

Huston-Tillotson University Faculty Annual Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

The intent of the annual faculty evaluation is to provide both summative and formative feedback to each full-time faculty member. As a summative instrument, the evaluation score will be used to determine merit pay, promotion, and tenure. In addition, the instrument will provide formative information to assist in the improvement of instruction and professional activities. The instrument was designed to provide flexibility for evaluating faculty from diverse disciplines.

PROCEDURES AND INSTRUCTIONS

Evaluation Period from August 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023

STEP	WHO	DOES WHAT	WHEN
1	Dean of Unit	Sets specific evaluation dates	Fall Faculty Institute
2	Dean of Unit	Provides evaluation forms to faculty at the Spring semester Faculty Institute	Fall Faculty Institute
3	Faculty Member	Decides on the weights for evaluation criteria in consultation with the Department Chair. (NOTE: The total of the domain weights must equal 100%.)	Week 3 of September
4	Faculty Member	Completes the Criteria Weighting Form and submits it to the Department Chair	Week 3 of September
5	Dean of Unit	Reviews and files the proposed distribution of evaluation criteria weights	Week 4 of September
6	Faculty Member	Submits Documentation of Instruction and Professional Activities to appropriate Department Chair. See required format. (Note: Materials will be kept on file, so photocopy important documents.)	Week 4 of January
7	Department Chair	Evaluates submitted documents for each faculty member in the Unit.	Week 2 of February
8	Department Chair	Completes Score Calculation Form and Evaluator Feedback Form	Week 2 of February
9	Department Chair & Faculty Member	Meets to review evaluation score and feedback form. Changes may be made as appropriate based on the faculty member's input.	Week 3 of February
10	Faculty Member	Accepts and signs off on the results of the evaluation OR	Week 3 of February
12	Faculty Member	Appeals to Dean of the Unit for in depth review	Week 4 of February
	Faculty Member	Rejects and does not sign off on results. A grievance may be filed to appeal the results. Refer to grievance policy in faculty handbook.	Week 1 of March
11	Department Chair	Submits evaluation results to the Dean of the Unit	Week 4 of February
12	Dean	Submit evaluation results to the Provost	March 1

CRITERIA WEIGHTING FORM

Evaluation Period: August 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023

Name:

Rank:

Division: School of Business and Technology

Date of Initial Appointment:

Four Domains of Faculty Evaluation with Percentage Ranges for the Distribution of Scores

<u>Domain</u>	<u>Percentage Range</u>
Instruction	50% - 70%
Scholarly Endeavors	10% - 30%
University, Community, and Professional Service	10% - 30%
Professional Development Activities	10% - 30%

Desired Weights in Each Domain for This Evaluation Period

Please indicate below the desired percentage weight you have selected for this academic year.
The total of the domain weights must equal 100%.

Instruction _____%

Scholarly Endeavors _____%

University, Community, and Professional Service _____%

Professional Development Activities _____%

TOTAL = 100%

Faculty Signature: _____

Date: _____

Approval of weighting of criteria by:

Division Chair: _____ Date: _____

DOCUMENTATION OF INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Instructions: Please use this format to provide the following information. Use appendixes to support evaluation materials with documentation.

- I. INSTRUCTION (50% - 70%)
 1. List courses taught by semester. (Include items listed below)
 - a. Course revision and/or new course design
 - b. Course coordination
 2. Guest lecturer for other classes (list)
 3. Maintaining students (e.g. student sessions, chat room, and supplemental instruction)
 4. Demonstrated creativity in teaching (e.g. teaching awards, established new clinical site, developed new teaching-learning activity, media production such as videos, software, etc.)
 5. Documentation of teaching effectiveness (e.g. student and/or peer evaluations) Results of Students' Course Evaluation are required.
 6. Academic advisement (major and advising center, etc.)
 7. Other evidence of your direct contribution to the instructional program.
- II. SCHOLARLY ENDEAVORS (10%-30%)
 1. Publication activities
 - a. Articles in refereed journals (published, accepted, submitted) Provide complete references.
 - b. Books, chapters (published, accepted, submitted) Provide complete references.
 - c. Monographs (published, accepted, submitted) Provide complete references.
 - d. Book reviews, abstracts, articles published by non-refereed journals (published, accepted, submitted) Provide complete references.
 - e. Electronic media (internet, books, arts, chapter, CD, etc.)
 2. Scholarly papers presented at local, state, regional, national, and/or international professional meetings (Indicate if your presentation was a poster or podium presentation; give title, author(s), date, place and location of meeting)
 3. Grant writing activities (Indicate Agency)
 - a. Research grants writing/submitted/approved
 - b. Training grants writing/submitted/approved
 - c. Other type of grants writing/submitted/approved
 4. Research Activities
 - a. Pilot studies complete
 - b. Other non-funded research activities
 - c. Works in progress
 5. Other scholarly activities (Examples: Performance, conducting institutional research for department/college/program, implementing technology instruction by writing software, developing media, etc.)
 6. Honors and/or awards
- III. UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY SERVICE (10%-30%)

