

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

Academic Faculty Evaluation

“Tool Kit”

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

Outline

1. Academic and Administrative Performance Evaluation & Development Process Objective
2. General Comments on the Evaluation Process
3. Rationale for Annual Evaluations
4. Annual Evaluation of Teaching
 - I. Motivation
 - II. Evaluation Guidelines
 - III. Evidence and Relevant Considerations
5. Annual Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Work
 - I. Motivation
 - II. Evaluation Guidelines
 - III. Evidence & Relevant Considerations
6. Annual Evaluation of Service
 - I. Motivation
 - II. Evaluation Guidelines
 - III. Evidence and Relevant Considerations
7. Annual Evaluation of Primary Assignment for Non-Teaching Academic Faculty
 - I. Motivation
 - II. Evaluation Guidelines
 - III. Evidence & Relevant Considerations
 - IV. Sample: Non-teaching Academic Faculty Role Statement
8. Example Role Statement

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

1. University of Nevada, Reno Academic and Administrative Performance Evaluation & Development Process Objective

The University uses the academic and administrative performance evaluation and development process to evaluate, recognize, improve, and sustain quality employee performance within each department, college, school, and division of the University.

Every faculty member's contribution is important to the achievement of the University's mission of teaching, research, and service. Our performance evaluation and development process assists faculty members and supervisors in setting goals, engaging in professional development activities, and measuring and rewarding success. The process articulates individual goals and achievement in the context of the overall mission of the institution. The university is committed to individual and collective responsibility of the success of the institution by articulating goals, fostering open dialogue and constructive feedback, emphasizing quality performance, and supporting professional development.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

2. General Comments on the Evaluation Process

Faculty roles vary substantially across the university, and expectations for excellence vary with roles and with academic discipline. Departments, or, in some cases, colleges, should agree on and clearly articulate the relative importance of various activities for merit. For example, one department might set the highest priorities for awarding merit on receiving competitive extramural grants and on teaching formal undergraduate courses. Another department might place the highest priorities on publishing books and mentoring graduate students. Just as different departments may have different priorities for awarding merit; priorities may also vary within departments across faculty ranks. For example, some departments may expect senior faculty to play a leadership role in service, in curriculum development, or in graduate mentoring. Priorities are expected to vary across disciplines. Good evaluations require that the departmental or unit priorities are clearly communicated so that all faculty have a good understanding of what is expected of them and of how their accomplishments will be evaluated.

The activities that have the greatest effect on evaluations (i.e., merit rankings) should be closely aligned with the unit's mission and role within the university. By aligning evaluation priorities with the unit's mission, the annual evaluation process will help promote the activities that are important. Evaluations are most likely to achieve this goal when standards are fairly applied, expectations are clear, and the metrics used to evaluate performance are well validated and appropriate. Depending on a department's goals, it may be particularly important to consider how to fairly evaluate contributions to interdisciplinary research or to long-term projects. Ultimately, effective evaluation requires sound professional judgment.

An evaluation is the primary mechanism by which faculty receive feedback on their professional activities and accomplishments. Consequently, it is critical that evaluations be honest and constructive. The integrity and effectiveness of the evaluation process also requires that evaluations are honest and clearly address significant weaknesses. Evaluators should allow sufficient time to draft and edit evaluations so that they are tactful, well reasoned, accurate, and fair. Most people respond better to praise than criticism, so if suggestions for improvement are needed, it may be effective to place them in the broader context of the faculty member's accomplishments. The data considered in the evaluation and the criteria or priorities used to evaluate them should be clearly communicated. Faculty also should have ample opportunity to discuss the evaluation in person with the evaluator.

Units should identify and discuss the appropriate categorization of certain activities whose categorization sometimes differs from discipline to discipline or across institutions (e.g., is journal editing to be counted under scholarship or professional service, do textbooks count under teaching or research, is direction of dissertation research to be counted under teaching or research?). It may be appropriate in certain disciplines to count certain kinds of creative or research-related work with students under both teaching and research (obviously, with appropriate weightings to avoid the effect of "double-dipping").

