities. Their teaching will be evaluated in the same manner as that of full-time faculty members.

2.4. Appeals

The Faculty Evaluation Committee considers circumstances in which a faculty member and his or her Department Chair or Dean have reached an impasse regarding agreement on the substance of annual goals, the level of achievement of a goal or goals, or the fulfillment of requirements for the awarding of tenure or promotion. An impasse will be considered to have arisen when

agreement between a faculty member and his or her Department Chair or Dean has not been reached by the end of two meetings within a period of one week.

****How should Department Chair feed to Division Chair and then on to VPAA and then Faculty Evaluation Committee ???******

The faculty member is responsible for initiating the appeal process. All appeals must be made in writing, using the Faculty Evaluation Process Appeal form (see Appendix 2.5). Appeals regarding a disagreement on proposed goals must be submitted to the VPAA on or before October 1st. Appeals regarding a disagreement on assessment of goals must be submitted to the VPAA on or before April 15th. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will forward the appeal to the Division Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair. If the Department Chair or Dean wishes to respond in writing to the appeal, he or she must send a written response to the Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair within five working days of receipt of the appeal. The committee may request a meeting with both the faculty member and the Department Chair or Dean, either together or separately. The faculty member and/or the Department Chair or Dean may decline the request.

Decisions by the Faculty Evaluation Committee require a majority of at least two-thirds of the Committee membership in order to be considered official. They will be rendered in writing, using the Review of Faculty Evaluation Appeal form (see Appendix 2.6) and will be communicated as soon as possible to the faculty member, the Division Chair, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. When considering appeals regarding a disagreement on proposed goals, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will communicate his or her decision in writing to the faculty member, Department Chair and Dean, and Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair by October 21st. When considering appeals regarding a disagreement on assessment of goals, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will communicate his or her decision in writing to the faculty member, Department Chair and Dean, and Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair by May 15th. The decision of the VPAA can be appealed to the President.

Effective July 1, 2002, the Faculty Evaluation Committee replaced the Faculty Evaluation Process Committee and the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, which were eliminated by vote of the Academic Council on April 19, 2002, recorded in minutes approved by the full faculty on May 3, 2002.

2.5. Compilation of Information for the Office of Institutional Research and Planning

The office of Institutional Research and Planning must compile information about faculty activities, largely in the category of professional development, that the current format of the faculty "Annual Evaluation: Statement of Goals" form does not necessarily elicit. To meet this need, faculty members will submit to their Chair a completed "School Annual Report: Numerical Summary Faculty Data" form (Appendix 2.7) when they turn in their annual report each Spring semester. In addition, Deans may request further information necessitated by circumstances within their schools, such as the requirements of specialized accrediting agencies.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Faculty Evaluation Process Flow Chart

Appendix 2: Forms

2.1: Annual Evaluation: Preliminary Statement of Goals

2.1.1: Sample Preliminary Statement of Goals

2.2: Faculty Annual Evaluation: Sample Assessment of Goals

2.3: Chair's Summary

2.4: Campus-Wide Student Evaluation

2.5: Faculty Evaluation Process Appeal

2.6: Review of Faculty Evaluation Appeal

2.7: School Annual Report: Numerical Summary Faculty Data

REVIEW OF FACULTY EVALUATION APPEAL

APPLICANT: _____

DIVISION: _____

DATE OF ORIGINAL APPEAL: _____

The Faculty Evaluation Process Committee has reviewed this case for:

- G A disagreement of goals that will determine a numeric evaluation as described in the Faculty Evaluation Process.
- G A disagreement of the numeric evaluation that agreed upon goals should be assigned.
- G A disagreement that the goals were actually achieved to the level of satisfaction the numeric evaluation warrants.
- G Other (please specify) _____

The Committee has reviewed the following items:

- G Evidence provided by the applicant of improper and/or unfair evaluation.
- G Response of the Division Chair.
- G Other (please specify) _____

After thorough review of the above documents the committee **G** finds **G** does not find that the goals established by the faculty member are sufficient.

After thorough review of the above documents the committee **G** finds **G** does not find cause to award the points requested by the faculty member.

After thorough review of the above documents the committee **G** finds **G** does not find that the goals agreed upon by the faculty member and the chair were achieved sufficiently to warrant the agree upon rating.

The points to be awarded the faculty member for evaluation year _____ should be _____.

SIGNATURE OF EACH COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____