

Annual Faculty Review Administrative evaluation Process and Procedures

Montana State University College of Business, December 2008

The annual faculty review process provided by the MSU College of Business Dean and Associate Deans includes a comprehensive review of teaching, scholarship, and service and a general review of professional development.

The review process is as follows:

1. Each faculty member submits a self-report of his/her accomplishments during the previous calendar year.
2. The Dean meets with each faculty member to discuss his/her self-report.
3. The Dean and each of the Associate Deans of the college independently evaluates each faculty member providing ratings for teaching, scholarship, service and professional development, along with an overall rating.
4. All of the ratings from the three administrators are compiled on a spreadsheet along with summaries of individual performance.
5. The three administrators meet to reconcile rating differences for every individual faculty member.
6. The consensus rating is recorded by and shared with the faculty member through the administrative evaluation of faculty performance.

Teaching Evaluation

Each instructor is encouraged to compile and maintain a comprehensive portfolio of teaching activities providing evidence of teaching accomplishments as detailed in the college P&T policies.

P&T Web Site: http://www.montana.edu/cob/Faculty_and_Staff/pandt.htm

The annual evaluation of teaching includes consideration of the following factors:

- General organization, preparation and delivery – Is there evidence that the instructor has an organized and well conceptualized plan for the courses assigned including course objectives, course policies, schedule of topical coverage, daily lesson plans/objectives, student activities, projects, homework, exams, etc.
- Teaching Responsibilities – What contributions were made by the instructor regarding total sections taught, number of students taught, number of preps in the year and number of new preps?
- Advising Effectiveness – Is there evidence that the instructor has provided effective advising to students?
- Internships/Individual Projects/Research Supervision – Is there evidence that the instructor provided effective supervision of student internships, individual projects and/or student research activities (graduate committees)?
- Recognitions/Awards - Did this instructor receive any teaching recognitions/awards from students, peers, colleagues, COB, MSU and/or professional/academic organizations?
- Pedagogical Innovation – Is there evidence that the instructor is developing more effective methods and approaches for improving instruction in the courses assigned and is there any

evidence that innovation has led to demonstrable improvements; has the instructor developed new courses or new preps in the recent year?

- Student Evaluation of Instruction – Is there evidence that students are satisfied with the teaching performance of the instructor including instructor expertise, organization, clarity, simulation of interest, availability, impartiality, concern and overall effectiveness?
- Pedagogical Collegiality – Is there evidence that the instructor collaborates with colleagues and peers to improve personal and colleague instructional methods and effectiveness including mentoring of junior faculty?
- Pedagogical Scholarship – Is there evidence that the instructor shares instructional expertise, research and innovation with the broader academic community through peer reviewed presentation and publication?

Each member of the administrative team makes a qualitative assessment of faculty performance with respect to the factors listed above. Each faculty member is then assigned an overall teaching rating based on the campus-wide five-point scale as shown below:

1 – Extraordinary Performance, 2 – Exceeded Performance Expectations, 3 – Met Performance Expectations, 4 – Below Performance Expectations, 5 – Unacceptable Performance

Scholarship Evaluation

Faculty scholarship is evaluated annually on a number of factors related to the long-term goal of developing and maintaining an ongoing program of intellectual contributions including regular refereed journal publication. Specific factors which are included in this evaluation are provided below. Annual evaluation of research performance is related to expectations expressed in the college P&T standards (referenced in the teaching section above), but should not be construed as an evaluation for purposes of promotion or tenure.

- Research Program – Does the faculty member enunciate a coherent research program with conceptual promise of relevance to the body of knowledge in a specific field of study, including pedagogical research, and is there evidence that the faculty member is carrying forward this research program through on-going intellectual contributions?
- Research Pipeline - Is there evidence of a pipeline of scholarly projects in various stages of development including new manuscript development, participation in scholarly conferences for feedback and collaboration, refereed journal submissions, refereed journal revisions, refereed journal acceptances and refereed journal publications?
- Research Outcomes - Are there scholarly outcomes in the current year including refereed presentations, proceedings and/or journal publications?
- Recognitions/Awards - Has the faculty member been recognized for research excellence by peers, colleagues, meetings, journals, associations, etc?
- Scholarly Collegiality – Is there evidence of scholarly collaboration and participation with colleagues and peers including reviewing, refereeing, discussing and providing feedback regarding the intellectual contributions of one's peers?
- Mentoring/Leadership – Does the faculty member take a leadership role as first author in scholarly endeavors and does the faculty member provide mentoring to students and junior faculty?

