

Chapter 4

Faculty Annual Reviews

4.1 EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY (formerly 2.4)

4.1.1 FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW (FAR)¹ (formerly 2.4.1 and 2.4.1.1)

The purpose of faculty annual review (FAR) is to encourage faculty to fully develop their potential as instructors, scholars, leaders, and citizens of the academic community (formative purpose); to promote activities and achievements that further the goals of the university; and to provide appropriate information for making personnel decisions (summative purpose). Faculty evaluations should be completed on all full-time and part-time faculty.

Generally, procedures developed for evaluation of faculty should be rigorous and fair and be conducive to the development and support of a wide range of faculty talent and interests, while channeling faculty efforts toward teaching and other activities essential to the university's fulfillment of its mission.

Since academic disciplines differ, it is appropriate that each discipline develop its own faculty evaluation procedures and conduct its own evaluations. The information in this handbook section represents guidelines to be followed by each unit in developing evaluation procedures. All evaluation systems should address the areas of teaching and advising (as assigned), scholarly and creative productivity, service/community engagement, and collegiality. They must also describe general procedures for using evaluation data. Finally, for those faculty serving in administrative roles, the administrative duties and goals should be evaluated in the FAR in addition to the aforementioned areas.

An annual performance review of all full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty shall be conducted by the department head, dean/director, or supervisor by the end of the spring semester; it shall be based upon evidence of performance in the calendar year (Spring, Summer, and Fall terms). Faculty will submit their annual review materials to their supervisor at the beginning of the spring semester. The purpose of the FAR is to provide documentation for tenure, promotion, or reappointment, and to provide feedback to faculty members about their ongoing performance and the extent to which they have met applicable performance criteria for their role. Faculty evaluations may be used in decisions regarding salary, reappointment of non-tenured faculty, promotion, tenure, participation in faculty development activities, and/or administrative appointments.

4.1.2 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION PROCEDURES² (formerly 2.4.1.2)

¹ Revised 06/2023

² Revised 06/2023

As referenced above, the evaluation process used in each school shall be based on Teaching Effectiveness and Academic Advisement, Scholarly/Creative Activity, Service/Community Engagement, Collegiality, and/or Professional Effectiveness of Librarians. For some faculty, Faculty Administrative Responsibilities may also be addressed in the evaluation process.

In determining the effectiveness of faculty members, the combined workload of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service/community engagement shall be determined by each school in conjunction with the institution's mission. The workload percentages for evaluation should reflect the actual workload of the faculty member. Any overload and/or administrative responsibilities should be included. A factor in determining overall annual performance must be the relative percentage associated with each of the areas of performance.

After a review of all evaluation information, the department head's and/or dean's conclusions will be communicated to the faculty member in an evaluation meeting. The evaluation meeting must provide an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions, and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and the supervisor.

4.1.3 DEVELOPMENT OF FORMATIVE PLAN³ (formerly 2.4.1.3)

Following communication of the department head's or supervisor's evaluation, the department head/supervisor and the faculty member will establish a formative plan that sets the goals, objectives, and workload percentages for the next evaluation period. The formative plan should be consistent with the goals and needs of the department and university.

4.1.4 THIRD YEAR REVIEW*⁴ (formerly 2.4.1.4)

At the time of the third annual evaluation, tenure-track faculty will be reviewed on the performance of the past thirty-six months to ensure that the candidate for promotion and tenure is appropriately progressing toward meeting the promotion and tenure expectations. The detailed Third Year Review portfolio will be submitted to the department head and/or dean as part of the FAR. The department head and/or dean will review the portfolio and document findings on the Third Year Review form. The Third Year Review Form should be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file within the department; a copy sent to the Provost's office. Additionally, the department head may choose to write a letter for the faculty member's file inclusive of strengths, recommendations, and a full tenure/promotion appraisal.

*Department heads/deans should be cognizant of service credit received by faculty members when determining timing of third year review. For instance, a faculty member receiving two years of service credit toward promotion and tenure would receive a third-year review at the end of the first year at JSU.

