

## Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Timetable and Criteria 2014-2015

The 2014-2015 evaluation of Department of Health Education and Behavior (HEB) faculty will utilize the following criteria and timetable for the yearly evaluations.

### **The timetable for completing the yearly evaluation:**

1. The HEB APR template will be available and posted as an Excel spreadsheet on the department's website and on the HEB secure drive in the fall semester. The approved Annual Performance Report (APR) form will be made available by **January 15** of each year.
2. By **January 20** of each year, the Department Chair will assign three faculty to the Annual Performance Report (APR) Review Committee, which will function to ensure that the APR accurately reflects the faculty activities.
3. Each faculty member completes an APR for the reporting year. For 2014-2015, activities in the report must have occurred between **March 16, 2014 and March 15, 2015**. Faculty must follow the notes and instructions in the APR when reporting activities.
4. The Chair, or his/her designee (e.g., Office Manager), must email each faculty member an unlocked Excel file of their individual APR Excel file by **March 1, 2015**. This file must contain the preloaded teaching evaluation scores and grant expenditures. However, Spring scores will not be available until early May and will be entered by the Office Manager shortly thereafter.
5. Each faculty member must electronically submit (email) their completed APR as an Excel File to the Office Manager by **March 15, 2015**.
  - a. The Office Manager will convert the submitted APRs to locked EXCEL documents and store them permanently to preserve the original file. The Office Manager will then create a file for each faculty member for review by the APR Review Committee.
  - b. The APR Review Committee will receive the faculty files by **March 29**. Each file will be reviewed for verification, missing documentation, errors, omissions and miscalculations.
  - c. The APR Review Committee will submit a report to the Department Chair by **April 15, 2015** that summarizes the Committee's findings in the verification process.
6. Based upon the summary findings of the APR Review Committee, the Department Chair will consult with each faculty member where discrepancies or errors have been noted by the Committee or by the Chair's further review of the document.
  - a. Each faculty member will have until **April 30, 2015** to respond in writing to corrections in the APR document.
7. In addition to the APR, faculty may submit relevant materials to support their teaching, research, and service by **April 9, 2015**. These materials can include a qualitative summary of their yearly activities, class notes, syllabi, a teaching portfolio, results of peer evaluations of teaching, and any other materials relevant to the faculty member's instructional assignment (see article 18.5 of the 2013-2016 Collective Bargaining Agreement approved September 20, 2013 for more information related to these materials). Documentation of manuscripts accepted, in press, or invited for revision can be submitted here. In addition,

submitted and grant application scores or other related documents may be submitted at this time for further review and documentation. With regard to service, any additional materials that provide further evidence of distinguishing service can be submitted at this time.

8. The Department Chair will use the HEB Tenure and Promotion guidelines, the verified APR, and any additional materials submitted to conduct and complete the annual letter and the Annual Performance Report-Evaluation. The credits awarded by the APR report and the additional documents will contribute a significant portion of the official data used to award merit pay increases as outlined in the HEB Merit Pay Plan.
  - a. The Chair will provide each faculty member with their written Annual Performance Evaluation and a proposed annual letter by **July 1, 2015**.
  - b. Faculty will be offered the opportunity to meet individually with the Chair to discuss their evaluation before the evaluation is finalized and placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Records will be maintained regarding any written rebuttal to the Annual Performance Evaluation by the Chair.

Based on the % appointment of the faculty in research, teaching, and service, the specific evaluations in each category will be weighted by effort assignment. In each category, the individual faculty will be evaluated as:

1. Does not meet expectations;
2. Meets expectations;
3. Exceeds expectations; or
4. Meritorious.

These considerations will then be put in a broader context that summarizes the overall contribution of the faculty member to the Department. Since an appropriate level of excellence and distinction is required in at least two categories of performance (e.g., teaching and research) for tenure and most levels of promotion, a view of the overall quality of performance irrespective of the relative assignment will be provided.

#### **Additional Criteria to Be Used by the Chair**

1. Teaching. Faculty will be evaluated based on their net contribution to the teaching mission of the Department. Though consideration will be given to the number of students enrolled in the classroom and the extent of effort involved based on enrollment size, faculty can submit materials on their teaching philosophy, documentation of teaching innovation, written comments from course evaluations, mid-semester evaluations and feedback forms, unsolicited written comments from students, written feedback from peer evaluations, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Additional consideration will be given to faculty participation in graduate student mentorship and research credit at the Ph.D. level. Advising master's level and undergraduate honors students will be considered as well, but will receive less weight. Results of off-book, or overload contributions to ongoing online education will not be specifically considered in faculty evaluations. However, original development, major revisions, or further development of new online education opportunities,

on-book or off-book, will be considered as positive data that further the mission of the Department. For faculty who are hired as Instructor, teaching will be the dominant component of the chair's yearly evaluation.

2. Research. Faculty will be evaluated by new manuscripts and publications that have accrued over the past academic year within the timeframe of the APR document. The evaluation will be put in perspective of the timeline of ongoing research that may or may not have come to fruition over the prior 3-year period. Particular emphasis will be placed on the quality of the publications and the journals they are published in. Citation rates will be considered, but will not be the final criteria used for manuscript quality. The rigor required of the publication as well as whether it represents original qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods research vs. commentary or literature review will be evaluated. However, it should be noted when commentary and evidence syntheses have noteworthy impact on professional practice. The highest priority will be given to manuscripts representing original research and when the faculty is either corresponding or first author. Faculty also will be credited as first author when his/her student is listed as first author. Though co-authorship is necessary and inevitable in multidisciplinary team science, secondary priority will be given to co-authored papers in which the role of the faculty is neither corresponding nor first author. For the purposes of the written faculty evaluation, independent of the % effort report, it is expected that all tenured or tenure-track faculty show some evidence of ongoing contributions to new scholarly work. This can be via published or submitted manuscripts, new grants and contracts awarded or submitted, new-mission related patents or contracts, new creative works, and ongoing contributions to the research activity of current PhD, MS, or undergraduate students. Creative works can also be related to development of new or innovative collaborative efforts.
3. Service. Some forms of service at the University, College, and Department levels are not always formal or explicit. Therefore, specific contributions to the service mission of the University that are not necessarily captured in the APR will be considered in this part of the evaluation. For example, developing new guidelines or protocols for Department activities, taking on leadership roles in new initiatives, or helping to solve difficult departmental challenges might be considered in this category. Local, state, national, and international service will be evaluated based on documented participation in committee work or leadership at these levels. Organizing and leading national or international symposia or playing leadership roles in organizing meetings will be strongly considered. Service that brings recognition to the Department and University at national or international levels will be particularly noted.

Approved by HEB Faculty vote on October 8, 2014.