

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES Wilkes Honors College (HC)

Annual evaluations will be conducted by the faculty member's chair and reviewed by the Dean and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.¹ The annual evaluation is conducted on a calendar year basis and includes an overall evaluation of Exceptional, Outstanding, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory achievement. The overall rating will be translated into a numerical rating, from an Exceptional rating of 5 to an Unsatisfactory rating of 1.²

Determining the Overall Rating:

Tenure-line Faculty: Faculty are rated in each area of the triad of instruction, scholarly/creative production, and service, as Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory per criteria given below. An overall evaluation score using the 5-rating scale is generally determined as follows, although variations may be made in individual cases based on exceptional performance.³

Exceptional: Excellent in all 3 areas.

Outstanding: Excellent in 2 areas and 1 Good.

Good: Good in 3 areas, or 2 Good and 1 Excellent, or 2 Good and 1 Needs Improvement, or 2 Excellent and 1 below Good (needs improvement or unsatisfactory), or 1 Excellent and 2 Needs Improvement, or 1 Excellent, 1 Good, and 1 below Good (needs improvement or unsatisfactory)

Needs Improvement: Needs Improvement in 3 areas, 2 Needs Improvement and 1 Good, 2 Good and 1 Unsatisfactory, or 1 Excellent and 2 Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory: Unsatisfactory in 2 areas with no rating of Excellent, 1 Unsatisfactory and 2 Needs Improvement

Instructors: Since instructors are not assigned research, they will be evaluated solely based on teaching and service. Their overall rating will be generally determined as follows:

Exceptional: Excellent in both areas.

Outstanding: Excellent in one area, Good in one area.

Good: No rating below Good; or 1 Needs Improvement and 1 Excellent.

Needs Improvement: Needs Improvements in 2 areas, or 1 Needs Improvement and 1 Good.

¹ As explained in the P&T Guidelines, there is not a direct relationship between annual evaluation outcomes and promotion and tenure decisions. The annual evaluations of faculty are determined by chairs and reviewed by the deans, while P&T recommendations are largely generated by tenured faculty in a separate process.

² In translating ratings to potential pay increases, note that a faculty member may earn merit pay with an overall rating of "3" (good) and a 3% sustained performance evaluation (SPE) raise requires an average rating of "4" (outstanding); an overall rating of "5" (exceptional) will not result in any additional pay increase.

³ For instance, faculty members may, in unusual circumstances such as a sabbatical, have atypical annual assignments that significantly alter the equal weighting of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Additionally, tenure-track faculty members may be assigned less service than their tenured colleagues. Such circumstances should be taken into account by the Chair in making the assignment and conducting the annual evaluation.

Unsatisfactory: Unsatisfactory in teaching regardless of the other score.

A faculty member earning a rating in categories below Good will establish a plan for improvement with his/her Chair, which may include peer mentoring, reassignment of duties, or other interventions as agreed upon by the faculty member and his/her Chair.

Annual Evaluation of Instruction

Materials used to evaluate instruction will include student evaluation data (SPOT scores), and evidence of teaching enhancement activities. Such activities are defined as those intended to benefit the HC by improving teaching effectiveness, student experience, and the curriculum, and also by disseminating one's experience and/or research results regarding teaching methods (examples are listed at the end of this section).

Note: In interpreting the student evaluation numbers, evaluators must consider factors such as patterns in student narrative comments, the size of the course (Is the course relatively large for the HC, or is the course so small that one student could significantly change the outcome?) and the role of the course in the curriculum (Is it a Core course, a gateway course for a concentration, a concentration requirement, or an elective?).

Translating SPOT scores into Annual Evaluation ratings:

SPOT ratings are based on question 6. Ratings in distance learning classes are based on questions 16 and 17. The following refers to the average score among courses taught:

A score falling between 1 and 2 will be considered excellent.

A score falling between 2 and 3 will be considered good.

A score falling between 3 and 4 will be considered needs improvement.