³ Revised 06/2023

⁴ Revised 06/2023

4.2 EVALUATION PROCEDURES OF ADJUNCT FACULTY⁵ (formerly 2.4.2)

Adjunct faculty serving in roles as full-time temporary or part-time temporary should receive an evaluation of teaching effectiveness annually, based upon their teaching schedule. The evaluation should be completed by the supervisor and sent to the Dean's office of the respective school. The supervisor of the adjunct should use the Adjunct Faculty Teaching Evaluation Form for completion of this process.

4.3 TEACHING AND ADVISING/PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATION (formerly 2.4.3)

4.3.1 CRITERIA FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS⁶ (formerly 2.4.3.1)

Evaluation procedures must properly reflect that teaching is the priority of faculty members. Faculty members at Jacksonville State University are scholarly teachers who provide evidence that their teaching is effective. Effective teaching will be documented through student and peer evaluations as well as through self-evaluation. Students will evaluate teachers on the professional aspects of teaching and on their response to instruction. Peers may evaluate pedagogical content knowledge as well as the professional aspects of teaching. Faculty members will provide a self-evaluation on the relationship between their instruction and relevance to the discipline.

Given JSU's mission as a learning-centered community, the following areas of effective teaching should be addressed:

1. Content expertise, which includes command of one's subject, knowledge of current developments in one's discipline and pedagogy, and the ability to relate one's subject to other areas of knowledge.
2. Instructional delivery skills, which include the use of interactive technology skills that promote or facilitate learning, effectiveness in communicating with students, the ability to stimulate and broaden student interest in the subject matter, and the ability to motivate students to engage in independent work.
3. Instructional design skills, which include the ability to design and implement effective program, course, and/or instructional experiences to promote student learning.
4. Student learning outcomes and assessment skills, which accurately measure that learning has occurred.

4.3.2 EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS⁷ (formerly 2.4.3.2)

Each program or department should use as many of the following sources as are appropriate and feasible to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness:

⁵ Revised 06/2023

⁶ Revised 06/2023

⁷ Revised 06/2023

1. Course materials (syllabi, assignments, exams, etc.) reflective of knowledge, organization, innovation, and teaching/pedagogical skills including, if in use, the learning management system organization of each course.
2. Student evaluations. The evaluator using these data must be cognizant of the relevant class and course characteristics that affect student ratings.
3. Evaluations by the department head, program director, or dean.
4. Evaluations by peers from inside and/or outside the university.
5. Self-evaluation.
6. Further course work or other continuing educational activities such as seminars and workshops in one's field.
7. Professional development, including, but not limited to, participation in seminars and workshops on pedagogy.
8. Evidence of student-learning outcomes.
9. Evidence of course development/revisions and/or program development/revisions.
10. Evidence of student work if applicable.
11. Evidence of work with graduate students, including theses, dissertations, and degree completions.
12. Teaching Awards/Honors.

4.3.3 CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVENESS IN ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT/PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATION⁸ (formerly 2.4.4.1)

The following criteria should be addressed when evaluating student advisement/professional consultation:

1. Ability to help students select a course of study appropriate to their interests and aptitudes.
2. Ability to assist students in academic and career planning.
3. Use of the services and support from the Office of Career Services.
4. Use of EAB-GradesFirst/Navigate to improve student academic outcomes.

4.3.4 EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS IN ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT/PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATION⁹ (formerly 2.4.4.2)

Effectiveness in advisement/professional consultation should be assessed and documented by the following:

1. Evaluation by supervisor.
2. Self-evaluation.
3. Student evaluations.
4. Letters of reference.
5. Participation in workshops or seminars designed to improve academic advisement skills.
6. Documentation from EAB-GradesFirst/Navigate.

⁸ Revised 06/2023

⁹ Revised 06/2023

4.4 PROFESSIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF LIBRARIANS¹⁰ (formerly 2.4.5)

Since librarians are seldom involved in formal pedagogical activities with students, they are usually evaluated on professional effectiveness rather than teaching effectiveness and academic advisement.

