

# FACULTY EVALUATION MODEL<sup>1</sup> AT VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

## INTRODUCTION

Valdosta State University wants its faculty members to succeed and to be productive members of the VSU community; therefore, the university and its colleges, departments, and divisions continuously use a series of evaluation processes that are intended to be both summative and formative. They should not only provide an accurate picture of the faculty member's performance in teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service, but they should also assist faculty members in defining and meeting their own professional goals in these areas.

Faculty members at Valdosta State University are evaluated both by themselves and others numerous times over the course of their careers:

- (1) Every semester, students are given the opportunity to express their opinions about classroom instruction through the **Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI)**.
- (2) Each year, faculty members evaluate themselves through an **Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan** to which their department/unit head adds an **Annual Evaluation**.
- (3) Each year, faculty members are evaluated according to individual departmental standards for the award of **merit pay**.
- (4) During their third year of full-time service at VSU, tenure-track faculty members are also evaluated by departmental committees as well as their department/unit heads when they participate in a **Pre-Tenure Review**.
- (5) Beginning in their fourth year of full-time university service (if hired as an Assistant Professor or the fifth year if hired as an Associate Professor), tenure-track faculty members are eligible to apply for **Promotion**, and they are eligible to apply for **Tenure** in their fifth year. In both these processes, faculty must show the results of their earlier evaluation processes to departmental colleagues, department/unit head, the appropriate dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- (6) Every five years after the award of tenure (unless interrupted by another personnel action such as promotion), faculty members participate in a **Post-Tenure Review**. During this review, they are evaluated by their departmental colleagues and their department/unit heads.

The Faculty Evaluation Model at Valdosta State University seeks to provide the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> "Model" indicates that colleges and units will modify elements of the evaluative procedure (e.g. arrangement of professional categories or addition of questions to the SOI, etc.) to facilitate planning, program evaluation by external accrediting bodies, or other disciplinary requirements.

- (a) the most helpful process for faculty members to ensure that they will have clear guidance about their performance goals and accomplishments in the areas of teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. This guidance should help faculty work in productive ways to achieve positive evaluations.
- (b) the most helpful product for faculty members, department/unit heads, and deans as they make decisions about the allocation of resources as well as for promotion, tenure, and merit pay increases.
- (c) the most efficient process for faculty members, department/unit heads, and deans so they will not need to do unnecessary and repetitive work.
- (d) the most uniform process/product possible within the context of the many different disciplines within the university so that all faculty members, department/unit heads, and deans may be assured of equitable evaluation.

## **(1) STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION (SOI)**

The main goal of Student Opinion of Instruction is to help faculty improve courses and instruction; moreover, the SOI is used in the annual evaluation of faculty. Therefore, faculty will administer student evaluations for each course\* they teach during the fall and spring semesters, and the summer sessions. All SOIs must include both quantitative and qualitative sections and be completed by the last teaching day of the semester or summer session. Results from these evaluations will be returned to the faculty member in a timely manner. Fall semester student evaluations will be returned by midterm of the following spring semester. Spring semester evaluations will be returned by midterm of the

Each institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with the Regents' Policies and the statutes of the institution against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution (Board of Regents' Policy Manual, section 803.07).

The guidelines pertaining to the above were developed by the Chancellor's Office. They read in part:

The purpose of the new faculty evaluation policy is twofold. The primary purpose is to aid the faculty member in improving and developing his or her performance as a member of the academic community and to ensure the faculty member's understanding of the relationship between his or her performance and the expectations of the institutions. Secondly, the faculty evaluation should assist the institution in its review of the faculty member for continued employment, promotion, tenure and merit salary increases. The institution may wish to develop different procedures for each category of review. However, the faculty member must clearly understand the criteria and procedures to be used in the evaluation process for continued employment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases.

The faculty has a right to comment in writing on any aspect of the annual evaluation.

The faculty shall sign and receive a final copy of their annual evaluation (Memoranda from the Chancellor to Presidents, June 22, 1981 and December 15, 1986).

