

## Procedures for Annual Evaluation of Regular Faculty

(version 1.3) Approved 12/2/2013

Revisions approved 11/2/2015, 11/29/2017, and 4/8/2019

### I. Introduction

The *Regular Faculty Handbook* (SG [3.08.5.a](#)) 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 (from SG [3.08.5.e](#)), “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.” Throughout the rest of this document, this recommendation is referred to as the “Written Performance Summary (WPS).”

The purpose of this document is to describe the procedures by which the Unit Head will evaluate faculty in the Mathematics Department and produce the required Written Performance Summaries in the event that peer review is waived. 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 (AC), 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

The MRC will use the following materials in the evaluation process:

1. The faculty member’s annual Faculty Activity Plan (FAP) for the evaluation year, as required by the *Regular Faculty Handbook* (RFH), SG [3.02A](#).
2. The faculty member’s annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR) for the evaluation year, as required by RFH, SG [3.02.B](#).
3. The faculty member’s CV.
4. Student evaluations from all courses taught by the faculty member during the evaluation year<sup>1</sup>.
5. The faculty member’s Written Performance Summaries (WPSs) from the previous two years provided those evaluations included recommendations for the current evaluation.
6. The spreadsheet, maintained by the Unit Head, containing historical information about all regular faculty members’ significant focus credit hours in scholarship and Advancement of Knowledge outcomes.
7. Optional supplementary materials submitted by the faculty member. Each faculty member may submit supplemental material consisting of up to three pages of additional reflection and/or a Class Visit Record (see Appendix D of the departmental “[Procedure for the Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty](#)” document) produced by a tenured or tenure-track GVSU faculty member<sup>2</sup>. The purpose of

---

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with the “CLAS Standards & Criteria for Personnel Evaluation” document, “while student evaluations are an important component of assessment of teaching performance, they do not outweigh other measures of teaching effectiveness. In reviewing student evaluations, attention should be given to overall trends rather than emphasizing individual responses, particularly outliers” ([p. 2](#)).

<sup>2</sup>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.

the supplemental material is to allow further evidence, reflection, or elaboration beyond that allowed by the word limits of the FAR through Digital Measures. Any faculty member who is able to accomplish items a) – f) below within the FAR may choose to not submit supplemental material and will not be penalized for doing so.

8. Other information obtained through the processes outlined in Section IV.6.b (the optional calibrating conversation) and Section IV.6.c (clarifying questions and the corresponding answers).
9. For untenured faculty, submitted comments relevant to the evaluation criteria solicited by the Unit Head from all departmental faculty.

Each faculty member is expected to include the following in their submitted materials:

- a) Reflection on their teaching including a response to significant patterns of concern raised in student evaluations and context from which to interpret those student concerns.
- b) As specified in *RFH*, SG [3.02.B](#), “Each year’s FAR should discuss how much of the work anticipated in the corresponding FAP was able to be completed and explain any additional work performed.”
- c) A description of how their significant focus time was used, including the number of credit hours of significant focus used in each category as well as outcomes (as required by *RFH*, SG [3.02.B](#)). Keep in mind that each credit hour of significant focus should correspond to approximately 50 hours of work and the following (from *RFH*, SG [3.01.D](#)):

A significant focus is concentrated activity that will, at its conclusion, produce a meaningful, documented outcome in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. It is undertaken in addition to expectations in those three areas. A significant focus can be a one-semester undertaking, or it can take multiple semesters to complete. Each semester, the significant focus shall require approximately the same amount of time as teaching a 3-credit hour or standard course. It shall not have been counted as part of the expected teaching load or have been compensated externally or additionally; exceptions to the compensation exclusion must be approved by the dean of the college.

- d) A description of the results of any reassigned time (as required by *RFH*, SG [3.02.C](#), which also includes: “Continued reassigned time is dependent upon demonstrated quality work.”).
- e) Evidence of meeting or exceeding the criteria (from Section IV of the departmental “Evaluation Standards & Criteria for Personnel & Annual Review” document) for their rank in each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarly activity, and service). In particular, include elaboration about any activities and the time spent on those activities with which members of the MRC may be unfamiliar. Also, faculty members are responsible for making the case for an exemplary rating by explaining what accomplishment satisfies the criteria for an exemplary rating (from Section IVF of the departmental “[Evaluation Standards & Criteria for Personnel & Annual Review](#)” document).
- f) Discussion of progress made on any recommendations specified in the WPSs from the previous two years, if applicable.

#### **IV. Evaluation Procedures**

1. The Unit Head and AC will maintain and annually distribute to faculty a list of guidelines for the preparation of FARs and supplemental materials. Those materials along with this document will also be posted on the [Mathematics Department Policies, Procedures, and Resources webpage](#).
2. The Unit Head will publicize the due date for FARs and supplemental materials during the fall semester.
3. 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.

