PROPOSAL OVERVIEW
A REVISED FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM
NOVEMBER, 2004

Introduction: In the Fall of AY 1999-2000, the Academic Vice President appointed an Ad Hoc Task Force charged with development of a new, more responsive, accurate, comprehensive and justifiable system of faculty evaluation. The pages that follow represent the work product of the Faculty Evaluation Task Force. During development of this proposal, the FETF:

1. Set the following goals for the new system. The system should be:
   - both formative and summative in function. That is, both faculty and administration will have access to student course evaluation scores, however student comments will go only to individual faculty privately. Summative data (student rating scores) and scores in scholarship and service will be the only sources of data used by administration for annual personnel / contract decisions.
   - sufficiently flexible to reflect the talents, professorial rank and unique role each faculty plays.
   - consistently applied across faculty and reasonable in terms of commitment of time and effort.
   - as objective as possible to afford equitability in decision-making across faculty.
   - tied to remuneration (merit pay potential)
   - confidential
   - sufficiently comprehensive to inform promotion decisions
   - discriminating between those faculty with and those without major administrative functions or appointments.
   - demonstrative of faculty productivity
   - cover all FT regular, pro-rata and FT and PT adjunct faculty

2. Developed new classroom evaluation forms based on the different types of courses taught at Samuel Merritt College. Form A is used for lecture, discussion, or seminar courses; Form E is used for skills classes; Form H is used for laboratory courses; and Form J is used for clinical courses.

3. Compiled an Evaluation Flow Chart, describing the timing and details of the various evaluations made of the faculty at SMC.

4. Devised a weighting system to allow faculty to indicate the relative weight each of the three areas of faculty activities (teaching, scholarship, and service) would be given in their evaluations.

5. Provided descriptions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service regarding:
what types of activities would be included within each area
what significance or weight should be given to each activity
how each activity should be evaluated
how each activity should be scored

6. Designed the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form and scoring system and designed the Administrator-Faculty Performance Summary to differentiate faculty with administrative components in their contractual obligations.

7. Developed a format for applying annual evaluation scores to the proposed merit pay system.
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I. INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THE FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY FORM

The comprehensive evaluation of all Regular and Annual faculty, inclusive of service and scholarship, is conducted yearly. Term faculty teaching greater than 12u/yr should be evaluated annually and every three years when teaching less than 12 units (or at the discretion of the chair). Term faculty are always on probationary review of teaching performance for at least one year or at the discretion of the chair.

1. Fill out the personal information in the upper left of the FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY FORM. The form is on pp. 7 & 8 of this document.

2. Examine the "PERCENT OF PARAMETER VALUES BY RANK" chart (pg. 6) and select the weighting percentages that you would like used in your evaluation next year from the appropriate column according to your rank. The percentages must total 100. Remember, these percentages represent the weights used in the evaluation and are not necessarily related to work load. For term faculty, role distribution should be listed as 100% for teaching.

3. Enter those values in the Renewal % column of the Role Distribution Grid on the upper right of the document.

4. In the Current % column enter the weights appropriate for this year's evaluation (refer to last year's evaluation). The percentages must total 100.

5. In the "TEACHING" section, enter courses taught in the preceding Spring, Summer, and Fall semesters, their scores ("COMBINED ITEMS 1-4" on your evaluations), and the mean evaluation score. Each faculty member is required to distribute the evaluation forms supplied by the Office of Institutional Research for each course taught at the College each semester. If a course is not evaluated for any reason, the faculty member must attach a written explanation to the FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY FORM.

6. Enter the mean score for all courses taught.

7. In the "SCHOLARSHIP" section, list those activities which you performed and their individual credit listings (see "SCHOLARSHIP EVALUATION AND SCORING", pg. 13). Term faculty may list any scholarly activities for the record, but will only be evaluated on teaching.

8. Enter the total credits earned.

9. In the "SERVICE" section, list those activities which you performed and their individual credit listings (see "SERVICE EVALUATION AND SCORING", pg. 15). Term faculty may list any service activities for the record, but will only be evaluated on teaching.