At Valdosta State University, the Annual Faculty Activity Report, Action Plan, and Annual Evaluation document plays a number of important roles:

- for faculty members, it helps them report their activities over the past year as well as evaluate their performance in teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service;
- for department/unit heads, it allows them to assess the progress of faculty members for their next personnel action or merit determination and to provide guidance and assistance to help faculty members reach departmental expectations and goals;
- for deans, directors, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, it not only provides documentation for personnel processes but also for strategic planning and development.

This document is also a critical component of the promotion and tenure process for faculty, it is the primary source of information for the university annual report, and it serves as a means to evaluate individual units' progress toward meeting strategic goals. Individual programs and departments should develop policies that address specific components of the report such as allocation of loads for service or special assignments. It is important that professional growth and productivity activities be discussed in departments, divisions, and colleges so that listings of activities are clearly and consistently reported across the unit.

### **Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan (FAR)**

Faculty members are responsible for accurately reporting all activities—in teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service in which they have been involved over the preceding calendar year. They should then view

these activities in light of whatever personnel action they will next undergo—pre-tenure review, application for promotion and/or tenure, or post-tenure review—and set goals for the upcoming year in all three areas. This planning process will aid not only faculty members in meeting their own professional goals, but it will also help them realize these goals in conjunction with university, college, and departmental goals. Department/unit heads will be able to see what resources will be needed to help faculty members realize those goals.

### **Annual Evaluation**

After the faculty member has completed the Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan, the faculty member's department/unit head will complete an Annual Evaluation. This document should evaluate the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. It should also include recommendations if activity in any given area is determined to need improvement. Attention should be given in cases where a faculty member has any form of load adjustment related to their duties within the department. The department/unit head should address the faculty member's planning and goals for the following year and determine if they are aligned with departmental, college, and university goals, and if they are prioritized in a manner that facilitates appropriate levels of activity that may lead to tenure and promotion.

Faculty Activity Reports and supporting documentation will be housed in the department/unit of the faculty member. Copies of the Annual Evaluation document will be forwarded to the appropriate dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

### **Schedule for Annual Faculty Activity Report, Action Plan, and Annual Evaluation**

First semester of employment:                    \*New faculty members meet with department/unit heads to discuss the Faculty Evaluation Model and departmental expectations.

### **(3) MERIT PAY**

The Board of Regents each year receives an appropriation from the General Assembly for all phases of its operations. Expenditures for operation of the University System, including salaries, are therefore necessarily contingent upon legislative appropriations. While compensation could be reduced as a consequence of actions of the governor or General Assembly, it is the stated intent of the Board "to maintain current salary commitments in so far as possible to every employee and the Board will exert its composite influence and best efforts to that end." (Board of Regents' Policy Manual,



The committee's report will be submitted to the faculty member and the head of the department/unit. A copy of the report should be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

If the faculty member feels that the report of the committee is unfair, the faculty member can follow the University's established appeals process.

## **(5) PROMOTION AND TENURE**

### **Promotion**

Promotions in rank are based on merit and are not automatic. The Board of Regents has fixed certain minimum criteria for promotion from one rank to another; these criteria include superior teaching, outstanding service to the institution, academic achievement, and professional growth and development. In at least two of these four areas, the faculty member's accomplishment should be noteworthy, with the greatest emphasis on teaching. Regents policies also state that there should be appropriate involvement of faculty in making recommendations for promotion. Each department/unit should have written procedures for making recommendations for promotion, and these procedures should be available to all faculty members.

At Valdosta State University, the terminal degree or its equivalent is normally required for promotion to associate or full professor. Strong justification should be provided in support of any recommendation for promotion to the ranks of associate or full professor without the terminal degree. In addition, length of service is considered for promotion: three years as instructor, four years as assistant professor, and five years as associate professor. Consideration is also taken of the number of promotions available to the university and the number of faculty members in each rank. Promotions are considered once each year at the April meeting of the Board of Regents.

Applications for promotion are initiated at the department level, with the applicant providing the relevant documentation. Appeal is through the deans to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the Board of Regents.

Criteria for Promotion are delineated in the Board of Regents' Policy Manual, Section 803.08.

### **Tenure**

Tenure resides at the institutional level and is not guaranteed. Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure. Faculty members with adjunct appointments will not acquire tenure, nor does tenure apply to honorific appointments.

