

## Supplemental Materials: Providing Fair and Full Evaluation

### I. Good Practices for Promotion and Tenure

- Clearly defined and published departmental promotion & tenure criteria – in general, every department should have well defined workload and service policies voted on by the faculty and published yearly.
- Describe all contributions of candidate to collaborations, including drivers on publications and fraction of funding (e.g., subcontracts).
- Candidate should note all publications with students – there should be a simple system to highlight publications with mentored students as the primary author – which helps to show student mentoring activities.
- Candidate encouraged to provide citations to publications – which can indicate the impact of the scholarly contributions.
- Candidate encouraged to provide technology transfer information – looking for impact beyond the academy.
- Candidate should distinguish between competitive and non-competitive funding.
- Journal quality – each journal a candidate publishes in should be annotated, indicating its quality, impact factor, and visibility in the field.
- Evaluation of conference quality - each conference a candidate presents at should be annotated with regard to the conference/organization's reputation and contribution to the field.
- Government adoption – e.g., standards developed by the candidate that have been adopted by a government agency or standards organization – another indication of impact beyond the academy.
- Peer review of teaching, including classroom observations.
- Compare teaching evaluations for the candidate to means and standard deviations within the department of evaluations in the same course.
- Choose external reviewers with stellar research credentials and from top universities whenever possible. Full professors are strongly preferred.

Note. Adapted from *P&T Good and Bad Practices*, by Matt O'Donnell, Dean of Engineering, University of Washington, 2007 Advance Leadership Workshop (February 15, 2007), University of Washington. Copyright 2007 Matt O'Donnell. Adapted with permission. [http://www.engr.washington.edu/advance/workshops/20070215\\_P&T\\_good\\_bad.pdf](http://www.engr.washington.edu/advance/workshops/20070215_P&T_good_bad.pdf)

## 2. Proposed Qualitative Terms for Use in Faculty Evaluation

This rubric assumes a “best fit” approach and the exercise of one’s professional judgment. Given these choices, and realizing that not every phrase necessarily applies in every case, ask:  
 “Which of the five qualitative levels best describes this candidate’s work in each category?”

<b>Teaching Effectiveness</b>	
Below Expectations	Problematic classroom or other teaching performance; unreliable advising and frequent unavailability; indifference toward or unreasonable resistance to meeting teaching standards
Fair	Fulfills all teaching responsibilities; meets minimal qualitative expectations in the classroom. Some unreliable availability or mistakes in advising; little or no curricular development; minimal efforts at improvement; one or more problematic elements in the area of teaching.
Good	Fulfills all teaching responsibilities. Evidence of solid work in the classroom; some successful effort to improve; good reliable student mentoring and academic advising.
Excellent	Fulfills all teaching responsibilities well. Evidence of overall excellence in teaching, advising, mentoring; curriculum or program development.
Extraordinary	Fulfills all teaching responsibilities very well. Demonstrable overall excellence in teaching, advising, and mentoring; leadership in curricular improvement, sharing of expertise.
<b>Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity</b>	
Below Expectations	No scholarly or creative activity, or activity of a quality below expectations given rank and position.
Fair	Minimal scholarship or research productivity of acceptable quality relative to rank and position.
Good	Some good, solid scholarly activity and productivity relative to rank and position; solid evidence of future plans with high likelihood of successful completion.
Excellent	Substantial scholarly effort and achievement relative to rank and position; completion of important research/creative projects in accordance with long term plans
Extraordinary	Significant and rigorous scholarship / creative work in prestigious venues. Major research or scholarly/creative achievements relative to rank and position.

<b>Professional Service</b>	
Below Expectations	Little or no meaningful or useful activity in serving department, college, or university in important ways. Or, behavior of a professionally unacceptable kind or harmful effect.
Fair	A minimal level of useful activity, relative to rank and seniority, in serving the program, department, College, University or profession.
Good	Consistently useful and effective service appropriate to rank and seniority, shows initiative; responsive to needs of students and department.
Excellent	Excellent initiative and effort with consistently beneficial results on important projects, appropriate to rank and position.
Extraordinary	Uniformly excellent effort and results in important projects; generosity of spirit in volunteering; effective leadership appropriate to rank and position

Note. From *Faculty evaluation rubric and eleven vignettes for discussion* (p.2), by Peter A. Facione, 2001, Millbrae, CA: Callpress. Copyright 1993 by Insight Assessment - The California Academic Press LLC. Adapted with permission. [http://www.insightassessment.com/pdf\\_files/Eleven%20fac-eval%20cases%20and%205-pt%20rubric.PDF](http://www.insightassessment.com/pdf_files/Eleven%20fac-eval%20cases%20and%205-pt%20rubric.PDF)

### 3. Sample Written Feedback to a Faculty Member

Professor Pam Poe

#### Teaching

The student evaluations place Pam right at the median within the department. She continues to teach the sophomore introductory lecture course every fall. In addition, her development of the new critical methods seminar for department majors has been a big project. She rolled up her sleeves last summer and produced the new course, offered this spring, that has contributed substantially to the quality of our program.

