Annual Evaluation of Faculty

UNIVERSITY POLICY #214

Authority:
Approval Date: April 1989
Effective Date: April 1989
Revision History: December 8, 1998; May 1, 2006; April 28, 2016; November 21, 2016; August 26, 2020
President's Signature: On File

SECTION 1: Introduction and General Principles

1.1 In accordance with West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission Series 9, "Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Promotion, and Tenure," West Liberty University establishes the following policy to govern the annual evaluation of faculty.

1.2 Consistent with this document, colleges, departments and programs shall supplement these guidelines with more detailed descriptions and interpretations of the criteria and standards that, when approved by the Provost, will apply to faculty members in the particular unit.

1.3 Annual evaluation, promotion in rank, and the granting of tenure are acts of critical importance both to members of the academic community and for the welfare of the university. While these three processes are distinct, they are also inextricably linked. The annual evaluation process contributes to the improvement of faculty members' performance and the University and is both evaluative and developmental. It provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's past performance and to develop future goals and objectives and it forms the basis for any annual merit salary raises or other rewards. Cumulatively, annual evaluations establish a continuous written record of expectations and performance that encourages professional growth and provides support for retention, promotion, tenure and other recognition. As merit pay rankings serve only to determine relative standings within departments, they must never be considered in promotion or tenure decisions or be interpreted as indicators of likely outcomes in those processes.

1.4 The performance of individual faculty members is evaluated annually throughout their career at West Liberty University as required by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission Series 9 (Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Promotion, and Tenure). These written evaluations, which are required for all full-time faculty members, provide individuals with a written record of past performance, accomplishments and continuing expectations, an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses, and documents that support recommendations and decisions concerning reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical and other leaves of absence, and performance-based salary increases. The primary purpose of annual evaluations is to assist individual faculty members in developing their talents and expertise to the maximum extent possible, and in promoting continuing productivity over the course of their careers, consistent with the

mission of the University. The specific nature and purpose of a faculty member's annual review may vary, however, according to the type of appointment, rank, and, where appropriate, tenure status. Part-time faculty should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment.

1.5 Responsibility for faculty evaluation is shared by members of the University community. Primary responsibility for the quality and presentation of an individual's work lies with the particular faculty member. Department Chairs and/or Program Directors, as appropriate, have primary responsibility for annual evaluations while independent reviews by Deans and the Provost assure fairness and integrity in the application of appropriate standards and procedures among programs, departments and colleges. The needs and circumstances of the program, department, college and University also enter into the determination of academic personnel decisions.

SECTION 2: Definitions, Criteria, and Standards

2.1 Faculty members are expected to contribute to the missions of specific programs, departments and colleges, and are to be judged accordingly. Consequently, the evaluation of faculty is to occur in relation to the faculty member's particular roles at the institution. Accomplishments of the faculty member are judged in the context of these roles.

2.2 In an initial Letter of Appointment (LOA), established no later than the end of the first semester of employment and approved by the Provost, the responsible University administrator (usually the Dean) shall define the general terms of the faculty member's major responsibilities. The terms of this appointment are to be reviewed periodically and may be modified consistent with this document, program needs, and other faculty personnel policies. Within the terms of this general apportionment of responsibilities, the details of a faculty member's specific assignments should be subject to joint consultation but are to be determined by the appropriate administrator. Teaching will normally be the faculty member's area of greatest responsibility. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members must do scholarly, creative, or professional work that informs their teaching, and must engage in service. It is expected that for most faculty members there will be responsibilities established in all three areas.

2.3 The criteria in the Letter of Appointment may be modified on an individual basis. Such a modification should be initiated primarily to assist the department or college in achieving its mission and goals. It will be made in consultation between the faculty member and Department Chair or Program Director with the approval of the Dean of the college and the Provost. Any such modification must be made in light of the needs of the academic program.

