



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The special faculty meeting on Faculty Performance Evaluation will be held Monday, October 28, at 5PM in the LC Forum. Prof. Michael Payne will preside. The only agenda item is the following report.

Andrea Halpern
Secretary of the Faculty

Faculty Performance Evaluation System

Recommendations of the
Performance Review Task Force¹
October 11th, 2002

The purpose of review is to provide recognition and rewards to faculty in proportion to their contributions to University goals, and to identify opportunities for improvement. Faculty at Bucknell contribute to the University's success through a wide range of professional activities. Reviews are intended to recognize those contributions and to affirm their value and importance. Thus, review criteria should refer to specific standards rather than impose artificial quotas on acknowledgement of faculty achievement.

The period of review should be long enough to provide the quantity and quality of information required for meaningful, constructive reviews that are sensitive to critical factors that distinguish high quality teaching, scholarship and service. This also would permit appropriate developmental feedback to be provided to each faculty member undergoing review. Early recognition and resolution of teaching difficulties is, however, particularly important at this institution, although this can be addressed apart from the full reviews conducted under the performance review system.

Performance reviews should be informed by commentary from the department or program level, and two levels of review should be provided to ensure consistent implementation of the review criteria throughout the institution. Based on these principles, the Performance Review Task Force recommends the following faculty performance review system:

- A. Performance reviews should provide both summative and developmental feedback to the fullest extent possible. This will be accomplished in part through written feedback from the primary reviewer, and in part by the assignment of part of the annual salary increment based on the results of the review.
- B. Reviews will be conducted on a three-year cycle. A three-year cycle provides sufficient evidence of the faculty member's accomplishments to permit a meaningful, accurate analysis, and we will be able to accommodate the workload of reviewing one third of the faculty each year. Untenured faculty will not be reviewed under this system, as they undergo formal retention/tenure reviews every two years; untenured faculty will receive across-the-board salary increases equal to the average annual increase for continuing faculty.
- C. The person under review will prepare and submit a portfolio of materials for review as detailed in appendix A.

¹ Task Force members: Carmen Acuna, Steve Bowen, Alison Draper, Genie Gerdes, Glyne Griffith, Peter Kresl, Jim Orbison, Kathleen Page, and Ron Ziemian

- D. Department chairs and directors of programs with faculty appointments will meet with their Dean to provide additional information that will place the reviews in context and help to improve the quality of reviews². The Chair's/Director's perspectives also will ground the feedback to faculty members as appropriate to the discipline. In some departments, this information may be relayed by the chair/director on behalf of a committee.
- E. Deans will conduct the primary reviews and assign evaluation scores. Secondary reviews that compare evaluation scores for consistency across departments and Colleges will be conducted by the Council of Deans. Associate Deans of Faculty may assist the Dean of Arts and Sciences in screening portfolios, but the actual evaluation score will be assigned by the Dean.
- F. Criteria for evaluation in teaching, scholarship and service will be those given in Appendix B. There will be no quotas for numbers of individuals in any particular level.
- G. Salary increments will include an across the board component figured as a percentage and equal to one half the CPI if sufficient funds are available. For amounts greater than one half the CPI, the Personnel Committee will recommend dollar amounts for each performance evaluation score as in the recent past. The Personnel Committee will re-evaluate the discounting factor each year and make adjustments as necessary. The weighting of teaching, scholarship, and service in calculating the merit portion of the salary increment will be 5, 4, 2, respectively.
- H. Responses to faculty will emphasize feedback on strengths and accomplishments, and opportunities for improvement. Statements will be illustrative but are not expected to provide a complete inventory of all accomplishments. Results of the evaluation will be communicated to the faculty member by the Dean.
- I. To identify any immediate need for faculty development in teaching, Chairs and Program Directors will review teaching evaluations for each course and section taught in their Department / Program each year after the Spring semester. If the evaluations for a course suggest there may have been difficulties, the Chair/Program Director will review the evaluations with the instructor to determine whether or not a problem existed and if so, how best to address it. The Chairs / Program Directors will provide the Dean with a written report on the outcome of his/her review of teaching evaluations, the nature of difficulties where they were identified, and plans for addressing them. Reports are due by the end of June.
- J. Consistent with the appeals process for retention/tenure/promotion reviews, performance review appeals will be accepted by the second-level review body, e.g. the Council of Deans.