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

Each evaluation should be summarized with respect to the unit's publicly-specified expectations and priorities (III.1), in consideration of the documented quality (III.2-3) and quantity (III.4) of the faculty member's contribution to the unit's mission. A consistent ranking system is one that assigns a rating to the faculty member(s) who were highly effective at making higher-priority contributions. For example, if large enrollment introductory courses are a higher priority to the department/unit than new upper-division courses, the weight on "teach large introductory course" should be higher than the weight on "develop new upper-division course" across all personnel evaluated in that department/unit. The process should result in the most effective teachers in the highest priority activities earning the highest merit rankings with respect to teaching.

Avoid common Pitfalls:

- a) Avoid the "permanent halo or doghouse" effects by focusing on the current evaluation year rather than recalling past performances
- b) Single aspects of a faculty member's performance should not determine their entire rating
- c) All judgments must be supported by evidence
- d) Evaluation requires more than description: An analysis of the relevant data and recommendations is critical
- e) Remain focused on the performance of the faculty member and not be generous to faculty members based on the fact that they are new faculty or beginners

Who Should Have Input into the Evaluation?

The faculty member's department chair should complete the evaluation; however, input for the evaluation should also include comments from a P.I. when a faculty member is extramurally funded since the faculty member's performance is directly related to the P.I.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

3. Rationale for Annual Evaluations

Board of Regents Handbook:

http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Handbook/Title-4/T4-CH03.doc_cvt.htm#t4c3s3

Section 4. Evaluations

1. The NSHE Code, Chapter 5, Section 5.12.1 and 5.12.2, establishes that written performance evaluations of academic faculty and administrative faculty shall be conducted at least once annually by department chairs, supervisors or heads of administrative units. One of the purposes of annual performance evaluations is to provide constructive, developmental feedback to the faculty member. (B/R 9/05)

2. All performance evaluations shall include a rating of (i) “excellent,” (ii) “commendable,” (iii) “satisfactory,” or (iv) “unsatisfactory.” No other rating terminology shall be used. The areas of evaluation and procedures for evaluation of academic faculty and administrative faculty are established in institutional bylaws. Evaluations of instructional faculty shall include an assessment of teaching evaluations completed by their students. The performance evaluations of executive and supervisory faculty shall include consultation with the professional and classified staff of the appropriate administrative unit. The evaluation of the presidents and the chancellor shall follow guidelines approved by the Board of Regents.

3. The annual performance evaluation of tenured faculty is addressed in NSHE Code, Chapter 5, Section 5.12.

University Bylaws:

http://www.unr.edu/vpaf/hr/policies/documents/unr_bylaws.pdf

Chapter III - Professional Responsibilities, Evaluation and Personnel Recommendations

39. Professional Responsibilities

All personnel evaluations shall be made on the basis of written and specific professional responsibilities and performance expectations mutually agreed upon by the individual faculty member and the responsible agent within the department as specified by department bylaws. All specifications of professional responsibilities for a member of the faculty shall be in accordance with the mission and priorities of that person's department, as defined in Section 6 of these Bylaws. Any deviations from the mission and priorities described in the department bylaws must be justified and approved in writing by the dean and the President. The agreement shall be subject to appropriate periodic review by the individual faculty member and the responsible agent within the department who shall make every effort to accommodate subsequent changes that may be desired by either party. If a member of the faculty and the responsible agent in the department are unable to reach an agreement about specified professional responsibilities, the matter is subject to the grievance procedure outlined in these Bylaws. The agreed upon

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

specification of professional responsibilities is subject to review by the dean or other appropriate administrators.

The responsibilities shall be listed whenever applicable under the following categories:

a. Instruction, e.g., classroom teaching, extension and outreach teaching, preparation, evaluation of students' performance, direction of independent study and theses, consultation with students enrolled in classes, and student advising.

b. Research, scholarly and creative work related to the members' discipline, e.g., books, articles, reports, paintings, and musical compositions.

c. Assigned professional responsibilities of administrative faculty members.

d. Additional administrative responsibilities of academic faculty members.

e. Professional service to the university, profession and public. This includes consultation, administration, or other University-sponsored services directed toward University or community welfare, and other professional activities as clarified below:

(i) The university, e.g., activities involved in University governance or otherwise facilitating the accomplishments of the University's mission.

(ii) The profession, e.g., activities related to professional growth and development including such things as specified participation in professional meetings, holding office in professional organizations, editing and refereeing professional journals, reviewing textbooks, research proposals, and other manuscripts, organizing scholarly meetings, and developing additional areas of professional competence.