2.4 Each program, department, or college shall refine the Areas of Contribution (teaching, professional activity, and service) in ways that reflect the unit's disciplines and mission, as they support the University's mission, per section III.B of this policy. The criteria shall be applied to all faculty members in ways that equitably reflect the particular responsibilities and assignments of each. How the unit criteria apply to a faculty member's own set of duties should be clear at the time of initial appointment and reviewed in the annual evaluation. The annual evaluation criteria define what that particular program or department means by teaching, professional activity, and service. Program and department evaluation criteria shall be approved by the Dean and the Provost and may be modified from time to time as necessary.

2.5 **Criteria Definitions.** The University faculty is a community of scholars whose scholarship is manifest in a variety of ways. These manifestations are commonly grouped into three areas of contribution: teaching, professional activity, and service.

2.5.1 **Teaching.** Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty members. Teaching involves the dissemination of knowledge, the stimulation of critical thinking, and the development of artistic expression. Teaching includes not only traditional modes of instruction such as the classroom lecture, but also modes such as clinical, laboratory, and practicum instruction; thesis direction; evaluation and critique of student performance; various forms of continuing education and nontraditional instruction; and advising, which is a special dimension of teaching, the success of which is essential to the educational process.

2.5.1.1 The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, the ability to transfer knowledge, respect for differences and diversity and, above all, the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students. Supporting documentation for the evaluation of performance in teaching will include evidence drawn from such sources as the collective judgment of students and of colleagues or administrators who have visited the faculty member's classes. It might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products related to teaching, the development or use of instructional technology, performance-based student assessment results, pedagogical scholarship in refereed publications and media of high quality, studies of success rates of students taught, course enrollments or other evidence deemed appropriate and proper by the department and college. Classroom and online observations, as appropriate, utilizing the forms in Appendix III will be conducted in accordance with Section 3.4 of this document.

2.5.1.2 It is expected that classroom and online course observations will generally not be announced in advance. In some cases, external reviews of teaching contributions by colleagues or administrators from outside the program may be appropriate.

2.5.2 **Professional Activity.** Professional activity involves the creation and synthesis of knowledge, the creation of new approaches to understanding and explaining phenomena, the development of new insights, the critical appraisal of the past, artistic creation and performance, and the application of knowledge and expertise to address needs in society and in the faculty member's field of expertise.

2.5.2.1 Professional activity is a critical component of the mission of the University, contributing to the general body of knowledge and thus infusing instruction and public service with rigor and relevance. It validates the concept of the teacher-scholar. Although often discipline-focused and individual, research also may be interdisciplinary and collaborative. Examples of professional activity include refereed publications (print or electronic), publications in other academic sources of high quality and other academically relevant media, presentations at regional / national / international conferences, and original contributions of a creative nature relevant to one or more disciplines. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity. Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work of considerable importance or a series of works constituting a program of worthwhile activity. Faculty members are expected to undertake a continuing program of appropriate studies, investigations, creative works, and/or professional practice.

2.5.3 **Service.** Service activities involve the application of the products of teaching and research that illuminate the conditions and address the needs of society and benefit the profession. These activities include service to the University, state and region, as well as at national and international levels. Service to the University includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's program, department and college. The University is committed to the performance and recognition of service activities on the part of its faculty as essential components of its mission. All faculty will be expected to participate and contribute to those activities related to the recruitment and retention of students and the assessment of programs.

2.5.3.1 The evaluation of service should include assessments of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to the University, society, or the profession. Especially relevant is the extent to which the service meets the needs of clients, induces positive change, improves

performance, or has significant impact on societal problems or issues. One important benefit of service to the University is faculty participation in the governance system. Service contributions considered for evaluation are those within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member and performed with one's University affiliation identified.

2.5.4 **Professional Conduct.** Professional conduct, as defined by the March 15, 2016 resolution "Statement on Professional Ethics" (Policy & Procedure Manual, Introduction, Faculty Senate), is expected. Adherence to this statement will be considered during annual evaluations. As it is expected that the Program Director, Department Chair and Dean will have adequate interactions with the faculty member to make such judgments, letters of recommendation and anonymous statements regarding a faculty member's professional conduct will not be accepted or considered.

