

To: Mathematics Department TT Faculty
From: Esther Billings
Re: Instructions for 2022 Annual Evaluation – including submission of Faculty Workload Report (FWR)
Date: December 12, 2022
[link to this memo](#)



The purpose of this memo is to provide details about information to include for submission for our annual evaluation (merit review) which includes submission of your 2022 Faculty Workload Report (FWR—formerly called *Faculty Activity Report or FAP*), CV, and optional supplementary materials. Email your FWR, CV, and any supplementary materials as separate PDF file attachments to Ana (vanbraga@gvsu.edu) by **5PM on Friday, January 13**.

Creating the FWR (Faculty Workload Report) form: Access the FWR form on Digital Measures (renamed watermark:faculty success) [here](#): Log in using your GVSU credential. Add in relevant activities related to 2022. When you fill in teaching (for calendar year and include sp/su if you taught), be sure to also note workload credit for math ed courses since it is different from published credits and indicate workload credit of 0 (workload 0 - counted as significant focus) if you taught a course for significant focus). Scroll to the bottom of the main page, click Reflections, and click Add New to create a 2022 FWR entry. Add “reflections” for each section of the FWR. From the main menu page, select the button “rapid reports” located on the top right and then choose Faculty Activity Report - University to generate the report.

Overview of Process:

- **Documents to Refer To:** The 2022 FWR will be used for annual evaluation procedures ([SG 3.07](#)) In our 11/30/22 TT department meeting, we voted to waive the right of peer review and we updated the procedures/annual review evaluation criteria. As a result, we will use our [Procedures for Annual Evaluation of Regular Faculty \(v1.4\)](#) to guide our process. Please read through this document to familiarize yourself with the merit review process and what is required. Criteria for annual merit evaluation can be found in Section IV the [Evaluation Standards and Criteria for Personnel and Annual Review](#) (starting at bottom of p.7). The Merit Review Committee (MRC) (Jiyeon, Akalu, Jon, Matt and Esther) will review your materials as outlined in our [procedures](#) document.
- **Materials to Submit:**
 - Download 2022 Faculty Workload Report (FWR), then save as PDF file titled (last name-2022FWR) and email to Ana along with your additional files (updated CV and any supplemental materials):
 - CV: The CV you submit should include work from at least the last 5 years (as relevant)
 - MRC Conversation: If you are interested, please fill out this [short survey](#). In addition, when emailing your FWR, CV, and (optional) supplementary materials to Ana, also indicate in your email whether or not you plan to sign up for a MRC conversation. This will expedite the scheduling process/

The following pages of the memo provide reminders of what to include. Please let me know if you have any questions.

MRC Recommendations: *Here are a few highlighted points from our [procedures](#) and MRC recommendations to keep in mind as you create your FWR and any supplementary material*

- **Numbered Criteria:** For your convenience, the MRC has numbered the items in the evaluation criteria tables so that if you want to refer to criteria directly, you can cite the associated number.
[Numbered Teaching Evaluation Criteria](#) [Numbered Scholarship Criteria](#) [Numbered Service Criteria](#)
- **As you reflect on teaching** (*In FWR reflection—or include part of reflection in supplementary material*)
 - We recommend you identify ways you have demonstrated effective or excellent teaching. Use the teaching criteria in our [Evaluation Standards & Criteria for Personnel & Annual Review](#) (p.10) to frame your discussion. It is helpful to MRC reviewers when faculty quote criteria directly. *For example, if you want to highlight ways you have focused on “developing students problem-solving skills and problem-approach behaviors”, you can either quote or index the criteria ([A.III.5](#))*
 - Describe aspects of your teaching over the past year that you believe have been most successful in promoting student understanding and engagement.
 - Analyze/reflect over student LIFT feedback, noting any themes and areas of strength or improvement. Be sure to include a response to significant patterns of concern raised in student evaluations and provide context from which to interpret those student concerns. ([III.9a](#))
- Report of results of reassigned time (as relevant) ([III.9d](#)) and discuss progress made on any recommendations specified in your written performance summary from the previous two years, if applicable ([III.9e](#))
- Report significant focus (SF) progress or results from W22 and F22. Include a description of how SF time was used, including the number of credit hours for each category used and outcomes ([III.9c](#)). If your FAP/SWP (F22) plans were modified, note changes (and describe how you utilized your SF).
- Indicate scope and work done related to scholarship and service in 2022.

[Submit any relevant supplementary material.](#)

- For more information about optional supplementary materials, see [III.7](#).
- Elaborate on any activities/times spent on activities the MRC might be unfamiliar with, either by providing detail on the FWR or explaining via supplementary material.
- **Exemplary:** As per [Procedures, III.9e](#), faculty members are responsible for making the case for an exemplary rating by explaining what accomplishment satisfies the criteria for an exemplary rating see [Evaluation doc, IV.A-F](#) (you may do this in writing as part of the supplementary material or sign up for a calibrating conversation with members of the MRC). See [link](#) for sample rationale (from last year); please use the numbering system [in this document](#) to indicate clearly which criteria you believe you have met. For example, if you got a teaching award, write “T.1: I received a teaching award.”

A note about interpretation of “exemplary” through publication: a publication does not automatically mean an exemplary rating. Remember, if you are getting significant focus in scholarship, it is expected you will be disseminating your work and will have at least one product from the Advancement of Knowledge category for every accumulated 18 significant credits. However, a publication could be considered exemplary when you publish a journal article/books with a competitive journal/publisher. For example, journals with low acceptance rates such as *The American Mathematical Monthly* or *The Journal of Research in Mathematics Education*. Or, you could make the case if you had multiple publications or a publication with limited scholarship significant focus.

Sign Up for Merit Review Committee (MRC) Conversation (Optional):

- You also have the opportunity to sign up for a conversation with members of the MRC. Purposes of a MRC formal conversation include: discussion of how you've met criteria, reflection over challenges, rationale for exemplary rating, or providing clarifying information. Esther Billings, Matt Boelkins, or Jon Hasenbank will facilitate these conversations, and the MRC subgroup (3 members) will be present for each conversation. More information on MRC conversations is given in [IV.4](#) (top of page 3). If interested, sign up for a MRC conversation no later than January 13, 5pm by [completing this short survey](#). You will receive a followup response assigning you a particular date and time. If you have any questions about the conversations, contact Esther or a member of the Merit Review Committee.