4.4.1 CRITERIA FOR PROFESSIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF LIBRARIANS¹¹ (formerly 2.4.5.1)

The attributes and qualifications to be documented in assessing the effectiveness of librarians should be related to the appropriate position classification and include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Command and knowledge of one's specialty area and ability to instruct in such areas as required.
2. Fulfillment of one's principal responsibilities as stated in the job description, performance contracts, or other guidelines, as published by the dean of library services.
3. Knowledge of current developments in one's area of responsibility.
4. Ability to effectively use ideas gained from individual study and observation for the improvement of one's area of responsibility in the library.
5. Ability to direct the activities of subordinate staff members.
6. Ability to interact and communicate effectively with library patrons.

4.4.2 EVIDENCE OF PROFESSIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF LIBRARIANS¹² (formerly 2.4.5.2)

Sources of documentation for evaluating librarians' effectiveness should include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Self-reflections.
2. Supervisor evaluations.
3. Evaluation by users of the librarian's expertise.
4. Evaluation by outside experts.

4.5 SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY¹³ (formerly 2.4.6)

Departments should recognize and evaluate a wide variety of scholarship activities consistent with the department's and the University's missions. Scholarly activities should not be rigidly categorized. Many activities and products can be classified as more than one type of scholarship.

¹⁰ Revised 06/2023

¹¹ Revised 06/2023

¹² Revised 06/2023

¹³ Revised 06/2023

To ensure consistency within the school, the dean, along with department heads, will approve departmental criteria, and its equivalents, for departmental scholarly requirements. In the evaluation of such activities, quality should prevail over quantity.

Consistent with its mission and vision as a regionally engaged institution, Jacksonville State University defines scholarship broadly through the Boyer model (Glassick, Huber, Maeroff, 1997), which includes four categories of scholarship:

1. **Scholarship of Discovery:** The scholarship of discovery encompasses what academics historically have referred to as basic or traditional “research,” as well as creative work in the literary, visual, and performing arts. Its primary purpose is understood as “contributing to the stock of human knowledge and the intellectual climate of a college or university.”
 - a. Examples: refereed publications based on research, scholarly books, book chapters, entries in reference works, performances, exhibits, digital media, and/or monographs.
2. **Scholarship of Integration:** The scholarship of integration involves faculty members “overcoming the isolation and fragmentation of the disciplines, making connections within and between the disciplines, altering the contexts in which people view knowledge and offsetting the inclination to split knowledge into ever more esoteric bits and pieces.”
 - a. Examples: professional development workshops, literature reviews, presentations of research at scholarly conferences or invited conference presentations/roundtables, and non-academic publications that address discipline-related concerns.
3. **Scholarship of Application:** The scholarship of application moves toward engagement as the scholar asks, “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?” Lessons learned in the application of knowledge can enrich teaching, and new intellectual understanding can arise from the very act of application. In brief, theory and practice interact in such ventures and improve each other.
 - a. Examples: research grants; development of centers for study or service; research projects that address issues of local, state, or other need; preparation of documents such as briefs, manuals, or other publications based on research for the good of the community (theory into practice); consultation arranged through the Office of the Provost and VPAA or as requested by other organizations; service as an editor or editorial board member of a discipline-related professional publication or other form of media (newspaper, magazine, literary magazine, scholarly professional journal, CD, video, website); new program development; conference planning— including paper, poster, abstract reviews, etc. Application of research for assessment; program reviews; accreditation reports, including surveys created, administered, and analyzed. Evidence of unpublished discipline-specific scholarship that is peer reviewed.
4. **Scholarship of Teaching:** The scholarship of teaching “initiates students into the best values of the academy, enabling them to comprehend better and participate more

fully in the larger culture.” Reciprocal benefits flow as well to the faculty members who enrich their teaching by building on what they learn in exchanges with students.

