CLAS General Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

In the Faculty Evaluation process, a review takes place at a number of levels, ranging from the FEC Committee on up to the President, as specified in the Faculty Handbook. At the department level (FEC Committee and Chair), this review takes into account the specific disciplinary guidelines agreed upon in the program, which should be in accordance with established standards of the profession. At the College Level, the Dean is expected to "level the playing field" among all programs in the college and to ensure that similar, non-discipline-specific standards are being held and met by all faculty members under review. At the VPAA and Presidential levels, this "leveling" role extends university-wide. In an effort to **supplement** *(but not replace) discipline-specific direction provided in departmental FEC guidelines, this document is intended to assist faculty members by providing additional guidance regarding performance expectations across all disciplinary lines.*

I. RETENTION- - Dean's level evaluation of review files includes the expectation that tenure-track faculty applicants for **retention** will show effort in all three categories of teaching, service, and professional development, and that this effort will progress and increase over the course of the probationary term.

There is an expectation that faculty in the **first half of probationary service (years P-1 to P-3)** will focus on learning the department curriculum, strong teaching, adjustments of teaching pedagogy in response to evaluations, advising, and appropriate departmental service, moving gradually and steadily into university-wide service commitments as the faculty member advances. These faculty members should show evidence of creating and following a research plan, including both personal study and planned presentations of research on and off campus, through manuscript submission and conference presentations.

During the **second half of the probationary period (years P-4 to P-6)**, faculty should show continuing teaching excellence (or much improved teaching performance), an increased service load with service beyond the department, and evidence of steadily increasing professional development, including internal and external validations of professional growth (conference presentations and publications). Disciplines will vary, so faculty need to provide evaluators with information about their discipline's journals and publication protocols.

Ideally, a faculty member with successful retention for six years who has consistently and satisfactorily addressed all concerns and formative suggestions raised in past evaluation cycles will be a candidate both for tenure and promotion to associate rank. However, these two types of recognition are not automatically awarded together. *Early requests for either tenure or promotion require the documentation of extraordinary and exemplary performance that goes beyond what would normally be expected for a favorable "on-time" decision and, as such, positive early decisions will be rare.*

II. TENURE -- The award of **tenure** is generally a sign that the University perceives the faculty member's contributions to the institution to be significant, of high quality, and likely to continue at the same level of commitment throughout the employee's affiliation with ENMU. There is an on-going expectation of collegiality and of continued and dynamic commitment to the institution and its mission. Tenure is earned through consistently strong performance in teaching, as well as satisfactory progress and performance in service and scholarship, commensurate with expectations at the completion of the probationary term.

Academic tenure is not an entitlement and in no way should years of service be considered the only prerequisite for receiving tenure. The award of tenure constitutes an earned recognition which is both an indication of the institution's present confidence in the individual faculty member and the institution's rightful expectation of continuing exemplary performance in accordance with principles outlined in the 1966 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. In all areas of evaluation, the faculty member's self-reflective narrative should address the ways in which the activities described are successfully tied to university's central mission of teaching and mentoring students.

III. PROMOTION -- The award of **promotion** requires verification that the applicant has demonstrated professional development commensurate with those at a senior academic rank at other institutions or in the profession generally. In some instances, a case may be made for outstanding teaching and excellent service balancing fewer publications, but there must be clear evidence of the faculty member being active in the profession, being aware of the current issues and scholarship in the field, and making a sustained effort to enhance and increase his/her expertise in the chosen area of doctoral work or a related area that complements the teaching assignment. Non-tenure track instructors will be evaluated primarily in the area of teaching, although they are expected to maintain scholarly currency in their discipline and to make limited service contributions at the department level. The following discussions refer to expectations in the three traditional areas of evaluation at the specified ranks. Please note that the expectations for each successive rank, by nature, include and expand upon expectations at lower ranks.

IV. RESOURCE FACULTY AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS -- In order to ensure a sound foundation for the assignment of teaching duties to part-time faculty, CLAS programs will exercise due diligence in monitoring their performance in delivering courses that adhere to curricular content and standards agreed upon by program faculty. Upon receipt of course evaluations at the end of each semester, the chair or program director will review course evaluations for all resource faculty members and TAs. These instructors and TAs will receive formal feedback from their supervisor at the end of their first semester teaching and at least once a year thereafter.