A score falling between 4 and 5 will be considered unsatisfactory

Excellent: Among several considerations, excellent teaching can be demonstrated through documented successful participation in teaching enhancement activities, a pattern of positive student comments, positive peer evaluations, other activities that contribute to HC instruction, and/or excellent student teaching evaluations. Excellent student teaching evaluations are defined as: a majority of courses rate an excellent; or the rating across courses of the instructor averages as excellent (scoring between 1 and 2).

Good: Documented successful participation in at least one teaching enhancement activity or activity that contributes to HC instruction, and a pattern of good SPOT evaluations (a score between 2 and 3), defined as: a majority of courses rate a good; or the rating across courses of the instructor averages good. Other evidence that may contribute to the ranking of good includes the results of peer evaluation, syllabi, course assignments, etc.

Needs Improvement: A pattern of needs improvement-category student evaluations, as indicated by one or more of the following: a majority of evaluations with a rating of needs improvement; or the rating across the courses of the instructor averages as needs improvement

(between 3 and 4).

Unsatisfactory: Failure to achieve at least a needs improvement rating.

Teaching Enhancement activities:

Examples of teaching enhancement activities that contribute to the HC include: Team-teaching a course, teaching a writing-intensive (WAC) course; teaching a Directed Independent Study (DIS) that is not the same version of a course being simultaneously taught; being primary reader of at least two honors theses for which one is not receiving a course reduction; serving as second reader of multiple honors theses; lecturing as part of the Honors College forum; receiving a teaching grant; successful curricular development (new course proposed, approved and taught; leading role in proposing a concentration that is approved and added to the curriculum); publication of a peer-reviewed article regarding teaching methods; making a presentation or having an organizing role in a conference on pedagogy; taking students to conferences/exhibitions to present their scholarly or artistic works.

Annual Evaluation of Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity

Faculty members may report research during years when an item is accepted for publication or during years when published but not both. For instance, if an Article is included in an annual report as forthcoming (i.e., accepted but not yet in print), the same Article should not be included in a future report.⁴

While an emphasis in annual evaluation is on finished work, faculty may also receive some credit for work that is in the production process (e.g., an Article sent for review; artistic work in progress). Documentation of such productivity must be provided by the faculty member.

Excellent: A rating of excellent will be achieved by accomplishing one or more of the following during the period of evaluation:

1. Acceptance or publication of an Article in a peer-reviewed national or international journal, or a chapter in a peer-reviewed book.
2. Acceptance or exhibition/performance of peer-reviewed creative work in nationally or internationally recognized shows. A local or regional exhibit will also count if it is in a museum.
3. Acceptance or publication of a book by a University press or commercial publisher on the basis of an externally peer reviewed manuscript (a book may be counted in two consecutive years).
4. Revision of a book by a University press or commercial publisher.
5. Receiving a significant grant or grants as a result of an external review process.
6. Acceptance or publication of a peer-reviewed textbook, or revised version of a textbook by a University or commercial publisher.
7. Editing a peer-reviewed book accepted by contract for publication.

⁴ As stated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, an Article is different from a "comment," a "note," or a "review." A series of notes, for example, may be considered as equivalent to a single Article.

8. Receiving a fellowship or residency.
9. Jurying or curating an exhibition or performance.
10. Acceptance of creative writing or other creative product in peer-reviewed national or international journals, books or magazines.
11. Presentation of 2 papers/posters at peer reviewed national or international conferences.
12. Organizing a professional conference, symposium, or exhibition.
13. Receiving an external or University award for scholarship or creative work

Non-peer-reviewed books: In some cases a book or other scholarly product that is not peer-reviewed but which appears in a reputable venue and makes a significant contribution to a field or fields will be considered in evaluating research. The faculty member must document the significance of the work.