10. Enter the total credits earned.

11. Schedule a meeting with your evaluating supervisor, and after consultation enter the "Award Points" in both the SCHOLARSHIP and SERVICE areas, as determined by the guidelines on pp. 13 and 15.
12. In the "SUMMARY STATISTICS" section enter the mean score for TEACHING, the award points for SERVICE, the award points for SCHOLARSHIP on the appropriate line of the "Composite Rating" column.

13. Enter the corresponding percent indicated in the "Current %" column of the Role Distribution Grid for each area into the appropriate space in the "Adjustment Percent" column.

14. Multiply each composite weighting by the adjustment percent and enter the amount for each into the "Weighted Composite Rating" column.

15. Add together the items in "Weighted Composite Rating" column and enter into the box labeled "Overall Composite Rating".

16. In consultation with your supervisor, complete the SUPERVISOR RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS and FACULTY COMMENTS sections of the form.

17. Attach your goals statement for the coming year.

   n.b. The goal statement is a listing of proposed activities in each area. Since conditions change throughout the year (additional teaching assignments made, additional task force or committee assignments, funding for a project is not realized, etc.), your goal statement should not be taken into consideration in the evaluation, rather only what you actually accomplish.
## II. PERCENT OF PARAMETER VALUES BY RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Category</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Max: 95</td>
<td>Max: 85</td>
<td>Max: 75</td>
<td>Max: 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 75</td>
<td>Min: 50</td>
<td>Min: 40</td>
<td>Min: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Max: 15</td>
<td>Max: 30</td>
<td>Max: 35</td>
<td>Max: 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 5</td>
<td>Min: 10</td>
<td>Min: 15</td>
<td>Min: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activities</td>
<td>Max: 10</td>
<td>Max: 25</td>
<td>Max: 35</td>
<td>Max: 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 5</td>
<td>Min: 10</td>
<td>Min: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Max: 0</td>
<td>Max: 10</td>
<td>Max: 10</td>
<td>Max: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This grid is applicable only for faculty who do not have an administrative appointment.
III. FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY FORM

Date of Evaluation: ____________________

Academic terms being evaluated:

_____________________________________

Faculty Name: _________________________

School/Department: ____________________

Faculty Classification:

Regular _____

Annual _____

Term _____

Professorial Rank: ____________________

Note: Append annual goal statement to this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE DISTRIBUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEACHING

List of Courses Evaluated (by name and number from previous Spring, Summer, and Fall terms):

Courses (required for all faculty):

Score:

1. ______ Mean score: _______
2. ______
3. ______ Approved by: ____________________
4. ______
5. ______

SCHOLARSHIP

Note: This section required for Regular and Annual Faculty only, optional for term faculty:

Listing of Scholarship: Credits:

1. ______ Total Credits: _______
2. ______
3. ______ Award Points: ______
4. ______
5. ______ Approved by: ____________________

SERVICE

Note: This section required for Regular and Annual Faculty only, optional for term faculty:

Listing of Service: Credits:

1. ______ Total Credits: _______
2. ______
3. ______ Award Points: ______
4. ______
5. ______ Approved by: ____________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Rating  X  Adjustment Percent  =  Weighted Composite Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING:</strong>  [ \text{rating} \times \text{percent} ] = [ \text{weighted rating} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE:</strong>  [ \text{rating} \times \text{percent} ] = [ \text{weighted rating} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOLARSHIP:</strong>  [ \text{rating} \times \text{percent} ] = [ \text{weighted rating} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN SCORE</strong>  [ \text{rating} \times \text{percent} ] = [ \text{overall composite rating} ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(faculty with administrative duties refer to Administrator-Faculty Summary Form, pg. 9, to derive this score)

OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING

---

**Supervisor Recommendations/Comments**

---

**Faculty Comments**

Faculty signature:

Supervising Faculty signature:
IV. ADMINISTRATOR-FACULTY PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Probationary Review _____
Annual Review _____ From: _______ To: _______
Special Review: _______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Administrative title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department**

**Scoring:**
1 Unsatisfactory
2 Needs Improvement
3 Effective / Competent
4 Very Good (top 35%)
5 Excellent (top 10%)

**Critical Requirements:** Provide numerical rating and narrative comment when appropriate.

___ **Working Relationships:** Demonstrates integrity; shows concern for people and circumstances, recognizes team contributions and accomplishments; creates a climate of respect and high morale.

