

P. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

I. General Criteria for Evaluation and Review

The professional lives of university faculty members traditionally have been characterized by expectations in the broad categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. Ideally the most effective members of the profession blend elements of these three components in many different combinations to achieve the overriding goal of stimulating student learning, which is of prime importance at Longwood University.

Therefore, evaluation and review of tenured and tenure-track faculty for annual performance evaluation, post-tenure review, probationary review, tenure, and promotion should focus on continuing efforts by the faculty, throughout their professional careers, to integrate teaching, scholarship and service so as to develop an academic atmosphere in which learning is cherished by faculty and students alike. For the purposes of these criteria, the term “evaluation” refers to the annual performance evaluation conducted by department chairs for all full-time faculty and used for determining merit pay increases and that trigger post-tenure review. The term “review” refers to appraisals of faculty members initiated by both a department promotion and tenure committee and the department chair; faculty are reviewed during the probationary process, for tenure, for promotion, and in cases of post-tenure review.

II. Relationship Between General and Department Criteria

Recognizing that different academic disciplines have unique characteristics and demands, the following criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service are presented as guidelines from which individual departments will develop specific standards for annual performance evaluation, post-tenure review, probationary review, and reviews for tenure and promotion to any rank. (See Section IV Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation and Review.) The Dean of the college and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (PVPAA) must approve departmental standards for faculty evaluation and review before they are implemented. Copies of the approved standards must be distributed to all departmental faculty in writing.

A. Teaching

In all personnel judgments, high quality teaching is the principal consideration. Each faculty member is expected to continuously refine his or her instructional knowledge base and methodology of delivery, constantly seeking the best way to foster student learning. To this end, all faculty members must present evidence of effective teaching which may be demonstrated by:

1. A current, sound knowledge base in the discipline reflecting continuous revision that improves course content.
2. Organized course preparation, including clear syllabi detailing objectives and expectations.
3. Organized preparation for each class, so that the course delivery flows as a cohesive whole.
4. Employment of a variety of teaching methodologies suited to the characteristics of each course, especially those that encourage discussion, promote skills, and develop critical thinking.

5. Demonstration of the ability to synthesize and correlate information, and to simplify complex topics.
6. Demonstration of effective, clear communication skills, and the ability to stimulate these skills in students.
7. Development of evaluation instruments that accurately assess the achievement of stated course objectives.
8. Consistency in grading, making assignments, and applying rules.
9. Consistency with the time requirements appropriate to the number of credit hours awarded.
10. Responsiveness to students in and outside the classroom.
11. High expectations for student achievement, and the provision of support that helps students meet these expectations.
12. Comprehensive student advising.
13. Enthusiasm for the discipline that transmits the excitement and value of learning.
 - a. Development of new courses and/or new curricula
 - b. Development of more effective measures of student learning
 - c. Development of more effective methodologies of content delivery
 - d. Direction of students in undergraduate research projects, master's thesis research, or internships
 - e. Incorporation into courses of information gained at appropriate professional meetings

B. Scholarship

As a community of scholars, the faculty is expected to impart to students an appreciation of the scholarly activity that forms the basis of knowledge in all disciplines. Recognizing that high quality scholarship takes time to mature, annual publication is not expected.

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members must present evidence of continuing scholarly activity as defined by each academic unit in their annual performance evaluation. Probationary faculty members must document, as part of their professional file, an ongoing research agenda that will lead to peer-reviewed scholarship. Faculty members seeking tenure or promotion to any rank must present evidence of scholarly activity that adds to the pedagogical and/or disciplinary knowledge base and that has been disseminated to the professional community pertinent to their discipline.

The following list is not meant to be all-inclusive. In developing their guidelines, departments should consider other factors, such as accreditation standards and emerging technologies in publishing and presentation, when developing their departmental standards for scholarship.

