

# Policy Shell Draft April, 2006

## Introduction

Throughout the course of a semester, faculty evaluate students' performance in a variety of ways (e.g., quizzes, examinations, essays, lab reports, oral presentations, annotated bibliographies), which function as both formative, geared toward the improvement of student performance, and summative, a grade entered in a grade book, means of evaluation. At the end of every semester for each one of our students, we produce a grade that summarizes the complex set of evaluations that we generate throughout the semester. The grades that we produce at the end of every semester are fundamentally summative: We turn to our grade books or Excel spreadsheets, calculate the final grades, and input them through CNU Live. Our letter grades are, of course, turned in to numbers in Banner. Those grades allow the university to produce an updated transcript for each student, which includes updated current and cumulative Attempted Hours, Passed Hours, Earned Hours, GPA Hours, Quality Points and GPA. From these numbers, we can track a student's academic standing, class standing, progress toward graduation, or whether they are on the Dean's List or on academic probation. If, as we all know, we do not input grades by the given deadline, calls go out and we are hunted down and told to enter our grades so that all the grades can be run and the most current set of numbers are produced, so that seniors, hoping to graduate, know whether they will or not.

Over the course of their career at CNU, students develop formatively with the aid of our instruction, advice and guidance, but they are tracked and progress through the university through a numbers-driven bureaucratic system that depends upon summative evaluations.

The system that the Faculty Evaluation Working Group has created is based on a model developed by Raoul Areola in *Developing a Comprehensive Evaluation System*. **The system conforms to how we already evaluate our students.** Key to its success is its formative elements (e.g., a development package), because opportunities for formative work need to be a formal and valued part of any good evaluation process. Just as important is a summative component that can clearly and fairly track and articulate a faculty member's performance through the use of a stable set of values and formulae for annual, merit, probationary, promotion and tenure, reappointment and post-tenure reviews. Below, the summative system is explained.

- I. Purpose
  - a. This system is meant to offer the faculty and administration a consistent, stable means of summative evaluation of faculty performance over the short (1 year) and long (multi-year) term
  - b. The system will have multiple purposes
    - i. Reappointment
    - ii. Tenure and promotion
    - iii. Post-tenure review
    - iv. Merit
  - c. The system will also offer opportunities for development
- II. Matrix/Matrices
  - a. Overview
    - i. The summative system is based on four numerical, formula driven matrices (Excel documents)
    - ii. The matrices
      - 1. 3 sub-matrices: each sub-matrix evaluates one area of faculty performance
        - a. Teaching (Figure 2)
        - b. Service (Figure 3)
        - c. Scholarship (Figure 4)
      - 2. Variable weighting of the sub-matrices
        - a. In order to give the system flexibility annually faculty may vary the weight ratios of the sub-matrices (within a set range).
        - b. The total percentages must add up to 100%
        - c. Weights are negotiated annually with the department chair
        - d. Weights
          - i. Teaching: 40-60%
          - ii. Service: 10-30%
          - iii. Scholarship: 10-30%
      - 3. The primary summative matrix (Figure 5)
        - a. Takes up the results of the three sub-matrices
        - b. To produce an Overall Composite Rating (OCR): that is, a final number
    - b. Sources of information/ratings: Where the data comes from
      - i. Teaching: 3 categories of evaluation
        - 1. Classroom design and delivery skills – student surveys
        - 2. Syllabi and course material – peer group

- 3. Advising – department chair
  - ii. Service
    - 1. Department chair – departmental and community service
    - 2. College dean – college and university service
  - iii. Professional development
    - 1. Peer group
    - 2. Department chair
- III. Procedure – Evaluation Cycle
  - a. At the beginning of the evaluation cycle, faculty meets with department chair to set the weights of the three sub-matrices
  - b. At the end of the evaluation cycle, the sources input summative number into the appropriate matrices
    - i. Teaching
      - 1. Students surveys: From all courses surveyed in an academic year, “Classroom Design and Delivery Skills” will be tabulated and averaged and then entered into the teaching matrix
      - 2. Peer group: Will review a faculty member’s course material for all classes taught in an academic year and render a summative number
      - 3. Department chair will review faculty advising duties for an academic year and render a summative number
    - ii. Service
      - 1. Department Chair will tabulate departmental and community service
      - 2. Dean will tabulate college and university service
    - iii. Professional Development: Peer group and department chair will review professional development material appropriate to each and tabulate numbers for the matrix
  - c. The final numbers from the sub-matrices will then be input into the primary summative matrix, which will produce an OCR.
  - d. At the end of the evaluation period, OCRs will be produced for all department faculty
- IV. Uses of OCR
  - a. Annual Review/Merit
    - i. Merit increase depends on where one’s OCR falls on the scale in relation to the other faculty OCR
    - ii. The higher on the scale, the greater piece of the merit pie one enjoys
  - b. Plotted over time (graph)
    - i. Probationary faculty (example)

1. During the probationary period, the faculty member can have an OCR no lower than X-value for more than one year: X-value or lower triggers a mandatory development plan for the faculty member
2. During the probationary period, the faculty member must score at or above Y-value for at least three years to achieve tenure and promotion
3. If the OCR falls below Z-value at any point in the probationary period, the faculty member is subject to dismissal

ii. Post-tenure review (example)

1. During the post tenure review period, the faculty member can have an OCR no lower than A-value for more than two years before a mandatory development plan for the faculty member is triggered
2. During the post-tenure review period, the faculty member must score at or above B-value for at least three years
3. If the OCR falls below A-value for three or more years during the post-tenure review period, the faculty member must adopt a development plan and achieve a C-value OCR within three years of the post-tenure review or be subject to dismissal.