Tenure may be awarded, upon recommendation by the President and approval by the Board of Regents, after completion of a probationary period of at least five years of full-time service, defined as a one-hundred percent workload basis for two out of every three consecutive academic terms, at the rank of assistant professor or higher. The five-year period must be continuous, with the exception of a maximum of two years' interruption





**Goal 1: Expand and strengthen established evaluation procedures**

Valdosta State University (VSU) already evaluates the performance of all faculty members through an established annual review process. This process is designed to guide faculty in maintaining a high level of professional competence and to recognize and reward faculty for outstanding achievement. The annual evaluations will serve as the guide for the post-tenure review, and each annual evaluation should end with a statement that clearly specifies if the previous year's performance was satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.

The post-tenure review process should not place an onerous burden on faculty to document their continuing competence, which is why the primary documentation submitted by faculty are the five most recent annual evaluations and a current curriculum vitae. Generally, faculty with three or more satisfactory annual evaluations with at least two of these within the three years prior to the review will be considered as candidates for reward and recognition by the department/unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty who have two or more unsatisfactory annual evaluations with at least one of these within the three years prior to the review will be considered as candidates for remediation. Faculty whose annual evaluations are between these extremes will be provided with information concerning their areas of strength as well as those areas which they should consider for continued development.

The post-tenure review will be conducted by each department/unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The deadline for submission of material will be consistent with those established for VSU promotion and tenure. This review should begin five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action (tenure) and continue at five year intervals unless interrupted by a promotion, impending candidacy for promotion within a year, or approved leave of absence. A statement will be added to each annual contract stating the anticipated year for post-tenure review. Tenured faculty who hold administrative positions above department head will be reviewed five years after returning to a full-time teaching appointment. The review process for department heads will be the same as for faculty except the report from the review committee will be submitted the dean of that college.

The post-tenure review should address accomplishments in teaching, in advising and serving students, in research/scholarly/creative activity, and in service. While a candidate should not be expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of the post-tenure review, faculty should provide performance documentation as follows:

- (1) a current curriculum vitae and copies of annual evaluations for the years under consideration;
- (2) measures of teaching effectiveness including, but not limited to, written student ratings and/or peer evaluations;
- (3) a self-assessment; and
- (4) other documentation faculty may choose to present.

**Goal 2: Recognize and reward outstanding professional accomplishments**

Post-tenure review should help tenured faculty members improve their performance. One important means of achieving this objective is formally to recognize and adequately reward outstanding faculty accomplishments. The University will develop a reward structure that recognizes faculty excellence, supports distinguished faculty work, attracts and retains outstanding faculty, and enhances the academic reputation of VSU. Such a reward program should include, among other measures, the following:

- (1) increased visibility for faculty achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service;
- (2) substantial merit-pay increases that are in addition to those awarded through the annual evaluation process; and
- (3) continuation, expansion, and support of course reassignment policy and an enhancement of the leave of absence program for the development of faculty scholarship, other creative professional activities, and teaching.

**Goal 3: Detect and remediate sub-standard professional performance**

If, as a result of the review process, the need for faculty development is recommended, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide a written summary of its findings and any recommendations to the department/unit head. Department/unit heads should add their own comments, confer with the faculty member, and present the findings. Both the department/unit head and the faculty member must sign the report indicating the results had been presented and discussed. If a development plan is proposed, recommendations from the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be forwarded to the department/unit head for additional suggestions.

This development plan must accomplish the following:

- (a) define specific goals or outcomes;
- (b) outline activities to be undertaken to achieve these goals or outcomes;
- (c) contain a schedule; and
- (d) define the criteria by which the faculty member's progress will be monitored.

The department/unit head will be responsible for forwarding the faculty member's development plan resulting from post-tenure review to the appropriate administrator at least one level above the faculty member's unit and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The department/unit head and administrative officer are responsible for arranging appropriate support for the approved plan, if required. This process will be integrated into the timetable for personnel decisions and merit pay decisions established by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The development plan will be signed by the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department/unit head, and the faculty member. A copy of this signed plan will be provided to the faculty member, committee members, the department/unit head, and the appropriate dean. As part of the annual evaluation, the department/unit head will meet with the faculty member engaged in enhancement work to review progress according to the plan. The outcome of this review will be included in the annual evaluation. If, in a period of time not to exceed three years, the department/unit head and Promotion and Tenure Committee agree the faculty member has been successful, they will report this to the department/unit head, dean, and the Vice President for Academic

Affairs. A faculty member who successfully completes the development plan will be reviewed 5 years from the date of the original review.