Over the next two years, I hope to see Pam devote attention to honing her teaching skills. One area she could usefully address is finding ways to encourage broader student participation in discussions. She is not undertaking any new course preparations in the coming year, which will give her an opportunity to consider new creative approaches to student involvement. I would be glad to consult with her on strategies and, if she wishes, to visit her classes occasionally.

#### Research

Pam's research has been showing good progress. We look forward to the publication later this year of the book version of her dissertation by State University Press. In the past year, she has submitted two papers that are under consideration by *The International Bulletin of Methodology*, one of the leading journals in her field. Pam understands that the college does not place substantial weight on the publication of dissertations (or other research projects undertaken elsewhere before a scholar joins our faculty). For a successful tenure candidacy, she will need to show a strong record of publication in peer-reviewed journals.

#### Service

Pam's service record is outstanding. She chaired the committee that conducted the campus-wide study of life and learning issues for female students. She was the primary author of the committee's report, which made major recommendations for reform in the areas of curriculum, housing, and student activities. On campus both female and male students eagerly seek her assistance with academic counseling. In the local community, her effective work on the board of the local United Way has brought credit to the college. Pam and I have discussed the weight that the college gives to service in evaluating faculty. While important, it stands behind teaching and research in our priorities.

Dr. Charles Candid, Department Chair

Note. From *Good practices in tenure evaluation: Advice for tenured faculty, department chairs and academic administrators* (p. 19), 2000, American Council on Education, Washington, DC. Copyright American Council on Education, The American Association of University Professors, and United Educators Insurance. Adapted with permission.

#### **4. Pre-Tenure Faculty Reviews (including reviews for part-time tenure-track faculty)**

Section 2.8.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*

##### **2.8.2 Probationary Period**

- The term “probationary period” is applied to the succession of term appointments, which an individual undertakes on a full- or part-time regular faculty appointment, and during which continued evaluation for reappointment and for an eventual tenured appointment takes place. The beginning of the probationary period for faculty members on term appointments is taken as July 1 or August 10 of the calendar year in which their initial full-time appointment begins, depending on whether they are on a calendar-year or academic-year appointment, regardless of the month in which their services are initiated. (The probationary period for new faculty appointed for spring term shall begin the following fall even though the spring contract period officially begins December 25.)
- The initial appointment for assistant professors, and for associate professors and professors employed without tenure, is ordinarily for a period of not less than two years. Multiple-year reappointment may be subsequently recommended.
- The maximum total period for full-time probationary appointments is six years, unless an approved extension has been granted. Decision about tenure, if not made earlier, is made in the sixth year of the probationary appointment. If the tenure decision made in the sixth year is negative, a one-year terminal appointment will be offered.
- Pre-tenure faculty members may request a term part-time appointment as described in section 2.6.1.3 for reasons of balancing work and family or personal health issues. In such cases, the probationary period will be extended proportionately. For example, two years of service at 50% will count as one year of full-time service. The term appointment may be renewed. (A permanent part-time appointment may be requested and granted following award of tenure.)
- In determining the mandatory tenure review year for those with partial appointments, general equivalency to full-time appointments is expected, so that approximately five years of full-time equivalent service is expected prior to the mandatory tenure review year if no tenure clock extensions have been granted; six years if one year of extension has been granted, and seven years if two extensions have been granted. (In summing partial years of service, a total resulting in a fraction equal to or less than .5 would be rounded down, and a fraction greater than .5 would be rounded up.) However, review for tenure must occur no later than the tenth year of service, resulting in somewhat less full-time equivalent service (4.5 years) for a faculty member with 50% appointment throughout all nine probationary years prior to review. If denied tenure following a mandatory review, a one-year terminal appointment will be offered.