² For evaluation of department chairs and program directors, another individual or committee will meet with the Dean to present additional information

Appendix A: Materials in the Review Portfolio

Teaching:

1. A brief description, up to two pages, of teaching activities over the past three years, including:
 - a. List of courses taught, with number of students and type of course (e.g. required course for majors, required service course for non-majors, elective, predominantly first-year students (or seniors), etc.); indicate whether or not this was the first time you offered the course, or if you substantially revised it; if the course was co-taught, indicate who the other instructor(s) were, and what your responsibilities included.
 - b. Academic advising activities, including number of advisees
 - c. New initiatives, refinements, courses, or other changes you undertook over the past three years in your teaching. Include, in particular, changes made in response to student evaluations, external program reviews, etc.
 - d. Brief discussion of primary areas of particular effectiveness in teaching, teaching philosophy and how you engage students, and how you have responded to assessment needs, course evaluations, external review recommendations, etc.
2. Course evaluations:
 - a. Summaries of numerical course evaluation ratings, including distribution and averages for each question.
 - b. Compilation of student comments for all courses in the past three years.
3. Syllabi for all courses offered in the past three years, plus any supplementary documents needed to provide the following information:
 - a. Course objectives
 - b. Course organization and introductory comments that help orient the student to the course
 - c. Student assessment and grading policies
 - d. Policies on student expectations regarding attendance, missed assignments, etc.
 - e. A list of student assignments (e.g. essays, examinations) sufficient to provide adequate and continuing feedback to the students on progress in the course
 - f. Office hours and other ways to contact the instructor if needed.

Scholarship:

1. Current *c.v.*
2. A brief (up to one and one-half pages) discussion of scholarship activities over the past three years including work in progress, and activities planned for the next three years.
3. A well-defined listing of scholarly “products” (journal papers, exhibits, books, book reviews, noting which were peer-reviewed, etc.). Publications should be listed with a complete citation (full author list, date, page numbers, etc.). Please be sure that your listing clearly indicates the status of each work (e.g. submitted, accepted pending revision, or in press with no further revisions required).
4. Copies of publications or other documentation of scholarly work (such as programs for concerts or exhibits) for this review period.

Service:

1. A brief (up to one page) discussion of primary service activities (department, college and university activities, as well as professional service activities) over the past three years, with a listing of committees served on or chaired and the time commitment, etc., and planned service activities during the next three years.

Appendix B: Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship and Service

TEACHING		
	Score	Description
Outstanding	5	Evidence of outstanding achievement in teaching effectiveness that includes substantial pedagogical or curricular development.
Excellent	4	Evidence of excellence in teaching effectiveness that may include pedagogical or curricular development.
Commendable	3	Evidence of consistently effective teaching that may include pedagogical or curricular development; areas warranting improvement are relatively minor.
Needs improvement	2	One or more areas of teaching performance indicate a clear need for immediate improvement.
Needs major improvement	1	One or more areas of teaching performance indicate serious deficiencies.

SCHOLARSHIP		
	Score	Description
Outstanding	5	Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by significant contributions that may include books, successful grant proposals, peer-reviewed articles, performances, or exhibitions of artistic works, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishment.
Excellent	4	Active scholarship as evidenced by achievement within a peer-reviewed process. Publications or shows, or other comparable productivity.
Commendable	3	Presence of a scholarly program as evidenced by some achievement within a peer-reviewed process and works in progress.
Shows effort	2	Presence of a scholarly program as evidenced by personal statement of research program and works in progress; little engagement in a peer-reviewed process. Little progress since previous review.
Minimal effort	1	Little or no evidence of a scholarly program.

SERVICE		
	Score	Description
Outstanding	5	Outstanding record of service and leadership in University, College, and/or departmental activities, and/or to one's profession; one major service activity within the University required.
Excellent	4	Participation in more than one major service activity or leadership in at least one University, College, departmental or professional service activity; one service activity within the University expected.
Commendable	3	Engagement in University, College, departmental or professional service beyond that required of all members of a department, including at least one major service activity.
Minor service	2	Participation in departmental activities that is expected of all members of the department. Little engagement in service beyond that.
Minimal service	1	Little or no engagement in University and/or departmental service. Does not fulfill some expectations of departmental members (e.g. attending department meetings, participating in DRC and search committees, and participating in departmental functions).