

**NUMBER:** 1413

**TITLE:** Evaluation of Faculty

**APPROVED:** June 12, 1980; Revised September 14, 1984; Revised November 19, 1987; Revised December 3, 1992; Revised April 8, 1993; Revised December 2, 1993; Revised April 6, 1995; Revised April 10, 1997; Revised April 12, 2001; Revised June 14, 2005; Revised April 6, 2007; Revised September 17, 2009; Revised December 10, 2009; Revised September 26, 2013

I. Board of Visitors Policy

- A. An annual evaluation of the performance of all faculty members will be conducted in order that they may receive full credit and review for their contributions to the University and to their disciplines. The three criteria on which this evaluation will be based are teaching, research, and service.
- B. The initial responsibility for evaluation of faculty performance rests with the chair, on the basis of evidence supplied by the faculty member or collected elsewhere. The faculty member shall be given a copy of the chair's evaluation and may submit comments. Both the chair's evaluation and the faculty member's comments are submitted to the dean, who has the final responsibility for evaluation of faculty. A copy of the dean's evaluation should be sent to the faculty member in a timely fashion.

II. Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty

A. Annual Evaluation

- 1. In order to insure that all relevant information is included in the evaluation, all faculty members are required to submit once a year a faculty information sheet in which they detail the evidence in support of their performance in teaching, research, and service, together with whatever other information they wish to be taken into consideration by the chair and dean in the evaluation. These evaluations will be based on a faculty information sheet, student evaluations of teaching, up-to-date curricula vitae, peer evaluation of course portfolios, and such other information as the faculty or the chair wishes to include. The evaluations will comment on the performance of the faculty member in teaching, research and service and on progress toward meeting individual goals resulting from previous evaluations.

B. Evaluation Process

- 1. The chair, using the faculty information sheet and whatever other information is obtainable, evaluates the performance of the faculty member during the previous year and writes up the evaluation into a formal statement of the contributions of

the faculty member to the department, college, and university. In the case of chairs, these evaluations are written by the dean. Since evaluation of performance is one of the essential factors in determinations concerning tenure, promotion, reappointment, and salary increments, the chair and dean should make every effort to insure that the evaluations are clear, honest, and genuinely evaluative. A listing of facts without interpretation is helpful neither to the faculty member nor to the committees concerning personnel decisions.

2. The chair and the dean will interpret the cumulative record of annual evaluations along with the performance of the tenured faculty member during the previous year (see section II.B.1), so that a clear picture of positive contributions and any deficiencies will emerge. An in-depth evaluation will be conducted if requested by the faculty member, the chair, or the dean. In no case will a faculty member be considered for promotion or other major personnel decision unless an in-depth evaluation as described in the policies on Evaluation of Teaching, Evaluation of Scholarly Activity and Research, and Evaluation of Service has been conducted in the previous twelve months.
3. The dean evaluates in writing the performance of the faculty member by either: endorsing the evaluation of the chair; or indicating areas in which the dean's evaluation differs from that of the chair.
4. After completing the evaluation of the faculty member's activities, the chair gives the faculty member a copy of the evaluation and discusses it with the faculty member. At this time, the faculty member and chair agree on a written set of goals for the coming year. If appropriate, the chair should make suggestions for improvement and give the faculty member a clear idea of ways in which the performance might be improved in future years.
5. Where deficiencies are noted, the chair should work with the faculty member to develop a plan to address the deficiencies and either provide resources to implement the plan, if necessary, or if resources are not available in the department recommend to the dean and provost that such resources be provided. If a pattern of deficiency in the performance of a tenured faculty member is documented from the cumulative annual evaluations, for a period of at least two years, the chair or dean shall call for an in-depth evaluation of the faculty member and may conduct a post-tenure review, as described in the Policy and Procedures on Post-Tenure Review. The chair should take particular care in the counseling of non-tenured faculty members who are working toward the criteria for tenure.
6. Copies of the faculty information sheets, the chair's evaluation, the faculty member's comments, and the dean's evaluation are retained for the record in the faculty member's personnel file maintained in the dean's office.
7. An annual evaluation is not required in the year a candidate is evaluated for tenure or for promotion to the rank of professor.

C. Appeal of Unfavorable Evaluations

1. Any faculty member who is dissatisfied with the personal evaluation prepared by the chair may present in writing additional comments or evidence to the chair and to the dean.
2. Any faculty member who is dissatisfied with the personal evaluation prepared by the dean may present in writing additional comments or evidence to the dean and to the provost and vice president for academic affairs.

D. Criteria for Evaluation

1. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of teaching, research, and service. The weighting of these three areas will vary from one faculty member to another depending upon the needs of the department and the particular accountability of the individual faculty member in contributing toward the fulfillment of these needs.
  - a. Teaching - It is the responsibility of the chair to evaluate the information that is available concerning teaching. (For a detailed discussion on evaluation of teaching, see the "University Policy on the Evaluation of Faculty.")
  - b. Scholarly Activity and Research - It is the responsibility of the chair to evaluate the quality of the scholarly activity and research of the faculty member (a mere listing of publications or grants does not constitute evaluation). Each department should establish, with the approval of the dean and the provost and vice president for academic affairs, a clear statement of the criteria for evaluating scholarly activity and research in that department. These criteria should take into consideration both the mission of the department and the nature of the scholarly activity and research within the discipline or related disciplines and in appropriate interdisciplinary venues. The evaluation of scholarly activity and research in a department should be based on these criteria. In evaluation, emphasis should be placed on quality, not just quantity. See Policy on Evaluation of Scholarly Activity and Research for more detailed information.
  - c. Service - The category of professional service is more difficult to define than teaching or research, but deserves the same kind of rigorous evaluation and positive credit. The chair has the responsibility to seek out methods of evaluating quality of professional service, not merely to list the activities. The task is sometimes complicated by the fact that much professional service takes place outside the department. Ideally, each faculty member should exercise their professional expertise in all three areas of department, college and University service, community engagement, and service to the discipline. Where individual faculty members may be expected by the chair to play different roles, those specific roles should be defined and understood. In all

cases, service should be judged on the basis of quality and effectiveness, not just quantity. When distance education technologies are used for providing service, evaluations should include items specific to these delivery formats. See the Policy on Evaluation of Service for detailed information.

- i. Departmental, college and University Service
- ii. Community engagement is defined as the application of a faculty member's professional skills to engage with the external community and is consistent with fulfillment of the University's mission. Community engagement in religious, political, or social organizations (although meritorious in itself) is not relevant to the faculty member's professional area.
- iii. Service to the discipline

E. Pre-Tenure Review

1. The concept of a major review of faculty performance is intended to serve the purpose of giving the faculty member a clear indication of progress toward tenure and to offer constructive suggestions for self-improvement.
2. Non-tenured faculty members, without prior teaching service credit toward tenure, who are in their third year of probationary service at Old Dominion University, will receive a major faculty review. This review will be conducted by the dean and will begin in the spring of the third year of faculty service. The review will include a meeting with the faculty member and chair. The review process, conducted by the department promotion and tenure committee, department chair, college promotion and tenure committee, and dean, will include an in-depth evaluation of teaching effectiveness, scholarly works, grant and contract efforts, and other professional activities. An evaluation report emphasizing the long-range impact of the faculty member on the University should be submitted to the provost and vice president for academic affairs by May 1 (December 1 for faculty hired mid-year) following the completion of the review at the college level with a copy provided to the faculty member at all evaluation levels.
3. In situations where a faculty member receives one or two years of credit toward tenure, the review process will be conducted during the second year of service at Old Dominion University, but no sooner than 12 months after initial appointment.