- Faculty members on part-time appointments may request a tenure clock extension in accordance with section 2.8.2.1. (Extensions are granted in one-year increments, not prorated by the part-time appointment percentage.) However, the extension will not be approved if it results in a mandatory review date beyond the tenth year.
- Up to three years of appropriate service at other accredited four-year colleges and universities may be credited toward the six-year probationary period, as specified below.
- A faculty member on probationary appointment who wishes to request a leave of absence shall consult with his or her department head or chair about the effect of the leave on the probationary period, taking into account the professional development that the leave promises. The request for leave should address this matter and the provost's approval of the leave request will specify whether the leave will be included in the probationary period.
- Under normal circumstances, departmental promotion and tenure committees review pre-tenure faculty members twice during the probationary period, usually their second and fourth, or third and fifth, years of service. The timing of the reviews should depend upon the nature of the faculty member's discipline and must be clearly indicated in written departmental policies. The terms of offer identifies the initial appointment period. Pre-tenure reviews may be delayed if there is an approved extension as described below. Changes or variations in the standard review cycle must be documented in writing.
- The initial review for a part-time faculty member should be no later than the third year of service (regardless of percent of employment) to give early feedback on their progress. At least two reviews should be conducted for part-time faculty members during their probationary period; more are recommended. The anticipated schedule for such reviews for reappointment and for the mandatory review for tenure should be documented in writing as part of the agreement for the part-time appointment. Changes should be agreed upon by the faculty member and department.
- These reviews are substantive and thorough. At a minimum, departmental promotion and tenure committees must review the faculty member's relevant annual activity reports, peer evaluations of teaching, and authored materials. It is strongly suggested that promotion and tenure committees and pre-tenure faculty use the promotion and tenure dossier format (see section 2.8.4) in organizing and presenting information for review.
- The pre-tenure reviews should analyze the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure and offer guidance regarding future activities and plans. All reviews must be in writing, with the faculty member acknowledging receipt by signing and returning a copy for his or her departmental file. In addition, the promotion and tenure committee and the department head will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review and recommendations. Individual faculty members are also encouraged to seek guidance and mentoring from senior colleagues and the department head. Pre-tenure faculty members bear responsibility for understanding departmental expectations for promotion and tenure and for meeting those expectations.

## 5. Faculty Annual Evaluation and Salary Adjustments

Section 2.9.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*

### 2.9.1 Annual Evaluation and Salary Adjustments

- All departments are required to have written guidelines outlining the process and criteria to be used in faculty evaluations. The adoption of such guidelines promotes consistency and transparency in this important aspect of faculty life. Guidelines and procedures for the annual review of university or alumni distinguished professors are established by the president and/or provost, who are responsible for their evaluations.
- Every faculty member's professional performance is evaluated annually and written feedback is provided separately from confirmation of any merit adjustments. The process begins with submission of a Faculty Activity Report (FAR). All non-temporary faculty members must submit a FAR annually. These reports become part of the basis for performance evaluations, awarding merit adjustments, and promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews.
- Department heads/chairs are responsible for conducting annual faculty evaluations, either independently or in consultation with an appropriately charged committee in accordance with departmental procedures. All evaluations must be in writing and will include a discussion of contributions and accomplishments in all areas of the faculty member's responsibilities, comments on the faculty member's plans and goals, and any recommendations for improvement or change. Faculty members should receive their written evaluations within 90 days of submission of required materials, and they are asked to acknowledge receipt by signing and returning a copy for their departmental file, or the electronic equivalent. Acknowledgement of receipt of the evaluation need not imply agreement with it. If a faculty member is in substantive disagreement with the evaluation, that member may submit a written response to the department head for inclusion in his or her personnel file.
- In addition to their annual evaluation letters, all pre-tenure faculty members receive at least two thorough reviews during the normal six-year probationary period and written feedback on their progress toward tenure by their departmental promotion and tenure committee prior to reappointment in accordance with guidance included in section 2.8.2.
- Faculty with part-time appointments will be reviewed on the normal annual review cycle. For purposes of annual review, the fraction of the appointment must be taken into account when considering the appropriate level of achievement in that year.
- Salary adjustments are based on merit; they are not automatic. Recommendations for salary adjustments originate with the department head or chair and are reviewed by the

dean, the provost, and the president. Because salary adjustments are determined administratively on an annual basis and based significantly on the quality of the faculty member's response to assigned responsibility, they do not necessarily reflect an accurate measure of the full scope of the faculty member's professional development as evaluated by relevant committees in the tenure and promotion process.