(iii) The public, e.g., consulting and other service for groups and organizations outside the University where such service is intrinsically related to the professional competence of the individual.

40. Evaluation

Each faculty member shall be evaluated according to the above specified professional responsibilities in order to assess the quality of professional performance as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, commendable, or excellent. An overall evaluation of "excellent" or "commendable" shall be considered meritorious. Each person shall submit documentation, as specified in department, unit, and University bylaws, for evaluation. The evaluation of each person shall carry a signed statement indicating that he or she has read the evaluation or has waived the right to read it. If the faculty member disagrees with any part of the evaluation, he or she may submit a written statement which shall be attached to the written evaluation and become a part thereof. Evidence of excellent performance in specified professional responsibilities shall be a requirement for tenure or promotion. All evaluations shall be initiated by the department and shall be made on the basis of equitable and uniform criteria. Quality of performance for each area of professional activity shall be assessed according to procedures and criteria specified in department, unit, and University bylaws. For academic faculty, evaluations shall include peer review. For tenure-track faculty members, external peer review shall be required for promotion or tenure, as specified in unit and/or department bylaws. All evaluations and reconsideration proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with principles of judicious review, here defined as careful and professional assessment of admissible evidence so as to insure a just and equitable recommendation.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

4. Annual Evaluation of Teaching

I. Motivation

The objective of good teaching is student learning. Good teaching is *necessary* at any land-grant university. All faculty are accountable for the learning of their students and clients. Assessment is a vital and expected part of our role as university faculty. The primary clientele of UNR are the citizens of Nevada.

II. Evaluation Guidelines

Each faculty member being evaluated is responsible for providing the evidence to support their evaluation with respect to both *quality* and *quantity* of teaching. The quality and significance of teaching should be evaluated by peers in the discipline or unit, whichever is more appropriate. This may include effectiveness in teaching, monitoring and coordinating educational activities, such as planning, assessing and documenting. Professional relationships with faculty and residents/students, effective communication skills and role modeling. Copies of written supporting evidence may be submitted along with the faculty evaluation form.

III. Evidence and Relevant Considerations

1) *Identify and Prioritize Contributions to the Teaching Mission*

Each unit identifies the types of teaching activities relevant for their unit, to include all activities identified in each member's role statement. Each unit specifies the relative importance of the different types of teaching activities toward meeting the mission of the unit. *The weights assigned to each type of activity in the individual faculty evaluations should reflect the same relative importance of the activity to the unit.*

Common categories of teaching activities include (but are not limited to):

- a) Classroom teaching
- b) Outreach teaching
- c) Teaching in a clinical setting
 - i) One-on-one teaching going over a patient
 - ii) Supervising a student/resident examining/treating a patient
 - iii) Teaching in a group setting (group rounds an inpatient or outpatient setting)
- d) Advising undergraduate or graduate students
- e) Directing undergraduate or graduate student research
- f) Graduate thesis/dissertation committee member
- g) Writing and grading of M.S. or Ph.D. comprehensive examinations
- h) Advising student clubs/organizations/societies
- i) Textbook writing (may be Research activity)

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

- j) Supervising teaching or research assistants (may be Research activity)
- k) Development of or first-time application of new techniques
- l) Training students (e.g. to use analytical instruments)
- m) Coordinating the undergraduate or graduate program (may be Service activity)
- n) Coordinating the curriculum, assessment, or placement (may be Service activity)

2) Choose and Interpret Student Evaluation of Teaching Metrics Carefully

The annual evaluation of faculty with some teaching appointment must include student evaluations of teaching, according to the Regent and UNR regulations. Student evaluations of teaching should, among many other considerationsⁱ

- a) Be standardized UNR-wide or nationwide, e.g. IDEA <http://www.idea.ksu.edu/podidea/index.html> or CIEQ.
- b) Be externally verifiable
- c) Provide constructive (*formative*) information

3) Identify and Use Other Measures of Teaching Quality or Effectiveness

Student evaluations of teaching should NOT be the only evidence of teaching effectiveness considered in the annual evaluation. Each unit should also specify other types of evidence that will be considered, and should be provided by the faculty member evaluated.

