

Evaluation of Faculty Policy and Guidelines for the College of Education and Human Development

I. Introduction

This document is based on the College Faculty Evaluation Task Force report, dated March 2002, and reviewed by the Council of Chairs, made available to faculty within the departments, discussed at two college faculty meetings approved by vote of the college faculty and revised, thereafter.

While these guidelines focus on the procedural matters involving evaluation at the college and departmental levels, departments should carefully attend to the major purpose of evaluation, the formative/developmental aspect of evaluation, as well. The evaluation process at the departmental level should involve an important conversation about the professional goals and developmental needs of the faculty member being reviewed. These conversations should take place within the context of the goals of the department, aligning the goals of the faculty member and those of the department.

II. Evaluation Procedures

All benefited faculty shall be evaluated annually, as required by the SBHE {604.3}, and in conformity with the procedures described herein. Each academic department shall have a written, up-to-date evaluation policy that is consistent with this college document, as well as university and SBHE policy and procedures. The policy should establish criteria appropriate for the discipline, mission of the department, and the types of appointments made. The departmental policy must be approved by the departmental faculty, College Council of Chairs and the Dean of the College. The department determines who shall serve on evaluation committees, including students; however, {FH 4.}, it is the policy of the college that only tenured faculty members may vote on tenure decisions.

It is policy of the college that the third-year, post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty members shall also follow the procedures provided in these guidelines, insofar as they apply to those situations.

Departments in which there are faculty members who are on special appointment, not on a tenure track, the department must have an evaluation policy appropriate for those types of appointments.

III. Procedures for Probationary and Tenured Faculty

The departmental committee shall prepare an evaluation report that must employ the three criteria required by the *Faculty Handbook* {II-8.1.1.3.a. (1)} (unsatisfactory, adequate, or excellent) for each of the areas of faculty work (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service). The department shall have specific and clear descriptions of expectations as spelled out in the position descriptions for those years in review in each of these areas of work for each rank. The department shall provide an explanation in every case, whether a faculty member is rated “unsatisfactory”, “adequate” or “excellent.”

Because the three categories required by the Faculty Handbook are very limited, care should be given to more fully describe those situations in which or when these terms fall short of accurately characterizing a person’s performance.

The committee must indicate whether to reappoint probationary members and whether to promote or tenure, or for tenured faculty, whether to recommend continued appointment.

The committee’s report should a) indicate the purpose of the evaluation and b) give summaries for each of the areas of work: teaching, scholarly and creative research, and service. In each section summary, include a statement about the candidate's performance—both quality of work and quantity of effort—as well as the committee’s recommendation(s). To help the College T & P Committee understand potential departmental differences in evaluation procedures, also include a description of the procedures and sources of information used to arrive at the summary of the candidate's achievement in each area. {For a description of the role of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, see the *College Bylaws*, 6.5.}

The result of the committee’s vote must be reported. For evaluations in which roll call voting is required i.e. tenure, promotion, the report must contain each member’s vote. Separate roll call votes must be recorded for promotion and for tenure if both are being evaluated in the same academic year. If there are any dissents to the committee’s recommendation, for promotion or tenure, minority reports must be signed by the dissenters and must be attached to the report.

The committee chair and all committee members must sign the evaluation report. The faculty member should sign the report after reviewing it; the signature does not imply agreement with the report, but it does indicate that the faculty member has received and read the evaluation report. The faculty member

may also prepare a written response to the committee's report or to any dissenting opinion attached to the report.

The role of the department Chair is described in the Faculty Handbook {8.3.1 and 5.2. and 5.2.A., B.1. and B.2.}. Within the College of EHD, it is the policy that the Chair may participate in the deliberations of departmental and college evaluation committees but may not vote in these committees. In the case of a small department when the Chair is the only tenured member of the faculty, the department shall determine whether the Chair will serve on the committee as a voting member or the department may have a written policy of using a tenured faculty member from another department within the college to serve in that role, in which case the method of selection of that person shall be specified in the policy. In these cases, the external person shall serve as the chair of the evaluation committee and will be responsible for writing the report. As an alternative, the faculty member and the department chair may agree on an external (to UND) evaluator from the discipline and the written report from the external evaluator will serve as a primary document for the evaluation. Costs for such evaluations must be approved in advanced by the dean.