___ **Guidance and Coordination:** Creates or maintains a value driven vision; provides focused goals; activities are mission driven; coordinates work in timely and efficient way; maintains high performance standards; facilitates professional development of staff and faculty.

___ **Budget Management:** Operates within budget guidelines; allocates resources fairly and in a reasoned manner. Analyzes and reacts to developing budget conditions.

___ **Communication:** Communicates effectively and appropriately; listens well; demonstrates respect for other points of view; provides effective feedback to team.

___ **Administration and Paperwork:** Effective and timely handling of administrative tasks; utilizes/develops functional systems / infrastructure to facilitate work efforts. Well organized.

___ **Leadership:** Demonstrates effective leadership style; consults team meaningfully; generates and uses new ideas; delegates authority and responsibility appropriately; is respected by colleagues for value of ideas.

___ **Decision Making/Problem Solving:** Uses evidence-based decision-making; arrives at sound conclusions; involves others in consensus decision-making.
___ **Knowledge of Job**: Mastery of all phases of responsibilities; adapts information and procedures to new tasks.

___ **Flexibility/Adaptability**: Adapts to changing circumstances, policies; considers others points of view.

___ **Professionalism**: Displays an appropriate professional demeanor; exercises discretion and integrity; properly represents the College.

Pg 2 Administrator-faculty Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X 0.1</td>
<td>=_________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Strengths:**

**Areas for Improvement:**

__________________________
Administrative Manager       Date

__________________________
Administrator evaluated       Date

Comments of Administrator being evaluated:
V. TEACHING EVALUATION AND SCORING

Teaching defined: A constellation of deliberative behaviors exhibited in a didactic or clinical setting that enables student learning. These behaviors in the classroom most often consist of delivering or ensuring delivery of expert content, and exhibiting mastery of instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills and course management skills. Relative to clinical teaching, relevant behaviors include excellence in patient care, incorporation of practice and ethical standards, completion of patient care objectives and utilization and mastery of instructional techniques unique to laboratory instruction.

The teaching function includes both instruction and advising. Examples may include the following:
- Teaches didactic / clinical / laboratory course offerings
- Designs/develops/implements new courses/labs
- Designs/develops course materials (instructional media)
- Incorporates innovative instructional strategies
- Demonstrates content expertise
- Coordinating or supervising instructional activities
- Academic, career and personal counseling
- Sponsoring or advising student groups
- Serving on master’s or doctoral committees

Score on course evaluations of teaching will be weighted according to the following categories which reflect the relative priority and importance of the overall instructional function at Samuel Merritt College.

- Content expertise – 10%
- Course management – 10%
- Advising – 10%
- Instructional delivery skills – 40%
- Instructional design skills – 30%

Faculty teaching performance will be evaluated primarily by student course evaluations. These evaluations will be conducted for all courses offered by the College and performance medians will be distributed by the Office of Institutional Research to both the Dean/Chair and the faculty member at the conclusion of each semester. All employment classifications of faculty are subject to annual faculty evaluations of teaching. In preparation for annual teaching performance evaluation, faculty will list all of their course evaluation median scores on the Faculty Evaluation Summary Form and assign a mean score.

It is advisable that when supervisors consider that overall teaching scores are below performance expectations that the faculty member be subject to departmental peer review procedures to assist the faculty member to improve.
VI. SCHOLARSHIP EVALUATION AND SCORING

Scholarship defined: Activities that result in production, reorganization/refinement or creation of works that advance knowledge in one's field. These works must be made public, be susceptible to critical review and evaluation and accessible for exchange and use by other members of one’s scholarly community. This category does not include consulting, personal or professional continuing education programming, syllabi formulation, or membership in professional organizations.

Faculty will be evaluated on a point system that reflects the minimum and maximum range for scholarship designated on the faculty evaluation grid.

SCHOLARSHIP SCORING SYSTEM
Requirements:
Instructor: no scholarship requirement
Asst. Prof: 5 – 25 credits
Assoc Prof: 10 – 35 credits
Professor: 20 – 45 credits

Qualified scholarship credits or activities are listed below followed by numerical credit weight. The mix of these credits and their numerical total for individual faculty are to be negotiated between the supervisor and faculty member. These ranges are meant to serve as guidelines for those annual negotiations.