Additional types of evidence of the quality of teaching include (but are not limited to):

- a) Peer evaluationsⁱⁱ
- b) Teaching awards
- c) Outreach program awards
- d) Awards won by supervised students
- e) Teaching grants
- f) Other instructional evaluation documents
- g) Unsolicited written statements from students, trainees, or clients
- h) Teaching materials including syllabi, tests, quizzes, homework assignments, handouts, graded papers, or contents of a teaching portfolio
- i) Other 'teaching' related evidence of quality
- j) Outreach teaching should measure outcome or impact assessment related to the learner, which might include changed behavior

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

4) Other Factors That May be Considered

When faculty make contributions to the unit's teaching mission that exceed the expectations in their role statement, or, when the particular activity requires an unusually high level of effort, the additional quantitative aspect should be taken into account. (But avoid double-counting.) Exceptional *quantitative* contributions to the teaching mission may include, for example:

- a) Larger courses (rather than smaller)
- b) Teaching more courses than listed in the role statement
- c) New preps (rather than repeat preps)
- d) Unexpected changes ; i.e. increases or decreases in student enrollment
- e) Required course (rather than elective)
- f) More contact or credit hours (compared to fewer)

- g) Supervision of numerous Teaching Assistants (or, making do without them)
- h) Being flexible and accommodating when asked
- i) Devoting extra time on professional development of teaching effectiveness.
- j) Distance education – online, hybrid, and interactive video classes
- k) Other 'teaching' related evidence of extra quantity
- l) Mentoring new faculty

¹ Selected research on the proper use of student evaluation of teaching includes:

- 1) Barbara Gross Davis (1993) Tools for Teaching San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers;
- 2) The Ohio State University Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Handbook (2001) http://www.ureg.ohio-state.edu/ourweb/Tests/TestsContent/SEI_handbook.pdf ;
- 3) Arreola, R. (2000) Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System 2nd Ed. Boston, MA: Anker Pub. Co.
- 4) Cornell University Teaching Evaluation Handbook Third Edition, 1997.
<http://www.clt.cornell.edu/resources/teh/teh.html>

- ¹ 1) Millis, B. J. (1992) "Conducting Effective Peer Classroom Observations." In D. H. Wulff and J. D. Nyquist (eds.), *To Improve the Academy. Vol. 11*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press;
- 2) NC State Peer Review of Teaching (2003) http://www.ncsu.edu/provost/peer_review/definereview.htm

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

5. Annual Evaluation of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Work

I. Motivation.

The mission of a research university includes the commitment to discovery and the advancement of knowledge and artistry. A land-grant university should produce research that addresses the great global and societal issues and artistry that contributes to the quality of life. Faculty members are responsible for contributing to the research and/or artistic mission of the university.

II. Evaluation Guidelines

Each faculty member being evaluated is responsible for providing the evidence to support the evaluation of their research/artistry with respect to both quality and quantity. This may include ability to identify and define significant Research and Development projects, to plan and execute well defined research and to generate effective results and reports worthy of publication. Copies of written supporting evidence may be submitted along with the evaluation form.

III. Evidence and Relevant Considerations

- a. Publications that have gone through the normal refereed process include but not limited to:
 - books, monographs, articles, book chapters, reviews, poems, musical compositions and other reviewed or juried publications such as fact sheets, bulletins and curriculum
 - recordings, such as CDs, videotapes, and films;
 - other scholarly and creative works published or produced by academic journals or scholarly presses
 -
- b. Exhibitions of art or design works at galleries
- c. Performances in recitals or productions
- d. Presentations of research or scholarly papers at scholarly meetings
- e. Scholarly reviews of the faculty member's publications or critical reviews of art works and performances
- f. Reprinting or quoting of publications, reproductions of art or design works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts appearing in venues in the discipline
- g. Contracts and competitive grants to support scholarly ideas or performance and demonstrable benefit to the department/college/unit.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

- h. Development of processes, instruments, software, computer programs, or technology useful in solving important problems, and where appropriate obtaining patents or copyrights for them to enable technology transfer
- i. Awards of fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection for assignment at special institutes for advanced study
- j. Other scholarly, creative, and/or professional activities demonstrably related to the discipline
- k. Quality and impact of scholarship/presentations versus the number completed**