The Chair shall prepare a separate evaluation report that must employ the three criteria, unsatisfactory, adequate, or excellent, for each of the areas of faculty work i.e. teaching, scholarly and creative activity, research, and service and shall make specific recommendations for improvement in every case, whether a faculty member is rated "unsatisfactory", "adequate" or "excellent." The Chair must indicate whether to reappoint probationary members or continue appointment for tenured members, and whether to promote or tenure. The report must be signed by the Chair and the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member being reviewed may write a response to the Chair's report, indicating any disagreements with conclusions or recommendations.

The college will provide a standard form to be completed by the departmental committee and a standard form to be completed by the department Chair. While these forms and procedures are required to insure consistency and equity, departments should feel free to emphasize aspects of evaluation and procedures that are appropriate to the discipline and type of work being evaluated, and may expand the materials for the review or the procedures described here, as long as those additions are provided for in the written departmental policy.

IV. Essential Documents at the Department Level

The following documents are considered essential and required for all evaluation files and shall be prepared by the faculty member being reviewed:

1. A standard cover sheet provided by the college.
2. A current curriculum vitae that provides accurate and up to date information that addresses the criteria for promotion and tenure. See the outline for the Curriculum Vitae provided by the Office of the VPAA.
3. Copies of the signed, position description forms, indicating the percent of effort in all three areas for the relevant academic years.
4. Student evaluation feedback must be provided for all classes taught during the review period and the original data must be available to the department review committee and Chair. Care must be taken to insure that individual students can not be identified. For example, hand written student feedback must be typed or reformatted. Summaries prepared by the person being evaluated are not acceptable.
5. At least one review of teaching in addition to student feedback, such as peer observations, or other evaluative materials or evidence of efforts at improvement of teaching.
6. A reflective statement written by the faculty member that elaborates on the materials contained in the file and assists the reviewers in understanding the professional work and place it in the context in which it was done. The statement should address all three areas of faculty work i.e. teaching, scholarly and creative activity, research, and service, and normally should not exceed three pages.

In a separate binder or holder, the following supporting materials must be available to the departmental evaluation committee and department Chair:

1. Copies of course syllabi for all courses taught during the period under review.
2. Either the original publications or copies documenting publication and the date and source of publication.
3. Copies of programs from conferences at which presentations were made, documenting the specifics of the presentation.

V. Optional Documents

The following documents may be provided in the file if they will enable reviewers to have a fuller and more accurate understanding of the professional work.

1. Examples of student work that illustrate the quality and nature of student Learning. A student release must be obtained to place the student's work in a faculty member's file. Any information that might identify individual students must be removed from the materials.
2. Letters of appointment to appropriate bodies or letters of recognition of significant professional contributions.
3. Copies of curricular materials.
4. Letters of support or evaluation from external experts.

VI. Essential Documents at the College Level

The following documents are considered essential and required for all evaluation files to be reviewed by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean and shall be prepared by the faculty member being reviewed.

1. A standard cover sheet provided by the College.
2. The forms required by the Office of the VPAA.
3. A current curriculum vitae that provides accurate and up to date information that addresses the criteria for promotion and tenure. See the outline for the Curriculum Vitae provided by the Office of the VPAA.
4. The report from the department evaluation committee.
5. The report from the department Chair.
6. Copies of the signed, position description forms, indicating the percent of effort in all three areas for the relevant academic years.
7. A reflective statement written by the faculty member that elaborates on the materials contained in the file and should assist the reviewers in understanding the professional work and place it in context. The statement should address all three areas of faculty work i.e. teaching, scholarly and creative activity, research, and service, and normally should not exceed three pages.

All of the materials available to the departmental review committee and Chair must be placed in a separate binder or holder and made available to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

VII. Required Elements of the Curriculum Vitae

The official curriculum vitae should include the following elements and should be up to date and accurate in all respects and should follow this outline, as recommended by the office of the VPAA.