V. CONTRACTUAL ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES -- CLAS faculty who have contractual administrative responsibilities (such as program directors) should address the performance of those duties, as well as both short-term and long-term goals, in their reflective narrative. It is not expected that FEC committees will have the information necessary to review an individual's administrative performance, but that aspect of their responsibilities will be addressed at the chair level of review and beyond.

Teaching

Professor:
A Professor must show a robust dossier of teaching facility, with verification of diversified expertise and leadership readily apparent across multiple years of service. Substantiation of teaching excellence is imperative at the rank of Professor. Leadership and mentoring must be patently evident, and the Full Professor must offer direction to both students and junior faculty as needed. This rank requires a vigorous willingness to work on departmental/programmatic agendas which are essential for ensuring excellence in teaching (e.g., curriculum revisions, assessment of program outcomes achievement, programmatic/content evaluations). Other teaching and student related activities, such as the supervision of independent studies or the mentorship of students at field sites, should further be noted in the Full Professor profile. The Full Professor should be concurrently competent in relating academic knowledge and demonstrating functional applications with diversified and flexible pedagogies and materials. A history of successful advising and distinction in teaching concomitant with personal and programmatic strategic leadership in teaching/curriculum development is expected. At this rank, there is an expectation for a demonstrated record of **excellence** in teaching.

Associate Professor:
An Associate Professor should show evidence of fitness at prior ranks. Active participation in departmental curriculum planning, revision, and implementation/ assessment should also be noted. An Associate Professor should take on an emergent leadership role in mentoring and programmatic teaching initiatives in the later years of rank. The Associate Professor should be proficient at advising as well as supervising student research efforts, both in academic and applied contexts. A well-developed plan of teaching with self-scrutiny and proactive problem solving should be apparent for the Associate Professor.

Assistant Professor:
Submissions at the Assistant Professor level should show evidence of Instructor level competencies as well as a willingness to learn and implement new pedagogies/technologies for teaching and other areas of curriculum development. As appropriate to the discipline, "application" or skills based teaching, as demonstrated by clinical and field/laboratory applications or academic knowledge, should be emergent in the more experienced Assistant Professor. Development of new courses, participation

in course assessment activities, and an evolving student advisor role is also to be expected at this rank. A pertinent philosophy of teaching should be manifest in the experienced Assistant Professor.

Lecturer/Instructor:
Expectations at the Instructor level are most heavily weighted by documentation of teaching effectiveness. This can be explored through examination of the Instructor's student evaluations of teaching: Numeric rankings approximating the department and/or college medians should be the standard. Qualitative comments from students should be addressed in the Instructor's self-evaluation of teaching and appropriate responses based on trend analysis findings should be apparent. The impact of these scores will be considered in conjunction with the number of years the faculty member has been teaching as well as a careful examination of selected course materials such as syllabi, assignments, course notes, examinations, and the like.

Consistent with the mission of the University, the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences hold paramount the goal of superior teaching. The substance of our teaching defines our success. The following catalog of teaching and other student-related activities is provided as a general guideline to assist faculty in the selection of formative goals for teaching, as well as to assist them as they consider the selection of artifacts for their faculty portfolio submissions. *Suggested teaching and other student-related activities are inventoried below.*

- Curriculum development
- Course research
- Development of new teaching materials (e.g., case based learning modules, performance rubrics)
- Development of new instructional strategies and teaching pedagogies (e.g., critical thinking, active learning, problem based learning, community based instruction)
- Development of new teaching formats (classroom/clinical demonstration modules, podcasts, Wimba./webcam, Polycom and Web-based applications)
- Developing/revising course syllabi (e.g., specifying assignments and measurement for documentation of student achievement, developing learner knowledge and skills outcomes tied to accreditation standards, student learning assessments, etc.)
- Team-teaching efforts (such as TA advising, faculty collaborative teaching efforts, etc.)
- Field, laboratory, clinical, and other *in situ* teaching and supervision (including demonstration, instructing in techniques, assisting with instrumentation use and analysis, developing written reports, etc.)
- Off-load teaching