1. The quality, impact, and significance of the work should be evaluated by peers within the discipline or administrative unit, whichever is most appropriate. Criteria for evaluating quality might include circulation, acceptance rates, and prestige of journals; reputation of scholarly presses; prestige of performance venues; the extent of the peer review process; the competitiveness of grants; the prestige and competitiveness of awards and fellowships; prizes and awards for excellence of previous research or artistry, and so on.
2. When written reviews are available (e.g., for journal articles or grant proposals), copies of the peer-reviews might be submitted along with the evaluation form. For grant reviews, overviews of the review process (e.g., indication of the overall success rate should be submitted along with the evaluation).
3. Faculty members involved in multi-authored publications or other collaborative work should indicate the nature and extent of their contribution.
4. Units should agree on the use of terms such as “under contract,” “in press,” and “forthcoming.”
5. Units should determine how to count multi-year grants and whether no-cost extensions will be credited. They should determine how to weight grants or contracts that run for part of the year versus the entire year.
6. Units should provide guidelines as to the relative importance of different types of scholarly and creative activities (e.g., do publications count more than presentations).
7. Units should decide whether certain publications should be credited for more than one year (e.g., books) and when publications should be credited (e.g., at acceptance or appearance of the work). Units may want to consider the appropriateness of a three- or four-year rolling average in scholarship/creative activities to minimize the effect of the erratic publication cycles of journals, the time-frame for book publication, and the fluctuation in state funding for merit increases.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

6. Annual Evaluation of Service

I. Motivation

Service activities are an essential part of the land grant university's mission. Faculty service develops and promotes goals of individual units, the institution, the profession, and external constituents. Service is essential for the smooth running of the institution and for its obligation to serve society.

Faculty members are expected to perform service in balance with excellence in teaching and scholarship. However, for grant faculty whose funding precludes them from engaging in service activities, it is appropriate to reflect this in the individual faculty member's role statement.

II. Evaluation Guidelines

Each faculty member is responsible for providing evidence of both quantity and quality of services activities. Copies of written supportive evidence may be submitted along with the evaluation form.

Units may suggest a set of guidelines for service by recommending both quantity and quality of service activities needed in a year in order to achieve an "Excellent" rating.

Units should expect and recognize different levels of service according to the rank of individual faculty members. For example, the non-tenured faculty may be protected from taxing service, while those with tenure and longevity may be expected to increase service commitments and assume leadership roles.

III. Evidence and Relevant Considerations

1. Service activity categories.

a. *Institutional service* includes but is not limited to:

- * Participation on department, college, and university committees.
- * Holding administrative roles within the department or college.
- * Engaging in activities at the university, college or department level that aid in governance or otherwise facilitate the missions and accomplishments of the University and unit.

b. *Professional service* includes but is not limited to:

- * Participation in professional meetings.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

- * Holding office in professional organizations.
- * Clinical service, such as clinical productivity, patient management skills, diagnostic and therapeutic acumen:
 - Clinical Competence: (Includes examination, diagnosis, therapeutic-ability, effectiveness in emergency management, patient interaction, consultations, special skills and record keeping)
 - Administrative Competence: (Includes supervisory ability, effectiveness in planning, administrative judgment, decision making skills, verbal/written skills and reporting)
 - Professionalism: (Includes professional behavior, dependability, relations with staff and community, ability to elicit cooperation, managing groups and adherence to ethical standards)
- * Editing and refereeing professional journals, reviewing textbooks, research proposals, and other manuscripts. Units might discuss whether these types of activities count under professional service or under research.
- * Organizing scholarly meetings.
- * Developing additional areas of professional competence.

c. *Outreach or Service beyond the university and the profession* includes but is not limited to:

- * Public scholarship involving in an ongoing relationship with professionals in a systematic exchange of practice and learning in a manner that exemplifies the land grant mission.
- * Consulting and other service for groups and organizations outside the University where such service is intrinsically related to the professional expertise of the individual and is performed with University affiliation identified.

Units are encouraged to apply proper emphasis to outreach as a discrete activity deserving of clear definition as described by the UNR outreach initiative circa 2003.

2. Service activities priorities.

Each unit determines the relative importance of certain types of service activities identifying them as MAJOR, MODERATE, and MINOR depending on:

- a. Level of involvement. Frequency of meetings, leadership roles, outside work required such as information gathering and writing reports.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

- b. Impact of the activity. How narrow or broad is the scope of the activity, who or what is affected, to what degree?

- c. Linkage to the unit's mission. Does the activity have a direct impact on the unit? Does it specifically support the stated mission?