- a. Examples: a publication of findings in a pedagogical journal or presentation with peers at a conference external to JSU.

4.5.1 CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY¹⁴ (formerly 2.4.6.1)

Scholarly/creative activity should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

1. Sustained inquiry in one’s discipline.
2. Scholarly productivity demonstrated by publication or, when appropriate, artistic works and performances.
3. Submission of significant proposals for research grants and projects.
4. Presentation of scholarly findings/creative work at professional meetings.
5. Submission of significant program/school/university-related documents (e.g., policies/procedures, annual reports, manuals/handbooks, new program proposals, curriculum development documents required to meet accreditation requirements, etc.).
6. Sharing expertise with the university community.
7. Use of research in developing new curricula, teaching methods, library services, or programs.

4.5.2 EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY¹⁵ (formerly 2.4.6.2)

Excellence in scholarly/creative activity should be assessed by evidence produced by the following types of procedures and activities:

1. Documented self-report of activities.
2. Evaluation by professional peers.
3. Publications, presentations, performances, and/or creative works.
4. Awards of grants, prizes, commendations, residencies, or proposals submitted for external/internal funding opportunities.
5. Demonstrated skills in the methods of one's scholarly discipline.
6. Technical reports, program proposals, accreditation documents, or other reports that are peer evaluated.
7. Community response to outreach programs, other evaluations or studies of impacts and outcomes of outreach or partnership activities that have led to scholarly reports, policies, academic and/or professional presentations, publications, etc.

4.6 SERVICE/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT¹⁶ (formerly 2.4.7)

The university considers service to include activities related to the university, the school/department, the community, and the profession. Community engagement, as defined

¹⁴ Revised 06/2023

¹⁵ Revised 06/2023

¹⁶ Revised 06/2023

by the Carnegie Campus Compact and JSU, is collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

4.6.1 CRITERIA FOR SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE/DEPARTMENT¹⁷ (formerly 2.4.7.1)

Service should include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:

1. Service on departmental/program committees, attendance at departmental/program meetings, participation in decision-making, curriculum development, and program evaluation.
2. Participation on school/university committees.
3. Leadership in some area of school/university governance.
4. Service as chair of a committee, director of a program, or officer of the faculty senate (without extra compensation).
5. Service as an advisor to an approved student organization.
6. Service as a representative of the university to the larger regional, national, or international community.

4.6.2 EVIDENCE OF SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE/DEPARTMENT¹⁸ (formerly 2.4.7.2)

Demonstration of university/college/department/program service activities should include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following types of evidence:

1. Documented self-reflection of activities.
2. Evaluations by the dean, department head, or program director.
3. Committee reports of participation.

4.6.3 CRITERIA FOR SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION/DISCIPLINE¹⁹ (formerly 2.4.7.3)

Service activities in support of the profession/discipline include, but are not necessarily limited to:

1. Leadership positions in professional organizations.
2. Appointment in a scholarly capacity to a state, regional, or national post.
3. Participation in professional organizations.
4. Presentation of papers (other than research) before learned societies.
5. Service in the individual's professional area as a consultant or resource person.
6. Review of creative work (without extra compensation).

4.6.4 EVIDENCE OF SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION/DISCIPLINE²⁰ (formerly 2.4.7.4)

Demonstration of service to the profession/discipline should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

1. Documented self-reflection of activities.
2. Evaluation by professional peers.

¹⁷ Revised 06/2023

¹⁸ Revised 06/2023

¹⁹ Revised 06/2023

²⁰ Revised 06/2023

3. Published citations or acknowledgments of contributions.

4.6.5 CRITERIA FOR SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT²¹ (formerly 2.4.7.5)

Service to the community should reflect the application of knowledge and skills related to one's professional field and may include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following. Community engagement activities include, but are not limited to, inquiry into community, engaged teaching and learning, and/or forms of participatory action research with community partners that embody both the characteristics of community engagement and scholarship.

