

## CLSE Annual Evaluation and Compensation Guidelines

All faculty members are required to submit annual reports every year and will be evaluated every year. Individual faculty members provide a 3-page or shorter summary (annual activity report) of their activities in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for the CLSE Compensation Committee. During January of each year, the CLSE Compensation Committee will utilize department evaluation criteria (see below) to conduct reviews of annual reports and will prepare narrative assessments of each faculty member. In addition, each member of the CLSE Compensation Committee will assign a numerical rating on each of the three performance dimensions for each faculty member being reviewed. The CLSE Compensation Committee shall rate each faculty member on each criterion according to the following five categories: Unsatisfactory, Progressing, Satisfactory, Above Expected, and Excellent. The Unsatisfactory level of evaluation is characterized by an absence of evidence, whereas the Progressing level is characterized by inconsistent or minimal evidence.

The written report from the CLSE Compensation Committee shall contain a summary of the evaluation in each of the criterion performance areas (Teaching, Scholarship, Service), in accord with departmental expectations and university guidelines. The report shall be signed by the evaluators. It shall be shared with the faculty member being evaluated, and signed indicating his/her understanding of its contents.

The CLSE Compensation Committee's narrative evaluations and performance rankings will be forwarded to the department head. The department head will review the faculty annual activity reports, the narrative assessments from the CLSE Compensation Committee and ratings provided by the CLSE Compensation Committee. The department head will meet with the CLSE Compensation Committee to discuss the assessments and ratings. The department head will then prepare a composite performance rating that takes into account the percentage weights for each of the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service agreed upon previously by the faculty member and the department head, consistent with applicable college criteria within the time specified in the compensation calendar.

Information provided to the faculty member by the department head on or before the date specified on the compensation calendar:

1. Copies of the Compensation Committee's narrative reviews and the committee's ratings on the three performance dimensions.
2. The department head's narrative review, ratings on the three performance dimensions and the composite performance rating. The composite rating will be proposed to the dean and the college council of heads for further consideration.
3. If the department head's rating on any of the three performance dimensions differs from that submitted by the CLSE Compensation Committee, the department head will provide a brief written rationale to the faculty member explaining the distinction.

The dean will meet with the department heads and review the ratings provided by each department head (and the narrative assessments as necessary) to determine the final composite rating of each faculty member.

Information provided to the faculty member by the dean on or before the date specified on the compensation calendar:

1. His/her final composite rating.
2. A brief written rationale explaining any differences in ratings between the dean's composite rating and the department head's composite rating, with a copy to the department head.

## Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Teaching

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching.	Meeting all <i>Faculty Handbook</i> teaching responsibility criteria; Providing evidence of effective teaching; Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest; or 2.51-3.00 where 1 is the highest).	Exceeding expected performance in at least three ways, including, but not limited to: Achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >3.51 where 5 is highest; or <2.0 where 1 is highest); Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials); Curriculum development activity; Support of graduate research efforts; Student advisement; Coordination of academic program; Contribution to the public affairs mission; Innovative use of instructional technology; Development of internet courses; or Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation.	High student evaluations (on a 5 pt. scale, >4.00 where 5 is the highest; <2.0 where 1 is the highest); Meeting above expected performance in at least five ways, including, but not limited to, those listed in the Above Expected criteria.

### Evidence of Quality Teaching:

- student evaluations and/or student feedback (50% or less of the evidence provided)
  - course syllabi and policy statements
  - alignment of courses with standards/competencies identified by the discipline
  - samples of assignments, examinations, or work turned in by students
  - course or curriculum development
  - evidence of instructional methods and evidence of instructional technology utilization
  - on-line course information
  - special access opportunities such as distance learning delivery
  - providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
  - evidence of academic and career advising
  - evidence of continuing professional education, advanced study, e.g., certificates
  - honors and awards for teaching
  - written comments by students
  - student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessment
  - peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
  - publications and presentations related to teaching
  - cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations
  - direction of theses, special projects, or dissertations
  - service on thesis, field study, or dissertation committees
  - participation in doctoral comprehensive examinations
  - department head assessment of the candidate's availability to students, collegiality, participation in curricular development, and appropriate use of instructional technology
- other evidence, as identified by the appropriate program faculty

## Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Research/Scholarship

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

<b>Unsatisfactory (1)</b>	<b>Progressing (2)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>	<b>Above Expected (4)</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.	At least one scholarship product from Category A or B, or at least two scholarship products from any of the Categories, A, B, or C.	At least two scholarship products from Category A or B.	At least two scholarship products from Category A and one scholarship product from B or C.

### CATEGORY A

- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in international/national peer-reviewed publications
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media.
- External grant applications that require substantial faculty effort.
- Principal investigator for external grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically \$10,000+).
- Primary author of NCATE Folio or Professional Organization Folio.

### CATEGORY B

- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in state/regional peer-reviewed publications
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media.
- Reviews for university self-studies that require substantial faculty effort.
- National or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- National or international awards for research

### CATEGORY C

- Local/university grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically <\$10,000).
- State and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- Nonrefereed publication(s) and electronic media.
- Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication.
- Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above.
- Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying report(s) emanating from such project(s).
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s).
- Completed dissertation as Chair of dissertation committee(s)
- Peer Reviewer for journal.
- Research consultant.
- Honors or awards for research.
- Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or referenced journals.
- Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one's own courses.
  - Other, as judged by appropriate program faculty.

## Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Service

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service.	Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance; and attained success in one additional areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation	Service extends beyond expected performance to include service activities that demonstrates attained success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation	Extends beyond expected performance to include service activities that demonstrate <b>Sustained</b> success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation.

Service Area	Examples of Service Activities
<b>1. University Citizenship:</b> serving the University organization and contributing fairly to the task of shared-governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-<b>Program service</b> (e.g., participation on curriculum revision committee; chair or member of program advisory board; chair or member of accreditation committee; academic adviser at undergraduate or graduate level; faculty search chair committee member; thesis chair or thesis committee member, program coordination duties beyond teaching);</li> <li>-<b>Departmental service</b> (e.g., departmental policy revision committee; space utilization committee; faculty search committee member; department Library representative);</li> <li>-<b>College service</b> (e.g., member of Dean’s faculty advisory committee; chair or member of COE Graduate Program Committee; member of NCATE accreditation committee; faculty, administrator, or staff search committee member)</li> <li>-<b>University service</b> (e.g., chair or member of University committees such as Graduate Council, Library Advisory Committee, University Assessment Committee; administrator or staff search committee member)</li> <li>-<b>Additional service activities</b> (e.g., task force chair or committee member; providing professional development activities; participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment); or other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Professional Service:</b> contributing to professional organizations within the faculty member’s field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, and/or international levels;</li> <li>-Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels;</li> <li>-Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels;</li> <li>-Sponsoring an active student organization;</li> <li>-Providing mentoring or advising;</li> <li>-Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching</li> <li>- Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Public Service:</b> serving community, state, national or international public constituents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Writing op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc.</li> <li>-Providing presentations to support individuals and groups of individuals in local communities, states, the nation, and other countries</li> <li>-Volunteering for local, community, state, national, and international organizations</li> <li>- Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Professional Consultation:</b> providing professional expertise to different individuals or groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations</li> <li>-Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member’s professional expertise</li> </ul>

## Appeals of Annual Evaluation Ratings

Only a faculty member's final composite performance rating may be appealed. Faculty will be provided clear information on the salary implications of the composite ratings prior to the deadline for submitting appeals to the department head as specified in the compensation calendar.

A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her final composite performance rating should first request a meeting with the department head to discuss the processes and underlying rationales by which the performance rating was determined. After the meeting with the department head, the faculty member may request a formal review of the rating by submitting a written appeal to the department head, stating the reasons for questioning the rating. At the request of the faculty member, the appeal, along with the department head response and other supporting materials, is forwarded to the dean. The dean transmits the appeal to the College Personnel Committee (or the College Compensation Committee, if one exists as a separate subcommittee of the Personnel Committee) for consideration. The College Personnel Committee (or Compensation Subcommittee) will consider the appeal. The committee's review should make use of the department performance criteria, the narrative and ratings from the department personnel committee and the department head, the department head's annual report of accomplishments, and summary descriptive measures (mean, median, mean, etc.) of the ratings of department faculty. If necessary, additional information may be requested by the committee in the process of their deliberations. The college committee will provide a written summary to the dean on the recommended disposition of the appeal.

If the dean makes a decision on the appeal that is different than that recommended by the college committee, the dean must provide a written rationale for that decision. The faculty member may continue to appeal to the Provost, who will review all written documents associated with the appeal.

The Provost may, at his/her discretion, meet with the faculty member. The Provost's decision is final. If the Provost's decision is different from the decision recommended by the college committee, the Provost must provide to the faculty member a written rationale for that decision. Only the performance rating itself can be appealed. Individuals who are successful on appeal will receive the salary increase merited by their revised performance rating. The actual percentage salary increase associated with each performance rating is not subject to appeal. This is the only appeal process to be utilized for appeals of the performance rating. Other grievance procedures, as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*, are not applicable.

At any time, any employee who believes that they have been discriminated against for any reason not related to job performance may consult with the Office for Equity and Diversity.

## Performance Parameters for Compensation System

In accord with University compensation guidelines, the faculty members of the Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Special Education have identified the following evaluation weights across three criterion areas (Teaching, Scholarship, Service) for decisions regarding, faculty promotion, tenure status, retention, and compensation.

These parameters do not refer directly to workload or time/effort/percentages, but rather to the weighting of performance dimensions for determining performance ratings; however, as individual faculty parameters are determined by department heads through a process of consultation with faculty, the percentage weights chosen should reflect the roles of individual faculty in fulfilling departmental needs and should also be consistent with any college-specific parameters that have been adopted. Grant activity will be counted in the performance dimension in which the grant/contract work is most applicable --- Teaching, Research, or Service. Performance parameters or "weights" should, as much as possible, reflect faculty assignments. Individuals who are assigned higher teaching loads should have more of their evaluation influenced by the quality of their teaching. Likewise, individuals who are provided with release time for research should be expected to produce more research, both in terms of quality and quantity.

Generally speaking, faculty assignment should reflect the effort that a department is expecting from faculty in each area. Evaluations focus on the outcome of those efforts – the learning that occurs or the research or service produced. Faculty

assignments and performance parameters should be negotiated between the department head and the faculty member at the same time.

### **I. Tenured Faculty -- 9-hour TLE**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension (Role)</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
30%	Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity	60%
30%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	60%
10%	Service	20%

### **II. Tenured Faculty -- 12-hour TLE**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension (Role)</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
50%	Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity	80%
10%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	40%
10%	Service	20%

### **III. Probationary Faculty**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension (Role)</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
45%	Teaching/Advising	60%
35%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	50%
5%	Service	15%

### **IV. Instructors & Greenwood Faculty**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension (Role)</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
80%	Teaching/Advising	90%
0%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	10%
10%	Service	20%

For purposes of planning and assessment, teaching one 3-credit course is typically viewed as the equivalent of 20% weight, as appropriate to the situation. Therefore, 3 courses would generally amount to 60% weight for teaching, etc. Other equivalencies are based on the college faculty workload policies.

For faculty with reassigned time the above percentages are negotiable, as approved by the department head. Probationary faculty may use the Tenured Faculty tables above, as appropriate to their specific faculty load and faculty goals. Faculty who receive funding for teaching, research, or service projects are to be provided with opportunities to adjust their performance weights to reflect whatever area of activity in which funding occurs. The exact weight of such activities should be negotiated between the faculty member and the department head. The weight assigned must be approved by the dean.