

**POLICIES, CRITERIA, AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION AND REWARD
OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY AND LECTURERS**

ORFALEA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE..... 2

FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT (FAR) 2

SELECTION OF AREAS OF EMPHASIS..... 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR QUALITY OF TEACHING 4

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH..... 4

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, STUDENTS, AND COMMUNITY 4

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS & ALLOCATION OF REWARDS 5

PROVISIONS FOR LECTURERS 7

PURPOSE

This document describes the procedures for annual performance reviews of the tenure-track (tenured and probationary) faculty (the “faculty”) and lecturers at the Orfalea College of Business (OCOB). The aim of these procedures is to afford faculty the freedom to choose the means by which they can best contribute to the OCOB’s mission as stated in the College’s Statement of Policies, Criteria and Procedures for Academic Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (hereafter the ARPT), and to implement a performance-based incentive system that rewards faculty for their accomplishments in that regard.

This document is in conformance with the current ARPT (adopted on 16 November 2003) and should be revised whenever the ARPT is amended. Proposed amendments to this document will only become effective after they have been approved by the majority of voting tenure-track faculty. The College’s ARPT document, this document, the Faculty Personnel Handbook, and the University’s Form 109 should be distributed to the faculty at the time of employment. Effective faculty governance requires that the OCOB community understand these important documents and implement needed improvements over time.

FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT (FAR)

Each faculty member will submit an annual report outlining his or her accomplishments in three performance areas: *Quality of Teaching, Quality of Professional Growth and Achievement*, and *Service to the University, Students, and Community*. Examples of the types of activities that qualify under each category are provided in the current ARPT.

The Faculty Annual Report (FAR) consists of four (4) pages, one per each type of activity (required) and a one page executive summary (optional).¹ The FAR form will summarize information for multiple periods so that faculty performance can be better assessed. A two-year time period will be used to assess the quality of teaching and service contributions. A five-year time period will be used to measure Quality of Professional Growth and Achievement. The executive summary will highlight faculty contributions since last year’s FAR was submitted. Individuals who submit a FAR will have access to all submitted FAR forms and the evaluations by the Area Chairs (AC) as well as the allocations by the Area Chairs’ Council (ACC).

To qualify for annual rewards, the faculty member must (1) submit a Faculty Annual Report and (2) receive an un-weighted rating of at least 2 in all three-performance areas (see section entitled “ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS & ALLOCATION OF REWARDS”). Faculty who fail

¹ In addition to the executive summary, faculty wishing to discuss special circumstances that affected their performance may attach a one page narrative.

to qualify for awards under these criteria will be expected to carry a 36 unit teaching load and will not be eligible for reimbursement for travel or other expenditures out of state funds.

SELECTION OF AREAS OF EMPHASIS

Table 1 presents a menu of allowable emphases and the corresponding minimum required teaching loads. All faculty members are expected to contribute to the College’s ability to reach its goals in each of the three areas. Each faculty member will select one option from Table 1.²

Table 1: Alternative Options For Tenure-Track Faculty				
Emphasis	Teaching		Professional Growth	Service
	Weight Allocation	Minimum Normal Teaching Load (in units)		
A. Quality of Teaching	70%	32	20%	10%
B. Quality of Professional Growth and Achievement	40%	24	50%	10%
C. Service to the University, Students, and Community	40%	24	20%	40%
D. (A) & (B)	55%	28	35%	10%
E. (A) & (C)	55%	28	20%	25%
F. (B) & (C)	40%	24	35%	25%

Faculty will select their desired emphasis for the next review year at the time they complete their FAR. The selection will be made in consultation with the individual’s AC. The AC should provide guidance based upon the individual’s strengths and the Area’s overall needs in each of the three performance categories. Although faculty will be allowed to change their weight allocation annually, it is anticipated that in most cases the areas of emphasis would be selected for a longer period of time.

² In some circumstances (e.g., in the case of area Chairs or other special assignments), actual teaching loads may be lower than the required minimum.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR QUALITY OF TEACHING

As the College's ARPT document clearly stipulates, the first, and most important, characteristic expected in a faculty member is the ability to teach well, coupled with a sincere interest in students. The faculty as a whole must be committed to a high level of instructional performance. Instructional performance includes keeping abreast of the relevant discipline, engaging in innovative curriculum development, experimenting in teaching methods, updating course content, effective student counseling, and other meaningful efforts to improve the quality of the instructional program. The ARPT provides a detailed list of specific factors that will be considered to evaluate teaching quality and effectiveness. Students' teaching evaluations are one factor listed in ARPT. The average of the score on the following five questions (selected by faculty on 10/16/2003) will serve as the summary of the teaching evaluations for each course.

Item Number	Text of the Question
3	This instructor is a good educator for this course.
6	The instructor was well-prepared for class.
7	The instructor used class time in a productive manner appropriate for the course.
9	The instructor was readily available for consultation during scheduled office hours.
15	The instructor was concerned with students' learning and was helpful.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The search for truth is the foundation for intellectual and personal growth. The University document (AB 85-2) commits the institution to establish and maintain an environment that fosters the complete intellectual and professional growth and development of the faculty. The OCOB recognizes and endorses the three categories of faculty contributions established by AACSB standards: *Contributions to Learning and Pedagogical Research, Contributions to Practice, and Discipline-Based Scholarship*. The ARPT clearly defines and provides examples of the AACSB standards.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, STUDENTS, AND COMMUNITY

In conformance with campus requirements, OCOB values service to the University, its students, and the community (including academic and professional associations). The ARPT provides definitions and examples of each type of service.

