

Proposed Comprehensive Evaluation Process (CEP)

Goal:

To develop a faculty evaluation system that will assist faculty in obtaining their goals of being excellent teachers, outstanding scholars and good citizens of the academic community. The faculty evaluation system should guide the faculty towards tenure and promotion and assist in deciding meritorious service to the University. (University Task Force website)

Over the last year, the University Task Force has consulted with Dr. Arreola on the strength and weakness, the advantages and disadvantages of various faculty evaluation processes; e.g. quantitative and qualitative processes (see Documents link on our website). We have reviewed the evaluation processes at institutions within The University of North Carolina, as well as, institutions outside of the state of North Carolina (see the Resources Link on our website). We have collated and reviewed the current evaluation process at Fayetteville State University (see Documents link on our website). We surveyed the faculty to identify the roles of the faculty at FSU and identify the activities that are associated with those roles (see Phase I link on our website). This was followed up with a second survey that asked the faculty to rank order these roles, categories and activities (see Phase II link on our website).

As a committee we analyzed the above data and discussed what should be included in the roles of teaching, scholarship/creative and service (see Phase I & II link for the results of these analyses). There was a vigorous discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of both the quantitative approach and qualitative (narrative) approach of assessment.

The current thinking of the committee is that the qualitative narrative approach is far superior to the quantitative approach. In that the narrative would explicitly inform the faculty member about the performance in teaching, scholar/creative activities and service. The narrative would provide constructive assessments of the faculty's activities, make suggestion for improvement where needed, and provide recognition for those activities in which the faculty member does exceedingly well. The CEP is based on the achievement of the faculty and contributions that the faculty makes to the department. This CEP is outcome based. Assessments will be based on a portfolio (FAAP: Faculty Academic Achievement Portfolio) that presents faculty's contributions to the department, college/school and university. (It has been suggested that faculty be trained in how to construct a portfolio which highlights that faculty's contributions). The proposed qualitative narrative approach is evidence based and would negate the present non-critical assessment process which optimizes a strategy to evaluate your peers as high as possible so that they would give you a good evaluation (In other words, I scratch your back, you scratch my back).

The proposed comprehensive evaluation process is the embodiment of a set of values and is designed for reflective thoughts on the activities of each role for; the faculty, the peers and the chairs. The committee reviewed the merits of a one-size-fits-all evaluation

process versus an evaluation process design specifically for the faculty within an academic unit. It made more sense to the committee that the evaluation process be tied to the goals and objectives of the academic unit. So, the CEP is designed to incorporate the goals and objectives of each department which should be aligned with the goals of the college/school, which in turn, should be aligned with the goals of the university. Strength of the system is that it is a dynamic system which changes as the goals and objectives of the department changes from year to year. The CEP will also assist faculty in developing their skills as teachers, researchers and good citizens of the academic community. These skills enhance the quality of education of our students and strengthen the reputation of the department, college/school, as well as, the university.

Included in this briefing document are examples of self, peer and chair evaluations for the Department of Psychology and the Department of Performing and Fine Arts (Area of Visual Arts). It should be noted, the documents included are only examples of the process. These examples have not been proposed nor reviewed by their respective department. These are prototypes of what CEP should look like. The committee envisions that the:

1. Faculty within the department shall meet to identify the goals and objectives of the department which should be aligned with the college/schools' goals and objectives, which in turn should be aligned with the university's goals and objectives.
2. Faculty in the department identify the activities that each of the faculty members will undertake to achieving those goals and objectives for the next academic year (by the end of April after the review of their current FAAP). A midyear addendum may occur to adjust the faculty member's goals and objectives (January).
3. Each faculty member shall develop a FAAP of their activities and complete a self evaluation at the end of the academic year (completed by the end of March).
4. The Department's Tenure Faculty Committee shall review the faculty's self evaluation and FAAP and provide a narrative assessment of the faculty's activities (completed by the middle of April).
5. The Department Chair shall also review the faculty's self evaluation and FAAP and provide a narrative assessment of the faculty's activities (completed by the middle of April).
6. The cycle starts over again with step 1.

Projected Timeline:

- May 1, 2006 the committee meets with the Provost (The speed of the completion of the instrument will depend on the outcome of meeting with the Provost).
- May/June 2006 (stipend for selected committee members the same as summer 2005 stipends) the committee will meet to complete the instrument and review the SIR II.

- September – December 2006 the Departments develop their goals and objectives and identify their expectations for tenure and promotion.
- January-February 2007 review the documents from each department and present the Departmental CEP to the Senate for approval during the March 2007 meeting.
- April 2007 pilot test the CEP by randomly selecting 10% of the faculty to be evaluated by both instruments (old and new). Only tenured or tenure track faculty will participate in the pilot.
- Summer 2007 (possible stipends) review the data, modify the process as warranted and Beta test the instrument in 2007-2008 by those who are not up for any personnel action.
- If there are no problems, then forwarded to the Senate for the September 2008 meeting for final approval and implementation of the process for 2008-2009.