



# FAYETTEVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY COMPREHENSIVE FACULTY EVALUATION

## 2009-2010 BETA TEST

1

**“We are not transforming one process, but the overall culture at Fayetteville State University about what is important.”**

**– Dr. Jon Young, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**

# FOCUS OF THE NEWLY DEVELOPED COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT\*

- To provide a narrative and formative process for feedback to the faculty regarding professional development, service, and teaching.
- To provide reliable information for personnel decisions (reappointment, promotion, tenure, merit pay and post-tenure review)
- To provide a peer review centered assessment instrument

\*This beta test process ,when implemented fully, will replace the current point system for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review.

## RUBRIC FOR THE NARRATIVE RATINGS

1. **Exceeds Expectation**—The faculty member provides clear evidences of being highly exceptional and outstanding in teaching, research/creative activities and service.

2. **Meets Expectations**—The faculty member provides clear evidences of meeting discipline-based expectations toward reappointment, promotion and tenure.

*Note: This is not to be viewed as a mediocre or an average rating.*

3. **Needs Improvement**—The faculty member provides clear evidences of meeting several disciplined-based expectations to include areas in which to focus for improvement the following academic year.

*Note: The rating of “needs improvement” should not be viewed as punitive, but as an advisement to assist the faculty in meeting his or her goals and objectives that should lead the faculty towards reappointment, promotion and tenure.*

# UNDERSTANDING THE BETA TEST EXPECTATIONS

1. All faculty will be expected to participate in the beta test.
2. New faculty in their second year of a two-year contract are required to participate in both instruments (the current and the beta test).
3. Any faculty member up for a personnel action in 2010 to include any awards program is required to participate in both instruments (current and beta test.)
4. All academic units must refine reappointment, tenure, and promotion expectations and annual guidelines which clearly explain and give examples of what “meets expectations, exceeds expectations” and “needs improvement” (See model posted in Phase VI titled “*Example Model of Minimum Requirements for Personnel Actions.*”)
5. Faculty, deans, and chairs are expected be familiar with the entire process and timeline for beginning and completing the beta test.
6. The Task Force Committee will continue to be available to academic deans, chairs, and faculty as a resource for the successful implementation of the beta test.

# TASK FORCE COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION

## School of Education

Dr. Linda Wilson-Jones

Dr. Priscilla Manarino-Leggett

## Department of Natural Sciences,

Dr. Sherrice Allen

Dr. Jianshi Wu

## School of Business and Economics

Dr. Petur Jonsson

Dr. Carolyn Jewell

Dr. Rammohan Yallapragada

## Department of Psychology

Dr. Tom Van Cantfort

Dr. David Montoya

## Department of Criminal Justice

Dr. Melissa Barlow

## Department of Social Work

Dr. Oliver Johnson

## Department of English and Foreign Languages

Dr. Gary McConnell

Dr. Booker Anthony

## Department of Sociology

Dr. Jilly Ngwainmbi

## Department of Government and History

Dr. Joseph Osei

Dr. Diane Oyler

## Department of Nursing

Dr. Jimmie Williams

## Department of Math and Computer Science

Dr. Guanghua Zhao

## Department of Performing and Fine Arts,

Ms. Soni Martin

Dr. Todd Frobish

Ms. Phoebe Hall

Dr. Sheryl Linch-Parker

# BETA TEST TIMELINE

## **First Meetings in August (Departments, Colleges/Schools)**

University, college and/or department initiatives are reviewed for faculty to select from to add to their goals for the academic year

## **August 31, 2009**

Deadline for faculty goals (university wide form) completed, turned into department

## **September 1-30, 2009**

Deadline for Chairs to give faculty feedback on their goals and objectives (when applicable)

Chair and peer review committee(s)

Deadline for peer review committee(s) to be formed

## **March 20, 2010**

Deadline for faculty to complete their Faculty Annual (Self Assessment) Report and portfolio ( in binder or electronic) - submit to peer review committee

## **April 20, 2010**

Deadline for the peer review committee(s) to complete their assessments and send to faculty member and the Chair

## **May 2010**

Deadline for Chair to complete their faculty assessment form and return to faculty

Post-school conference Discussion

Call Meeting of the Faculty Senate

# REVISION OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) EXPECTATIONS TIMELINE

## **October 30, 2009**

Deadline for departmental or school submissions of revised drafts to RTP expectations and annual guidelines.

Deans for review and comments.

## **December 1, 2009**

Deadline for Dean's submission of draft(s) to Provost for review and comments.

## **January 15, 2010**

Deadline for Provost to return drafts to departments/school.