University & Community Activities

- a. Committee activities (list by type, date)
 - b. Student and/or faculty recruitment (list by type/date)
 - c. Mentoring colleagues (list colleague and how mentored)
 - d. Lecturer to service and professional organization title, organization, date)
 - e. Administrative duties
-
1. Professional organization activities
 2. Community organization activities
 3. Honors and/or awards
- IV. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (10%-30%)
1. Professional certification (indicates if new or renewed)
 2. Professional practice activities (CPA, exam review, etc.)
 3. Consultation activities (e.g. assisting in research activities, expert witness, clinical agency consultation, technical writing).
 4. Attendance at professional development activities: e.g. conference, seminars, campus workshops, CE activities, scholarly meetings (list by name of conference, place, date)
 5. Memberships and participation in professional organizations

SAMPLE EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p>9-10 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OUTSTANDING</p>	<p>Work is notable for high quality and effectiveness, and there is clear, strong evidence of exceptional performance in one or more areas of evaluation within the domain.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">EXAMPLES FOR EACH DOMAIN</p>	<p>INSTRUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of an innovative teaching tool or course design that addresses the unique characteristics of our students. <p>SCHOLARLY ENDEAVORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication in peer-reviewed journal. <p>UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY SERVICE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant leadership to campus or community by organizing an event. <p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced certification in area of expertise.
<p>7-8 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SUPERIOR</p>	<p>This rating carries the implication that the individual's performance in a particular area of activity reflects an above average degree of productivity and effectiveness, but not necessarily unusual or exceptional.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">EXAMPLES FOR EACH DOMAIN</p>	<p>INSTRUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of an innovative teaching tool or course design. <p>SCHOLARLY ENDEAVORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of abstract in peer-reviewed journal or proceedings. <p>UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY SERVICE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to campus or community by volunteering to assist with an event. <p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at national convention within area of expertise.

<p>5-6 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AVERAGE</p>	<p>This rating should always be interpreted in a favorable light. In any group, no matter what level, there is a middle range of performance. This rating implies that the individual has been productive and effective in the area that is being evaluated. It is expected that this rating will be the one that is most frequently applied.</p> <p>Work with regard to all areas of evaluation in a section is generally effective but is not clearly marked by evidence of unusual or exceptional performance. An occasional minor deficiency in one or more areas of evaluation may be noted.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">EXAMPLES FOR EACH DOMAIN</p>	<p>INSTRUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective and appropriate teaching strategies. <p>SCHOLARLY ENDEAVORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of article for publication. <p>UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY SERVICE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in campus or community event. <p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular attendance at campus workshops.
<p>3-4 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MARGINAL</p>	<p>Work with regard to most areas of evaluation in a section is adequate. There may be evidence of deficiency in one or two areas, but the deficiency is not pervasive within the domain.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">EXAMPLES FOR EACH DOMAIN</p>	<p>INSTRUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of dated theoretical models. <p>SCHOLARLY ENDEAVORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works in progress. <p>UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY SERVICE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at campus or community events. <p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occasional attendance at campus workshops.
<p>1-2 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">UNSATISFACTORY</p>	<p>The individual's performance in the area that is being evaluated has not been productive or effective. Work with regard to one or more areas of evaluation is significantly deficient. Deficiencies are pervasive and are not offset by demonstrated strengths.</p>

<p>EXAMPLES FOR EACH DOMAIN</p>	<p>INSTRUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inability to communicate course content effectively to students. <p>SCHOLARLY ENDEAVORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No evidence of scholarly work. <p>UNIVERSITY & COMMUNITY SERVICE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No involvement in campus or community events <p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No evidence to support professional development activities.
--	--

EVALUATOR'S FEEDBACK FORM

INSTRUCTION

CHOSEN DOMAIN WEIGHT (50-70%) _____ EVALUATION SCORE (1-10) _____

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

SCHOLARLY ENDEAVORS

CHOSEN DOMAIN WEIGHT (10-30%) _____ EVALUATION SCORE (1-10) _____

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

UNIVERSITY, COMMUNITY, AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

CHOSEN DOMAIN WEIGHT (10-30%) _____ EVALUATION SCORE (1-10) _____

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHOSEN DOMAIN WEIGHT (10-30%) _____ EVALUATION SCORE (1-10) _____

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement: