

**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

I. Board of Visitors Policy

- A. A regular review 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.

II. Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty

- A. These procedures are designed to implement the policy established by the Board of Visitors for evaluation of faculty. In all cases, the board policy is governing.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.

- D. In the case of tenured faculty members, the department chair will also conduct annual evaluations. These evaluations will be based on the Faculty Information Sheet, student evaluations of teaching, up-to-date curricula vitae, peer evaluation of course portfolios, and such other information as the faculty member or the chair wishes to include. The evaluation 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. (See section F below.) 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 C), 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 (such as designation as an eminent scholar) unless an in-depth evaluation as described in paragraphs E or K has been conducted in the previous twelve months.
- E. 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.
1. 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.") Among items for consideration are the following:
    - a. Student opinion questionnaires - Results of current student opinion questionnaires must be used in the evaluation. Such results, however, constitute important raw data concerning teaching performance and cannot be meaningful in themselves unless interpreted in relationship to other factors. It is the responsibility of the chair to provide such interpretive evaluation.
    - b. Student interviews.
    - c. Results of student achievement tests, if feasible and appropriate.
    - d. Peer evaluations of course portfolios or their equivalent.
    - e. Other relevant information.
    - f. If the principal contribution of the faculty member to the department is in the area of instruction, the number of student credit hours produced by the faculty member should also be taken

into consideration since the best teachers should be showing a decided impact on the largest number of students.

- g. Faculty members who teach noncredit courses, workshops, or colloquia in their area of specialization that are sponsored by the university should have their performance in these activities included as part of the evaluation of teaching.
  - h. Faculty members who are assigned to teach credit or non-credit courses, workshops, or colloquia using distance education technologies, such as instructional television, should have their performance in this activity included in the evaluation of their teaching. The evaluation should include criteria specific to distance education and, when appropriate, evaluations obtained through regional or national consortia, such as National Technological University.
  - i. If the faculty member is working within interdisciplinary courses or is on loan from another department for a portion of his/her teaching, it is the responsibility of the chair to seek out evaluations from other chairs with whom the faculty member is working and to incorporate these in the evaluation.
2. 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. Within the definitions noted below, 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. The following, where appropriate, are included in the definition of scholarly activity and research at Old Dominion University:
- a. Publications - In evaluation, the chair should take into consideration and comment upon the reputation and editorship of journals in which the faculty member has published and the nature of the reviews received for published books. Evaluation of the quality of the publication is essential. For major personnel decisions (e.g., tenure and promotion) external evaluations of the publication are encouraged and may be required.

- b. Presentations at professional meetings - The chair will be expected to evaluate such presentations on a similar basis to publications in learned journals - that is, taking into consideration the extent of external peer review before acceptance of the paper and the prestige associated with having a paper accepted for presentation at that meeting.
- c. Grants and contracts - In evaluation of faculty members' funded research activity, the chair should take into consideration the aggressiveness with which the faculty members have sought out research opportunities (considering their availability of opportunities in their fields), the effectiveness with which faculty members have met the requirements established by the funding agency, the effectiveness with which the faculty members have worked with graduate assistants and colleagues, and the leadership which faculty members have provided on particular grants (as principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or major participant).
- d. Computer software and educational media - Creative work resulting in the creation of significant computer software or educational materials (e.g., videotapes) for use external to the university will be evaluated by the chair based on external evaluations and reviews.
- e. Instructional research - the chair should give credit to effective instructional research by faculty members, with emphasis on well-designed and controlled research in teaching, particularly in their own disciplines, and the recognition that the instructional research has received through publication or adoption at other institutions.
- f. In the creative fields, such as music, theater, and art, performance and exhibition are counted as research activity. The chair should evaluate the quality of the artistic production, using evidence such as published reviews of performance or awards in juried exhibitions.
- g. In technical and professional fields where a master's degree is recognized as the terminal degree by the appropriate accrediting agency, research activities may include applied projects which directly support the needs of industry, and/or the community and results in a comprehensive published technical report. Examples of other appropriate research and scholarly activities are publications in trade journals, monographs, development of new products, processes, or techniques and software development.



quantity of service should be evaluated. The chair should evaluate service on departmental committees and seek the evaluation of the dean for college committees, the president or the provost and vice president for academic affairs for university committees, and the chair of the Faculty Senate for Faculty Senate committees.

