

To: All Full time and Part Time Faculty
On Continuing Appointments

From: Scott Stevens

Re: ELI Year End Evaluation Procedures and Criteria

Date: Adopted April 13, 1991; amended February 7, 2001, amended again February 5,
2003

This proposal seeks to amend the annual evaluation policy first adopted by the ELI faculty in April 1987 and subsequently revised and adopted on April 13, 1991. This new plan attempts to meet two objectives: (a) build in greater flexibility into the evaluation process by permitting faculty the opportunity to have effort weighted according to their current interest and activity and (b) provide greater assurances of fairness in the evaluation process. This policy is distinct from ELI's promotion and peer review procedures and policies.

Procedures for Allocating Merit Pay Increases

Each year University faculty are awarded across-the-board pay increases that have been specified by the University's Collective Bargaining Agreement with the faculty union. All ELI full time faculty on continuing appointments fall under the guidelines of this agreement. The Director enters these percentage increases on budget turnaround forms without regards to individual performance appraisal.

In addition to across-the-board increases, however, each department receives additional monies to be distributed according to individual faculty appraisals and that department's specific guidelines for merit distribution. The University Budget Office generally issues "minimum" and "maximum" merit percentage rates to prevent huge disparity in the allocation of merit. Since part time faculty are not at this time part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the University has historically required department chairs to award increases to these faculty based entirely on merit increases (a percentage that is generally equal to the combined across-the-board and "average" merit increase rate".

Institute Procedures

In January of each year the director sends an announcement to all full time faculty members to schedule an annual observation. Both the director and the associate director are eligible to conduct observations. The assistant director observes S contract faculty. Prior to their scheduled observation, faculty members must provide the observer with a detailed lesson plan explaining the instructional context for the lesson (i.e., how it fits

with what has previously been taught and what will subsequently be taught), the day's activities and handouts, and any special circumstances about which the observer should be aware. Each instructor is encouraged to specify which area of teaching (i.e., planning, instruction, management, or interpersonal skills) on which he or she wishes the observer to focus. The criteria for the observation are based on "The Effective ESL Teacher" guideline (attached).

In March and April, the director meets with every full time faculty member to conduct an annual evaluation. Prior to that meeting and subsequent to their observation, faculty members are asked by the director to submit a letter (1) reviewing their contribution to the program as well as a self-assessment of their performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service in accordance to the workload planning form that was completed and approved a year ago in consultation with the director and (2) describing their goals for the next year in the same three areas. In the letter, faculty members should also indicate to what extent their efforts contributed to the unit as a whole fulfilling its mission.

Method of Evaluation

The director's evaluation of faculty members is based on the following criteria:

Teaching (60-80% weighted effort)

The category of "teaching" includes classroom or tutoring instruction; course development; Institute seminars and workshops presented; personal instructional development (seminars attended, courses taken, etc.); and student advisement. Teaching is to be evaluated on the basis of the following data:

1. Student course evaluations (required) to be administered every session except those in which an instructor is teaching for fewer than six weeks.
2. Director's or associate director's observation of classroom faculty (required) at least once each year. Faculty may be exempted from observations in the eighteen months immediately following receipt of the letter announcing a positive outcome of a peer review or promotion.
3. Observation by colleagues or outside observers (optional) of faculty at their request. The Director or Associate Director will provide class coverage for colleagues needing to observe other teachers.
4. The classroom faculty's personal written appraisal of his or her teaching performance.
5. Sample materials developed by the faculty member—or any other material the teacher feels appropriate to submit.

Using this information, the Director will evaluate each faculty member on a 0 – 9 scale, based on his or her individual performance for the year. Scores below 4 are considered unsatisfactory; scores of 4 to 5 constitute an acceptable though undistinguished level of performance; scores of 6 to 7 are considered meritorious; and scores of 8 to 9 indicate an excellent to outstanding performance. Part time and full time faculty will be ranked separately.

Research and Scholarly Activities (10 – 30 % weighted effort)

This area is evaluated in more straightforward manner, according to the following formula:

10 x number of books published that year

6 x number of juried articles/chapters published in professional journals or edited books

6 x number of books accepted for publication—to be used for only one year.

