

November 16, 2001

## **COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND URBAN AFFAIRS FACULTY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL GUIDELINES**

### **PREAMBLE**

Each year faculty members are required to prepare an annual report, which is to serve as the basis for an annual performance appraisal. The criteria identified in this statement are intended to serve as guidelines in assisting faculty in the compilation of their annual report and the College/School administration in their appraisal of performance as reflected in the annual report. The determination of the level of performance in each of the appraisal areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service will be made by the School Director upon review of the faculty member's annual report and accompanying documentation. Such determination will be made with reference to the listed criteria within each appraised area, respecting both quality and quantity. The listed criteria are intended to be inclusive but not exhaustive.

### **PRINCIPLES**

The following principles underlie the faculty performance appraisal:

1. The functions of the College (the University) are Teaching, Research, and Service. It is expected, therefore, that all academics employed within the College will engage in activities in each of these areas and their performance appraisal will be measured insofar as they have carried out their expected assignment in each area. The College Differential Faculty Assignment Policy allows for differential workload assignments and faculty appointment classifications. As such Differential Faculty Assignments may be weighted differently in the appraisal of the three elements of Teaching, Research, and Service. For example, faculty having reduced teaching loads through differential faculty assignment will receive proportionately reduced recognition for teaching performance in their annual appraisal.
2. Performance expectations and performance appraisal will be related to the criteria for the granting tenure and promotion and the faculty member's differentiated assignment. In other words, yearly performance appraisal factors must be congruent with the criteria for faculty progression through the ranks and the criteria for achieving tenure.
3. Performance expectations and performance appraisal will increase with ascending order in relation to academic rank and progression through the ranks. Specifically, the expectations placed on a senior Full Professor should be higher than on a beginning Assistant Professor. Such a principle of appraisal will provide for situations wherein equal output by an Assistant and

Full Professor would lead to a higher performance appraisal of the Assistant Professor.

4. Upon completion of the review of the annual report each faculty member will be provided with a narrative evaluative statement for each of the areas of Teaching, Research and Service. A determination of level of Performance will be provided for each of the separate areas. In addition, a summative overall statement of Level of Performance will be identified.
5. Level of performance in each of the areas of Teaching, Research and Service will be identified with the descriptors:

Unsatisfactory  
Satisfactory  
Good  
Very Good  
Excellent

6. Where merit is to be determined by performance appraisal ranking in each of the three elements of Teaching, Research and Service will yield a merit recommendation.

## **Performance Appraisal Guidelines**

### **Teaching**

Teaching is a fundamental and a major requirement of the University and its faculty. Teaching or instructional activity spans a range of activities and occurs in many different contexts. For the purposes of these Performance Appraisal guidelines it includes classroom lectures, seminars, clinical and laboratory supervision, tutorials, student advising. Active participation in graduate supervision and committee membership on qualifying exams, thesis and dissertation committees will be included in teaching [consistent with the additional responsibilities] more weighting may be assigned in the annual appraisal to those faculty members assuming the role of Chair of these committees.

Faculty are expected to design and implement a broad range of learning experiences in order to facilitate and direct the attainment of specific learning objectives in the context of their teaching assignments. Faculty are required to be available to meet with students to discuss assignments and any difficulties that the students may be encountering with the subject material.

Faculty are required to show evidence of their class preparation through the provision of comprehensive course syllabi, including course outlines, course

objectives, evaluation criteria and bibliographies. Such course syllabi must be congruent with the Schools' programs and curricula objectives.

Faculty are expected to continuously review and update their course materials in order to reflect the current knowledge within the substantive area. It is required that faculty will continuously enhance their teaching by introducing teaching innovations. Examples of teaching innovations may include the use of computer assisted learning, web based and/or assisted learning, and the development of software. To be considered in the appraisal system these teaching innovations must be observable and available for peer evaluation.

Performance appraisal of teaching will also include evidence of a faculty member's development, for example, attendance and instructional development courses, computer utilization, and audio visual training seminars and the incorporation of methods derived from the seminars would enhance a faculty member's teaching appraisal.

While not the only means of appraising teaching performance, student evaluations will definitely be part of the process. Such evaluations will be reviewed for each of the courses taught by the faculty member in the academic year. Student evaluations will be considered in the context of:

- Class size.
- Grade distribution.
- The instructor's experience with the course.
- The nature of the course; quantitative, theoretical, clinical, etc.
- Any information the instructor may wish to provide with regard to difficulties or issues encountered during the teaching of the course.
- New modes of delivery, creative/innovation, new course development.

### **Levels of Performance**

The levels of performance for teaching appraisal will be determined in reference to the following criteria:

### **Teaching Criteria**

- The quality of course syllabi (including yearly updates).
- The quality of course assignments.
- The degree to which the course syllabus addresses the expected curriculum objectives for the school.

