FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION   **Policy Number: F.07.07**

Scope: All faculty

Purpose: To establish policies that delineate opportunities and obligations for faculty pursuing personal professional career progression at the University of St. Thomas.

POLICY FOUNDATION

Faculty development refers to a specified process of personal professional advancement and progression for faculty at the University of St. Thomas. Faculty evaluation refers to an assessment of personal professional performance of faculty at the University of St. Thomas. The latter provides a measure of the former. To some degree, this policy is shaped by all other faculty policies, since the first obligation of faculty is to serve as a responsible contributor to the academic mission of the University as expressed in the University mission and values and codified in the faculty policies. Faculty evaluation includes both a peer review dimension and an administrative dimension. Faculty development, when evaluated, generates data that provide guidance for and validation of decisions of faculty retention, promotion, tenure, and compensation.

POLICY STATEMENTS

1. **Faculty Development**
   a. Faculty development initiatives are the responsibility of the individual faculty member in negotiation and collaboration with department chairs and/or deans of the individual department or school and furthered by peer collaboration, support, and feedback.

   b. Faculty development initiatives must be congruent with and further the University mission, values, and priorities as well as those of the individual department and/or school.

   c. Deans and/or department chairs are responsible for providing structured, specific mentorship to faculty to provide guidance, support, and feedback for faculty development. Wherever feasible, peers participate in this guidance, support, and feedback, particularly those with demonstrated personal professional achievement. A written report of actions taken to meet this peer and administrative responsibility is included in the school's individual faculty member's employee file. Faculty members can review this written report upon request to the dean.

   d. Faculty development goals are articulated in writing through the annual faculty evaluation process described below in F.07.07(3).

      i. Both long term and short-term goals should be articulated.
      ii. All aspects of the faculty member's contractual conditions should be addressed in the individual development goals.
      iii. Goals can be updated or altered in negotiations with the department chairs and/or deans as necessary or appropriate.
      iv. Goals should also be compatible with the University's policies and procedures including promotion and tenure criteria.

e. Deans are responsible for approval of the individual faculty member's annual goals, which are then forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review and modification as appropriate.

2. Student Development

a. **Teaching.** Excellence in teaching includes the following key features:

   i. sufficient planning, organization, and preparation;
   ii. mastery of, and enthusiasm for, one's subject matter;
   iii. a willingness to provide students with regular feedback and encouragement;
   iv. stimulation of student interest in the subject;
   v. the capacity to foster both students' critical thinking skills and their ability to learn independently;
   vi. remaining current and proficient with modes of pedagogy and discipline-specific knowledge;
   vii. the creation of an environment conducive to learning, one that includes concern and respect for students as individuals and members of a learning community. A faculty member will be approachable and available to students both in and out of the classroom;
   viii. modeling of the lifelong learning that we hope to inspire in our students.

   For librarians, teaching is one component among several job responsibilities. Teaching library science, whether for a credit bearing class or for no credit, does not carry the same weight or central focus as for teaching faculty members. For this reason, the "Teaching" and "Assessment of Teaching" criteria for librarians is given a lessor weight, as appropriate, to individual librarians. This is in accordance with Policy F 03.01, section 5 (f).

b. **Assessment of Teaching.** The following items will be provided as a means of assessing excellence in teaching:

   i. evaluative summaries of classroom visits by chairs and, if relevant, other colleagues;
   ii. course evaluations by students including at least the most recent section of each course taught since the last evaluation;
   iii. student learning outcomes and student success;
   iv. course syllabi;
   v. sample copies of examinations or other assignments used in evaluated courses;
   vi. where applicable, summaries of independent studies and experiential learning projects.

