



Procedures for Annual Evaluation of Regular Faculty

Approved 12/2/2013

Revisions approved 11/2/2015

I. Introduction

The Faculty Handbook (Section 3.03.A.5) specifies that “every member of a unit will be given the opportunity to evaluate his/her colleagues based on the evaluation criteria unless a two-thirds majority of the faculty vote each year to waive that option.” Furthermore, “if peer evaluation does not take place, the Unit Head shall evaluate each faculty member against the evaluation criteria and transmit a recommendation to the appointing officer.”

The purpose of this document is to describe the procedures by which the Unit Head will evaluate faculty in the Mathematics Department in the event that peer review is waived. These procedures continue the past practice of delegating primary responsibility for review and oversight of the annual evaluation process to the department’s Advisory Committee, while also providing mechanisms for broader departmental input on the performance of untenured faculty, more flexibility for faculty to document their work, and greater alignment with the department’s personnel process.

For the purposes of this document, the phrase “faculty member” refers to any tenured or tenure-eligible member of the Mathematics Department.

II. Merit Review Committee

Each year, a Merit Review Committee (MRC) will be formed. The MRC will typically consist of all members of the Advisory Committee, including the two assistant chairs. However, the Unit Head, in consultation with the Diversity Advisory Committee, may appoint up to two additional members to the MRC to ensure that: (1) the MRC is broadly representative of the department in terms of rank, scholarly expertise, and other relevant factors; and (2) the MRC contains at least one Inclusion Advocate.

III. Materials Used in the Evaluation Process

For each faculty member, the materials used in the evaluation process will include the annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR) required by the Faculty Handbook (Section 3.02.B) and student evaluations from all courses taught during the evaluation year. For untenured faculty, the evaluation materials will also include comments relevant to the evaluation criteria solicited by the Unit Head from all department faculty.

In addition to these required materials, each faculty member may submit supplemental material consisting of up to three pages of additional reflection and/or a class visitation report conducted by a tenured or

tenure-track GVSU faculty member¹ using the Class Visit Record from Appendix D of the department's personnel policy document.

All faculty are expected to reflect on their teaching in their FARs. One purpose of the supplemental material is to allow a mechanism for faculty to (1) highlight evidence of teaching excellence in support of a rating of Exceeds Expectations in the area of teaching; or (2) to provide additional reflection on and/or context from which to interpret critical trends in student evaluations. The supplemental material is optional. Any faculty member who is able to provide thoughtful reflection on their teaching within the FAR—including a response to any significant patterns of concern raised in student evaluations—may choose to not submit supplemental material and will not be penalized for doing so.

IV. Evaluation Procedures

1. The Unit Head and Advisory Committee will maintain and annually distribute to faculty a list of guidelines for the preparation of activity reports and supplemental materials.
2. The Unit Head will publicize the due date for FARs and supplemental materials during the fall semester.
3. Once FARs and supplemental materials are submitted, they will be made available to all faculty via the department's Blackboard site.
4. The Unit Head will provide a mechanism for all faculty to share comments and concerns about the performance of untenured faculty as it pertains to upcoming contract renewal, tenure, and promotion decisions.
5. Each member of the MRC will review each faculty member's FAR, supplemental material, and, for untenured faculty, comments provided by department faculty. Each member of the MRC will review numerical student evaluation data for each faculty member, and written comments from student evaluations will be read by the Unit Head and at least two members of the MRC.
6. Per the Faculty Handbook (Section 3.03.A.6.a), the Unit Head will prepare a draft written performance summary for each faculty member that discusses the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. For untenured faculty, this performance summary will summarize relevant themes from departmental feedback and address any departmental concerns regarding contract renewal, tenure, and promotion.
7. The MRC will meet with the Unit Head to discuss each faculty member's draft performance summary in light of the materials provided for the evaluation. Based on this feedback, the Unit Head will prepare a final performance summary for each faculty member. For any case in which the Unit Head is considering a Less than Satisfactory overall evaluation, the faculty member involved will be given an opportunity to meet with the Unit Head and MRC prior to their performance summary being finalized.

¹ For the purposes of annual evaluation, no faculty member may both visit and be visited by the same colleague in the same year. In other words, a faculty member who completes a CVR for a colleague may not also submit a CVR completed by that same colleague in the same year.

8. The Unit Head will share all final performance summaries with the MRC prior to submitting them to the Dean.
9. The Unit Head will meet with each untenured faculty member by the end of the winter semester to discuss their written performance summary and their performance for the past year. All other faculty members will be offered an opportunity to meet with the Unit Head to discuss their performance. If a faculty member does not request such a meeting, it will be assumed that the faculty member does not wish to meet.
10. Each faculty member may choose to append a response of at most one page to their performance summary, which will become part of the performance summary and will be included in future portfolios for contract renewal, tenure, and/or promotion.
11. Untenured faculty members will sign their written performance summary and retain a signed copy for inclusion in future review materials. This signature does not indicate that the faculty member agrees with the recommendation, but only that s/he has received it.
12. For untenured faculty members, portfolios for contract renewal, tenure, and/or promotion must include all FARs from previous years and written performance summaries for the 2012 calendar year and all subsequent years. It is the candidate's responsibility to include these materials in their portfolio.
13. For tenured faculty members seeking promotion, portfolios must include FARs and written performance summaries from the previous five years. If the previous five-year period includes years prior to 2013, only performance summaries for the 2013 calendar year and subsequent years are required to be included.
14. The department will keep copies of all performance summaries and faculty responses (as described in Item 10 above) for five years. With the exception of class visits conducted by the Personnel Committee, supplemental materials will not be retained and need not be included in portfolios for future personnel actions.
15. For the purposes of annual merit evaluations, only performance summaries and faculty responses will be submitted to the Dean. Supplemental materials are for departmental use only. However, class visits conducted by the Personnel Committee will be retained and included in portfolios for future personnel actions, as described in the department's personnel policy document.

