

Annual Review Committee Recommendations

The Annual Review Committee was charged to bring forward recommendations to the tenure-track faculty regarding the criteria and standards upon which faculty members will be evaluated in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. As faculty members in HHD move to revise the Annual Review Standards and processes, it is essential to understand several aspects of the process:

- First and foremost it is essential for tenure-track faculty to understand that Annual Reviews evaluate productivity in relation to the letter of hire and role statements (if applicable) and are not related in any meaningful way to the retention, tenure, or promotion process. Adequate or above average annual reviews absolutely DO NOT imply or suggest that a faculty member will receive a favorable retention, tenure, or promotion review.
- Department Chairs/Heads are required to conduct an Annual Review and provide a rating of performance on the “Annual Review Card.” As long as the process for assigning a category is consistent and applied equally to all faculty members, *how* and *what* categories are used is left to each department to decide.
- In years when salary raises are present, each department can decide how to allocate the money in one of two ways:
 - ✓ Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) and Merit, or
 - ✓ COLA
- Over the past 12 years, the department of HHD has received a total of 40 % in faculty raises, which amounts to an average of 3.3% per year. This amount can be fairly characterized as less than or equal to the local cost of living.
- As a Department, we may not be able to permanently decide to treat all raises as COLA only; however, we can choose to do so until such time that an annual raise constitutes a substantive increase that would prompt our faculty to consider using merit as a means to distribute raise allocations.
- We would recommend that the faculty establish a cutoff percentage. In years when the raise percentage is below the cutoff, the raise percentage would be treated as COLA and distributed equally to all of those who met or exceeded expectations in their review (those who failed to meet expectations would not receive a raise). In years when the raise percentage exceeded the cutoff amount, the raise percentage would be treated as merit and distributed according to a formula that would allocate 0 to those who failed to meet expectations, some amount to those who met expectations, and a higher amount to those who exceeded expectations.
- The committee unanimously agrees that the Chair should conduct the Annual Review and conference with individual faculty members each year.

The Annual Review Committee offers the following recommendations to HHD faculty members for consideration and adoption:

- In an effort to simplify the structure, the Annual Review Committee advocates against the use of plusses or minuses in the review process. Therefore, we would suggest that faculty members be evaluated as below expectations, meets

- expectations, or exceeds expectations.
- Based upon committee deliberations and feedback from faculty members, the Annual Review Committee is bringing to the faculty a three-tier model for consideration.
 - ✓ The three-tier model includes “below expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “exceeds expectations” categories. This model differentiates faculty members according to levels of performance and recognizes those who produce more quantitative and qualitative outcomes during a review period.
 - In an attempt to simplify the process for submitting annual review evidence, we recommend that each faculty member submit an Annual Review Report that contains:
 1. A copy of the Delaware Report (already required by MSU), and
 2. A Performance Review.
 - ✓ The Performance Review would address two Criteria: Quantitative and Qualitative types of evidence in each area of the responsibility (teaching, research, service) and would not be more than a few pages in length, depending upon amount of evidence being submitted.
 - ✓ Standards of performance are outlined and are meant to provide a structural guideline to determine if a faculty member is below expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations during the review period.
 - Those faculty members with an Administrative Component to their workload will provide an additional section to their Performance Review that addresses their administration performance.

There are a few things that we as faculty members must decide upon:

1. Are we willing to treat most years' raises as COLA and only allocate raises based upon merit in the years that the raises are deemed substantive? What will the cutoff (substantive) percentage be?
 2. Do we support the respective standards (*amounts* of performance and *quality* of performance in relation to workloads) in the areas of teaching, research, and service?
-

Annual Review Committee Three-Tier Model

Faculty members (Instructional, Professional Practice, and Extension) shall be evaluated for merit based on the following criteria consistent with his/her letter of hire and annual workload. In the Three-Tier Model, faculty members will be evaluated as: below expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations in each of the categories of *Teaching*, *Research*, and *Service*, and consequently receive one *Overall* score that summarizes performance.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS:

Teaching

Quantitative: Student perceptions of teaching effectiveness that report a mean of 2.5 - 2.9 (average for all courses) on the Aleamoni or comparable scores on a departmentally approved form. A table of all teaching scores for the year would be submitted.

Qualitative: Self evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness that takes into account factors that influence teaching. In addition, other evidence of teaching may be included such as: teaching awards, advising and other teaching related activities not included in annual teaching workload i.e. theses, professional papers, innovative teaching materials, program/project development, new courses, telecommunications, etc.