- The breadth and depth of appropriate assigned readings and appended bibliographies.
- The overall satisfaction of the faculty member's performance as identified in the student evaluations.
- Special teaching contributions such as the introduction of a new course, a teaching innovation, and/or evidence of providing leadership in teaching.
- Number and type of graduate (Master's, Ph.D.) committees chaired, frequency of meetings and progress of student.
- Number and type of examination committees chaired.
- Number and type of memberships on graduate committees.

### **Unsatisfactory**

This category would be assigned to faculty members whose performance evidenced one or more of the following:

- Unapproved absences from class.
- Frequent tardiness for class
- Failure to provide acceptable course outlines
- Unavailability to students outside of class.
- Receipt of consistently low evaluations of teaching performance from students.
- Reported complaints from students and peers in regard to teaching performance, supervision of students and/or field education/clinical instruction.
- Reported complaints regarding failure to respect student diversity.
- Violation of university policies regarding sexual harassment.
- Failure to comply with School, College, University teaching policies, e.g., failure to provide grades on time, over extension of "incompletes", failure to post office hours, etc.

### **Satisfactory**

- No evidence of unsatisfactory teaching

- Course syllabi conform with School, College, and University policies and procedures as identified in the applicable Handbooks
- Evidence of participation in student advising
- Student ratings are near or at the mid point on the course and instructor satisfaction scale
- Teaching load is consistent with the faculty norm
- Course syllabi are clear and well organized
- Course objectives are stated and are consistent with the educational program objectives
- Required office hours are posted and observed
- Grades are submitted by deadline dates
- "Incomplete" grades are submitted within two semesters

**Good**

- No evidence of unsatisfactory teaching
- Course syllabi conform with School, College, and University policies and procedures as identified in the applicable Handbooks
- Evidence of participation in student advising
- Student ratings are above the mid-point on course and instructor satisfaction
- Teaching load is consistent with the faculty norm
- Course syllabi are clear and well organized
- Course objectives are stated and are consistent with the educational program objectives
- Required office hours are posted and observed
- Grades are submitted by deadline dates
- "Incomplete" grades are submitted within two semesters

- **Course assignments are specified and are appropriate for the level of the course and comply with School, College and University policies**
- **The breadth and depth of the assigned reading and bibliographies are appropriate for the course level**
- **Assigned grades reflect a full range**
- **Demonstrated incorporation of innovative instructional methodologies, e.g., web-assisted, internet use, case studies, audio-visual, computer simulation, etc. in some part of more than one course**
- **There is evidence of availability to facilitate student learning beyond the classroom**
- **Evidence of participation in Masters and/or Ph.D. thesis committees**
- **Evidence of participation in Ph.D. qualifying/comprehensive/examination committees**

### **Very Good**

- No evidence of unsatisfactory teaching
- Course syllabi conform with School, College, and University policies and procedures as identified in the applicable Handbooks
- Evidence of participation in student advising
- Student ratings are above the mid-point on course and instructor satisfaction
- Teaching load is consistent with the faculty norm
- Course syllabi are clear and well organized
- Course objectives are stated and are consistent with the educational program objectives
- Required office hours are posted and observed
- Grades are submitted by deadline dates
- "Incomplete" grades are submitted within two semesters

- Course assignments are specified and are appropriate for the level of the course and comply with School, College and University policies
- The breadth and depth of the assigned reading and bibliographies are appropriate for the course level
- Assigned grades reflect a full range
- Demonstrated incorporation of innovative instructional methodologies, e.g., web-assisted, internet use, case studies, audio-visual, computer simulation, etc. in some part of more than one course
- There is evidence of availability to facilitate student learning beyond the classroom
- Evidence of Membership on Masters and/or Ph.D. committees
- Evidence of participation in Ph.D. qualifying/comprehensive examination committees
- **Chaired 1 to 2 Ph.D. qualifying/comprehensive examination committees**
- **Chaired 1 to 2 Ph.D. dissertation committees with evidence of student progress**
- **Evidence of mentoring and leadership with colleagues for curriculum development or improvement of teaching effectiveness**
- **Incorporation of writing, oral and/or computer skills in course assignments**

### **Excellent**

- No evidence of unsatisfactory teaching
- Course syllabi conform with School, College, and University policies and procedures as identified in the applicable Handbooks
- Evidence of participation in student advising
- Student ratings are at the highest level on course and instructor satisfaction
- Teaching load is consistent with the faculty norm