6. Cooperation with the Office of Admissions in recruiting of students to the university - The evaluation of the director of admissions should be sought by the chair for faculty members engaged in recruitment activities.
  7. Other departmental, college, and university service - Specific roles in working with other university departments (for example, the Academic Television Services, the Office of Residence life, or the University Library) may be given to the individual faculty members. The chair should seek the evaluation of the director of the unit involved.
- b. Community service, i.e., the application of a faculty member's professional skills for the service of the community in a manner that assists in the fulfillment of the mission of the university - Professional service does not include service to religious, political, or social organizations that (although meritorious in itself) is not relevant to the faculty member's professional area.
1. Service to university outreach programs - From time to time the university will develop specific non-instructional outreach programs and centers in such areas as improvement of the urban environment or marine studies. Service in these areas should be evaluated by the chair after consultation with the director of the program or center.
  2. Noncredit courses, workshops, projects, and colloquia in areas of the faculty member's expertise - The chair should seek the evaluation of the director of the appropriate noncredit program in determining the quality of work being done by the faculty member in relating to the community. (In some cases, of course, such programs would be considered part of departmental teaching or service and would be evaluated under these categories.)
  3. Speaking activities, particularly through the university Speakers Bureau - Attempts to evaluate quality rather than quantity must be made.

4. Consulting, either reimbursed or unreimbursed - The chair should seek to learn and evaluate the degree to which consulting activities have been considered successful by the agency employing the faculty member. Consulting activities, if they are to be credited positively in the evaluation, must have the prior approval of the chair, the dean, and the provost and vice president for academic affairs and must be clearly related to the university's mission and the faculty member's responsibilities in teaching, research, and service.
  5. Any other ways in which the faculty member is using professional knowledge for the service of constituencies in the Eastern Virginia region.
- c. Service to the discipline
1. Service to scholarly or professional societies - This category may include holding of office, editing proceedings, reading non-research papers, being instrumental in bringing a group to campus and serving on the local arrangements committee, developing a teleconference, and any other ways in which the faculty member is active within such a society. It is the responsibility of the chair to evaluate the quality of the work done for the society by the faculty member and the stature of the society itself and its relevance to the mission of the university.
  2. Service as editor or reader for a scholarly journal in the field -The chair should be familiar with and comment on the prestige and quality of the journal involved.
  3. Any other way in which the faculty member is making a contribution to the advancement of the discipline other than in areas relevant to teaching and research.
4. As part of the evaluation, the chair should include a summary of the faculty member's performance as it relates to the expected role that the faculty member is to play in the department. In the case of faculty members who are working toward the criteria for tenure, the evaluation should specifically address the expected role the faculty member is to play in the projected long-term needs of the department. The chair should indicate whether:

- a. the faculty member is performing demonstrably above the expected criteria;
  - b. the faculty member is living up to the expectations of the relevant rank and place in the department; and
  - c. the faculty member is falling short of the expected criteria.
- F. 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. 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 as described in section K below. The chair should take particular care in the counseling of non-tenured faculty members who are working toward the criteria for tenure.
- G. 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.
- H. The dean evaluates in writing the performance of the faculty member by either:
  - 1. endorsing the evaluation of the chair; or
  - 2. indicating areas in which the dean's evaluation differs from that of the chair.
- I. 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.
- J. 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. It is important that the review extend beyond certifying adequate teaching performance and focus on creative ability, productivity, and potential to excel.

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.

In situations where a faculty member receives one or two years of credit toward tenure, the review process will be conducted after the second year of service at Old Dominion University.

- K. Where a pattern of performance deficiency has been noted on the part of a tenured faculty member over a two-year period, the chair and dean may conduct a post-tenure review.
- L. 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.