SECTION 3: The Annual Evaluation Process

3.1 Annual evaluations are to be based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence. The primary evidence to be weighed will include materials contained in the faculty member's personnel file, the Faculty Performance Planning Document (FPPD), the Faculty Professional Activity Report (FPAR), and additional documents provided by the faculty member in support of their FPAR. To these are added professional judgments as to the quality of the faculty member's teaching, professional activity, and service, as applicable. The FPPD, completed FPAR, and supporting documentation shall be added to the personnel file at the conclusion of the annual evaluation process.

3.2 The annual evaluation will be conducted by the Department Chair or Program Director, as appropriate or, in the case of Department Chairs and Program Directors, by the Dean. Written evaluations, utilizing the form provided in Appendix II, will be provided to each faculty member and forwarded to the Dean, who may provide an evaluative statement.

3.3 The annual evaluation should be related to the faculty member's assignment and performance, and should be both formative and summative. The review is primarily focused on the events of the immediately previous one-year period; it is also to be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years, in order to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed. The resultant annual assessment will be used to guide the faculty member in areas in which improvement may be needed, and, if positive, as a basis for merit salary adjustment. The annual evaluation also provides the opportunity to develop changes in responsibilities that reflect the strengths of the individual and the needs of the university.

3.4 **Specific Applications**

3.4.1 **Tenure-Track Faculty.** Tenure-track faculty members are those who are in a tenure-track appointment but are not yet tenured. For these persons, the annual evaluation provides an assessment of performance and develops information concerning the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure. It communicates areas of strength and alerts the faculty member to performance deficiencies at the earliest possible time. Any concerns held by the evaluators regarding the faculty member's performance should be stated in the written evaluation, which is intended to enhance the faculty member's chances of achieving promotion and tenure. In the faculty member's first review, limited evidence of progress will be available. For that review, material in the file such as reports by colleagues on teaching performance and information on activities in professional activity and service are useful in order to assess progress. As the faculty member moves through the tenure-track period, annual evaluations will focus increasingly on the successful outcomes of activities rather than simply on the activities themselves. At a minimum, tenure-track faculty members should receive one classroom or online observation each semester for the first four semesters and then at least one per academic year thereafter until they are tenured and fully promoted. While the absence of negative annual evaluations does not guarantee the granting of tenure, these evaluations should apprise tenure-track faculty members of performance deficiencies. Occasionally, the evaluations will result in termination of the individual's appointment, sometimes prior to the critical year, and, where appropriate, terminal contracts; in these cases, notice shall be given in accord with HEPC Title 133 Series 9.

3.4.2 **Tenured Faculty. Not Fully Promoted.** The annual evaluation of faculty who are tenured, but not fully promoted will generally emphasize both quantitative and qualitative progress toward the highest possible rank given their assignment and qualifications. While not all faculty members may attain the highest possible rank, annual evaluations should guide faculty toward that achievement. These faculty members should receive at least one classroom or online observation per academic year.

3.4.3 **Tenured Faculty. Fully Promoted.** Promotion to the highest rank requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates many strengths and few weaknesses. Consequently, the primary purpose of evaluating faculty at these ranks is to describe their performance in the context of appropriate expectations, an important factor in performance-based salary adjustments and reappointment. The annual evaluation process is also used to encourage faculty members to continue to perform at exemplary levels. Classroom and online

observations for faculty members in this category will be accomplished at the discretion of the appropriate Program Director, Department Chair, and/or Dean.