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS & ALLOCATION OF REWARDS

The evaluation of annual FARs will follow a two-stage process. In the first stage, each AC will evaluate the individual's FAR. In the second stage, the FAR, accompanied by the AC's evaluation, is forwarded to the ACC, which in turn conducts the final evaluation and determines reward allocations. Faculty with identical areas of emphasis will be considered and rewarded simultaneously. Tenure-track (tenured and probationary) faculty will be evaluated in a single pool.

The Evaluation Process

ACs will have three weeks to complete the evaluation of the FARs. Upon completion of the AC's evaluation, the faculty will be notified in writing (utilizing the form shown in Appendix 1). The faculty member has the option to submit a one page rebuttal within five working days (a week), which will be included in the materials forwarded to the ACC.

ACs will forward the FAR documents and the accompanying materials to the ACC. Upon receipt of these materials, the ACC will have three weeks to complete its evaluation and allocation of rewards. The faculty members will be notified of the ACC's decision both in writing (utilizing the form shown in Appendix 1) and through review with their AC. Faculty members will again have the option to submit a one page rebuttal within five working days, which will be reviewed by the ACC prior to the final determination of reward allocations.

Evaluation in each of the three performance areas will be based on a point system that moves in .5 increments within the range 1-4. This point system is based on standards used in the College's ARPT document and the University's Form 109.

- **Performance Level 1:** The individual has reached a high level of professional development and is making an outstanding contribution (**4 Points**)
- **Performance Level 2:** The individual meets the requirements of the present assignment and is making a valuable contribution (**3 Points**).
- **Performance Level 3:** The individual meets the requirements of the present assignment adequately (**2 Points**).
- **Performance Level 4:** The individual does not meet satisfactorily the requirements of the present assignment (**1 Point**).

Sabbatical or Other Leave: When faculty have been absent during the evaluation period, the following criteria will apply. In assessing teaching and service, the evaluation period will include the two most recent years excluding the period of leave. In assessing professional growth the time period will remain the prior five-years unless the leave was not related to professional development, in which case the evaluation period will cover the most recent five years excluding the absence.

Guidelines for Untenured Faculty: The requirements and evaluation procedures outlined in this document apply to untenured faculty during their probationary period (inclusive of credit toward service at other institutions). Untenured faculty should consult with their AC and Peer Review Committee to select the most appropriate emphasis from Table 1. It is generally expected that the appropriate emphasis will be *Quality of Professional Growth and Achievement* (emphasis B).

Evaluation of Teaching Performance: There are two components to the evaluation of teaching performance, (I) the average score on the above five items from the students' teaching evaluations (a quantitative measure), and (II) a subjective evaluation of teaching performance and goal attainment jointly determined by the AC and the ACC. The weights assigned to items (I) and (II) will be 65% and 35%, respectively.

The overall teaching evaluation score will be the average of the teaching scores from all courses taught during the preceding *two years*. This overall average will be multiplied by .65 to create the quantitative portion (I). For the subjective portion, the evaluators (the AC and ACC) will consider the individual's contributions to other factors listed under "Quality of Teaching" in the ARPT. Moreover, the role the faculty has played in meeting the Area's and the College's teaching needs will be considered. A subjective score in the range 1-4 will be assigned and weighted by .35 to arrive at the subjective measure (II). The total of the quantitative and subjective measures will be used to assess the individual's *Quality of Teaching*.

Evaluation of Professional Growth: The AC and ACC will assign a subjective evaluation based on the individual's contributions to items listed in the ARPT.

Evaluation of Service Performance: The AC and ACC will assign a subjective evaluation based on the individual's contributions to items listed in the ARPT.

The table below provides an example for a hypothetical faculty member demonstrating how a grand score summarizing individual's performance in teaching, professional growth, and service is determined. Assuming the faculty has chosen to emphasize teaching and professional growth, with corresponding weights, 55% teaching, 35% professional growth, and 10% service. The quantitative teaching scores is 3.2 (overall average of all courses taught during the last 2 years). The subjective evaluations awarded by the ACC are as follows: Quality of Teaching= 4.0, Quality of Professional Growth=2.5, and Quality of Service=3.0. The individual's overall performance rating (3.06) will be computed as follows:

A. Area of Evaluation	B. Evaluation Rating	C. Weighting Factor	D. Weighting for Evaluation Option Selected	E. Weighted Evaluation Rating (Column B x C x D)
Teaching (I): Average Student Evaluations	3.2	.65	.55	1.14
Teaching (II): Subjective Evaluation	4.0	.35	.55	0.77
Professional Growth	2.5	1.0	.35	0.85
Service	3.0	1.0	.10	0.30
TOTAL				3.06

PROVISIONS FOR LECTURERS

Submission of the annual FAR is optional for lecturers. Lecturers will be allowed to select from the evaluation options in Table 2. Lecturers will be evaluated in a separate evaluation pool.

Table 2: Alternative Options For Lecturers			
Emphasis	Teaching	Professional Growth	Service
A. <i>Quality of Teaching</i>	100%		
B. <i>Quality of Professional Growth and Achievement</i>	90%	10%	
C. <i>Service to the University, Students, and Community*</i>	90%		10%
D. (A) & (B)	80%	10%	10%
E. (A) & (C)	80%	20%	
F. (B) & (C)	80%		20%

* This option is only available for lecturers with such assignment.