



Faculty Annual Review Process for Administrative Use IST_AC-06 Administrative Guideline

This review process applies to all individuals with full-time faculty appointments. This does not include individuals going through 2nd, 4th and 6th year tenure reviews, non-tenure line promotion reviews, reviews for promotion, AC-40 reviews and those with significant administrative responsibilities (e.g., Associate Deans).

Given the nature of this process, all information that is shared during the process as well as any conversations that take place within evaluation committees must be held in confidence. Everyone is free to discuss the general process and criteria, but specific cases should not be discussed even with those individuals. Individuals with questions regarding the outcome of this process should speak with the Dean.

The materials to be considered for each faculty are listed in the companion document: FAR Review Process: Faculty Version.

Process

One committee for each Faculty Area will be established to provide input to the Dean to assist in the annual evaluation process. Each committee member will use an evaluative worksheet to give a rating for each faculty based on review of the appropriate FAR materials with comments/justifications submitted to the Dean. The committee as a whole submits a one to two paragraph narrative to the Dean. The Dean uses the input from committees when completing the formal annual evaluation process.

This annual evaluation is intended to be both formative and summative. It is formative in that it should provide useful guidance to the faculty regarding their activities and plans thereby helping them plan more appropriately for the future. At the same time, it is summative in that this is the official appraisal of one's activities for the previous year.

To the extent possible, the make-up of the committees will be such that there is some consistency from year to year, but also so there is some change in membership. Committee membership should also seek to ensure that the diversity of perspectives and approaches within the college is represented.

- The FAR committee is selected within each Area by the PIC and Area faculty. The committee membership will be communicated to the IST faculty.
- Each committee will be responsible for providing input to the PiC for their Area faculty's teaching, research and service.
- Each committee member will have the opportunity to review all relevant materials for all

Area faculty being evaluated by that committee and complete the worksheet with their individual rank for each with comments/ justification. After this individual review is complete, each committee will meet as a group to discuss all individuals being reviewed and provide one to two paragraph narrative to the Area PiC. During this discussion, committee members may update their feedback if they feel this is appropriate, but there is no expectation of complete agreement by all members of the committee. Both the individual evaluative worksheets by the committee members and the narrative will be submitted to the Area PiC.

- Each committee will send the three individual worksheets and combined narrative to the admin support person, who will track and file information, and send to the PiC.
- The Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs will use input from the committees to complete the formal annual review process. When reviews are complete, the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs will meet with all faculty that receive a rating of unsatisfactory or needs improvement in any of the areas of evaluation. The ADFA or Dean will also meet with any other faculty that would like to discuss the outcome of the annual review process.
- The FARs are distributed to faculty electronically as PDF.
- The faculty return a signed copy to the admin support person via email or hard copy. The copies are all filed in each faculty folders under Faculty Annual Reviews.
- Following the completion and distribution of the FARs to faculty members, there will be a debrief meeting with the FAR committees, ADFA, and admin support person.

Teaching is evaluated based on the quality of the learning experience as assessed using the materials available such as SEEQs and peer reviews, as well as the significance and impact of the courses; supervision of independent studies, theses, and dissertations; new courses developed or existing courses that were revised; and related activities. Teaching is **not** evaluated based on the number of courses taught. Teaching may also include engagement in the pursuit of funding for activities that are most appropriately described as teaching (e.g., redesigning a course) as well as the execution of related activities. Unfortunately, there continue to be challenges with peer evaluations including results that are in stark contrast to other feedback about the same courses and the fact that our current process results in our only having peer evaluations for a subset of faculty. As a result, peer evaluations are not currently included as part of the annual review process.

Research is evaluated based on the significance and impact of the outcomes produced and the venues in which the outcomes were presented, engagement in the pursuit of funding as well as the execution of externally funded research activities, and related activities.

Service is evaluated based on an individual's engagement with department, college, and institutional service as well as service to the profession including engagement in the pursuit of funding for activities that are most appropriately described as service (e.g., funding for student scholarships) as well as the execution of related activities.

Additional Notes:

- Faculty are encouraged to submit a narrative with their FAR materials offering any additional

information that may be helpful.

- Non-tenure line responsibilities beyond teaching will be clearly documented and provided by Dean so committees know what is expected.
- Contact Finance and Research Offices prior to end of fall semester to request the following information for the committees:
 - Number of IST students paid by each faculty member on a research grant
 - IST Faculty serving as a Co-PI on grants and supervising students
 - Post docs, RAs or wage pay roll students funded using external funds by each faculty member
- Extra comp teaching—anything that is not part of a faculty member’s contract—should not be included in annual review information.
- SEEQ Information:
Provide SEEQ information only for courses taught on-load (not extra comp) courses.
Provide a list of all courses taught on-load.
- Debrief Meeting should be scheduled in May to review the FAR process.
- FAR Kickoff Meeting with Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs and administrative staff should be scheduled in October to prepare the start of the FAR process.
- FAR Charge meeting with Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs and PICs and admin staff should be scheduled once committee established and before end of fall semester.

Templates:

Templates are available for the Review Committee to use when preparing their reports.

- Template 1 – Individual Committee Member Evaluation of Teaching, Research and Service
- Template 2 – Overall Committee Report on Teaching, Research and Service.

Reminder: Include: FAR Administrative Timeline

Revised: 01.8.18

Revised 2.4.25 kw updated letterhead, process, terms to NTL, SEEQ,