3.4.4 **Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.** Faculty members in this category are not subject to the probationary period of the tenure track; however, they have all the rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility. Annual evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty will be based on assignments as described in the Initial Letter of Appointment and in any subsequent documents that identify their responsibilities in teaching, service and scholarship. The annual evaluation will focus on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. These faculty members should receive at least one classroom or online observation per academic year. The annual evaluation of a promotable faculty member will generally emphasize quantitative and qualitative progress toward the next appropriate rank. While not all promotable faculty will attain promotion, annual evaluations should assist them toward that goal. Non-renewal of grants or other external funds may result in non-renewal of contracts, in spite of positive evaluations. Non-tenure-track faculty appointments are only for the periods and for the purposes specified, with no other interest or right obtained by the person appointed by virtue of such appointment.

3.4.5 **Adjunct Faculty.** Evaluation of adjunct faculty will be based on assignments as described in the notice of appointment and any subsequent documents, and will focus primarily on strengths and weaknesses, on the best use of the faculty member's talents to meet the unit's needs, and on specific recommendations for improvement and professional development. Adjunct faculty should receive periodic reviews that are appropriate to their assignment. Classroom and online observations for faculty members in this category will be accomplished at the discretion of the appropriate Program Director, Department Chair and/or Dean.

3.4.6 **Department Chairs and Program Directors.** Department Chairs and Program Directors will receive annual faculty evaluations from their Deans using the same procedures and forms as are used for other faculty members. Initial Appointment Letters for these individuals should be modified by the appropriate Dean at the time of their appointment to administrative positions to reflect any modifications to expectations regarding service and professional activity, an overview of administrative expectations, and an acknowledgement of the impact of a reduced teaching load on evidence of teaching performance. Department Chairs and Program Directors will receive 6 classroom and/or online observations by their Deans in accordance with their academic rank and tenure status.

3.5 **Descriptors for Annual Evaluation.** The annual review of each faculty member's performance in each of the mission areas to which they are assigned shall be assessed

as: Exceeds [characterizing performance of highest quality]; Meets [characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation as well as possible future promotion and award of tenure, although these are not guaranteed]; or Needs Improvement.

3.5.1 Based on these descriptors, a faculty member with a preponderance of "needs improvement" ratings, particularly in an area in which a significant contribution is required, would not qualify for promotion or tenure. The assessments provided by annual reviews should be a basis for those periodic recommendations forwarded to the Provost, which relate to promotion, tenure, or negative action. Positive recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should be supported both (a) by a series of annual reviews above the "meets" level, and (b) beyond those reviews, by performance which is judged to meet or exceed that of peers of similar rank and/or experience at West Liberty University.

3.5.2 Detailed guidelines, or performance factors, will be set for each academic department or program, as appropriate, and approved by the Dean. The establishment of guidelines will be initiated by the Department Chair or Program Director and will involve the faculty of the program or department. They may be modified from time to time as required. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated based on their department or program's guidelines, the general guidelines provided in this policy, the faculty member's initial Letter of Appointment, and any subsequent documents which modify the expectations in that letter.

3.6 **Timeline for Annual Evaluation.** Each academic year, each faculty member must establish and meet objectives in all three categories of evaluation. A faculty member cannot be considered meritorious or satisfying tenure or promotion guidelines without having met criteria in all three categories of evaluation. Documentation supporting all activities and achievements is the responsibility of the faculty member, with the exception of student course evaluation results and faculty headcount reports, which will be provided to the appropriate administrators and added automatically to the faculty personnel file. All other supporting documentation should be submitted electronically to the Provost's office in the specified format for inclusion in the personnel file. Faculty members on sabbatical leaves or leaves of absence will not be eligible for merit-based salary increases, however they must participate in the process and receive an evaluation for any portion of the academic year during which they are not on such leave. In the steps below, the Dean serves as evaluator for Department Chairs and Program Directors.

3.6.1 Any modifications to department or program annual evaluation criteria are to be submitted to the Dean for approval by the second Friday in September. If

approved by the Dean and the Provost, these will be filed in the Office of the Provost.