For a faculty member who fails to achieve the improvements identified in the development plan within the agreed-upon timetable as evidenced by the department/unit head's evaluation, both the faculty member and head will be asked to submit a written explanation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The faculty member's account should explain why the faculty member has been unable to meet the terms of the development plan. The Promotion and Tenure committee may respond to these written explanations in one of three ways. The Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- (1) may agree with the faculty member's evaluation that performance has improved;
- (2) may agree with the faculty member's explanation for why the performance goal(s) have not been met; in this case, the committee will work with the faculty member to revise the development plan; or
- (3) disagree with the faculty member's explanation; in this case it will prepare a report of the entire post-tenure review process specific to the case, and forward it to the faculty member, the department/unit head, and the dean with the recommendation that appropriate sanctions be implemented.

Regardless of the committee's recommendation, the faculty member can follow the appeals process established by the Board of Regents. If the administration decides to initiate sanctions or dismissal procedures because of an unsatisfactory performance on the part of the faculty member, it will adhere to the University and Board of Regents guidelines for dismissal for cause.

### **Establishing Standards of Performance**

Each department/unit will periodically review and maintain its statement of expectations for satisfactory performance applicable to all faculty members (tenured and non-tenured). Departmental/unit statements will address expectations for the areas of teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. These must be as specific as possible, without arbitrarily precluding the diverse contributions that individual faculty members might make to the university community. Individual differences in teaching, scholarship, and service are valued. After approval by the members of the department/unit, the statement will be submitted to the dean for review.

The dean of each unit will certify in writing that department/unit expectations are in keeping with the established mission of the college, that they meet minimum standards, and that expectations are equitable throughout the college. These expectations will be provided to all new faculty. Questions concerning these policies and procedures will be answered at annual meetings open to all faculty of the college.

### **Conclusion**

This post-tenure review provides an opportunity to assess faculty development goals and achievements and provides assistance to faculty in ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth. The post-tenure review is distinguished from the annual review in

that it requires faculty and administrators to assess achievements and goals over a longer term. It also merges the faculty and administration into a unit dedi

## **APPENDIX A**

Excellent/Good/Acceptable/Unacceptable or Significantly Exceeds Expectations/Meets Expectations/Falls Short of Expectations/Falls Significantly Short of Expectations.

**5. Interpretations of student ratings averages should be guided by awareness that students tend to rate faculty at or near the high end of the scale.** It is therefore not appropriate to use the median (or 50th percentile) as a presumed dividing line between strong and weak teachers. More appropriate would be to assume that the majority of teachers are strong. It is also appropriate, when evaluating average ratings of individual instructors, to

proportions decrease, particularly in small classes, there is greater opportunity for the rating of one or a few students to disproportionately affect the results.

For References, see [http://www.und.edu/dept/oid/evaluation\\_literature.htm](http://www.und.edu/dept/oid/evaluation_literature.htm)

**Thinking about Teaching Evaluations** <http://www.oberlin.edu/cot/pdweval.htm>

Patty deWinstanley, Associate Professor of Psychology (Oberlin), prepared the following based on her reading of the extensive literature on teaching evaluations. She focused predominantly on three literature reviews: [1] Cashin, W. E. (1995). Student Ratings of Teaching: The Research Revisited. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Idea Paper no.32; [2] Aleamoni, L.M. (1999). Student rating myths versus research facts from 1924 to 1988. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13(2), 153-166. (Provided to COT in Spring, 2000); and [3] Pratt, D. D. (1997). Reconceptualizing the evaluation of teaching in higher education. Higher Education, 34, 23-44.

### **1. Students can make reliable and valid judgments about an instructor and certain aspects of instruction.**

#### **A. Reliability**

Just as you would throw away a bathroom scale that gave you a different measure of your weight every time that you stepped on it, an evaluation form with low reliability also should be thrown away. Fortunately, under best case scenarios, student evaluation forms have been shown to be reliable.

Reliability refers to the consistency, stabshould bSto

Cashin (1995) provides the following guidelines for assuring that acceptable levels of reliability are achieved for student evaluations when making personnel decisions.

1. Reliability will be achieved only to the extent that the surveys are well designed, thus forms should be developed in consultation with someone knowledgeable about educational measurement.
2. Reliability will be achieved when using "ratings from a variety of courses, for two or more courses from every term for at least two years, totaling at least five courses." If there are less than 15-20 students in any class, data from additional classes are recommended.

Aleamoni (1999) echoes Cashin's suggestions and further emphasizes the importance of consultation in the construction of the evaluation forms: "It should be noted, however, that wherever student rating forms are not carefully constructed with the aid of professionals, as in the case of most student- and faculty- generated forms, the reliabilities may be so low as to negate completely the evaluation effect and its results".

## **B. Validity**

Although you might not throw away a scale that always reported your weight at ten pounds lighter than every other scale that you have stepped on, you would know that the scale isn't a valid measure of your weight. A scale can be highly reliable (always giving you the same weight) but not valid (the weight is really ten po



B. More advanced students give higher ratings than less advanced students.

C. Teacher/student interaction, or rapport

D. Course difficulty, workload

E. Grading and examinations

F. Student self-rated learning

All authors of the review articles cautioned that a single overall (or general) measure of teaching effectiveness is inadequate because single items are not reliable or valid. Furthermore, single items, such as in general how would you rate this teacher's effectiveness, tend to correlate with many more of the factors that are unrelated to teaching effectiveness (i.e., gender, class size, etc.)

**4. All authors of the review articles state that student evaluations must be used in conjunction with other methods of evaluating teaching. Pratt (1997) lists six principles for evaluating teachers in a broader approach that includes student evaluations as only one aspect of teaching evaluations.**

The six principles are as follows:

A. Evaluation should acknowledge and respect

**Mean**—The mean score represents the numerical average for a set of responses. The following points assume a scale in which a low score is assigned to negative responses (i.e., poor) and a high score to positive responses (i.e., excellent).

**Generally, the higher the mean score, the better the evaluation.**

On a 5-point scale, items with mean scores above 4.0 generally reflect teaching aspects that are particularly effective.

**Standard Deviation**—The standard deviation represents the distribution of the responses around the mean. It indicates the degree of consistency among student responses. The standard deviation is often abbreviated in data tables as *s*, *sd*, *SD*, *std*, or *StD*.

The standard deviation



## Appendix B

1. WHAT WERE THE BEST FEATURES ABOUT THIS COURSE?

/ f54/ WYUT INSTRUCTOR'S STRENGTHS COURSE?

**Appendix C**  
Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Division: \_\_\_\_\_

Year: \_\_\_\_\_

**The Annual Faculty Activity Report, Action Plan, and Annual Evaluation document plays an important role for faculty, departments, and the units within the university as part of strategic planning and development. This document is also a critical component of the promotion and tenure process for faculty; it serves as the primary source of information for the university annual report and as a means to evaluate individual units' progress toward meeting strategic goals. Individual programs and departments should develop policies that address specific components of the report such as allocation of loads for service or special assignments. It is important that research and scholarly activities be discussed in departments and colleges so that listings of activities are clearly and consistently reported across the unit.**

**Faculty members completing this form should make every effort clearly to address all of the areas within this document that relate to the individual's responsibilities at the university. Activities should be listed only once within the report; do not include the same activity in two different categories. ( Parttime Faculty complete only Section A ) .**

**The role definitions in this document are adapted from Raoul A. Arreola's *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. Bolton, MA: Anker, 1995.**





**4. Guided independent study, internships, or other teaching responsibilities:**

Name of Student	Description of Activity

**5. Awards or special recognitions earned in this area.**

*Please be prepared to include materials supporting your report if requested. Newly developed course materials should be included in departmental files.*

**GOALS**

**Planning is an important part of the evaluation process. When completing this section**

EMC /P /MCID 8 B52C 0.000dev(EMC /P /MCID 8 B53C 0 Tc 0 3 TD()TjEMC /P 36/Artifac CID Subtype /Fo

**B. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND PRODUCTIVITY**

Professional growth and productivity is defined as improving the competence of faculty members to better fulfill the role and responsibilities of their position within the institution, professional achievement or contribution to the teaching/learning process, or education profession in the faculty member’s area of expertise.

**1. Publications, Performances, Exhibitions, and/or Creative Research:**

Please list publications, performances, exhibitions, and/or creative research (attach a copy of each publication and use a standard bibliography form, including page reference and date. For artistic or creative activity, include appropriate citations, references, or documentation).

**2. Research/Scholarship and/or Artistic Work in Progress:**

**3. Appearance on professional programs:**

Professional Association	Nature of Contribution	Date

**6. Memberships and offices held in professional associations:**

Professional Association	Office Held /Member

**7. Meetings of professional associations attended:**

Professional Association	Location	Important Sessions Attended

**8. Professional Training Sessions/Workshops attended**

Professional Development Activity	Date	Topics Covered

**9. Paid consultancies, workshops, professional development activities provided.**

**10. Awards or special recognitions earned in this area.**

*\*Please be prepared to include materials supporting your report if requested. Make sure that appropriate final reports for research projects have been submitted.*





**4. Membership/Leadership/Participation in community organizations/activities**

Community organization or activity	Role

**5. Unpaid consultancies, workshops, professional development activities provided.**

**6. Awards or special recognitions earned in this area.**

- Please be prepared to include materials supporting your report if requested. Letters of support or appreciation, reports, information from conferences shared or utilized by your department would be appropriate support material for evidence in this area.*

**GOALS**

**Planning is an important part of the evaluation process. When completing this section include specific goals and objectives, remembering that goals should be broad and flexible and recognizing that they may be subject to change. Relate your goals to past Faculty Activity Reports; Department Head Evaluations; Departmental, College, and University Goals; and Strategic Plans. Some plans may need specific timelines or may need to be set within the context of other actions taking place within a department. These details should be included in this report.**

A. Review and list your goals for last year in college and community service and indicate progress made.

**Valdosta State University  
Annual Faculty Evaluation  
(Calendar Year \_\_\_\_\_)**

Date of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION**

College/Division:

Department:

Name:

Highest Degree Earned:

Year:

Appointment Year:

Appointment Rank:

Present Rank:

Year First Promotion:

Year Second Promotion:

Total Years at VSU:

Years in Present Rank:

Next Scheduled Personnel Action:

Eligibility Date:

## FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION

*After reading the faculty member's Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan, department/unit heads will complete this annual evaluation. The statement should evaluate the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. It should also include recommendations if activity in any given area is determined to need improvement. Attention should be given in cases where a faculty member has any form of load adjustment related to their duties within the department/unit. The department/unit head should address the faculty member's planning and goals for the following year and determine if they are aligned with departmental, college, and university goals, and if they are prioritized in a manner that facilitates appropriate levels of activity that may lead to tenure and promotion. The department/unit head's assessment of the faculty member should be based on departmentally established standards of performance.*

***SATISFACTORY:** Satisfactory performance is demonstrated by performance levels that are recognized as meeting all reasonable and acceptable standards compared to other professional faculty within the department.*

***UNSATISFACTORY:** Unsatisfactory performance is demonstrated by performance levels that are clearly recognized as not meeting reasonable and minimal standards compared to other professional faculty within the department, or documentation is not provided by faculty when requested or prescribed in the evaluation process.*

### 1. Teaching and Instruction

\_\_\_ Satisfactory

\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory

### 2. Professional Growth and Productivity

\_\_\_ Satisfactory

\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory

### 3. College and Community Service



\_\_\_ Satisfactory

\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory

**4. Recommended Activities for Improvement**

Progress toward next personnel action (List next scheduled personnel action and earliest date, or due date for that action): \_\_\_\_\_

Overall Evaluation:     Satisfactory             Unsatisfactory

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department/Unit Head

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

The faculty member's signature on this document does not indicate agreement with its contents but that the faculty member has read the evaluation and discussed it with the evaluator. The faculty member has the right to append a response to this evaluation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
VPAA Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date