EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Philosophy

Management is a balance of art and science and of judgment and numbers. This merit evaluation process recognizes the need to develop comparative analysis with other faculty members and departments. However, it also recognizes that quality, specifically in an academic environment, is most difficult to measure in a precise way. Further, attaching numerical measure to individual faculty activities can reduce motivation and encourage "block filling" and mediocrity. We also must recognize expected levels of performance have changed over the years. Yet, it is imperative to have goals and sub-goals so faculty and Chairs can seek targets for growth and development. It is hoped the process fulfills this philosophy.

A 100 percent evaluation in 1980 would be about 80 percent today. The quantity of faculty members is nearly the same, but the quality significantly higher.

The merit evaluation system provides input for faculty and administrative decision such as:

- Providing faculty feedback on effort and goals.
- Identifying faculty development needs, such as release time, training activities, attendance at academic meetings, etc.
- Providing information for Department, College, and University promotion and tenure review. This includes review of nontenure faculty prior to promotion/tenure consideration.
- Assigning summer teaching.
- Providing information for merit pay recommendations to the Dean.
Source of Guidance

There are six primary sources of guidance for this paper.

3. Faculty Evaluation Procedures adopted by the Faculty Senate. 1983, September.
4. College of Business Mission and Objectives.
5. College of Business Faculty Development Policy and Procedures.
6. Faculty Handbook revised Fall, 1995

Merit Evaluation Criteria:

The Faculty Handbook lists four areas requiring evaluation for merit pay. Teaching must be assigned a minimum of 40 points, and the other three areas should have weights of at least 10 points each. The range of points to be used by the Department of Management and Business Systems are shown below. A maximum of 100 points can be awarded to an individual. Individuals should establish their goals in each area in a way that best fits their objectives and strengths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Area

Teaching

Individual criteria are described below with examples. Points will be awarded according to the following guidelines.

Maximum points (55) will require excellent student evaluations and evidence of four superior accomplishments in other areas of the teaching criteria listing.

To achieve 40 points or more requires satisfactory student evaluations and evidence of two satisfactory accomplishments in other areas.

Points will be awarded based upon evidence presented by the individual, observation of the individual by the Chairman, and judgment.

Criteria:
1. Student Evaluations. Excellent evaluations are those with ratings significantly above the median rating for courses similar in type (e.g., compare major courses to other major courses, CBK courses to other CBK courses, etc.)

2. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments (e.g., successful teaching in the UWG Honors Program).

3. Letters from former students attesting to the individual's instructional abilities (This kind of evidence could be used to show that the teacher was responsible for the student's learning something of value.)

4. Successful direction of individual student work (e.g., special projects that were put to use by businesses, or that received special recognition - like winning a competition, etc.)

5. Effectiveness as shown by peer evaluation. While there is no formal system of peer evaluation, colleagues could provide statements of observed performance in team teaching situations, curriculum development projects, etc.

6. Scholarship related to teaching. Research related to teaching effectiveness, evaluation, etc., which had a positive impact on the individual's classroom effectiveness, could be counted in this area.

7. Successful development of courses. Development of new courses, or substantial redesign of existing courses could be considered in this area.

8. Development of effective curricula innovations and/or instructional methods. Examples could include the development and incorporation of technology into the classroom through the use of distance learning, computer assisted instruction, use of telecommunications, etc., the enhancement of presentation and curriculum building skills through education/training programs, etc.

**Professional Development**
Criteria to be used in assigning points are listed below. The following general guidelines will be used in awarding points.

Maximum points (35) requires a minimum of one article in a nationally recognized, quality journal, and at least 4 significant accomplishments in the areas listed below.

To receive 15 or more points requires a minimum of one peer reviewed article, and at least two significant accomplishments in the areas listed below.

**Criteria:**
1. Publications in nationally recognized, quality journals. These would be nationally recognized journals that use a blind review process, and other prestigious professional journals, such as *The Harvard Law Review*.

2. Publications in peer reviewed journals. This category would include journals that use an editorial board, and prominent trade journals such as *Training and Development Journal*.

3. The publication of books


5. Presentations before learned societies and professional organizations.

6. Honors and awards for research, scholarship, or other creative activities.

7. Reviews of a candidate's publications or creative work by persons of recognized competence in the discipline.

8. Election or appointment to offices in professional organizations, successful committee work and important service to state, regional, national or international professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work.

9. Receipt of competitively awarded grants or fellowships, or admission to seminars related to one's discipline, scholarship, and/or creative activities.

10. Membership on editorial boards.

11. Development of scholarly applications of technology, e.g., laboratory devices, computer software packages or programs, videotapes, etc.

12. Consultation which involves scholarly application of professional expertise.

13. Professional development activities such as conferences and workshops which show initiative on the part of the individual and which have a clear benefit to the organization.

**Service**

Criteria from the Faculty Handbook are listed below with examples. The following general guidelines will be used for assigning points:

Maximum points (25) in this area will require four substantial achievements in the areas listed.

Evidence of substantial achievements/efforts must be documented and must involve more than just being a member of an organization.

**Criteria**
1. Successful development/presentation of service programs or projects. This can include Continuing Education programs, faculty development seminars, fund raising projects, etc.

2. Effective service-related consultation work or technical assistance. This could include such things as providing legal advice to a committee or administrator, providing assistance with statistical analysis to a colleague or committee, assisting colleagues with computer problems, providing programming assistance, etc.