Each member of the administrative team makes a qualitative assessment of faculty performance with respect to the factors listed above. Each faculty member is then assigned an overall research rating based on the campus-wide five-point scale as shown below:

1 – Extraordinary Performance, 2 – Exceeded Performance Expectations, 3 – Met Performance Expectations, 4 – Below Performance Expectations, 5 – Unacceptable Performance

Note that although pedagogical research is valued by the college as contributing to the college's mission, a record of research which is exclusively pedagogical will not allow a faculty member to remain academically qualified and, under the college's P&T standards, is not sufficient to attain tenure or promotion

Service Evaluation

Each faculty member is evaluated regarding service contributions to the college and university, to professional and academic societies/associations, as well as to relevant community, county and state organizations relating to the college and/or the university missions.

The following factors are considered in the service evaluation:

- College and University – Is there evidence provided of effective service to the college through college committees and other college participation, oversight, supervision and administration? Recognition is given to service in leadership positions such as committee chair or student club advisor, as well as to other contributions to the collegiality and culture of the college. *Note that attendance alone is not typically considered to be a service contribution.* Service for which a faculty member is compensated through pay or course release time is weighted less than other service for purposes of the annual review.
- Professional and Academic Organizations – Is there evidence of service contributions to professional and academic organizations in roles such as session chair, program chair, editor, officer, consultant, etc. *Note that membership alone is not typically considered to be a service contribution.*
- Public Service – Is there evidence of service contributions to public organizations whose missions are related to, or contribute to, the college and university missions. Public service to unrelated organizations while laudable is not considered to be a faculty contract expectation. *Note that participation in organizations associated with personal interests alone is not typically considered to be a service contribution.*

Each member of the administrative team makes a qualitative assessment of faculty performance with respect to the factors listed above. Each faculty member is then assigned an overall service rating based on the campus-wide five-point scale as shown below:

1 – Extraordinary Performance, 2 – Exceeded Performance Expectations, 3 – Met Performance Expectations, 4 – Below Performance Expectations, 5 – Unacceptable Performance

Professional Development Evaluation

Ongoing professional development is an expectation of the faculty contract and is evaluated in the annual administrative evaluation; however the degree of scrutiny is at the “pass/fail” level rather than on an ordinal five point scale. It is often the case that a faculty member who is meeting expectations for

scholarly activity through participation in academic and/or professional conferences is also satisfying the expectations for professional development.

Overall Rating

Each faculty member is also assigned an overall performance rating on the five-point university scale. The relative contribution of each of the ratings is considered, so that a dramatic positive or negative performance in a single area can have a significant impact on the overall performance rating. Normally, higher ratings in the separate categories of teaching, scholarship and service are correlated with higher overall performance ratings.

1 – Extraordinary Performance, 2 – Exceeded Performance Expectations, 3 – Met Performance Expectations, 4 – Below Performance Expectations, 5 – Unacceptable Performance

Notes on Ratings

Ratings are typically determined on an iterative basis. Each administrator determines ratings for every individual faculty member independently. Before meeting together the administrators rank all faculty in teaching, research, service and overall performance to be sure that all ratings are “ranked” correctly. All individual faculty performance ratings are validated by comparison to the performance of other faculty members and through careful adjustment of the ratings as appropriate. Once each individual administrator is comfortable with the ranking of the faculty ratings then the same process is repeated with all three administrators-in order to maximize the inter-rater reliability of their evaluation of faculty performance. The result is a reliable and valid college-wide faculty rating system that provides a fair assessment of faculty performance.