1. **Examples of scholarship that adds to the disciplinary knowledge base**
 - a. Presentation of new disciplinary knowledge at appropriate professional meetings
 - b. Publication of new disciplinary knowledge in appropriate journals, especially those that are refereed
 - c. Publication of books that add to disciplinary knowledge
 - d. Performances or shows, especially juried or invitational, that are presented to public constituencies

- e. Design and execution of workshops that disseminate knowledge to public constituencies
 - f. Successful development of grants
 - g. Presentations open to the public, such as colloquia, that share new disciplinary knowledge
 - h. Editing of a professional disciplinary journal
 - i. Organizing and implementing a disciplinary lecture series
 - j. Serving as a reviewer of professional journal articles and/or books
2. **Examples of scholarship that adds to the pedagogical knowledge base**
- a. Presentation of innovative teaching techniques at appropriate professional meetings
 - b. Active participation in workshops and conferences for faculty development designed to invigorate teaching
 - c. Publication of innovative teaching techniques in appropriate journals, especially those that are refereed
 - d. Publication of pedagogically related books
 - e. Design and execution of workshops to improve teaching
 - f. Successful development of grants
 - g. Presentations open to the public, such as colloquia, that share new pedagogical knowledge
 - h. Editing a professional journal devoted to pedagogy
 - i. Organizing and implementing a lecture series related to pedagogy
 - j. Serving as a reviewer for pedagogical journal articles and/or books

C. **Service**

Faculty members have a further obligation to share their expertise with students, their colleagues, and public constituencies in a variety of service settings. Faculty members undergoing annual performance review, post-tenure review, probationary review, and reviews for tenure and promotion to any rank must document activities that render service to the institution, community, and/or society at large, which may be represented by:

1. Consulting work, or presentations, to organized entities such as schools, industries, businesses, civic organizations, and clubs that adds to the knowledge base of these entities.
2. Participating membership on departmental, college wide, university wide, or professionally related committees.
3. Participation in University governance, including attendance at departmental, college, and university faculty meetings.
4. Holding office in state, regional, or national professional organizations.
5. Serving as the sponsor/advisor for student organizations.
6. Participation in activities that create, foster, and support connections among student groups, and between student groups and external constituencies.
7. Participation in activities that promote skill development in students outside the classroom.
8. Serving as coordinator of a program or interdisciplinary minor.
9. Coordinating assessment and/or accreditation activities.
10. Active participation in the recruiting of students.

11. Responsibility for a university facility.
12. Effective execution of special assignments requested by department chairs, deans, or other individuals associated with the University.

III. Evaluation of Reassigned Time for Administrative or Supervisory Duties

A number of faculty serve in administrative or supervisory capacities which involve the reassignment of their time from teaching duties to other duties. The evaluation of faculty with reassigned time for other duties should acknowledge this additional dimension of performance with an additional set of criteria. These criteria will vary, depending on the nature of the duties performed by the faculty member. The faculty member, the department chair, and the person supervising the reassigned time will establish appropriate alternate criteria depending on the nature of the duties associated with the reassigned time. This may involve separate evaluations from the department chair and the person supervising the reassigned time. A copy of this agreement will be given to the faculty member, chair, person supervising the reassigned time, college and the PVPAA. This sort of reassigned time should not be given to non-tenured tenure track faculty except in exceptional circumstances. If the reassigned time is outside the department then the person supervising the reassigned time will see that the department gets additional resources if necessary to cover duties previously performed by the faculty member.

IV. Evaluation of Faculty on Sabbatical Leave or in Faculty Connections

If a faculty member is granted a sabbatical or a connections leave in an upcoming academic year, then the faculty member and the Department Chair will establish appropriate criteria for evaluation at the end of the current academic year. Establishing these criteria may involve lowering minimum percentages of teaching, scholarship, and/or service in a typical faculty evaluation; the Chair and the college Dean must approve any such reductions. All criteria will be in writing, and a copy of these criteria will be given to the faculty member, Chair, and college Dean.

If the sabbatical is for the full contract year, then the evaluation should be based exclusively on the parameters of the approved sabbatical. If the sabbatical is for one-half the contract year or the faculty member is part of the Connections program, then the evaluation of areas of teaching, scholarship, and/or service that are not related to the sabbatical or Connections will occur solely for the semester in which the faculty member is not on sabbatical or Connections. For areas of teaching, scholarship, and/or service that are part of the sabbatical or Connections, evaluation must include elements of faculty performance during both semesters.