- The salary adjustments of continuing faculty members are approved by the board of visitors, and each faculty member is informed in writing of the board's action as early as possible.

## **6. Guide to Faculty Expectations and Evaluation Procedures Department of Biological Sciences**

Prepared by the Department Head and Executive/Personnel Committee  
December 16, 2003; updated February 11-22, 2004, and April 14, 2004

### **Mission of the Department:**

- (1) Use innovative research to generate new knowledge in the biological sciences.
- (2) Provide comprehensive education in the biological sciences at the undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral levels.
- (3) Provide information and advice to individuals, government and industry to facilitate understanding of the natural world and enhance the quality of life.

### **Departmental Goals (Faculty are expected to contribute to each of the following three major categories):**

- (1) Research/scholarship
  - a. Generate high quality, high impact research/scholarship as judged by peers at other institutions
  - b. Generate funding to support research/scholarship and graduate/postdoc training
- (2) Teaching
  - a. Provide research training with emphasis on Ph.D. students and postdocs
  - b. Provide undergraduate research training
  - c. Provide high-quality teaching in upper (3000-6000) and/or lower (1000-2000) division courses
  - d. Provide international dimensions to learning at Virginia Tech
  - e. Generate funding to support educational initiatives
- (3) Service/Outreach
  - a. Provide support to governance of the department/college/university
  - b. Active support of the biology profession outside of the university
  - c. Provide continuing or public education outside of the VT classroom

### **Evaluating Faculty Contributions to the Goals and Mission of the Department:**

The department recognizes that individuals have different talents and interests, and supports the idea that maximum progress toward departmental goals will be made if individuals are allowed to vary in the time allocated to research, teaching and service. It is clear that excellent research is always highly regarded and rewarded, and is necessary for tenure and promotion. To encourage and reward excellent contributions in teaching and service, the department has developed a procedure that will divide the total departmental work load and allocate it to individual faculty in an objective and fair manner, and will reward those who carry large teaching and service expectations and also perform well in those areas. The evaluation procedure is a two-step process beginning with the assignment of teaching/research/service load, and ending

with evaluation of performance by the Department Executive and Personnel Committee (E/P), Department Head, and Dean.

**Procedure for Setting Variable Teaching, Research and Service Assignments:**

- (1) Guidelines for teaching and research assignments are outlined in Table 1.
- (2) Each spring, faculty must use Table 1 to submit a proposed 3-year outline of teaching responsibilities along with the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The outline will be evaluated by the Department Head and E/P Committee. By summer, each faculty member will be notified if the plan is accepted or in need of modification to meet specific departmental needs. This is meant to be a fluid, flexible process, with room for making changes if mutually agreeable to the faculty and Department Head, and to meet changing needs of the faculty and department.

**Procedure for Evaluating Faculty Performance:**

- (1) FARs will be evaluated by the E/P committee, Department Head and Dean each year (with a transition during the calendar years 2003 - 2004 from our older system of evaluating assistants each year, associates every other year and fulls every third year).
- (2) Using the general performance criteria listed in Table 2, the E/P committee and department Head will assign a score of 0-10 (5 = meeting expectations, 10 = outstanding) to the research, teaching and service components of each faculty member's contributions. In determining these scores, the E/P and Department Head must weight many nuances; there is no specific numerical procedure that can adequately capture the quality and amount of scholarship that each faculty member contributes.
- (3) To provide a fair assessment of how faculty are performing based on the individualized expectations that each faculty has, a weighted overall score will be calculated using the procedure outlined in Table 3. Both the individual categorical scores (research, teaching and service) and overall weighted score will be used by the department Head and Dean to evaluate relative performance of faculty. The weighted score will be particularly useful to reward faculty who have large teaching or service expectations and perform well in these areas.

Guide to Faculty Expectations and Evaluation Procedures, Department of Biological Sciences

Table I. Teaching/research assignment guide developed by the Department of Biology during 2001-2002 academic year, modified 2003.  
 NOTE: Departmental expectations for teaching and service (determined by the E/P Committee and Department Head) must be met before reductions in teaching responsibilities can be made.