Good: A rating of good will be achieved by accomplishing one or more of the following during the period of evaluation:

1. Acceptance or publication of a peer-reviewed Article in a local, state, or regional journal.
2. Acceptance or exhibition/performance of peer-reviewed creative work in local, state, or regionally recognized venues.
3. The presentation of 2 scholarly papers/posters at peer-reviewed professional conferences—local, state, or regional; or of 1 paper/poster at a peer reviewed national or international conference.
4. Significant favorable critical reviews and citations of recently published work of the candidate.
5. Acceptance or publication of creative writing or other creative product in local, regional, or state peer-reviewed journals, books, or magazines.
6. Acceptance or publication of a review of a book, exhibition, or performance in a journal that is considered major in an area of inquiry.
7. Acceptance or publication of a note or comment in a peer-reviewed journal.
8. Submitting a grant proposal for an external review processes.

Needs improvement: Evidence of continuing research/creative activity and submission of research/creative product for publication; presentation of a paper at a local, state or regional professional conference; writing applications for grants; manuscript(s) or other creative work in progress. Overall, scholarly activity that has a reasonable expectation of leading to peer-reviewed publication or receipt of externally reviewed grants.

Unsatisfactory: Failure to meet the requirements of a needs improvement rating.

Annual Evaluation of Service:

Evaluators will take into account both the quality and quantity of activity in deciding the overall rating of service. Quality of service can be documented by memos from a committee chair, fellow members, college chair or administrator, or participants or beneficiaries of a service activity. Service on a committee that did not meet during the year may not be counted toward an evaluation rating.

Examples of service include: chairing or serving on a standing or ad hoc College committee (ad hoc committees include search committees); participating in the regional, state or national honors community by attending conferences; serving on a university committee; advising/assisting student organizations; participating in University governance (e.g. UFF, Faculty Senate); assisting with recruiting activities (e.g. visiting schools, participating in open house, Scholars Day, Orientation events); serving in professional associations; community outreach (e.g. talks to the community or local schools; service on boards); organizing events for the community that bring them to the campus.

Excellent: The following examples represent a sample of activities that would merit a rating of excellent during the period of evaluation. This list is not exhaustive, as other potential combinations of activities might also apply.

1. Providing substantive service chairing a HC Committee.
2. Providing substantive service in a leadership role in organizing and encouraging student activities.
3. Providing significant service on multiple HC Committees; or on an HC committee and: a University Committee, in University governance, community service, or professional service.
4. Exemplary service on an HC Committee as well as participation in student activities or recruitment.

Good: The following examples represent a sample of activities that would merit a rating of good during the period of evaluation. This list is not exhaustive, as other potential combinations of activities might also apply.

1. Significant service on an HC Committee, University committee, or ad-hoc committee.
2. Significant participation in student activities.
3. Service on a committee and participation in recruitment events.
4. Significant community service (i.e., multiple lectures, meetings or other services).
5. Significant service to the profession (e.g., chair of a panel and member of advisory board for a journal).
6. Other combinations of good College, University, and Professional service.

Needs Improvement: A faculty member participates in the governance of the college through regular attendance and participation at faculty meetings and activities. In addition, a faculty member is expected to participate in regular College and University functions.

Unsatisfactory: This rating should be given to faculty members whose service does not meet any of the criteria listed above.

Chair's Role in the Annual Evaluation Process

The chair is an advocate for the success of faculty to whom he or she is assigned. After submitting the annual evaluation form for review, faculty members have the opportunity to meet with the chair to discuss its contents, ask and answer questions, and receive feedback. Faculty should bring to the meeting a copy of the completed annual evaluation form, an updated CV, and relevant documentation of items listed on the evaluation form (e.g., letters indicating receipt of an award or honor, messages indicating the inclusion of artwork in an exhibition, or the acceptance of books, articles, and chapters for publication, etc.).

Faculty Response to Annual Evaluation

A faculty member may request in writing a meeting with an administrator at the next higher level to discuss concerns regarding the evaluation that were not resolved in discussions with the chair. In addition, each candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor may choose to be assigned a Faculty Mentor, who is an academic/professional advisor with no supervisory responsibilities. The Faculty Mentor must be a tenured member of the HC faculty. The candidate in consultation with the Associate Dean(s) would select the Faculty Mentor. At the request of the faculty member, the advisor may attend meetings between the faculty member and his or her supervisor regarding issues of assignment.