Linkage to the unit's strategic plan. Does the activity accomplish key tactics that help the unit meet strategic goals?

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

7. Annual Evaluation of Primary Assignment for Non-Teaching Academic Faculty

I. Motivation

The primary responsibilities of many academic faculty are focused on programs and activities related to support more than teaching scheduled courses. These activities apply faculty professional knowledge and skills to a variety of initiatives providing support for the university research and instruction, and for the people of Nevada.

II. Evaluation Guidelines

How well each faculty member executes programs, activities, and teaching agreed to in their annual role statement is the basis for evaluation. Each faculty member being evaluated is responsible for providing evidence to support the evaluation of their performance in fulfilling various programs, activities, and teaching agreed to in their annual Role Statements. Copies of written supporting evidence should be submitted along with the evaluation form. Role Statements may be revised during the year – additions, modifications, deletions -- and indication of such changes should be included in the evaluation document.

III. Evidence and Relevant Considerations

1. Where qualitative or quantitative performance measures have been agreed upon in the role statement evidence should be presented against which the quality and quantity of work may be weighed.
2. Where output or outcome measures have been agreed upon in the role statement evidence should be presented against which the quality and quantity of work may be weighed.
3. Where work is done in collaboration or partnership with others, faculty members should provide – as much as possible – evidence of the nature and extent of their involvement.
4. Unofficial testimonials from individuals participating in programs or services included in the faculty member's Role Statement may be considered as evidence of performance.

Sample non-teaching academic faculty role statement

Non-teaching academic faculty role statements should briefly summarize the faculty member's position description and clearly delineate specific goals / objectives / expectations for the current year. The yearly expectations must contribute to the specific mission of the unit and to the overall university mission.

For effective evaluation, goals/objectives/expectations should include concise descriptions of the goal and of its expected outcome. Quantifiable or qualitative standards for measuring the effectiveness of the faculty member's performance should also be included.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

In cases that teaching is a non-teaching faculty member's primary assignment (though she/he is stationed in a usually non-teaching unit), standard methods of teaching evaluation as outlined elsewhere in this document should be utilized.

A sample non-teaching library academic faculty role statement (Performance Expectations) is included below.

**Faculty Role Statement
Information Technology Division
For Calendar Year: 2000**

Name: John Q. Public

Title: Widget Coordinator

Department: Library

Position No: P000-00

Signature of Faculty Member:

Supervisor: Second Reviewer:

Signature of Vice President/Dean:

I. Position Summary (brief description of primary responsibilities of the job):

A. Position Summary

As Widget Coordinator this position does the various tasks that widget coordinators do – which should be generally described here... Serves on library and university committees, participates in professional activities and in some type of research, publication and/or other creative activity contributing to professional development. . (this is the faculty member's specific job description)

B. Duties:

- 1) Provides leadership in the development of the Library's widget collection, including the identification and provision of access to digital widget files available on the Internet, and developing means for access to data files through local networks.
- 2) Supervises three classified staff in the Widget department.
- 3) Identifies widgets for cataloging.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

II. Performance Expectations (place in priority order)

A. Primary Responsibilities

#1

<p>Clear, specific statement of the expectation (action to be taken): Identify two major widget producing entities on campus that would benefit from partnering with IT (/Libraries) to establish Widget Websites.</p>
<p>Description of the outcome/result to be accomplished: Two Websites that provide access to the UNR Widget producing entities.</p>
<p>By when (target completion date): July, 2000.</p>
<p>Standard or quantifiable measure: Quantity - identify at least one partner early in the year – if successful and feasible, identify at least one more later in the year. Quality – subjective peer review of Library Web Advisory committee.</p>
<p>Relevance to unit strategic plan: 2d, 4a, 4c</p>

#2

<p>Clear, specific statement of the expectation (action to be taken): Establish and assess with John Public a prototype archive for preservation of and access to UNR scholarly Widgets created in digital formats. If deemed feasible in prototype, roll out as an actual Widget repository.</p>
<p>Description of the outcome/result to be accomplished: Policies and procedures for a Widget repository will be drafted. A prototype Web platform will be established, tentatively employing our existing Web server and storage platform. A poll/survey to assess the viability and feasibility of rolling out will be taken. If deemed feasible, the product will go into production.</p>
<p>By when (target completion date): August, 2000 prototype, December 2000 actual.</p>
<p>Standard or quantifiable measure: Subjective evaluation by Library administration.</p>
<p>Relevance to strategic plan: 4a, 4c</p>

B. Research and Scholarship

C. Service

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

Sample non-teaching academic faculty role statement

Non-teaching academic faculty role statements should briefly summarize the faculty member's position description and clearly delineate specific goals / objectives / expectations for the current year. The yearly expectations must contribute to the specific mission of the unit and to the overall university mission.