3.6.2 Each faculty member will have an initial performance planning conference with their Department Chair or Program Director by the last Friday in September, at which they submit their Faculty Performance Planning Document (FPPD) for the academic year. *See* Appendix I.

3.6.3 The Department Chair or Program Director reviews and approves the performance plan by the first Friday in October and submits a copy of this document to the Dean for information. Modifications are possible, but must be made in consultation with the Department Chair or Program Director. Department Chairs and Program Directors should have individual progress meetings with junior faculty members at least once, near the mid-point of the academic year.

3.6.4 Each faculty member submits a Faculty Professional Activity Report (FPAR) to their Department Chair or Program Director by the second Friday in April. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure all supporting documentation, except as noted above, is included with this report and then added to their personnel file. *See* Appendix II.

3.6.5 The Department Chair or Program Director conducts an annual faculty evaluation conference with each faculty member, at which time the faculty member is provided with a copy of the completed FPAR Evaluation Form indicating the faculty member's ratings in each performance category and narrative suggestions for improvement, if needed. Evaluation conferences are mandatory and must be completed by the first Friday in May. The Department Chair or Program Director submits their completed evaluations to the Dean for review and approval.

3.6.6 The college Dean, in conference with the Department Chair or Program Director, reviews and approves the final evaluation, including eligibility for merit-based salary increases, of all faculty members in the college by the third Friday in May. Merit tiers, as described in WLU Policy 245, are established at the college level. Deans will include Department Chair and Program Director evaluations in the determination of merit. There will be three tiers of Merit: High Merit, Merit, and No Merit. Faculty members with a No on Professional Conduct will fall into the No Merit tier. All other faculty members will be assigned to the appropriate Merit tier based upon their performance in relation to the definitions and standards set by their programs and college. Any adjustments made to the preliminary evaluation are provided to the faculty member, along with the merit

level earned. The Dean submits all completed FPARs to the Provost for review and filing no later than the last Friday in May.

APPENDIX I
WLU FACULTY PERFORMANCE PLANNING DOCUMENT

1. The Faculty Performance Planning Document represents the official Faculty Performance Plan for an academic year (i.e., end of one AY to end of the following AY), and it cannot be unilaterally altered.
2. The FPPD is not a contract, nor does it function as a single criterion for merit evaluation. The FPPD does, however, require that a faculty member establish and meet professional, departmental, college and University-wide goals.
3. The FPPD must be dated and signed by the faculty member, Department Chair or Program Director, and Dean.
4. The FPPD is the responsibility of the faculty member. It represents his/her outline of planned objectives for the academic year. Information from this document will serve as the basis for the initial conference between the faculty member and the Department Chair or Program Director. This meeting must be held by the last Friday in September.

FACULTY INFORMATION

Department: _____
Faculty Name (print): _____
Academic Rank: _____
Academic Year: _____

Performance Factors: The faculty member should list definite items by which each area may be evaluated.

Teaching: (Do not list required activities, such as meeting classes on time)

Professional Activity: (Include a minimum of two activities)

Service: (Include a minimum of two activities)

Initial Performance Planning Conference Date: _____

Faculty Signature: _____

Department Chair/Program Director Signature: _____

APPENDIX II
WLU FACULTY PERFORMANCE ACTIVITY REPORT

1. The Faculty Performance Activity Report is the official faculty evaluation document for an academic year (i.e., end of one AY to end of the following AY).
2. The FPAR is the faculty member's description of their performance during the academic year. It should address all of the items in their Faculty Performance Planning Document as well as any other pertinent and significant activities that have occurred during the academic year.
3. The FPAR must be accompanied by evidence to support all claims of performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure documents provided as evidence are also provided to the Provost's office in the specified electronic format for inclusion in their personnel file.
4. The FPAR must be dated and signed by the faculty member, Department Chair or Program Director, and Dean.
5. The FPAR is the responsibility of the faculty member. Information from this document will serve as the basis for the annual faculty evaluation conference between the faculty member and the Department Chair or Program Director. This document and supporting evidence must be submitted by the second Friday in April. The evaluation conference must take place no later than the first Friday in May.