4 x number of papers presented at national and international conferences (e.g., NAFSA, TESOL, or JALT)

3 x number of articles published in newsletters and other publications (nonjuried), or the number of regional conference presentations (e.g., PennTESOL, WATESOL, BATESOL, as well as other qualifying conferences)

2 x number of books in progress, with faculty providing evidence of their progress

1 x number of book reviews or conference panel presentations (latter not to be confused with colloquiums or workshops, which are counted as papers)

1 x effort on completed, though unpublished papers

The rating of the instructor in this area, using the same scale described for teaching, is based on the total score derived from the quantity of scholarly activity (see above) as well as an assessment of how successful the instructor was in meeting his or her goals for the year and an assessment, where possible, of the quality of the work and its relevance to the field. Faculty members are encouraged to include any reviews or evaluations of their scholarly activity along with their annual letter to the director.

Service (10 – 30% weighted effort)

This area describes service at the public, University-wide, and department level. Public service includes but is not limited to:

- Efforts on behalf of professional organization (e.g., as in offices held; service does not include presentations or conference attendance, which are addressed in scholarly activity and teaching, respectively);
- Extra-curricular activities or trips with students outside teaching schedules (i.e., non-ELI sponsored activities);
- Special programs or presentations (e.g., Were you a keynote speaker or performance “director” for an ELI graduation? Did you assist with a student performance for some campus event? Did you coordinate special presentations at public schools or with community organizations? Did you assist with an ESL-related program for the public schools or some other agency?)

University service includes but is not limited to:

- Advisement to student groups on campus;
- Active participation in University (e.g., Faculty Senate) or IPSS committees
- Special assignments on behalf of the University outside of the ELI
- Participation in University forums or conferences

Department service includes but is not limited to:

- Proposal grant preparation or administration;
- Coordination of special programs (or other special administrative service);
- Active participation on ELI committees (e.g., scholarship, advisory, orientation, curriculum, technology, student attendance and conduct, newsletter, library, textbook, faculty review, and search;
- Participation in ELI orientation activities (note: teachers are expected to participate in three orientation activities per year--two of which must be all day trips--as well as the holiday party and summer picnic; list the activities in which you participated, making notation of those that exceeded the minimum);
- Effort in special projects or task forces;
- Effort in organizing retreats, guest speaker presentations, or ELI colloquia or training workshops;
- Scheduled administrative duties (interviewing students, testing, etc.)

The year-end letter written by faculty members describing effort in this category will form the basis for assessment in the area of service. However, the Director’s personal observations and those of colleagues will also be included in the evaluation process, which will also make use of the 0 – 9 scale, relative to other faculty.

University/Public Service vs. Department Service

There can be no clear-cut “points” system for evaluating University Service performance. In most aspects of Public and University service, for example, there will be little opportunity for Director’s observations or student/colleague evaluations to guide the Director in making qualitative assessments, for input will tend to come exclusively from each faculty member’s end-of-the-year letter (although faculty are encouraged to submit any letters from colleagues who can evaluate their performance in these areas). Moreover, as a self-supporting unit, service that directly contributes to the enhancement of the Institute must take priority. For this reason, department service activities, which are subject to the Director and colleagues’ direct observation, will generally be weighed twice that of Public or University service.

Exceptions

Exceptions to this lower weighting of University Service activities would include, for example, special appointments to University task forces or committees requiring the Director’s authorization or significant allocation of a teacher’s effort for a specific duration of time. A letter from fellow task force members may prove helpful in making distinctions between attending meeting and completing a major project. Exceptions to a lower weighting of public service activities would include, for example, a teacher’s coordination of a conference or special public event of importance to the community.

In general, faculty should simply enumerate their University and Public service activities and expect roughly one point to be allocated to each qualifying activity item. Faculty should mark and justify those activities that they wish to be considered in the “exceptions” category.