3. Committee work at the department, college or university level for which the individual can demonstrate a significant contribution.

4. Effective advisement of student organizations. Evidence of effectiveness could include the creation of an organization, exceptional achievements of an organization, etc.

5. Successful counseling/advising of students. Credit in this area would require efforts over and above the normal advising duties of the individual.

6. Successful service on local, statewide, regional, national, or international levels in community-service organizations. This could include officership in civic organizations, churches, etc., but would not include only membership in an organization.

7. Honors, awards and special recognitions for service to the institution or the community.

8. Significant contributions to the improvement of student, faculty or community life.

9. Exceptional contributions toward the development of collegiality.

The following quote provides guidance for items 8 and 9;

Service may also include a teacher's relationship, attitudes, and behavior within a department. The instructor who is seen as supportive and positive, who may serve as catalyst to his associates or to their programs, may serve the department without spending defined periods of time in "service" activities. Service maybe viewed as a willingness to carry extra workload or more of the less desirable kinds of courses in his teaching load. Therefore, in some instances, service may encompass much of a faculty member's personal behavior in a group context, and the resultant evaluation criteria could be in terms of his or her personal contribution to a more smoothly functioning organization. Other faculty and administrators in the immediate environment again are the best sources of this information. (Genova, et al, p. 19)

**Other**
The ten points in this area will be awarded for demonstrated achievements over and above those
covered in the other three areas. For example, an individual may achieve more in the professional development area that is required to get the maximum points (such as two or three prominent refereed journal articles along with other accomplishments), or an individual may have a combination of achievements that would qualify for more points than are available in the other three areas. In these cases, up to 10 additional points would be awarded for these achievements at the discretion of the Department Chair. The individual should provide suggestions/recommendations in this area.

**Procedure**

1. At the start of the evaluation year (April 1), each faculty member submits an annual goal request to the Chair (attachment #1). It includes a desired application of points to the three global areas and specific actions/objectives to achieve the targets. Goals/actions/objectives should be realistic and challenging, therefore, the faculty member is not expected to reach all established targets. Resource requests are included in the request. The faculty member should consider his/her performance targets in comparison to other College of Business faculty.

2. The Chair reviews the goals/objectives/activities with the faculty members. Points of emphasis and deemphasis are discussed, and the document is agreed on by both parties.

3. During the year, events could occur that would change the focus of the individual, such as unexpected appointments to committees, or unforeseen opportunities for research. When such events dictate changes to goals/objectives/activities, the changes should be discussed with the Chairman, and a revised set of goals/objectives/activities agreed upon by both parties.

4. In early March, each faculty member self-evaluates his/her performance based on the approved goals/objectives/activities (attachment #2). This is provided to the Chair.

5. The Chair prepares his or her own evaluation without referring to the faculty member's proposed scores. Since decisions on development, promotion and merit pay involve comparison, the evaluation must consider current performance of peer faculty members. The Chairs may modify their evaluation based upon review of the faculty member's report.

6. The Chair and faculty members jointly review the Chair's evaluation and agree on the final document. This document is to be signed and dated by both individuals. If an appeal is planned (see below), it should be noted after the signature on the evaluation.

7. Copies of all the documents are retained in the Department personnel files. They are to be used, as needed, by the Chair and faculty.

**Appeals** - If there is a disagreement about the evaluation, the faculty member has ten (10) days from the date the document is signed to respond. If the disagreement cannot be resolved at this level, it will be forwarded to the Dean for review.
GOALS FOR 20__ - 20__(April 1 – April 1 )

Faculty Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (40 - 55 points)</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Institution (15 - 25 points)</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth &amp; Development* (15 - 35 points)</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (10)</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total ______

100

SPECIFIC SUPPORTING OBJECTIVES/ACTIVITIES

Teaching

Service

Professional Growth & Development*

Other

* College and Department Emphasis on Journal Level Activity

[List on back: specify travel and other resource needs.]
MERIT SELF EVALUATION                          Attachment #2
20___ TO 20___

FACULTY
MEMBER_______________________________________________________

DATE OF
REPORT_________________________________________________________

INPUT AREA


1. Teaching (40 - 55 points) Include any innovations.         My Goal ____ My Score____

2. Academic Development & Professional Growth (15-35 points)  My Goal ____ My Score____

Research and intellectual development

Provide citation of books, papers, articles and proceedings.
Indicate submissions under review, seminars, presentations, etc.(use back of page if necessary)

3. Service to Institution (15 - 25 points)                    My Goal ____ My Score____
   List committees, Continuing Education, etc.

4. Other (10) What else should be considered evaluating your merit.        Total _______
**MERIT EVALUATION FORM**

Faculty Member____________________________________________________

Conference Date ___________________________________________________

Merit Points Awarded________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Teaching (maximum 55 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Academic Achievement &amp; Professional Growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Maximum - 35 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Service to Institution (maximum 25 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Other (maximum 10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS (include any other item needing consideration)**

I have been apprised of the content of this evaluation and am aware of my right to respond in writing to this evaluation within 10 days of conference date.

__________________________________  ____________________________________
Faculty Signature   Date  Chair’s Signature   Date
Travel Requirement/Needs  Attachment #4

for
AY 20__/20____

Please list your travel needs for the next academic year and submit them with your merit evaluation information.