- Workshops (student orientations, portfolio/special project instructional presentations, practicum/lab/field meetings, etc.)
- Student specific (e.g., directed studies, internships, student remediation plans; preparing students for conferences and other presentations, mentoring)
- Guest lecturing and speaker programs
- Advising
- Developmental advising (e.g., preparing students to make reasoned academic and professional choices; counseling students regarding course selection)
- Degree plan formulation and updates
- Student research (e.g., reviewing prospectus submissions, supervising projects/theses)
- Course/program assessment activities
- Course data collection/analysis and application to teaching
- Programmatic student assessment measures (e.g., comprehensive examination questions, capstone projects, portfolios)
- Appraisals
- Classroom teaching evaluations by students (e.g., numeric rankings, qualitative comments, performance trends as noted across APEs)
- Peer evaluations
- Non-classroom teaching evaluations (e.g., tutoring, directed studies, practicum, field programs, senior projects)

Any valuation of faculty achievement in teaching must necessarily consider a teacher's experiences, opportunities, and the progression of their abilities from semester to semester for this appraisal to be valid and useful for future growth and development. Faculty should be advised of the need for self-reflection on their teaching to inform change as needed for their evolution as successful educators.

Service: (University, College, Department, Profession, Community)

Professor:
A Professor demonstrates university, college and departmental leadership by chairing committees, drafting documents, and initiating needed department studies and projects; serves willingly on university task forces; leads the department in overseeing advising responsibilities (for students within and beyond the department), and represents the department at university activities, recruitment events, etc. Faculty at this rank should also take a leadership role in mentoring junior faculty members.

Associate:
Associate Professors give evidence of active participation in and support of department planning; assume committee responsibilities outside the department; mentor Assistant Professors in service responsibilities; and demonstrate active involvement in advising.

Originally distributed: 10 December 2009/ Approved without Revisions 27 September 2020

Assistant:

For an Assistant Professor, the primary service responsibility is within the department during the initial year and, after the first year of probationary rank, the Assistant Professor begins to participate on college-wide and university-wide committees; becomes proficient about department and its curriculum; learns the advising process; and mentors students—particularly those upperclassmen who are considering graduate study.

As a general guide regarding the types of service activities that could be recognized, with due consideration to the relative scope and effort involved, the following are examples of service activities at various levels:

Departmental service: Special recognition should be given for service on committees with unusual demands of time and effort, such as key search committees, certain standing committees, and task forces. Faculty must provide documentation/explanation of this effort. Faculty should provide documentation of their contribution in the categories that are relevant to them. The following are suggestions and examples:
> department chair
> special department responsibilities
> committee chair
> committee member
> advising students in the department
> supervision of independent studies
> contributions to sponsored groups and/or activities
> program development
> other

College/University service
> committee chair
> committee member
> contributions to ENMU activities and students organizations
> program development/interdisciplinary activities
> involvement in university projects
> sponsor/advisor of student organizations
> awards and recognitions
> other

Professional service
> memberships in professional organizations, especially in the role of officer
> professional activities/positions/responsibilities

Community Service
> volunteer community organizations-chair or member

Originally distributed: 10 December 2009/ Approved without Revisions 27 September 2020

membership on voluntary boards
assistance to public schools/other educational institutions
other community-based activities

Scholarship/Professional Development

Professor:
A Full Professor disseminates knowledge at the national/international level; contributes significantly to the profession through juried journal publications and/or invited publications and presentations; maintains an established agenda of scholarship and mentors others in the department in terms of scholarly activity; and maintains professional contacts and networks within one's professional field.

Associate:
At the Associate professor rank, a faculty member disseminates knowledge at regional/national level; contributes to the profession through juried publications that demonstrate application of scholarly knowledge; maintains a continuing scholarship plan; and demonstrates ability as a collaborator (with colleagues, students) or team member in the research process, as appropriate to the discipline.

Assistant:
An Assistant Professor disseminates knowledge at the regional/state level; contributes to the profession through juried publications or invited pieces (such as textbook and book reviews, etc.); and demonstrates continued progress in defining a scholarship plan leading to the support of teaching, publications, campus presentations, and conference presentations.

With regard to Scholarship, the departmental FEC guidelines will be of paramount importance in delineating any peculiarities of the established standards of the discipline.