   In addition, faculty may submit letters written by on- or off-campus peers that address the faculty member's intellectual ability, the quality of their syllabi and other course materials, and their pedagogical skills.

c. **University Mentoring**
   Faculty may find opportunities to mentor individual students. Indeed, some of the most

important faculty/student relationships that produce vital development of students occur outside of the formalized academic advising process. Faculty often forge bonds with non-advisee students who are departmental majors or who have their departmental homes elsewhere on campus. Sometimes these mentoring relationships are extensions of academic work; sometimes they extend from the faculty and student's engagement in formal community development activities; sometimes they result from more random interactions that often occur in a relatively small community. Whatever their origins, mentoring relationships are appreciated by both faculty and students and are an important part of student development at the University.

d. **Assessment of Mentoring**
If distinctive mentoring relationships have developed during the time since the last evaluation, the means of evaluation of excellence in mentoring may include the following:

   i.   overviews of the nature, scope, and number of such mentoring relationships since the faculty members last evaluation, presented in his/her written materials;
   ii. at the discretion of the faculty member, student letters overviewing the nature and extent of the mentoring relationships and the manner that the interactions have contributed to the students' ongoing development;
   iii. colleague and department chair letters recognizing the faculty member's outreach to students through informal mentoring.

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assist faculty members in their professional development. It is also the key instrument for all decisions related to tenure, promotion, and other forms of recognition. The process of self-evaluation is a continuing process carried out by the faculty member in consultation with his or her department chair, dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, through periodic visitation and informal consultation. Faculty members are encouraged to meet with their department chair or dean to discuss informally the evaluation procedures.

3. **Faculty Evaluations**
   a. All faculty members are evaluated annually by their individual department/school. All probationary tenure-track faculty also participate in a more substantive review by their individual department/school in their third year.

   b. The department chairs and/or deans are responsible for explaining requirements for tenure and promotion to all new probationary tenure-track and term faculty members upon their initial employment. This responsibility is then incorporated into the mandated annual and subsequent more substantive performance reviews of all faculty members.

   c. All faculty evaluation involves three dimensions:

      i. Self-assessment, by the faculty member, of progression toward meeting individual written goals, both short-term and long-term.
      ii. Self-assessment and assessment by peer colleagues of the discipline-specific promotion and tenure criteria of the faculty member's department and/or school. These criteria address all three domains of evaluation: teaching effectiveness,

          (job knowledge and skills for librarians) research/scholarship/creative works, and University and community services. Discipline-specific criteria are detailed in F.03.01 Promotion and Tenure, 4(e).

    iii. Self-assessment and assessment by peer colleagues of the University-wide promotion and tenure criteria. These criteria address all three domains of evaluation: teaching effectiveness (job knowledge and skills for librarians) research/scholarship/creative works, and University and community services. University-specific criteria are described in greater detail in F.03.01 Promotion and Tenure. Rubrics for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness are described in greater detail in F.03.01(7). Rubrics for the evaluation of research/scholarship/creative works are described in greater detail in F.03.01(8). Rubrics for the evaluation of University and community services are described in greater detail in F.03.01(9).

d. The criteria in Rubric B, Rubric C, and Rubric D may be adjusted as needed to align with a department's discipline specific criteria. Pursuant to faculty development (see F.07.07[1]), the deans work with the department chairs or program directors to formalize these criteria that are expected of all the faculty members in a given department. School deans are responsible for approving such criteria that are then forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review and modification as appropriate

e. The specific performance conditions of each faculty member are identified in the faculty member's contract and must be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation, as described in F.01.06(8) Faculty Contracts, *Contract Conditions.*

f. To facilitate evaluation, the candidate is required to submit relevant documentation as needed or germane and as determined by the individual department/school.

g. Each department and/or school will develop procedures for the annual evaluations. The structural aspects of the evaluation process replicate that of the application of rubrics for promotion and tenure articulated in F.03.01 Promotion and Tenure 10(e). All departments and schools include a peer review component in the annual review process.

h. In evaluating each of the three major domains, those responsible will rate the candidate, interpreting the following three categories in light of how they apply to discipline-specific criteria, the University-wide criteria, the expectations of the University of St. Thomas faculty and the expectations of faculty from comparable institutions:

    i.   exceeds expectations
    ii.   meets expectations
    iii. does not meet expectations

i. Unwritten or undocumented criteria cannot be introduced or applied in review processes.