4. Before the FAR due date, the Unit Head will provide the opportunity for any interested faculty member to schedule an optional “calibrating conversation<sup>3</sup>” in order to discuss the extent to which they have met the evaluation criteria. Scheduling of the calibrating conversations will be completed by the FAR due date, and the calibrating conversions will occur after the FAR is submitted as specified in 6.b. below. In addition to the trained Cognitive Coach, at least one other member of the MRC will be present for each calibrating conversation. The information obtained during the calibrating conversation will be treated as (additional) supplementary material for the evaluation. So, a calibrating conversation can be used in lieu of submitting supplementary materials and also provides the opportunity for faculty members to make the case for an exemplary rating to MRC members.
5. Once FARs and supplemental materials are submitted, they will be made available, along with the corresponding FAPs, to all faculty via the departmental Blackboard site.
6. The MRC will be divided into subgroups; the Unit Head will be a member of each subgroup and will assign the MRC members to subgroups keeping diversity (i.e., rank, specialization, gender, etc.) in mind. All faculty members will be assigned to a subgroup for performance review and will be divided among the subgroups so that each subgroup has approximately the same total number of reviews, no MRC member reviews their own performance, and each subgroup reviews approximately the same number of faculty at each rank.
  - a. Each MRC subgroup will review each assigned faculty member’s materials (see Section III).
  - b. After each MRC subgroup member has independently reviewed the materials, including information from the calibrating conversation if applicable, the subgroup will meet to discuss their evaluations of and rationales for each faculty member’s work performance. After this discussion:
    - If all subgroup members agree on the evaluation, the subgroup will generate a written summary of key contributions/strengths/areas of growth for each area of evaluation and provide it to the Unit Head.
    - If there is not unanimous agreement, this evaluation becomes an “all-read” and will be discussed by the entire MRC at a later date. A summary of key contributions/strengths/areas of growth for each area of evaluation and the subgroup’s discussion will be written and then shared at the entire MRC meeting as the starting point of the whole-MRC discussion.
  - c. If questions of clarity arise, a member of the MRC may contact the faculty member under review for clarification via email or in person. If clarification is made verbally, two members of the MRC will meet with the faculty member to help ensure that the faculty member’s responses are accurately interpreted. Faculty members may also choose to participate in a calibrating conversation (see Section IV.4) so that MRC subgroup members may have the opportunity to ask any clarifying questions as part of the calibrating conversation.
  - d. Based on the verbal and written feedback from the MRC subgroup, the Unit Head will prepare a draft WPS for each faculty member (*RFH*, SG [3.08.6.a](#)) that discusses the faculty member’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. For untenured faculty, this WPS will summarize relevant themes and address any departmental concerns regarding contract renewal, tenure, and promotion.
7. The entire MRC will meet for the following purposes:
  - a. To discuss the “all-reads” and work to form a consensus on each faculty member’s overall performance evaluation and key contributions/issues in each area of evaluation. As part of this dialog, the subgroup’s initial summary will be shared and discussed. The MRC will work to reach a consensus and after the discussion, a written summary of key contributions/strengths/areas of growth for each area of evaluation will be created by members of the MRC and provided to the Unit Head, who will use this rationale to draft the WPS. If consensus is not reached, the Unit Head will make the final evaluation.
  - b. To discuss and provide feedback on each faculty member’s draft WPS prepared by the Unit Head (from Sections IV.6.d and IV.7.a) in light of the materials provided for the evaluation. During this discussion, all members of the MRC may contribute evaluative feedback on both the criteria used for the evaluation and the performance ratings.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is a specific type of guided conversation facilitated by a trained Cognitive Coach© lasting at most 15-20 minutes.

8. Based on the feedback received from the entire MRC, the Unit Head will prepare a final WPS for each faculty member. For any case in which the Unit Head is considering a Less than Satisfactory overall evaluation rating, the faculty member involved will be given an opportunity to meet with the Unit Head and MRC prior to finalization of their WPS.
9. The Unit Head will share all final WPSs with the MRC prior to submitting them to the Dean.
10. Once approval from the Dean is obtained, the Unit Head (as required by *RFH*, SG [3.08.6.a](#)) will provide each faculty member with their WPS by the end of the winter semester.
11. The Unit Head will meet with each untenured faculty member by the end of the winter semester to discuss their WPS 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 performances. If a faculty member does not request such a meeting, it will be assumed that the faculty member does not wish to meet.
12. Each faculty member may choose to append a response of at most one page to their performance summary, which will become part of the WPS and will be included in future portfolios for contract renewal, tenure, and/or promotion.
13. All faculty members except full Professors will sign their WPSs and the department will retain signed copies for inclusion in future review materials. This signature does not indicate that the faculty member agrees with the recommendation, but only that they have received it.
14. For untenured faculty members, portfolios for contract renewal, tenure, and/or promotion to Associate Professor will include all signed FAPs and FARs since their initial hire at GVSU and signed WPSs for the 2015 calendar year and all subsequent years.
15. For tenured faculty members seeking promotion to Professor, portfolios will include all signed FAPs, FARs and WPSs from the previous six years. If the previous six-year period includes years prior to 2015, only performance summaries for the 2015 calendar year and subsequent years are required to be included.
16. The department will keep copies of all WPSs and faculty responses (as described in Item 13 above) for six years. With the exception of Class Visit Records produced by the Personnel Committee, supplemental materials will not be retained and need not be included in portfolios for future personnel actions.
17. For the purposes of annual merit evaluations, only FARs, WPSs, CVs, and faculty responses (if applicable) will be submitted to the Dean. Supplemental materials are for departmental use only. Class Visit Records produced by the Personnel Committee, however, will be retained and included in portfolios for future personnel actions, as described in the departmental "[Procedure for the Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty](#)" document.
18. The Unit Head will maintain a spreadsheet of faculty members' overall annual ratings, which includes rationale for all exemplary ratings.
19. As specified in *RFH*, SG [3.08.6.d](#), the annual salary letter will communicate both the percent and actual dollar amount of the salary adjustment, including a breakdown by category of adjustment (merit, promotional increment, and special salary adjustments). This letter will be mailed to faculty when the actual dollar amounts are known.
20. Faculty who disagree with their salary adjustment may appeal (*RFH*, SG [3.08.7](#)) using pertinent supporting material according to the procedure specified in BOT [4.2.18](#).
21. Additionally, each year, the Unit Head, in consultation with the MRC, will make recommendations to the Dean for special salary adjustments due to salary compression or other issues of inequity. In the event that a salary is not adjusted after several years of such MRC recommendations, the Unit Head may recommend a higher dollar amount from that year's total departmental salary adjustment allotment to address the issue.