

FACULTY EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

2019-2020

Introduction

Samuel Merritt University faculty are evaluated on an annual basis as described in the Faculty Handbook. The system used to administer and document evaluations is managed through Human Resources (please see your supervisor or HR for additional information). This document describes the process by which faculty are evaluated and scored in the areas of service, scholarship and teaching.

The overall goals of the faculty evaluation process are to be:

- Both formative and summative in function
 - For formative: both faculty and administration will have access to student course evaluation scores and peer review of teaching evaluations.
 - For summative data: student rating scores and peer review of teaching evaluations along with scores in scholarship and service will be the 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
- Applicable to all regular, annual, and adjunct faculty

Contents

I. PERCENT OF PARAMETER VALUES BY RANK	3
II. SERVICE EVALUATION AND SCORING	4
III. SCHOLARSHIP EVALUATION AND SCORING	6
IV. TEACHING EVALUATION	8

I. PERCENT OF PARAMETER VALUES BY RANK

Faculty are permitted to adjust differential value weightings for each role category within the ranges listed in the table below. Please remember that these percentages refer only to how each category will be *valued* in the overall evaluation, i.e., they are not a determination of how workload will be divided.

Review the table below 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. For **term faculty**, role distribution should be listed as 100% for teaching.

Role Category	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Teaching	Max: 95 Min: 75	Max: 85 Min: 50	Max: 75 Min: 40	Max: 60 Min: 20
Service	Max: 15 Min: 5	Max: 30 Min: 10	Max: 35 Min: 15	Max: 45 Min: 20
Scholarly Activities	Max: 10 Min: 0	Max: 25 Min: 5	Max: 35 Min: 10	Max: 45 Min: 20
Administrative Activities NOT related to an administrative appointment*	Max: 0 Min: 0	Max: 10 Min: 0	Max: 10 Min: 0	Max: 10 Min: 0

*This grid is NOT applicable for faculty who have an administrative appointment

II. SERVICE EVALUATION AND SCORING

Service Defined:

Service consists of meaningful activities (volunteer, reimbursed or paid) provided to the university, community, corporate partners or other relevant external agencies that promotes the image, mission or strategic priorities of the university, 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 University and faculty role.

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

Areas of Acceptable Service\Activity include:

- Department Committee
- University Committee
- Leadership activity with/in University Task forces / ad hoc or work committees
- Guest lecturer at University 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 member 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, university and/or profession.

Faculty Service Requirements

At minimum, all faculty from Instructor through Professor are expected to participate in faculty organization meetings and department meetings. Additional service requirements at each rank are:

- Instructor: 5–15 credits
- Asst. Prof: 10–30 credits
- Assoc. Prof: 10–35 credits
- Professor: 20–45 credits

Credits for Faculty Service:

Category 1: 5 credits

This category is for attendance at regular meetings that do not require work outside of the meeting. The minimal requirements to earn 5 points are:

- Attending Program, Department, School Faculty Meetings (only count 5 points for any combination of the 3)
- Attending Faculty Organization meetings
- The faculty member must receive 5 points in this category to meet minimal qualifications and receive points from Category 2 or 3.

Category 2: 10 credits (as member) plus 5 credits for serving as chair of a committee

This category is for responsibilities on University, Program, Department, School, Professional or Community Organizations (e.g. Boards) that require ongoing, substantial work outside of the regular meeting times. Each service effort is counted as a separate item with separate credit within this category.

- Faculty Organization Committees
- University or Faculty Org. Long-term Task Forces (e.g. Workload, Salary, WASC) or Standing Committees (e.g. CPAC, Technology)
- School/Program/Department Committees or Task Forces
- Professional Association (regional, state or national) or Community Agency Board of Directors or Committee Chairperson (must be professional or health- related)
- Accrediting Agency on-site reviewer (when performing an on-site review. A listing as an on- site reviewer and not providing a review in a year is not credited.
- Peer review (5 points for each peer review completed)

Category 3: 7-10 credits (as negotiated or agreed upon by Dean/Chair/Director and Faculty)

This category is for service responsibilities that take some effort aside from the direct time involved for the event, but are not ongoing in nature. Each service effort is counted as a separate item with separate credit within this category.

- One time or short-term consultation (unpaid) to community service organization
- Volunteer at community service event
- Volunteered and unpaid guest lecture or in-service for a community agency, lay/public group, another Department or School at SMU (e.g. from CSPM to OT, from Nursing to PA).

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.