For effective evaluation, goals/objectives/expectations should include concise descriptions of the goal and of its expected outcome. Quantifiable or qualitative standards for measuring the effectiveness of the faculty member's performance should also be included.

In cases that teaching is a non-teaching faculty member's primary assignment (though she is stationed in a usually non-teaching unit), standard methods of teaching evaluation as outlined elsewhere in this document should be utilized.

A sample non-teaching library academic faculty role statement (Performance Expectations) is included below. (Would be good to include a sample for Cooperative Extension as well??)

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

8. Role Statement Sample Description (Academic Faculty)

The purpose of a role statement is to outline how much effort is put toward meeting the strategic mission of the college in teaching and research and potential service for the coming year so that the faculty member and the chair can agree on what activities will be considered in the faculty member's evaluation at the end of the year.

A good role statement is a reasonably reliable snapshot of the contribution the faculty member expects to make to the department, the college, and the university over the next twelve months. It serves to make sure the faculty member is evaluated against an agreed-upon plan, and worked out in concert with the chair. It also serves to clear up any misunderstandings about expectations.

While the role statement stands as a cooperative agreement between the faculty member and the chair or department, it also helps ensure faculty will be evaluated according to their own unique skills and interests. It discourages cookie cutter approaches to evaluations.

Because the role statement is unique to the faculty member, it can encourage individual growth and progress. Because the role statement can change from year to year, it allows flexibility in scheduling, shifts in direction, and revised percentages of time given to teaching, research and service.

Role statements can be written as memos to the department chair and Dean and can reflect ongoing discussions of the individual's hopes and plans. The department chair and dean(s) should sign the role statement to ensure that all are in agreement. When the individual comes up for evaluation of any kind, the role statement should be the operative document of expectations and should provide weighting for teaching, research and service. Did you achieve your goals? Did you exceed them? Did you run into problems? If so, what should be considered to solve the problems?

An example of a useful Role Statement might be:

Teaching (40%)

In the Fall I plan to teach (names and numbers of courses) and to advise four graduate student's theses and two dissertations. In the Spring I plan to teach (names and numbers of courses) and continue advising the graduate students.

I would also like to start work on an outline for a new course in a rapidly developing area of our discipline which we believe would attract graduate students from the departments of x and y as well as our own.

The contents of this document are intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. The information provided should be considered as a guide unless otherwise specified and should be read in conjunction with written documents at the department or college/unit related to the evaluation and merit process.

At your suggestion, I re-read my student evaluations from last year. They gave me high marks on everything except my grading which still seems unclear to several students. I am attending a workshop this Summer and one of the seminars covers the topics of clarifying grades to students. I anticipate learning how to improve this aspect of my teaching next year.

Research (40%)

My overall research agenda continues to be _____ but I have made some modifications.....

This Summer, I sent two research articles to refereed journals for review, (Titles and publications)

This Fall, I plan to apply for a grant in the sum of _____ and work on three more articles for publication. The topics I plan to pursue are (descriptions of each article planned, status and target publication)

Service (20%)

My primary service to the department is directing the graduate program that includes recruiting, planning schedules, administering policy statements, and signing off on programs of study and meeting with prospective students. This work takes 10 to 15 hours a week.

For service to the university, I serve on the Graduate Council which meets x times and I chair the committee on _____.

For my service to the profession, I will be the research chair for the (name of professional organization). This year I will be coordinating a research paper competition of 100 papers reviewed by up to 60 judges. I will also schedule all the research panels for this year's convention. This work should consume 8 to 10 hours a week.

My service to the community is _____.

Some role statements do not contain percentages of time; however, all role statements should contain the percent weighting for teaching, research and service. Some are designed to describe the individual's goals in terms of the relevance to the overall strategic plan for the department. Occasionally, a role statement is revised mid-year because an unexpected change occurs on the person's life or the department needs.