- Course syllabi are clear and well organized
- Course objectives are stated and are consistent with the educational program objectives
- Required office hours are posted and observed
- Grades are submitted by deadline dates
- “Incomplete” grades are submitted within two semesters
- Course assignments are specified and are appropriate for the level of the course and comply with School, College and University policies
- The breadth and depth of the assigned reading and bibliographies are appropriate for the course level
- Assigned grades reflect a full range
- Demonstrated incorporation of innovative instructional methodologies, e.g., complete web-assisted or on-line courses, internet use, case studies, audio-visual, computer simulation, etc. in all courses taught
- There is evidence of availability to facilitate student learning beyond the classroom
- Evidence of Membership on Masters and/or Ph.D. committees
- Participated in Ph.D. qualifying/comprehensive examination committees
- Evidence of mentoring and leadership with colleagues for curriculum development or improvement of teaching effectiveness
- Incorporation of writing, oral and/or computer skills in courses assignments
- **Funded training grant for academic program or project after 1<sup>st</sup> year**
- **Chaired 3 or more Ph.D. qualifying/comprehensive examination committees**
- **Chaired 3 or more Ph.D. dissertation committees with evidence of student progress**



- **Award, honor, or recognition for teaching from a regional, national, or international organization or agency**

## **RESEARCH**

Research, scholarship, and other activities leading to the development of knowledge and professional practice constitute a major expectation on faculty within a university. The concepts of research, scholarship, and creative professional activity are to be evaluated under the heading of research. Importantly, work to be included under the heading of research must meet the two criteria of **peer review and dissemination** in scholarly journals and books. Consideration will be given to the quality of the journal in which the article is published. Where creative professional activity is to be appraised, the same principle of peer group review with written appraisals must accompany the submission to be considered as research. Products generated as technology transfer may be considered within the category of research if they are peer reviewed and disseminated, e.g., audio visual teaching aids, computer software, and academic materials produced on CD's etc.

For the purposes of determining the level of performance in the appraisal a distinction will be made among the categories:

1. work in progress
2. work in press
3. work completed (published)

**"Work In Progress"** is considered to be work in any stage of preparation prior to acceptance and dissemination. Work to be considered as **"Work in Press"** is essentially work that has been completed awaiting publication. For the purposes of appraisal, work to be considered as **"Work in Press"** will be supported by a letter from a publisher indicating that the work has been peer reviewed and accepted for dissemination (publication). **"Work Completed "** is peer-reviewed work, which has been disseminated through accepted means in print or through some electronic means.

Normally, "Work in Progress" will be acknowledged during one reporting year only. To be considered as "Work in Progress" a faculty member must provide a date at which the work began and the projected completion date. If a work "In Progress" is to be considered in a subsequent year, rationale must be submitted along with evidence that significant progress has been achieved.

In consideration of the level of performance for work in progress and/or completed work, differential weighting may be assigned to co-authored (co-edited) versus sole-authored (sole-edited) publications. Specifically, in the submission of the annual report, the faculty member will be required to submit

the estimated or agreed upon percentage contribution to the work in progress, work in press, and completed work. This is applicable to work to be published, innovative professional practice, and research proposals.

### **Levels of Performance:**

The levels of performance for research appraisal will be determined in reference to the following criteria:

### **Research Criteria:**

- A research grant, funded research project, contract research, university funded research (differential consideration to the size of the grant and the rigor of the competition will be given), training grant (funded first year will be considered research, subsequent years will be considered teaching)
- An unfunded or self-funded research project
- Unfunded research proposals
- Publication of an authored book
- Publication of an edited book
- Publication of a co-edited or co-authored book
- Revised editions of books
- Editorship of a scholarly journal
- Editorship of a special issue of a journal and/or a symposium
- An article in a refereed journal
- A book chapter
- Major published research reports
- Refereed training/teaching manuals
- Refereed contribution to or innovation in professional practice
- Peer reviewed poster or conference presentation
- A paper published in refereed conference proceedings
- A production or dissemination in non print media, such as preparation of a film, video tape, or computer software

### **Unsatisfactory**

- No evidence of work in progress, in press, or completed work

### **Satisfactory**

- Evidence of work in progress (e.g. journal article, book chapter or book)
- No evidence of work in press or completed work

### **Good**

Evidence of research contributions in combination (see Research Criteria above), which meet or exceed the following:

- Work in progress
- Refereed work in press
- Research grant (P.I. or co-P.I.) in progress
- Peer reviewed research presentation

### **Very Good**

Evidence of research contributions in combination (see Research Criteria above), which meet or exceed the following:

- Work in progress
- Refereed work in press
- Peer reviewed research presentation
- **Submitted grant (P.I. or co-P.I.)**
- **Refereed work published**
- **Book in press**

### **Excellent**

Evidence of research contributions in combination (see Research Criteria above), which meet or exceed the following:

- Work in progress
- Refereed work in press
- Peer reviewed research presentation
- Research grant funded (P.I. or co-P.I.)
- **2 or more refereed works published**
- **Book published**

## **SERVICE:**

This category is intended to encompass the variety of expectations placed on a faculty member to contribute to the ongoing maintenance and development of the University, College, and School. These activities require attendance at faculty meetings, membership on University, College, and School committees. In addition, especially in Schools where there is a strong professional focus, there is a need for participation in what is generally recognized as community service. Such community service may include membership on local, state, national and international committees, academic consultation and advisory committees. There are also a number of activities classified under service, which relate to an individual's scholarly expertise and pursuits. A combination of Service activities is expected but commitment to various categories may vary year to year. Any activity for which the participant receives remuneration is considered consulting outside activity rather than service.

### **Levels of Performance**

#### **Service Criteria**

The levels of performance for service appraisal will be determined in reference to the following criteria:

- Participation at School, College and University faculty meetings
- Active membership on committees within the School, College and University
- Chair of committees within the School, College and University
- Active participation on Community Committees at local, state, national and international levels
- Chair of Community Committees at local, state, national and international levels
- Acting as a book reviewer or grant reviewer
- Active service as a member of an editorial board or grant selection committee
- Active service as a referee or reviewer for a journal or research granting organization
- Non-peer reviewed publications including articles in newsletters, newspapers, magazines, etc.
- Chairing a session at a scholarly or professional conference
- Assuming a leadership role in a scholarly or professional conference
- Interviews in the media, speeches, contributions to public proceedings, etc.
- Consulting to or advising a government, a service agency, or a community group.
- Mentoring faculty in teaching and/or research as evidenced by a mutually developed plan
- Active service to professional organizations.

Those faculty members who have been appointed to administrative positions will have their administrative performance evaluated under the heading of Service to the School and/or College.

### **Unsatisfactory**

- No active contribution to the School, College, University and the community at large is evidenced

### **Satisfactory**

- Regular participation in faculty meetings at the School and College level
- Participation in School, College, University level committees
- Membership in professional organizations
- Membership in community committees
- Attends School, College and/or University functions, e.g., graduation, convocation, student ceremonies

### **Good**

Evidence of service contributions in combination (see Service Criteria above), which meet or exceed the following:

- Regular participation at faculty meetings at the School and College level
- Attends School, College and/or University functions, e.g., graduation, convocation, student ceremonies
- **Shows evidence of contributions in committees at School, College and/or University level**
- **Shows evidence of active participation in at least one community level activity**
- **Serves as an advisor to student and/or alumni organization(s)**
- **Shows evidence of voluntary participation in an academic/scholarly and/or professional organization activity, e.g., book reviewer, member of editorial board, chair, etc.**

### **Very Good**

Evidence of service contributions in combination (see Service Criteria above), which meet or exceed the following:

- Regular participation at faculty meetings at the School and College level
- Shows evidence of active participation in at least one community level activity
- Service as advisor to student and/or alumni organization(s)
- Shows evidence of participation in any academic/scholarly volunteer activity e.g., book review, member of editorial board etc
- **Provided leadership and/or substantial contributions to committees at School, College and/or University level**
- **Evidences substantial voluntary activity within the scholarly communities, e.g., serving as a member of an accreditation body**
- **Mentoring faculty in teaching and/or research as evidenced by a mutually developed plan**
- **Shows evidence of voluntary leadership in 2 or more committees or task forces in academic, scholarly and/or professional organizations**
- **Evidence of submitted training grant for service program or project**

### **Excellent**

Evidence of service contributions in combination (see Service Criteria above), which meet or exceed the following:

- Regular participation at faculty meetings at the school and College level
- Evidences an active participation in the community such as assuming the chair of committees within the community
- Chairs committees within the School, College and/or University
- Service as an advisor to student and/or alumni organization(s)
- Shows evidence of participation in any academic/scholarly volunteer activity e.g. book reviewer, member of editorial board, etc.

- Provided leadership in four or more committees per semester at School, College and/or university level
- Evidences outstanding voluntary activity within the scholarly communities
- Mentoring faculty in teaching and/or research as evidenced by a mutually developed plan
- Shows evidence of voluntary leaderships in 2 or more committees or task forces in academic, scholarly and/or professional organizations
- **Evidence of submitted training grant for service program or project**
- **Generally recognized as excelling in the area of service, both in terms of quality and quantity of involvement**
- **Position of leadership in a professional organization e.g. President or Vice President of an Organization**
- **Procurement of funds from agencies or organizations for student scholarships**
- **Award, honor, or recognition of service from a regional, national, or international organization or agency**