Categories	Teaching Responsibility	How Determined
(A) New faculty	3 semesters off/ 4 years	Automatic; semesters off chosen by faculty
(B) Research scholarship exceptionally good as determined by presence of national competitive grant support; high quality, quantity or potential impact of publications; funds generated to support postdocs or GRAs, and evidence for excellent advising of graduate and undergraduate research; etc.	1 semester off/ 2 years	Automatic in case of a new or renewed nationally competitive grant (Faculty and Department Head together determine semester(s) with no teaching); If no nationally funded grant in hand, can be determined by Department Head in consultation with faculty E/P Committee
(C) Research scholarship meets expectations for average teaching & research faculty member in department; e.g., one or more of the following: publication record about 2 pubs/yr, applications made for competitive extramural grants, some extramural funding in hand, some graduate and/or undergraduate research training in lab, etc.	1 course each semester	Automatic
(D) Research program somewhat below expectations for average teaching and research faculty; e.g., at least one scholarly publication/year but without nationally funded grants for more than three years, no postdocs and few or no graduate student and undergraduate research trainees	3 courses/year	Faculty can volunteer or be directed to choose by E/P Committee and Department Head in accordance with results of FAR reviews
(E) Instructors and tenured faculty with no or minimal research; e.g., little or no involvement in graduate or undergraduate research education, no publications for last two or more years, etc.	4 courses/year	Faculty can volunteer or be directed to choose by E/P Committee and Department Head in accordance with results of FAR reviews

Guide to Faculty Expectations and Evaluation Procedures, Department of Biological Sciences

(F) Dedicated Teaching Faculty; teaching scholarship must be exceptional as determined by teaching awards, innovations in teaching, grants and publications in pedagogy, learning, etc.	3-4 courses/ year	Faculty identifies interest and applies to E&P committee; E&P Committee and Head must approve request; Evaluations consider teaching scholarship
(G) New research or special initiatives	1 semester off	Application submitted to E/P Committee at time of FAR
(H) Special administrative assignment	Possible reduced teaching	Negotiations with Department Head

Table 2. Criteria Used to Assess **Quality** (not quantity) of Faculty Contributions

<b>Pre- amble</b>	As the Department assesses teaching loads, it affirms its commitment to encourage, recognize, and reward quality in scholarship, teaching, and service.
<b>Research</b>	The significance of peer-reviewed publications, as judged by the reputation of the journal in which they appear and the impact of the research on the field of biology
	The significance and impact of other scholarly publications
	The degree to which an individual contributes, leads or inspires collaborative projects
	The initiation of new and imaginative research efforts
	Obtaining competitive, peer-evaluated research grants
	Obtaining outside financial support for graduate students and postdocs
<b>Teaching</b>	The quality of an individual's teaching, as judged by student and peer evaluations and by teaching awards
	Involvement in teaching as judged by new teaching initiatives and participation in teaching related activities such as workshops
	The successful mentoring of undergraduate, M.S., and Ph.D. students and postdocs as judged by the successful completion of degrees, student publications, student-obtained research grants, and post-graduation success of students
	The quality of academic advising as determined by student demand for advising services, activities of clubs that are being advised, and solicited and unsolicited feedback obtained by the Biology Academic Advising Center
<b>Service/ Outreach</b>	The impact of service activities in governance and operations of the department, college and university as judged by time commitment to these activities, leadership provided, and products produced such as new policies
	The impact of service activities to the profession, as judged by time commitment to these activities, leadership, and products produced
	The impact, time committed and leadership in public service (in the biological field) and special biology programs such as continuing education

Table 3. Guidelines for determining percent research/teaching/service appointment and weighted faculty evaluation scores. Note: These are approximate guidelines.

*Step 1: Determine appointment assuming service ~10% (service can be modified on a case-by case basis, to be negotiated with head prior to year of evaluation)*

Assignment Category (From Table 1)	Number of courses* taught per year	Teaching appointment (%)	Research appointment (%)	Service appointment (%)
A	1.5	30	60	10
B	1.5	30	60	10
C	2	40	50	10
D	3	60	30	10
E	4	80	10	10
F	3-4	70	20	10
G	variable	variable	variable	>10

\* a single course is ~ 3 credit lecture class with 25 or more students. The evaluation of quality of effort can be used to provide more weight for larger classes, more credit hours of teaching, or special work loads such as writing intensive or study abroad.

*Step 2: Weight evaluation scores by appointment. For example:*

Appointment (% teaching: research: service)	Teaching			Research			Service			Weighted Total Score
	Score	Weight	SxW	Score	Weight	SxW	Score	Weight	SxW	
30 - 60 - 10	7	0.30	2.1	3	0.60	1.80	6	0.10	0.60	<b>4.50</b>
80 - 10 - 10	7	0.80	5.60	3	0.10	0.30	6	0.10	0.60	<b>6.50</b>