Scoring: If the faculty member achieves sufficient credits within their range described above, they are given a score of 3.5. The supervisor or Dean, at their discretion can award any numerical value between 3.6 and 5.0 for exceptional work or work beyond that which was originally negotiated. If the faculty member fails to achieve sufficient credits within their range described above, the supervisor or Dean, at their discretion can award any numerical value between 0 and 3.4 for the deficient performance.

The single source of annual evaluation for the “scholarship” requirement will be the evaluating supervisor. Additionally, scholarship evaluation will be conducted at periodic intervals as described in the Evaluation Flow Chart by both departmental committees or the College Rank and Promotion Committee.

Publications (refereed) 15
Books 50 (single author text)
Chapters 15
Manuscript submitted 5
Monographs 15
Published abstracts / proceedings 5
Invited national/international presentations 25
Invited state/local presentations 15 (not a guest lecturer at SMC)
Invited published commentary 5
Workshop presentation 5-15
Poster session 10
Software/media 15
Extramural grant submitted 20 / plus 10 if funded
Intramural grant funded 5
Non-refereed material (discipline specific) 5
Editor 25 (books and journals)
Journal editorial board member or reviewer 15
Extramural grant reviewer 15
Ongoing research / active data collection and analysis 45/study
Advanced education: Relative to doctoral programs or bona fide fellowships, a total of 80 points can be used over the reasonable length of the program. Clinical specialty preparation can received a total 20 points over the reasonable length of the program.

Note: Categories of books and ongoing research should be time limited, usually to two-three years. Length of years these items can be used as scholarship credits is to be negotiated between faculty and supervisor.
VII. SERVICE EVALUATION AND SCORING

**Service defined** – Consists of meaningful activities (volunteer, reimbursed or paid) provided to the college, community, corporate partners or other relevant external agencies that promotes the image, mission or strategic priorities of the college well-being of relevant individuals or groups among the community of interest or that promotes the professional growth of faculty. Paid services can be negotiated with the supervisor as long as they provide a direct and beneficial contribution to the College and faculty role.

Conceptually, “service contributions” will be determined for each rank designation as either as “adequate,” that is, meeting minimum (see grid) requirements made of all faculty or “accomplished,” that is meeting the maximum requirements for any particular rank.

**Areas of Acceptable Service Activities:**
Department Committee
College Committee
Leadership activity with/in College
Task forces / ad hoc or work committees
Guest lecturer at College or in Community
Professional Leadership (officer, board, state/national leadership)
Invited consultant or instructor (>4 hours)
Professionally related community service

NOTE: Activities listed above are meant to guide faculty and supervisors during their annual selection and negotiation of goals for the new year in the area of “Service.” It is incumbent on the faculty to demonstrate that selected service activities are 1) of substantive import 2) have relevance to the faculty role and 3) are equitable among faculty in assessing their relative worth to the department, college and/or profession.

Items may be counted more than once toward the total of all service “credits.” That is, if you sit on two committees, you get two credits.

Faculty may also negotiate for more than a single credit in any particular category, depending on the time commitment paid to it. For instance, someone who is an elected officer of a national professional organization would necessarily receive more credit than being a member of a college committee. These negotiations are decided between the faculty and supervisor.

**How is Faculty “Service” Performance Measured?**
At minimum, all faculty from Instructor through Professor are expected to participate in faculty organization meetings and department meetings for **five credits**. In addition, further requirements at each rank are:

- **Instructor:** 5 – 15
- **Asst. Prof:** 10 - 30
- **Assoc. Prof:** 10 - 35
- **Professor:** 20 - 45
Scoring:
If the faculty member achieves sufficient credits within their range described above they are given a score of 3.5. The supervisor or Dean, at their discretion can award any numerical value between 3.6 and 5.0 for exceptional work or work beyond that which was originally negotiated. If the faculty member fails to achieve sufficient credits within their range described above, the supervisor or Dean, at their discretion can award any numerical value between 0 and 3.4 for the deficient performance.

The single source of evaluation for the “service” requirement will be the evaluating supervisor. Neither students, nor peers will be involved in this segment of the evaluation.