

# Annual Evaluation Guidelines for Faculty 2020-2021

(adopted based on Department Suggestions and Discussion/Recommended by Evaluation Panel)

Evaluators must consider the rank when evaluating teaching, research and service; said consideration is tied to the expectations based on rank in the faculty handbook

Faculty must comply with and follow instructions of department chair regarding teaching scheduling and standards, research procedures and compliance, and service requirements.

Overall scores consider the fare form credit given. DO NOT FORGET to rate summer activity for teaching and or research (presuming that it was compensated by the University).

**Evaluation Key:**

Unsatisfactory (U)	Performance that is clearly substandard. Performance improvement plan is mandated, and termination may be appropriate.
Needs Improvement (NI)	Performance that is below a reasonable expectation for the faculty rank that an individual holds
Meets Expectations (ME)	Performance is sound for the faculty rank held and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description.
Exceeds Expectations (EE)	Performance is sound for the faculty rank held and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description. The individual has distinguished themselves in some way by performing at a level that is above a normal expectation for their faculty rank.
Exemplary (E)	Performance is sound for the faculty rank held and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description. The individual has truly done something that is outstanding and that is not present in the majority of the faculty.

## Teaching:

University teaching and student learning encompass much more than the hours faculty members spend in the classroom. Teaching also involves keeping up with the field (both technical and changes in pedagogy), planning lectures, creating instructional materials, appropriately utilizing the CANVAS LMS, constructing tests, grading papers, mentoring/interacting with students, participating in tutorials, recitations, and formal teaching committees, working with graduate students, supervising student educational assistants (SEAs), conducting office hours, and participating in professional development programs. Because many aspects of teaching remain invisible to students, their evaluations alone are inadequate to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of teaching effectiveness. In addition to student assessments, some departments may have obtained evaluations from individuals who both understand the subject matter and recognize the intellectual effort and pedagogical merit involved in various instructional activities.

**Evaluation Philosophy:** Evaluations are earned by faculty and supported by the evidence (both quality and quantity) that a faculty member is performing his or her duties at a certain level. To achieve a “Meets Expectations” rating, a faculty typically *must* perform the appropriate core duties in the teaching that were assigned. An evaluator may consider elements such as number of students and student credit hours supported, number of different courses delivered, and also should consider how effective the communication with students is based on a range of elements including the course syllabus, SAI results and comments, and use of CANVAS.

## Elements to consider:

### Evidence:

- Courses taught
- Student Credit hours produced
- DFW rate
- Course GPA
- SAI
- Thesis or projects directed, where applicable
- Thesis or projects committee, where applicable
- Instructional materials sufficient to demonstrate performance ratings below

### Elements that are core duties and typically, where appropriate, are present to achieve MEETS EXPECTATIONS performance (based on evidence supplied in the dossier):

- Syllabus timeliness, construction, and compliance with required standards
- Presence to deliver course AND be appropriately available to students (e.g. office hours)
- Participates and cooperates appropriately in multi section courses
- Curricular Rigor; evidence based upon items such as alignment between outcomes and assessments, syllabus, course materials, examinations, and examination practice
- Grading aligns as a fair assessment of mastery of material and is fair to students
- Grading and examination policies and execution lead to proper and fair assessment
- Grades assignments and exams in a timely manner
- Adheres to appropriate student learning outcomes to ensure we provide a quality education: evidenced by examinations and completion of planned course material

- Submits midterm and final grades consistently and on-time, maintains approved syllabus and updated accurate gradebook in Canvas, submits assessment reports and other documentation consistently and on time
- Submits attendance reports as required, tracks student attendance in Canvas or appropriate verifiable method
- Appropriate use of SEAs as per department and academic affairs guidelines and demonstrating appropriate responsibility in the delivery of the course
- Appropriate interactions, consistent with university policy and guidelines, with students and appropriate professional behavior in communication with students
- Demonstration of ongoing and reasonable improvements in courses, and a plan for further improvements, that have been delivered multiple times by the faculty member
- Executes teaching duties with honesty and integrity

**Elements that may be used by an evaluator to justify an Exceeds Expectations or Exemplary rating** This must be very carefully considered in the context of the institution and is specifically not a list-based, check-box exercise. If a faculty member is clearly demonstrating effectiveness in all of the areas for consideration under meets expectations, with respect to their workload, consideration of exceeds expectation may be appropriate. Evidence presented must support teaching and pedagogical excellence that is distinct from the Meets Expectations requirements.