## **February 15, 2010**

Deadline for revised drafts based on comments by the Deans and Provost.

# **RESOURCE DOCUMENTS**

**Similar to the current instrument, copies of all resource documents remain the faculty member's personnel file.**

# EXPECTATIONS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE AND ANNUAL REVIEW GUIDELINES

## **Expectations for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure**

Each school/department/program specifies its own discipline-specific requirements and expectations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure according to rank. These guidelines are an attempt to assist the faculty in their goals of obtaining reappointment, promotion, and tenure and can be applied to post-tenure review.

In this document there should be guidelines which clearly explain and give examples of what “meets expectations, exceeds expectations” and “needs improvement.”

## **Annual Report Guidelines**

Each college/school/department/program specifies its own general philosophy and the explanations that help guide the faculty in understanding discipline-specific activities and performances.

# FACULTY ANNUAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- Faculty goals for the academic year should be developed at the very beginning of the academic year and recorded on the Faculty Annual Goals and Objectives form – a university wide document.
- The personal goals set forth by the faculty member should include a selection of initiatives by the university/school/department/program.
- Goals are to be reviewed by the Chair and discussed with the faculty member. These stated goals for the academic year drive the self assessment instrument and the peer assessment instrument at the end of the academic year
- Before writing their goals, all members of the faculty should be very familiar with their Faculty Annual (Self Assessment) Report, the Standardized Peer Assessment Form, and the Faculty Assessment by Chair Form

## PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE

Each department or school has set up their own peer assessment procedure for selecting the peer review committee(s). Selection of the committee(s) should take place before the end of September each academic year. Every faculty member should be clear on the selection and structure of their peer review committee(s).

At the beginning of each academic year, all departments and schools should have the option of voting to change the structure of their peer review committee(s). All changes should be noted in the minutes from the school or department meeting and posted.

# FACULTY ANNUAL (SELF ASSESSMENT) REPORT

## **First Page is a university-wide document includes:**

- Academic program (fall and spring, year)
- Semester course numbers and titles
- Number of students in each course
- Student evaluation score in each course
- If the course entailed new preparation
- Number of advisees in each semester
- Other (independent studies, thesis/dissertation)

Other than the first page, the **remainder of the Faculty Annual Self Assessment Report** was developed by each unit (go to the website to see your area):

- All faculty fill out their annual report, accompanied by a portfolio (either electronic or portfolio book).
- This annual report and the portfolio travel to the peer review committee .

# UNIVERSITY-WIDE PEER ASSESSMENT FORM

A university-wide peer assessment form was developed to ensure equity and fairness.

The peer assessment process is integral to the success of this instrument - assessment of faculty is in the spirit of collegiality, accuracy, transparency, and accountability.

## 5-YEAR PEER ASSESSMENT MATRIX

The 5-Year Peer Assessment Matrix does not replace the narrative assessment forms of the peer review committee.

The matrix is a quick summary review of the results of the peer review committee's narrative.

Faculty should keep an accurate original of the document to travel with the portfolio each year for the annual assessment process, included in the portfolio for any personnel action, and included in the portfolio when competing for a university-wide awards.

## FACULTY ASSESSMENT BY CHAIR FORM

Faculty Assessment by Chair Form is university-wide to ensure equity and fairness.

Chairs have the opportunity to limit their narrative if the peer review committee has been thorough in their narrative assessment. All ratings of meets expectations or needs improvement must have explanations.

## 5-YEAR FACULTY ASSESSMENT BY CHAIR MATRIX

The 5-Year Faculty Assessment by Chair Matrix does not replace the narrative assessment form of the department chair.

The matrix is only a quick summary review of the results of the peer review and the chair's review.

Faculty should keep an accurate original of the document to travel with the portfolio each year for the annual assessment process, include in the portfolio for any personnel action, and include in the portfolio when competing for a university-wide award.

# OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS TO DEVELOPMENT THE COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

- <http://www.uncfsu.edu/evaltaskforce/>

Go to Task Force on a Comprehensive Evaluation website to review all states of the process, data collected, early information submitted from all disciplines.

(Phase I- Phase V)

- [http://www.uncfsu.edu/evaltaskforce/Phase%20VI/Phase\\_VI.htm](http://www.uncfsu.edu/evaltaskforce/Phase%20VI/Phase_VI.htm)

Go to this website (Phase VI) to review the proposed documents from each discipline, the full narrative dating July 2009 (participants, voting results, and various committee's contributions), and the fill able university wide documents developed.

END OF PRESENTATION