FACULTY INFORMATION

Department: _____
Faculty Name (print): _____
Academic Rank: _____
Academic Year: _____

Performance Factors: The faculty member should list activities/achievements from the current AY.

Teaching: (Do not list required activities)

Professional Activity:

Service:

WLU FACULTY PERFORMANCE ACTIVITY REPORT
Evaluation Form

Performance Evaluation Rubric – to be completed by department chair or program director See Section III B for definitions of descriptors. Faculty member's LoA and program/college definitions and standards are to be considered. Attach additional sheets, if necessary.

Areas of Contribution			
Teaching	___ Exceeds	___ Meets	___ Needs Improvement
Professional Activity	___ Exceeds	___ Meets	___ Needs Improvement
Service	___ Exceeds	___ Meets	___ Needs Improvement
Professional Conduct		___ Yes	___ No
Merit Ranking	___ High Merit	___ Merit	___ No Merit

1. Faculty members who receive "Needs Improvement" ratings, and who are being re-appointed for the following academic year, will be asked to develop an individual Performance Improvement Plan using the form in this policy. Such Performance Improvement Plans are subject to approval by the Program Director or Department Chair and the Dean.
2. In accordance with the March 15, 2016 resolution "Statement on Professional Ethics" (Policy & Procedure Manual, Introduction, Faculty Senate)

Comments or suggestions for improvement:

Faculty comments:

Annual Faculty Evaluation Conference Date: _____

Faculty Signature: _____

Department Chair/Program Director Signature: _____

DEAN REVIEW OF ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION
Approve:_____ Disapprove:_____
Date: _____ Signature: _____
If disapprove, specific reasons/recommendations

PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The areas designated below have been rated as "Needs Improvement" on the annual evaluation. This document outlines the areas of deficiency with suggestions for improvement.

Mark areas needing improvement with an (x).	Deficiencies (w/evidence):	Suggestions to improve*:	Criteria for success:
	Teaching		
	Service		
	Professional Activity		
	Professional Conduct		

*Suggestions are ranked in order of priority.

If the criteria for success listed above are not met, then_____

_____

Acknowledgement of meeting and understanding:

Faculty Signature:_____ Date:_____

Department Chair/Program Director Signature:_____ Date:_____

APPENDIX III CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

Faculty Member: _____ Date: _____ Time: _____

Course Discipline, Number, Section and Title: _____

1. Effective use of class time (Exp: prompt/prepared/start and end on time, minimal digressions)
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

2. Subject enhancement (Exp: elicits critical thinking, enhances material in text, helps students achieve higher level of comprehension)
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

3. Lesson preparation (Exp: logical progression, up-to-date information, appropriate level of rigor)
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

4. Effective communication (Exp: audible, clear, good pace, responds appropriately to questions)
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

5. Enthusiasm, confidence and command of classroom
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

6. Fosters student engagement Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

7. Enhances learning environment (Exp: promotes student engagement, checks for understanding)
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

8. Professional behavior (Exp: respectful, appearance, interest in student learning)
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

9. Conclusion (Exp: provides summary/review of concepts or activities)
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

10. Instructional methods/techniques
Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

Additional comments (continued on reverse if necessary)

Observer signature: _____

Faculty Member signature: _____

ONLINE OBSERVATION FORM

Faculty Member: _____ Date of observation: _____

Course Discipline, Number, Section and Title: _____

1. Course and instructor contact information are available and accurate

Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

2. Instructor interacts regularly and appropriately with students

Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

3. Instructor responds appropriately and in a timely fashion to student questions/concerns.

Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

4. Assignments, exercises, etc. are graded in a timely fashion and students receive appropriate feedback

Excellent Good Satisfactory Unsatisfactory N/A

Additional comments (continued on reverse if necessary)

Observer signature: _____

Faculty Member signature: _____