Examples might be:

- Successful course delivery innovation – has attracted students’ interests, increasing retention and curricular progression.
- Curricular Innovation: New course development, innovation in pedagogy that is significant
- Active Participation in curriculum development for new concentration, or a new degree program
- For Exemplary the faculty has truly done something that is outstanding and that is not present in the majority of the faculty such as:
  - Successful Curricular innovation – has attracted interests from other universities, increasing enrollment
  - Demonstrable impact on student retention and facilitating progression to timely graduation

## Research:

Research at Florida Poly is evolving as a core duty for the faculty that do not hold the title instructor. While research can be hard to measure, as a core duty, faculty need to demonstrate activity and success in this realm. If faculty do not have time to do research, this will be indicated on their FARE form in terms of the credit granted; where there is no time, the rating should be N/A. Where there is time, the rating expectation must be adjusted to reflect the amount of time available. For instance, if a person has only a small amount of credit available for research, achieving Meets Expectations performance requires demonstrated progress commensurate with the time allocated. If there is more time, the progress must be more significant. Regardless of time available, an above Meets Expectations score requires the presence of items from the evidence list identified below. Research must advance the mission of the university and support the program and concentration(s) in which the faculty member teaches.

## Elements to consider:

### Evidence:

- Refereed Publications
- Non-refereed publications
- Books, book contributions
- Presentations or invited talks
- Funded projects
- Works in Progress where there is work product as evidence
- Proposals submitted
- Editorial position in a national level journal
- Students supported/advised and/or student effort in research programs
- Research activity with students that has an outcome
- Other activity pre-approved by Department Chair and/or Division Director.

**Elements that are core duties and typically must be present, as demonstrated by evidence, to achieve MEET EXPECTATIONS performance: Examples are not exhaustive, but all activity must demonstrate impact and relevance to university and field.**

### Core element that must be present:

- Adequate progress on clearly defined, multi-year research plan (ideally explicitly laid out, but may be evident in other ways)
- Executes research duties with honesty and integrity

### Other core elements that are appropriate to consider

- Appropriate pursuit/success in developing a funded research program,
- Works/Proposals in progress reflect substantial progress toward completion and promise of likely success.
- Recognizable major publication (s) or significant grant funding with progress on grant commensurate with grant size
- Substantial industry project with significant impact on research, development, application (where the faculty member secured prior approval, followed appropriate procedures, and advances the research and/or educational mission of the University, department, and/or program.)

- Publication in high impact factor journals
- Research awards such as grants
- Honorific research societies
- Compliance with all rules, regulations, disclosures, and requirements associated with research, including following institutional protocols for engagement with external partners or potential partners.
- Research presentation or publication that receives public recognition and/or publicity, or impacts public policy or enhances the University's economic impact
- Successful publication or presentation at a national conference or significant contribution to a state or regional conference.
- Any of the items in the "Facts" column that hold demonstrable national or international impact or advance the program, department, and university's reputation.

**Elements that may be used by an evaluator to justify an Exceeds Expectations or Exemplary rating**

This must be very carefully considered in the context of the institution and is specifically not a list based, check box exercise. Evidence presented must support research excellence that is distinct from the Meets Expectations requirements.

. Examples might be:

- Significant research award from a competitive proposal process
- Publication activity that is of high quality and above the norm for the department

## Service

Service comes in a variety of capacities. The basic levels are departmental, division-level (where applicable), and institutional. Institutional service includes University committees but also leadership and advising of student organizations, clubs, or professional societies. Service also includes externally-focused service in the form of community relationships or formal efforts to solicit industry engagement in either curricular or research capacities, or unfunded consulting relationship with local, state, or federal government, private entities, or industry. A third broad category is professional service, which may include affiliations with state or national organizations as an organizer, peer reviewer, society fellow, or other activity that advances the discipline or profession and demonstrates recognition of the faculty-member's expertise and authority.

### Elements to consider:

#### Evidence:

- Nature of service assignments
- Student organizations supervised
- Community-related service
- Industry or other agency service
- Professional service
- Demonstrated contribution and impact of contribution to service roles.

#### Elements that are core duties and typically must be present to achieve and provide evidence to MEET EXPECTATIONS performance:

- Executes service duties with honesty and integrity and demonstrates collegiality in performing service roles
- Regular, documented active participation in assigned service duties
- Participation in department meetings
- Demonstrable results or progress made on external service activity
- Significant, demonstrated contribution to internally assigned service roles that enable the unit or organization to fill a gap, solve a problem, or advance in some important way (e.g. contribution to curriculum advisory board relationship).
- Successfully develop or lead co-curricular project such as speaker-series or other events or competitions.
- Initiate meaningful service contribution to program, department, or University.
- Sponsor a new student organization or grow an existing one.
- Enable the organization to achieve positive impact on campus community or a professional society that advances the culture of learning among students in the discipline. All rules must be followed when leading student clubs or organizations.
- Foster significant one-time relationship or potential for extended relationship with external entity that benefits the program, department, or University through research, curriculum, in new or existing areas.
- Provide professional service that raises the profile of the program, department, and university.
- Member of grant review committee for governmental agency or foundation, editorial board, journal reviewer or co-editor

**Elements that may be used by an evaluator to justify an Exceeds Expectations or Exemplary rating**

- This must be very carefully considered in the context of the institution and is specifically not a list based, check box exercise. Evidence presented must support service excellence that is distinct from the Meets Expectations requirements.

An example might be:

- Significant, demonstrated contribution to internally assigned service roles that enable the unit or organization to fill a gap, solve a problem, or improve productivity