Appendix A – Evaluation Categories and Criteria

1. The department's workload and evaluation document (*Workload and Evaluation of Regular Faculty*) defines the criteria by which faculty are to be evaluated.
2. For each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service), each faculty member will receive a rating of Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, Partially Meets Expectations, or Does Not Meet Expectations. A rating of Meets Expectations indicates that baseline expectations have been met. A rating of Exceeds Expectations is reserved for work that is of higher quality and rises significantly above baseline expectations. A rating of Partially Meets Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations indicates that baseline expectations have not been met.
3. Each faculty member will receive an overall evaluation of Satisfactory, Exemplary, or Less than Satisfactory. This rating will be based on the extent to which the faculty member meets or exceeds expectations in each of the three areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service).
4. The evaluation of whether a faculty member meets or exceeds expectations in each area will be based in part on the faculty member's rank and area of significant focus. Section 1.2 of *Workload and Evaluation* provides further details about the types of activities that meet expectations for each area of significant focus. In particular:
 - Per Section 3.01 of the Faculty Handbook, "the primary responsibility of faculty is excellent teaching." Faculty with a significant focus of teaching are evaluated under the same criteria as their peers (including those who do not choose a significant focus of teaching), but satisfy the expectations of their significant focus by teaching additional credits.
 - Faculty with a significant focus in the area of scholarly/creative activity are expected to advance a program of scholarly development aimed at publication or other forms of dissemination and validated by peers or broader audiences.
 - Faculty with a significant focus in the area of service are expected to engage in significant service activities characterized by responsibility and effectiveness, resulting in high quality, demonstrable outcomes.
5. As teaching is difficult to evaluate from the limited information available during the merit review process, faculty members who demonstrate thoughtful reflection on their teaching in their FAR and/or supplemental materials—including an appropriate response to critical trends raised in student evaluations—will generally be deemed to have met expectations in the area of teaching. In order to exceed expectations in teaching, faculty must provide evidence of excellence in teaching (as specified by CLAS Standards and the department's workload and evaluation document) in their FAR and/or supplemental materials. The extent to which excellence must be demonstrated in order to earn a rating of Exceeds Expectations depends in part on the faculty member's rank. A faculty member may be rated as not meeting expectations for teaching if trends in student evaluations and/or other information available to the Unit Head (and shared with the MRC) provide evidence of either (1) significant concerns pertaining to teaching effectiveness that are not adequately addressed in the FAR and/or supplemental material; and/or (2) concerns pertaining to teaching effectiveness that have been raised in one or more past merit evaluations and have not been resolved.

6. Consistent with the CLAS Standards, “in reviewing student evaluations, attention should be given to overall trends rather than emphasizing individual responses, particularly outliers” (p. 3). Likewise, the MRC will interpret student evaluations consistent with the view of the CLAS College Personnel Committee, which is articulated in the document posted at <http://gvsu.edu/s/vZ>.
7. There are many factors involved in determining each faculty member’s overall evaluation from their ratings in each of three areas (teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service). This process inherently involves a number of professional judgments on the part of the Unit Head and the Merit Review Committee. While it is impossible to write down a set of rules that encompasses every possible circumstance, the following guidelines provide a general framework for determining overall evaluations from individual category ratings.
 - A faculty member who meets expectations in all three areas will receive an overall evaluation of Satisfactory.
 - A faculty member who exceeds expectations in all three areas of evaluation will receive an overall evaluation of Exemplary.
 - A faculty member who exceeds expectations in one or two areas of evaluation and meets expectations in the remaining area(s) will receive an overall evaluation of either Satisfactory or Exemplary.
 - The overall evaluation of a faculty member who does not meet expectations or only partially meets expectations in any of the three areas of evaluation will vary depending on the extent to which expectations are not met and the faculty member’s performance in the other areas of evaluation.

Due to the inherent differences between annual merit evaluations and personnel reviews, which span a greater period of time, it is not necessary to meet all of the criteria for personnel evaluation in a given year in order to earn a rating of Exemplary. Conversely, annual evaluations of Satisfactory or better are not sufficient to guarantee that the criteria for contract renewal, tenure, or promotion have been met.

8. To the extent that it is possible, the Unit Head will, in his or her discretion, take performance in each of the three areas of evaluation into account when recommending raises to the Dean. So, for example, a faculty member who receives a Satisfactory overall evaluation but exceeds expectations in one or more areas may be recommended for a higher percentage raise than a faculty member who receives a Satisfactory overall evaluation and meets (but does not exceed) expectations in all three areas.