Department Service

Department Service activities will be prioritized in terms of the extent of faculty effort required for each. It is very important to recognize, however, that a number of factors can influence weighting. For example, the curriculum committee (when active) demands much more effort than, say, the scholarship committee and would normally be given greater effort, but an individual member of the curriculum committee who has contributed less in actual effort than that of his or her fellow members shall earn no advantage from serving on this “weightier” committee. In addition, the weighting of effort in grant writing or program coordination will be influenced by the size of the grant or program, whether release time or additional salary has been allocated for the work, and of course the quality of performance in these areas. The rough prioritizing of Department service is provided below, subject to the qualifying factors listed above:

Greatest weighted effort

(Generally three times effort of Public or University service activities)

- Principal investigator or major contributing writer for a major grant or proposal preparation (\$100,000 +)
- Major program coordination (defined by program intensity, objectives, lack of integration into intensive program and complexity)
- Major role in curriculum revision
- Significant role in major task force
- Chair, Newsletter committee

Greater weighted effort

(Generally twice effort of Public or University service activities)

- Principal investigator or major contributing writer for grants less than \$100,000
- Program coordination (smaller, less complex programs or those largely integrated into the IEP)
- Major role in newsletter preparation
- Major role in SALC/computer lab development
- Major role in development of orientation program
- Special administrative assignments
- Important role in curriculum development
- Chair of a search committee
- Chair of a peer review or promotion committee
- Chair of ELI committee showing significant activity
- Significant role on a particularly active ELI committee, as attested to by committee chair

Weighted effort

(Generally equal effort of Public or University service activities)

- Service on ELI standing committees
- Chair of less active ELI standing committees
- Completion of required administrative duties (interviewing, coordinating graduations, proctoring tests)
- Participation on search committees
- Participation on peer review or promotion committees

The total points awarded for all service activity factors significantly into an evaluation of service that also takes into consideration a faculty member's performance, where known, in any of these assignments. On this basis, the director awards a numerical rating on the 0-9 scale.

Faculty Review Process

After all necessary information has been gathered, the Director will complete a faculty appraisal form for each faculty member and review the assessment with each instructor. During this review meeting, the faculty member and director will complete a workload planning form, setting goals and assignments for the new year—and establishing what percentage of effort will be given in each of three areas (teaching, scholarly activity, and service). This planning form serves as a formal commitment by the Director and the faculty member and should be altered only by mutual consent. The faculty member may also offer his or her own comments on the appraisal. Both parties may sign the appraisal at that time; alternately, the faculty member may return after the median rating for all faculty members has been determined to sign the document. The signature of the faculty member will not necessarily signify agreement with the findings of the director. The director will not at that time divulge information concerning merit allocation, since evaluation always precedes budget turnaround.

ELI's Merit Metric Addendum to Faculty Evaluation Procedures (Approved by the faculty on February 5, 2003)

Subsequent to meeting with all faculty members for their annual review, the director will determine the median rating for each category and notify all teachers of these results. The allocation of merit money will be determined by using the following metric approach:

1. A faculty member's rating is multiplied by the allocated workload percentage to get a sub score for *teaching*. For example, an instructor who has agreed to 70% (.70) weighting for teaching and receives a score of "7" has a teaching sub score of 4.90.
2. A faculty member's rating is multiplied by the allocated workload percentage to get a sub score for *scholarly activity*. For example, an instructor who has agreed to 10% (.10) weighting for scholarly activity and receives a score of "6" has a scholarly activity sub score of .60.
3. A faculty member's rating is multiplied by the allocated workload percentage to get a sub score for *service*. For example, an instructor who has agreed to 20% (.20) weighting for service and receives a score of "8" has a service sub score of 1.6.
4. The points for all three categories are then added up. In the previous example, the subscore would be 7.10 (4.9+.60+1.6).
5. Five points are subtracted from each faculty member's subscore. Since "5" is the "at expectation" rating for each category, faculty should fall above that mark for their work to be considered meritorious. Thus a total workload of 100% (.10) x an average rating of 5 for the three areas is 5.0

6. The Director calculates the new final factor (evaluation subscore – 5) and divides all available merit money by the total of all final factors (i.e., number of shares) to determine the value of each share.
7. All available merit money is distributed based on the number of shares earned by each faculty member as a result of his or her final factor.