1. Lectures or performances to community groups.
2. Participation as a member of, or as a consultant (without compensation) to, non-profit organizations designed to serve the general public.
3. Service Learning. Service learning is a pedagogical technique in which students participate in volunteer community service as part of their work for class. Students apply the skills and knowledge from their classes in their service and reflect, in the classroom, on the people, organizations, agencies, and social institutions they encounter. Students use volunteer work as a foundation for their course work throughout the semester. For faculty, service learning may be considered service to the university as a part of curriculum development and, by definition, service to the community.
4. Public art installations.

4.6.6 EVIDENCE OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT²² (formerly 2.4.7.6)

Demonstration of appropriate service to the community should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

1. Self-reflections adequately documented.
2. Recognition of service by community groups or leaders.
3. News articles or announcements.
4. For community engagement, evaluation of community partnerships, documentation of community response to outreach programs, or other studies of impacts and outcomes of outreach or partnership activities that have led to scholarly reports, policies, academic and/or professional presentations, publications, etc. These examples may also reflect scholarly activities.

4.7 FACULTY ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE DEPARTMENT²³ (formerly 2.4.8)

²¹ Revised 06/2023

²² Revised 06/2023

²³ Revised 06/2023

4.7.1 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE/DEPARTMENT²⁴ (formerly 2.4.8)

Across the university, many faculty are assigned administrative responsibilities which vary from program to program. Some faculty may serve as department heads, program coordinators, program chairs, grant coordinators, etc. The department head should evaluate the administrative assignment of the faculty to determine if the responsibilities are indeed administrative versus service activities. Faculty also serving in administrative roles should be evaluated on that role during the Faculty Annual Review. Faculty serving as department head, are evaluated by the dean.

Specific criteria and evidence to evaluate effectiveness should be determined in consultation with the department head and/or dean and align with the goal of the administrative role.

Faculty administrative responsibilities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Program oversight.
2. Grant oversight.
3. Recruitment/marketing.
4. Program reports.
5. Coordination or oversight of capstone courses, field placements, practica, co-op/internship experiences, etc.
6. Program admission decisions and advisement.
7. Mentorship and training of faculty.
8. Assistance with program evaluation and/or accreditation activities.
9. Evaluation of program outcomes.
10. Overall management of an academic department.

4.7.2 EVIDENCE FOR FACULTY ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE/DEPARTMENT²⁵ (formerly 2.4.8.1)

Demonstration of appropriate administrative responsibilities should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

1. Documented self-reflection of administrative responsibilities.
2. Enrollment trends.
3. Documented marketing activities.
4. Trended program reports regarding capstone courses, field placements, practica, co-op/internship experiences etc.
5. Advisement reports.
6. Recruitment and retention reports.
7. Program outcomes reports.
8. Other reports or documentation which reflect administrative effectiveness or successful completion of responsibilities.

All evidence sources listed may not be applicable for all administrative roles. Other evidentiary sources may be identified as appropriate.

²⁴ Revised 06/2023

²⁵ Revised 06/2023

4.8 COLLEGIALLY²⁶ (formerly 2.4.9)

4.8.1 CRITERIA FOR COLLEGIALLY²⁷ (formerly 2.4.9.1)

Demonstrate a willingness and ability to work effectively with colleagues to support the mission of the university and the common goals of the academic unit, which includes working professionally with colleagues to create an academic community that values the contributions of all members and encourages cooperation and collaboration. Any aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impacts performance, positive or negative, will be addressed in faculty annual reviews.

4.8.2 EVIDENCE OF COLLEGIALLY²⁸ (formerly 2.4.9.2)

Demonstration of collegiality should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

1. Self-reflection adequately documented.
2. Effective team teaching, if applicable, as evaluated by the dean/department head.
3. Letters of support by professional peers.
4. Recognition of collegiality by peers, community groups, and/or leaders.
5. Letters of support from committee members, program/department colleagues, colleagues external to the university.

²⁶ Revised 06/2023

²⁷ Revised 06/2023

²⁸ Revised 06/2023