1. Educational background, listing all degrees, certificates, and appropriate educational preparation, indicating the institution and date of completion.
2. Professional experience, listing all appointments with dates of appointments, institutions, official position titles or rank, and brief descriptions of essential duties.
3. Courses taught and the dates and institutions and levels of the Courses, e.g. 100, 200, etc., as well as the record of advisement for undergraduate students and including the names and dates of graduate degrees awarded to graduate advisees.
4. Service activities, indicating the nature and period of service, separated into university service, college service, departmental service, and service to professional/disciplinary associations, and public or not-for-profit organizations.
5. Publications, clearly indicating the full citation, the audience e.g. state, regional, national, international, the type of review e.g. juried or non-juried, invited, etc., and stage of publication e.g. under review, in press, or published, and the order of authorship, if multiple authors.
6. Presentations, clearly indicating the full citation, the audience, the type of presentation e.g. workshop, panel, invited, juried, etc.
7. Grants and contracts awarded and proposals submitted but not awarded.
8. Memberships in professional and academic associations and offices held.
9. Professional consulting activities.
10. Honors/Awards

College of Education & Human Development

Evaluation Report from Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee

I. Identifying Information

Candidate: _____ Current Rank: _____

Department _____ Academic Year/Evaluation _____

Purpose of Evaluation (check all that apply):

Tenure ____ Promotion ____ Annual Review ____ (Year ____) Post Tenure ____

Candidate's Position Description for current academic year:

Teaching ____% Research ____% Service ____% Other ____%

List any special assignments.

Names of Members of Evaluation Committee Rank Tenure Status

Chair _____

Committee member _____

Committee member _____

Committee member _____

Committee member _____

Because different departments use different procedures to conduct their evaluation, give a brief description of the process used to conduct this evaluation (or if easier, attach a copy of pertinent documents, e.g., minutes of meetings, policy statements).

List special assignments used in conducting the review when appropriate (e.g., primary author of report, section authors, interviewers, classroom observers)

II. Summary of Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service

Summaries in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, research, and service should address quality, as well as quantity.

Summary of review of teaching and student advisement, including sources of information used for the evaluation:

_____ Excellent _____ Adequate _____ Unsatisfactory

Summary of review of Research/Scholarly Activity:

_____ Excellent _____ Adequate _____ Unsatisfactory

Summary of review of University/Professional service:

_____ Excellent _____ Adequate _____ Unsatisfactory

Summary of review of administrative or other areas if applicable, (e.g. program coordinator):

_____ Excellent _____ Adequate _____ Unsatisfactory

III. Committee Recommendation

Recommendation of the committee (including role call votes on promotion and tenure decisions):

Any statements of dissent or responses to the recommendation of the committee (List and attach the statements):

Committee Chair's Signature _____ Date _____

Committee Member's Signatures

Faculty Member's Signature _____ Date _____

The faculty member's signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the contents of this report, only that it is recorded with the full knowledge of the faculty member being evaluated. A written response may be provided to any statements contained in this report.

Evaluation Report from Department Chair

I. Identifying Information

Candidate: _____ Current Rank: _____
Department _____ Academic Year/Evaluation _____

Purpose of Evaluation (check all that apply):

Tenure ____ Promotion ____ Annual Review ____ (Year ____) Post Tenure ____

Candidate's Position Description for current academic year:

Teaching ____% Scholarly & Creative Activity ____% Research ____%

Service ____% Other ____%

List any special assignments:

Because different chairs and their departments use different procedures to conduct their evaluation, give a brief description of the process used to conduct this evaluation. Also, note if procedures varied from the usual departmental process.

II. Summary of Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service

Summaries in the areas of teaching, scholarly & creative activity, research, and service should address quality, as well as quantity.

Summary of review of teaching and student advisement, including sources of information used for the evaluation:

____ Excellent ____ Adequate ____ Unsatisfactory

Summary of review of Research/Scholarly Activity:

____ Excellent ____ Adequate ____ Unsatisfactory

Summary of review of University/Professional service:

____ Excellent ____ Adequate ____ Unsatisfactory

Summary of review of administrative or other areas, if applicable, (e.g. program coordinator):

____ Excellent ____ Adequate ____ Unsatisfactory

III. Chair's Recommendation

Department Chair's Signature _____ Date _____

Faculty Member's Signature _____ Date _____

The faculty member's signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the contents of this report, only that it is recorded with the full knowledge of the faculty member being evaluated. A written response may be provided to any statements contained in this report.