

PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION SEPTEMBER 2023

The document describes processes for annual informal evaluation of junior faculty members, 5-year evaluations for senior faculty members, how these evaluations are used to determine ratings for annual evaluations, the process for determining merit raises, and finally the timeline that will be used each year to execute these evaluations. These procedures are for all faculty, including tenure-track, research, and instructional faculty. These procedures are only for annual evaluations, and it does not describe the procedures for comprehensive reviews, reappointments, tenure reviews, and promotions. These procedures were discussed and adopted by the faculty in a departmental vote conducted on January 19, 2021. They were amended in September 2023 to add staff input and link to our updated faculty expectations documentation.

I. DEFINITIONS

- A. Junior faculty members - non-tenured tenure-track faculty, full-time instructors, and research assistant professors.
- B. Senior faculty members - tenured faculty, senior instructors, principal instructors, teaching professors, and research associate/full professors.
- C. Formal review - these reviews include reappointments, comprehensive reviews, tenure reviews, and promotion reviews. The processes used for these reviews are governed by the [departmental bylaws](#) and [university policies and procedures](#).
- D. Annual informal evaluations - these evaluations are those conducted for junior faculty using the process described in Section II.
- E. 5-year evaluation - these evaluations are those conducted for senior faculty using the process described in Section III.
- F. Annual evaluations - these are the required evaluation ratings that must be submitted to the college each year.

II. JUNIOR FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS

- A. This process is used for all non tenured tenure-track faculty, full-time instructors, and research assistant professors.
- B. This process is only used when no formal review is being conducted. When a formal review is conducted, the procedure is as described in the [departmental bylaws](#).
- C. The materials considered for this evaluation include the following items:
 - 1. An updated curriculum vitae
 - 2. The most recent FRPA report
 - 3. Student and peer course evaluations
 - 4. A report of research awards and expenditures during the past year
 - 5. Collected Staff Feedback
 - 6. Any additional material that the candidate would like to provide
- D. Once the file is complete, the candidate is given one week to review the materials in their evaluation file and may report any inaccuracies.

- E. The initial evaluation is compiled by the two mentors assigned to the junior faculty member.
- F. Before their presentation to the PUEC, each mentor meets with the faculty member being evaluated and attends one lecture.
- G. The mentors present their initial evaluation to the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC).
- H. The PUEC provides their feedback, and a letter summarizing the evaluation is prepared for the faculty member under evaluation including a rating to be used in their annual evaluation is compiled by the mentors..
- I. The overall rating must consider the workload breakdown between teaching, research, and service for the faculty member under evaluation. Department expectations of faculty for annual evaluations can be found [here](#).
- J. The Chair, Associate Chair for Faculty, and the mentors meet with the junior faculty member to discuss the evaluation and steps necessary to achieve tenure and/or promotion.

III. SENIOR FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS

- A. This process is used for tenured faculty, senior instructors, principal instructors, teaching professors, and research associate/full professors.
- B. At least once every 5 years, each senior faculty member is evaluated either using this process or a formal promotion process described in the [departmental bylaws](#).
- C. A faculty member may request an early evaluation before the next required evaluation.
- D. The materials considered for this evaluation include the following items:
 - 1. An updated curriculum vitae
 - 2. Faculty professional plan form
 - 3. FRPA reports for the previous 5 years
 - 4. Student and peer course evaluations
 - 5. A report of research awards and expenditures during the past 5 years
 - 6. Collected Staff Feedback
 - 7. Any additional material that the candidate would like to provide
- E. Once the file is complete, the candidate is given one week to review the materials in their evaluation file and may report any inaccuracies.
- F. The initial evaluation is compiled by a three-person committee composed of the following members:
 - 1. A chair assigned by the Associate Chair for Faculty
 - 2. One representative selected by the faculty member under evaluation
 - 3. One representative selected by the chair of the evaluation committee
- G. All members of the committee should hold an equal rank (including tenure, if applicable) with the exception that a committee for a Full Professor can include one Associate Professor.
- H. A faculty member being evaluated may optionally select one faculty member to not serve on their evaluation committee.

- I. Before the committee presents their evaluation to the PUEC, the evaluation committee **MUST** meet with the faculty member under evaluation to ensure their evaluation is fair and accurate.
- J. After the committee presents their evaluation to the PUEC, the PUEC provides their feedback, and a letter summarizing the evaluation is prepared for the faculty member under evaluation including a rating to be used in their annual evaluation for the following 5 years.
- K. The overall rating must consider the workload breakdown between teaching, research, and service for the faculty member under evaluation. Department expectations of faculty for annual evaluations can be found [here](#).
- L. If a faculty member receives an overall rating of below expectations or lower, then they must be evaluated again the following year.

IV. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

- A. When there is a formal review conducted, the results of the formal review are utilized to determine the faculty member's annual evaluation rating.
- B. When there is no formal review and the faculty member is a junior faculty member, then the results from the informal evaluation are utilized to determine the faculty member's annual evaluation rating.
- C. When there is no formal review and the faculty member is a senior faculty member, then the results from the last formal review or 5-year evaluation are utilized to determine the faculty member's annual evaluation rating.
- D. Feedback may be considered that is provided by the college on evaluations, but the final decision on all annual evaluations rests with the PUEC.

V. DETERMINATION OF MERIT RAISES

- A. Each year's raise pool is divided into two categories: standard raise pool and merit raise pool.
- B. The amount in each category is proposed by the Chair and approved by the PUEC.
- C. The Chair proposes to the PUEC for approval a list of faculty to receive an equal share from the standard raise pool (typically all faculty with meets expectations or above).
- D. The Chair proposes to the PUEC for approval a list of faculty to receive an additional raise from the merit raise pool.
- E. Note that while this is performance-based, it is not necessarily directly tied to evaluations, and can be used to correct salary inequities due to compression or inversion.

VI. TIMELINE

- A. Formal reviews are typically conducted each Fall semester and used for annual evaluations during the same academic year.
- B. Informal junior faculty evaluations are conducted early in the Spring semester and used for annual evaluations during the same academic year.

- C. Meetings with all junior faculty members with the Chair, Associate Chair for Faculty, and their mentors to discuss their evaluations occur during the Spring semester each year.
- D. 5-year senior faculty evaluations are conducted late in the Spring semester and used for annual evaluations in the subsequent 5 years.
- E. During the first 5 years of this evaluation process, some faculty do not have an evaluation available to use to set their annual evaluation rating. Their starting rating is determined by the PUEC at the beginning of Spring 2021, and it is used until they undergo an evaluation using this process. This rating is based on past evaluations.

VII. GRIEVANCES

- A. The final authority on all evaluation decisions is the PUEC, so any grievances raised are with the decision of the PUEC.
- B. While the Department Chair and Associate Chair for Faculty can participate as faculty members that prepare evaluations to be presented to the PUEC, they are not members of the PUEC. Therefore, they have no voting rights in the evaluation decisions and are thus considered impartial for the purposes of raising grievances.
- C. A faculty member may raise concerns to the Department Chair and Associate Chair for Faculty if they feel that these procedures have not been followed by the PUEC resulting in an unfair evaluation.
- D. If the Department Chair and Associate Chair for Faculty cannot determine a resolution satisfactory to the faculty member who raised the concern AND the PUEC, then the Department Chair shall convene a Grievance Committee as described in the [departmental bylaws](#).
- E. Grievances about salary are governed by the Salary Grievance Process.