4. Substantive Faculty Evaluations
a. As described in policy F.03.01 Promotion and Tenure, "all probationary tenure-track faculty participate in a more comprehensive and detailed performance review in their third year."

b. For probationary tenure-track faculty members, their three-year substantive performance review is an integral part of their process toward pursuit of tenure and

promotion and includes a formal performance review by the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee. A detailed description of this review is available in the faculty procedures.

c. All substantive faculty evaluation involves three dimensions:

   i.   Self-assessment, by the faculty member, of progression toward meeting individual written goals, both short-term and long-term.
   ii. Self-assessment and assessment by peer colleagues of the discipline-specific promotion and tenure criteria of the faculty member's department and/or school. These criteria address all three domains of evaluation: teaching effectiveness (job knowledge and skills for librarians), research/scholarship/creative works, and University and community services. Discipline-specific criteria are detailed in F.03.01 Promotion and Tenure, 4(e).
   iii. Self-assessment and assessment by peer colleagues of the campus-wide promotion and tenure criteria. These criteria address all three domains of evaluation: teaching effectiveness (job knowledge and skills for librarians), research/scholarship/creative works, and University and community services. They are described in greater detail in F.03.01 Promotion and Tenure. Rubrics for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness are described in greater detail in F.03.01(7). Rubrics for the evaluation of research/scholarship/creative works are described in greater detail in F.03.01(8). Rubrics for the evaluation of University and community services are described in greater detail in F.03.01(9).

d. The criteria in Rubric B, Rubric C, and Rubric D may be adjusted as needed to align with a department's discipline specific criteria. Pursuant to faculty development (see F.07.07[1]), the deans work with the department chairs or program directors to formalize these criteria that are expected of all the faculty members in a given department. School deans are responsible for approving such criteria that are then forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review and modification as appropriate.

e. Each department and/or school will develop procedures for substantive evaluations. The structural aspects of the substantive evaluation process replicate that of the application of rubrics for promotion and tenure articulated in F.03.01 Promotion and Tenure, 10(e) and the procedures aligned with this policy.

f. In evaluating each of the three major domains, those responsible will rate the candidate, interpreting the following three categories in light of how they apply to discipline-specific criteria, the University-wide criteria, the expectations of the University of St. Thomas faculty and the expectations of faculty from comparable institutions:

   i.   exceeds expectations
   ii. meets expectations
   iii. does not meet expectations

g. Where a substantive evaluation results in the rating of "does not meet expectations" in any of the three domains of academic mission achievement, a process of intervention as described in faculty procedures is initiated.

h. Unwritten or undocumented criteria cannot be introduced or applied in the substantive review processes.

5. **Process of Faculty Evaluation**
   a. The annual faculty evaluations occur after January 1 and concluded before March 1 each year to allow for generated data of an individual faculty member's achievements between January 1 and December 31 of the preceding year to be considered in the anticipated ensuing faculty contract.

   b. Each school will develop a process and the necessary forms for the annual evaluation and the substantive evaluation of their faculty members, including a specified system of peer review. The department chairpersons and/or dean will initiate the process with a written directive and timeline. All faculty are required to respond to the directive, meet the timeline, incorporate peer review, and provide a self-assessment guided by personal short-term and long-term goals, the domains of performance meeting the academic mission and individual contract conditions.

   c. Each faculty member's supervisor, either the department chair or the appropriate dean, will review the faculty member's evaluation documentation, meet with the faculty member and provide evaluation feedback, ranking the faculty member using the ratings described in 3(h) above.

   d. If a faculty member receives a ranking of "does not meet expectations" in any of the three domains of the academic performance in his/her annual evaluation, then a process of intervention is initiated as described in the faculty procedures. If the evidence of improvement specified in the intervention plan is insufficient by the dates established in the plan, the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Dean may take appropriate administrative action.

   e. The faculty member is required to provide a signature on the evaluation documentation, concurrently indicating agreement with or disagreement with the evaluation ratings.

   f. The documentation of the faculty member's review is forwarded to the dean, including the ratings of both the supervisor and the agreement or disagreement of the faculty member. The Dean provides a written review of and comment on the evaluation and forwards the documentation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

   g. The Vice President for Academic Affairs reviews all documentation and forwards the final documentation to the faculty member with signatures of all parties involved.

   h. All actions to be taken based on "Does Not Meet Expectations" ratings of an individual faculty member are initiated upon completion of this process.

6. **Bonuses**

   Bonuses may be available upon meritorious performance at the discretion of the University.

APPROVED: Board of Directors   **Date of Original Formation: 04/21/2014**

Revision Number: 3
Revision Date: 12-01-21
Effective Date: 03-04-22