

## **SOE Annual Merit Evaluation Process 2006-2007**

*Expectations:* The categories outlined in the CLAHS Faculty Annual Report (FAR) provide the general basis for the expectations for annual evaluation in the School of Education. Three basic activities that stem from the tri-partite mission of a land-grant university guide our work: inquiry, leadership and advocacy. Quality, quantity, and impact of work defines the level of productivity and meritorious nature of individual work. Faculty are expected to be engaged in scholarly activities that result in publications, presentations, and sponsored programs. Faculty are expected to teach well as evidenced by student evaluations, continuous course improvement, and engagement in ongoing professional development. Faculty are expected to engage in outreach activities with our PK-12 partners, and/or with colleagues around campus that advance learning that has the potential to impact post-secondary students. Hence, the School of Education takes seriously its role to advance learning PK-20.

*Process:* Faculty are guided by the categories outlined in the Faculty Annual Report template that has been developed by the CLAHS Faculty Council in alignment with the expectations communicated by the Provost. All faculty are expected to submit their reports by April 15<sup>th</sup> of the target year, along with an updated vita and any supporting materials from the reporting year. Tenure-track, clinical, and temporary faculty are all asked to submit a FAR. Submissions of the FARs and vitae are electronic, with the FAR and supporting materials also submitted in hardcopy. All faculty have the option to meet with the Director to further elaborate on the written report.

The Director and relevant unit chairs each review the FARs independently, and categorize the faculty within each unit as either high, middle, or low performers using the general categories of the FAR (i.e., teaching/advising, research/scholarship, outreach/public service, and professional/university service) and any information not reflected in the major categories. Each department unit chair is also asked to identify the top performer in his/her unit, as well as any serious faculty performance problems. The Director then meets with each unit chair separately and compares ratings. When a difference of opinion arises, the unit chair and Director review the individual faculty member's FAR and discuss its contents and any other information that either might have that is not written on the document.

The Director then organizes and orders all SOE faculty into a single rank ordered list from which merit raise increases are derived. A draft listing is shared and discussed with the Dean based on his/her assessment of individual faculty members' work. Issues of extraordinary contributions, salary compression, etc. are also discussed. The Director may revise the rank ordering before final submission. The Dean then has the purview to modify the merit assignments prior to conversation with the Provost, who then presents his/her final

assessment to the Board of Visitors for approval. The final merit assignments are sent back to the Director and are inserted into the salary letters which are sent to faculty in November of the subsequent year.

### **Description of status of untenured faculty**

Mentoring activities occur from the School and departmental unit level. During the 2006-2007 year, formal School-level activities included a new faculty dinner, at least one individual meeting with the new faculty during each semester of the first year, and school-wide meetings that addressed promotion and tenure expectations and processes. OERO provides support in terms of mini-grants and international travel money. Informal meetings, both individual and group, were held with new (i.e., pre-tenured) faculty throughout the year. This summer, one faculty member in each unit has been hired to be available to work with faculty who are submitting papers for promotion/tenure or reappointment. In addition, I convened the P&T Task Force this year to articulate written expectations and procedures, as well as create more formal mentoring activities within each departmental unit. One clear caveat that has been brought forth from both pre-tenured faculty and formal/informal mentors is that it is the pre-tenured faculty member's prerogative to take advantage of the available support and heed the advice offered by colleagues. While this has not been an issue in most cases, there are still some cases when appropriate advice was offered but not followed.

The unit activities have included:

- Educational Leadership and Policy Studies: Members of the P&T committee meet with pre-tenured faculty to discuss expectations and processes. Sample dossiers and exhibit boxes are shared. Informal mentoring is available within the programs.
- Learning Sciences and Technologies: The unit chair met regularly with the pre-tenured faculty. Each pre-tenured faculty member was assigned a dossier mentor and a discipline-specific mentor. The names of the mentors are included in the two-year reappointment letter so that the clear source of support is named.
- Teaching and Learning: The unit chair held meetings with pre-tenured faculty, created Brown Bag lunches to give each an opportunity to share their work, and met individually with faculty to discuss specific issues that were interfering with productivity and community building.

Based on the work of the P&T Task Force, next year's activities include:

1. Increased support during the reappointment process. Specific guidelines for expectations and processes were developed, reviewed by the entire faculty, revised and distributed to put into effect in fall, 2007.
2. Provision of an exhibit box for each pre-tenured faculty member and each tenured associate who is submitting papers for full professor. Specific guidelines were developed and the skeletal box with labeled hanging file folders is supplied by the School.

3. A revised role for each unit's promotion and tenure committee:  
Each unit's P&T committee will fulfill its role in the fall evaluation activities, then provide support for the upcoming 'class' in the Spring.
4. Continuous improvement and articulation of the expectations and processes: Each year, the School's P&T processes and timeline are revised based on feedback from the P&T committees and faculty who have negotiated the reappointment and P&T processes.
5. Implementation of the revised annual evaluation system that is based on the P&T expectations established this year.