III. SCHOLARSHIP EVALUATION AND SCORING

Scholarship Defined:

Scholarship refers to 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. Please refer to the SMU Philosophy of Scholarship statement in the Faculty Handbook.

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

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.

Credits for Faculty Scholarship:

Publications (refereed) - 15	Poster session 10
Books (single author text) - 50	Software/media 15
Book Chapters - 15	Extramural grant submitted 20 (+10 if funded)
Manuscript submitted 5	Intramural grant funded 5
Monographs 15	Non-refereed material (discipline specific) 5
Published abstracts / proceedings 5	Editor 25 (books and journals)
Invited national/int'l presentations 25	Journal editorial board mbr. or reviewer 15
Invited state/local presentations 15 (not a guest lecturer at SMU)	Workshop presentation 5-15
Ongoing research / active data collection and analysis 45/study	Invited published commentary 5
Extramural grant reviewer 15	

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.

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 University Rank and Promotion Committee.

IV. TEACHING EVALUATION

Teaching Defined:

Teaching is 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 the clinical learning environment.

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

Foundation and Key Concepts for Evaluation:

The foundation for the assessment of student learning are the Course Learning Outcomes and the Department/Program Learning Outcomes and Institutional Learning Outcomes to which they are mapped. The faculty member's focus on student learning at all three levels is essential for successful teaching. Faculty now have the capacity through Canvas to link assignments & rubrics to outcomes for transparency and equity in grading and documenting that students are learning and successful.

The key concepts of effective faculty evaluation of teaching are (a) well-defined faculty roles and expectations, (b) an understanding of teachers and teaching contexts, (c) an understanding of learners and learning, and (d) a balance of evaluation for summative and formative purposes. These concepts have been incorporated in the SMU process for annual evaluation of teaching.

These concepts inform both faculty members and evaluators of faculty performance because teaching and learning requires an ongoing collaborative effort among faculty about what it means to be an effective teacher, and what constitutes significant student learning. These concepts and the learning outcomes contextualize teaching and maximize the utility of evaluation for the faculty member, Deans/Chairs/Directors and the Academic Vice-President. An understanding of these concepts and learning outcomes increases appropriate use of evaluation results by promoting local ownership and understanding of the evaluation process. Because of the variety of contexts in which teaching occurs across the University, there will necessarily be some variability at the School/Department/Program and, and, to some extent teacher and course levels. While that variability requires considerable inquiry, dialogue, and reflection, it is essential that warranted variability be recognized in approaches to teaching.

Purpose of Teaching Evaluation:

As part of the overall Faculty Evaluation Process, the evaluation of teaching and learning, is used to:

1. Provide formative evaluation for a faculty member's development in all of their teaching roles;
2. Provide summative evaluation for use in faculty members' application for promotion;
3. Provide summative evaluation for use in faculty contract renewal and teaching assignments.

Evaluation Process:

The process for the annual teaching evaluation has four components:

(1) student evaluation of course/instructor using a University-approved instrument, (2) peer evaluation, (3) Dean/Chair/Program Director evaluation, and (4) self-assessment.

1. Course and Instructor Evaluations (Students). Students evaluate delivery of instruction (including aspects of classroom management such as diversity and inclusion), assessment of learning, course advising, and administrative requirements using an approved, standard instrument.

2. & 3. Peer evaluation and evaluation by the Dean, Chair or Program Director. Peers and the Dean/Chair/Program Director evaluate subject matter mastery, curriculum and course development, assessment of learning (including alignment and mapping of assignments to course learning outcomes in Canvas), course design and administrative requirements. (Information regarding peer review including the rubric for classroom observation can be found at: <http://bit.do/SMU-Peer-Review>). While classroom observation contributes to evaluation of the delivery of instruction and the other elements included in the peer review, its use is optional. At a minimum, all faculty will have a peer review following the first year of teaching at SMU, and every three years thereafter for assistant professors, every four years for associate professors, and every five years for professors. The Dean, Chair or Program Director may request a peer review if student course and instructor evaluations fall below departmental performance expectations, as described above, or if the peer review reflects the need for continued improvement.

4. Self-assessment. Each faculty member completes a self-assessment based on a critical self-reflection of their teaching, student learning and the faculty member's goals. The faculty member uses the information from the peer review, supervisor review, and student evaluation to complete this self-assessment. The self-assessment is used to analyze all of the above elements and forms the basis for developing the faculty member's goals for further development.

Scoring:

The Instructor Mean Score from EvaluationKit is reported for each course being evaluated and the mean is calculated. The mean serves as the score for evaluation of teaching from student evaluations.