Note: *ELI faculty have elected for merit to be distributed according to flat dollar amounts assigned to each share, rather than basing the award on a percentage of salary.*

Example of how the metric would be applied using hypothetical ratings of all 15 faculty members

Merit operating assumptions:

1. Merit is distributed based on the number of shares held by each faculty member.
2. The amount of each faculty member’s base salary is not to be the basis of merit distribution.
3. Ratings that do not exceed “5” are not to be considered meritorious for the purpose of merit distribution.

Hypothetical merit pool available to ELI faculty: \$17,500

Hypothetical Ratings for all fifteen faculty members:

	<u>Subscore</u>	<u>Minus 5</u>	<u>Final Factor</u>
1.	7.5	-5	2.5
2.	8.0	-5	3
3.	8.5	-5	3.5
4.	7.0	-5	2.0
5.	6.5	-5	1.5
6.	8.8	-5	3.8
7.	8.3	-5	3.3
8.	7.8	-5	2.8
9.	5	-5	0
10.	4.5	-5	0
11.	6.8	-5	1.8
12.	7.5	-5	2.5
13.	8.3	-5	3.3
14.	8.8	-5	3.8
15.	8.5	-5	3.5
Total ELI factor:			37.3

Divide total factor by total merit pool: $\$17,500/37.3 = \469.17 (value of each share of the merit pool).

Subscore	Minus 5	Factor	Factor *share	Share \$	Old salary	Auto. 2.5%	New Salary
7.5	-5	2.5	2.5 x 469.17	1173	40000	1000	42173
8	-5	3	3 x 469.18	1408	38000	950	40358
8.5	-5	3.5	3.5 x 469.19	1642	37000	925	39567
7	-5	2	2 x 469.20	938	50000	1250	52188
6.5	-5	1.5	1.5 x 469.21	704	55000	1375	57079
8.8	-5	3.8	3.8 x 469.22	1783	53000	1325	56108
8.3	-5	3.3	3.3 x 469.23	1548	51000	1275	53823
7.8	-5	2.8	2.8 x 469.24	1314	48000	1200	50514
5	-5	0	0 x 469.25	0	45000	1125	46125
4.5	-5	0	0 x 469.26	0	50000	1250	51250
6.8	-5	1.8	1.8 x 469.27	845	41000	1025	42870
7.5	-5	2.5	2.5 x 469.28	1173	44000	1100	46273
8.3	-5	3.3	3.3 x 469.29	1548	47000	1175	49723
8.8	-5	3.8	3.8 x 469.30	1783	44000	1100	46883
8.5	-5	3.5	3.5 x 469.31	1642	49000	1225	51867

Total merit distributed: \$17,500

Appealing Annual Evaluation Decisions

The Policy Guide for Department Chairs and Academic Program Directors notes, with regards to annual evaluations, “that no chairperson or any single individual can duplicate the judgment of several committees, nor can performance during a single year determine one’s promotion, nor can these procedures match the extensive and intensive evaluation which takes place when a person comes up for promotion [or peer review].” In other words, based on the evidence of student evaluations, class observations, the faculty member’s year-end report, and other evidence a faculty member may choose to submit (such as peer observations), the director makes his or her best qualitative assessment of a colleague’s performance for the year. Faculty may disagree and have opportunity on the form to indicate where their assessment differs from that of the director. In other words, there may be times when the director and faculty colleague may simply have to agree to disagree.

However, if a faculty member feels strongly that the director has not acted in good faith to render a fair and equitable evaluation and if reasonable attempts to work out a remedy with the director have failed, then he or she should contact the AAUP contract maintenance officer. The maintenance officer will use the information provided by the faculty member to determine the merits of the case. If there are grounds for further action, ELI’s director will be asked to meet with the faculty member and the maintenance officer to address the issue(s) raised. If it isn't resolved at that meeting then the maintenance officer will meet with the vice president for administration and the director to address and resolve the issue(s).