Note: *Student* perceptions of teaching effectiveness (quantitative) may not be used as the sole determinant in meeting expectations.

Research

Quantitative: One visible product presented or published which may include:

- Professional Publications (books, chapters in books, articles in refereed and non-refereed journals, book reviews, technical and research reports, or monographs)
- Professional Presentations and Workshops
- Externally funded grant proposal and grant administration
- Product Development (instructional media - films, videos, computer programs, software, educational projects, and innovative teaching materials)
- Professional Productions (performance, choreography, juried and non-juried creative works)

Qualitative: Self-evaluation of research effectiveness that takes into account factors that influence research productivity. In addition other evidence of research may be included such as: research recognition awards, research in progress, pilot data, unpublished works, research team supervision or consultation.

Service

Quantitative: Meets a minimum of 1 category below:

- Documented two semesters of department, college or university service
- Documented service to professional organizations
- Documented service to local, state and or national constituents

Qualitative: Self-evaluation of the value and importance of the service. In addition, other evidence of service may be included such as: service awards or recognition, professional consultation, editorial review boards, professional pro bono work and other service related activities.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

Teaching

Quantitative: Student perceptions of teaching effectiveness that report a mean of 3.0 or above (average for all courses) on the Aleamoni or comparable scores on a departmentally approved form

Qualitative: Self evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness that takes into account factors that influence teaching. In addition, other evidence of teaching may be included such as: teaching awards, advising and other teaching related activities not included in annual teaching workload i.e. theses, professional papers, innovative teaching materials, program/project development, new courses, telecommunications, etc.

Research

Quantitative: Two or more visible products presented or published

- Professional Publications (books, chapters in books, articles in refereed and non-refereed journals, book reviews, technical and research reports, or monographs)

- Professional Presentations and Workshops
- Externally funded grant proposal and grant administration
- Product Development (instructional media - films, videos, computer programs, software, educational projects, and innovative teaching materials)
- Professional Productions (performance, choreography, juried and non-juried creative works)

Qualitative: Self-evaluation of research effectiveness that takes into account factors that influence research productivity. In addition other evidence of research may be included such as: research recognition awards, research in progress, pilot data, unpublished works, research team supervision or consultation.

Service

Quantitative: Meets a minimum of 2 categories:

- Documented two semesters of department, college or university service
- Documented service to professional organizations
- Documented service to local, state and or national constituents

Qualitative: Self-evaluation of the value and importance of the service. In addition, other evidence of service may be included such as: service awards or recognition, professional consultation, editorial review boards, professional pro bono work and other service related activities.

BELOW EXPECTATIONS:

Teaching: Fails to meet established standards for Meets Expectations
 Research: Fails to meet established standards for Meets Expectations
 Service: Fails to meet established standards for Meets Expectations

Overall Rating Determination

The **Teaching** component will be assessed as follows:

Category	Measure	Value
Fails to Meet	< 2.5 Aleamoni	0
Meets	2.5 – 2.9	1
Exceeds	3.0 or higher	2

- ◆ *The Teaching component may include a qualitative component that will be taken under consideration in conjunction with student evaluations.*

The **Research** component will be assessed as follows:

Category	Measure	Value
Fails to Meet	No visible product	0
Meets	1 visible product	1
Exceeds	2+ visible products *	2

- ◆ *The Research component table is structured without regard for author position on either abstracts or manuscripts. Grant work must be indicated as Primary, Co-investigator, or Consultant to a grant.*

The **Service** component will be assessed as follows:

Category	Measure	Value
Fails to Meet	No service category met	0
Meets	1 service category met	1
Exceeds	2+ categories met	2

The **Overall** Annual Review score will be made as follows:

Assessment Scoring Translation		
Exceeds Expectations	EE	A score of '2' in the top two workload assigned portions will result in an " Exceeds " (i.e. 50% Teaching, 40% Research)
Meets Expectations	ME	A score of '1' or higher in every portion will result in a " Meets "
Below Expectations	BE	A '0' in any portion will result in " Below "

Extraordinary Performance (EP)

This category will only be applied to the overall rating. The numerical range of possible performance ranges from 0-6. If a faculty member scores '2' in each area (teaching, research, and service) for a total of 6, then the faculty member's Annual Review performance shall be judged *Extraordinary*.