<u>APPENDIX</u>

CAVEATS REGARDING SCHOLARSHIP

The college recommends that faculty exercise caution when disseminating their scholarship, in order to avoid falling into the trap of predatory publishing, a practice that has increased greatly in prevalence in recent years. Not only do such publishing practices violate traditional expectations regarding peer review, but they also put the scholar at risk of having otherwise solid research disqualified for consideration by

legitimate scholarly venues. The following non-exhaustive list of caveats* is offered to help identify possible "red flag" practices that deserve additional scrutiny:

- Charging exorbitant rates for publication of articles in conjunction with a lack of peer-review or editorial oversight.
- Notifying authors of fees only after acceptance.
- Targeting scholars through mass-email spamming in attempts to get them to publish or serve on editorial boards. (These spam-like invitations shouldn't be confused with the emails received from the scholarly organizations you are a member of or with emails from the journal or publisher where your past work has appeared.)
- A strikingly quick turnaround from submission to publication. Peer review process not explained and conducted in no time; no revisions required.
- Quick acceptance of low-quality papers, including hoax papers.
- The title is similar to that of a well-known publication or it suggests an overly broad or extremely vague scope.
- Listing scholars as members of editorial boards without their permission or not allowing them to resign.
- Listing fake scholars as members of editorial boards or authors.
- The publisher's website include typos and grammatical errors; contradictory details about editorial policies, fees, etc.; dead links and no information about the publisher's physical address; a look and interface that mimics the design of a well-known publisher or journal.
- Fraudulent or improper use of ISSNs.
- Giving false information about the location of the publishing operation.
- Fake, non-existent, or mis-represented impact factors.

Faculty are encouraged to use due diligence and we recommend using this checklist* as a point of departure for assessing potential journals and publishers:

____Check that the publisher provides full, verifiable contact information, including address, on the journal site. Be cautious of those that provide only web contact forms.

____Check that a journal's editorial board lists recognized experts with full affiliations. Contact some of them and ask about their experience with the journal or publisher.

____Check that the journal prominently displays its policy for author fees.

____Be wary of e-mail invitations to submit to journals or to become editorial board members.

Originally distributed: 10 December 2009/ Approved without Revisions 27 September 2020

___Read some of the journal's published articles and assess their quality. Contact past authors to ask about their experience.

___Check that a journal's peer-review process is clearly described and try to confirm that a claimed impact factor is correct.

___Find out whether the journal is a member of an industry association that vets its members, such as the Directory of Open Access Journals (www.doaj.org) or the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (www.oaspa.org). [Some questionable journals appear in directories such as DOAJ and Cabell's; we don't advise using this as your sole criteria.]

___Use common sense, as you would when shopping online: if something looks fishy, proceed with caution.

___ Request assistance from a reference librarian.

*Sources: https://predatoryjournals.com ;
http://qcc.libguides.com/open/predatorypublishing ;
http://guides.lib.jjay.cuny.edu/c.php?g=288349&p=1922637

Please note: After first gaining general attention as a trend 2008, the number of publishers with known or suspected predatory or otherwise questionable practices has grown from a handful at that time to numbers in the thousands --according to some sources-- less than a decade later. Predatory practices are also being reported in terms of conferences that are not affiliated with any legitimate scholarly organization.

Suggested File Organization

*Due to variations among disciplines and faculty status, <u>not all of these sections will be included in each file in any given year</u>. **(As appropriate, a department may provide additional guidance for faculty with any special circumstances, such as instructor status, or director or coordinator responsibilities.)** The following suggestions are intended as **helpful recommendations** for achieving a format that will facilitate review and enhance the effectiveness of documentation.*

Suggested template:

<u>Section A:</u> INTRODUCTORY MATERIALS
1. Cover letter requesting retention/advancement, promotion, and/or tenure.
2. Updated CV
3. Self-evaluation of teaching, scholarly development, and service (or, alternately, these self-evaluations can preface the subsequent sections)
4. Previous appraisals (FEC, Chair, Dean, VPAA, President) organized in reverse chronological order by academic year
5. Some departments request that a copy of department- and college-level FEC guidelines be included. **This is helpful to reviewers, even if not required**. These can be placed within binder or in rear pocket.

<u>Section B:</u> TEACHING
This section could be organized in several ways, two of the most common being: a.) according to courses taught and organized in reverse chronological order. For example, all samples of teaching materials for a given course would be grouped together with the most recent syllabus filed at the beginning.; b.) organized in reverse chronological order by semester, with each section including the teaching materials for that semester.
1. Philosophy of teaching (optional)
2. List of courses taught
3. Course evaluations arranged in reverse chronological order by course. Many departments include department-, college-, and university-wide comparative data for student evaluations. **Again, this is helpful to reviewers, even if not required.**
4. Peer evaluations of teaching (optional)
5. **Syllabi of all courses taught, organized according to the academic year. Please check with your department FEC and Chair to determine whether they prefer ALL syllabi, or just syllabi from the current review year, plus selected syllabi from past years that are included to provide a clear picture of course development through the period of appointment.**
6. Samples of teaching materials (handouts, graded assignments, etc.) for current review cycle
7. Advising (number of advisees, **any documentation shared with advisees, and information about how often you meet with advisees)**
8. Field, laboratory, clinical, or other *in situ* teaching and supervision
9. Special teaching initiatives (Collegiate Renewal innovations, any curriculum projects, new courses, pedagogical innovation, team-teaching, integration of student research into teaching, etc.)
10. Contributions to curricular development, **including assessment activities and documents**
11. Mentorship of junior faculty in teaching
12. Professional development and/or certification related to teaching, with discussion as to how it has or will be integrated in course design and delivery.
13. Other relevant supplemental documentation, as appropriate

Section C: SCHOLARSHIP*
This section can be divided into 4 parts (research plan, publications, conferences, and manuscripts). Materials in each section should be organized in reverse chronological order, and should include either full citations for publications, and/or final or draft versions of unpublished scholarly efforts, or similar documentation of creative efforts. **Such documentation can be included on a jump drive, for efficiency.** Copy of acceptance letter and/or listing in conference agenda should be used to document pending publications and all presentations. Materials might include:
1. Research plan/overview of research interests (template can be provided)
2. Published articles or reviews (photocopies) or letter of acceptance with mss (discuss local, regional, national or international scope of conference or publication and, if applicable, impact factor of journal)
3. Mss. submitted for publication
4. Conference paper/presentation
5. Creative project(s)
6. Description of ongoing research
7. Description of ongoing research to enhance teaching
8. Academic presentations
9. Workshop or conference attendance

Section D: SERVICE
This section should be divided into 3 parts: department, university, and community (including professional service). Materials might include:
1. Special (uncompensated) department responsibilities
2. Committee service (indicate tasks, leadership roles, and whether a department, college, or university committee; state nature of service or responsibilities and contributions)
3. Formal mentoring of new faculty
4. Service as Faculty Advisor to a student organization
5. Service to professional organizations, including leadership roles
6. Lectures or presentations to campus or community groups
7. Community service pertinent to professional work

Section E: ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIGNMENTS (if applicable)
This section should include a self-evaluation of activities related to director/coordinator or other compensated administrative assignments and appropriate documentation of efforts in this area. Such positions are disparate, so the possibilities for documentation are equally varied.

Section F: Specific documents as required by your program or department.

Helpful tips for Organization of File
Clarity of presentation is a primary value in the preparation of the review file. Faculty are encouraged to be concise and selective in their presentation of materials, but they are advised to make their case as they deem best. Generally, three-ring binders are the easiest folders to review and to transport from office to office, and a single well-documented sturdy binder (that remains locked when reviewers handle the material) is ideal. For ease of review, a table of contents and tabbed dividers are recommended. If you choose to use plastic document protector sleeves, since they are often hard to handle, please make sure that no more than one page facing in each direction is included per sleeve, so that evaluators do not have to pull pages out and dis-assemble your file for review. It is appropriate to include electronic versions of supporting documents (manuscripts, correspondence, etc.) on a jump drive. FEC review files are a cumulative view of accomplishments from hire; therefore, faculty are encouraged to retain some

salient parts of prior cycles' materials in their review file and to add materials through probationary and promotion years. Files should provide evidence that the faculty member has consistently and satisfactorily addressed all concerns and formative suggestions raised in past review cycles. To be considered for evaluation in the cycle under review, an activity generally must have come to fruition during the year under review. (For example, committee assignments that take effect during the current academic year will be included in the <u>next</u> review file, as will scholarship submitted or accepted for publication or presentation only after the current academic year has already begun.)

* To address concerns about growing trends in predatory publishing practices, we suggest including the following documentation to assist reviewers in evaluating the scholarly legitimacy of publications referenced in your file:

- Comments from reviewers
- Dated communications (and projected timelines) from the publisher
- Link information to the publisher's official website