

Department of French & Italian
Revised Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures

Approved by the Department on 20 Oct. 2005

Approved by the Provost on 9 Nov. 2006

Note: The original departmental plan was approved on December 10, 1996. Changes were made on January 30, 1997, in response to recommendations from the College Office. Further changes were made in August 1997, in response to recommendations from the Office of the Provost, and again in February 2005 (approved by Provost March 2006).

Introduction.

The Department of French and Italian has a long tradition of evaluation of faculty, dating back to a time well before it was required other than for promotion and tenure procedures or for merit salary recommendations. Student evaluations have been used in various forms since before 1950 (when French was a part of the Department of Romance Languages). Chairs and/or committees have reviewed faculty performance in all areas and chairs have discussed ways for improving performance with their colleagues as a matter of professional collegiality. This document codifies and makes explicit procedures already in place and adds others to conform to current university regulations.

Statements of Performance Expectations.

- A. The Department of French and Italian expects its faculty to excel in a traditional balance of professional activities: research, teaching (including advising), and service to the department, school, university, profession and community. All faculty are expected to excel in all three areas. The expected distribution of effort for the department as a whole is 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service.

- B. The minimal acceptable level of performance for a faculty member is: quantitatively, meeting the agreed upon allocation of effort for each year in each of the three categories; qualitatively, being evaluated as "good" in all three categories. Evaluation procedures are described below, under "Portfolio Review and Evaluation." Current goals are, for each category:

- 1. Teaching.

Quantitative. The normal load at the 40-40-20 formula is four courses per academic year (two per semester). Exceptions may be made for those in administrative roles. Teaching assignments (specific courses) are made by a scheduling committee of the whole of the Faculty, headed by the Chair, who is the department's Scheduling Officer. The committee attempts to maintain balance in the assignment of graduate and undergraduate courses while being guided by the needs of our students for particular courses.

Qualitative. We expect faculty to score overall in the EXC/VG columns on the attached student evaluation forms (by long experience, we recognize that there will be some individual students who rate a faculty member as G, P or VP and that there will be some items on which the person is not rated above G by any student: we look for a pattern) and to be described by students in the comment section as a person who embodies the qualities specified in that form. When requested by a faculty member, peer evaluations

are considered in assessing his or her overall teaching performance.

Additional explanation of criteria: A faculty member is expected to know his/her field thoroughly and to keep abreast of developments in that/those fields. S/he is expected to motivate students in a positive way and to provide students with timely and practical feedback through exams, papers, and other instruments (with comments, not just grades).

We expect faculty members to be available for consultation at OFFICE HOURS (an OH list is maintained by the secretary and OH are to be announced in the syllabus and posted on office doors) and/or by appointment.

Thesis/Dissertation Direction is an important contribution to the graduate teaching function of the department. Faculty members are expected to maintain expertise in their field so that they may direct students in an informed way as they develop a topic, do their research, and write their dissertation. Timely return of drafts and efficient coordination with second and third readers (and as second and third readers) is part of appropriate performance of this duty.

Advising is considered an essential part of teaching and each faculty member is expected to contribute to the departmental advising effort, either in graduate advising, undergraduate major advising, freshman-sophomore advising, placement advising, or some combination of the above. All advisers are expected to be aware of the rules for completion of requirements, etc., but emphasis is placed on advising students as persons interested in a liberal arts education, not simply on fulfilling requirements for graduation.

2. Research.

Faculty are expected to remain active in their fields by keeping abreast of current developments and conducting research that will lead to presentation of their findings at scholarly conferences and/or in scholarly journals. Books and articles in refereed journals are given greater weight than papers delivered at conferences. Both the quality of research and the quantity of research will be valued. Publication in refereed journals will be one measure of quality, as will the demonstrated recognition of the significance of the faculty member's research by others (citations to her/his work).

3. Service.

All faculty are expected to contribute to the functioning of the department, the college, the university, and the community by serving on committees, fulfilling administrative duties, serving in professional organizations, etc. Tenured professors are expected to make more substantial contributions in this area than untenured professors.

[The attached self-evaluation form, completed each year by each faculty member, indicates how each of these categories is covered in the evaluation process.]

- C. At the beginning of each evaluation period, the Chair will consult with each faculty member and determine the goals and expectations for that person, including any differential allocation of effort in the three categories. No faculty member will be permitted to choose to go below 40% in teaching, nor 30% in research, nor 10% in service. The Chair will consider each case, then assign percentages and approve the

statement of goals and expectations. Faculty members may contest the Chair's decision; arbitration by a faculty committee of three persons will be used if discussion does not lead to a mutually acceptable solution; should that be unsuccessful, the faculty member may appeal as specified in Section II.E. of the University Council Document on Faculty Evaluation.

If a faculty member fails to meet the agreed upon allocation of effort in a given year in each of the three categories, and if the faculty member does not receive an evaluation of at least "good" in all three categories, the department chair and the individual will develop a plan to address the areas of difficulty. Continued failure to demonstrate progress following development of an intervention plan will result in the Chair initiating a recommendation of dismissal.

Annual Evaluation System.

Overview.

Evaluations are conducted at the beginning of the spring semester for the previous calendar year. The Chair is responsible for informing faculty that self-evaluations are due on a given date (usually in January: we follow the schedule of the College). The department's Faculty Evaluation Board reviews those self-evaluations plus all other documentation. Following the Faculty Evaluation Board's deliberations, the Chair prepares a written evaluation for each faculty member. A minimum of a full week is allowed for the faculty members to review the Chair's statements and, if they choose to do so, to make appointments to discuss the evaluation. All of this takes place well before the time usually set for merit salary decisions.

Portfolio Preparation.

The portfolio will consist of the self-evaluation file that each faculty member submits to the Faculty Evaluation Board for review and of documents that the Chair adds as they are received during the year. The self evaluation will contain, in addition to a current CV and a detailed outline of what has been accomplished in the previous year, all relevant documentation, including, but not restricted to: copies of all published research, any supporting documentation regarding the quality of publications (reviews of and/or references to the work), student evaluations for each course taught, unsolicited letters from students, supporting documentation regarding quality of service. The documents added by the Chair may include peer evaluations and letters addressed to the Chair. The Chair will inform the faculty member of the number and type of those additions, as is done in the promotion and tenure process.

Portfolio Review and Evaluation.

The Faculty Evaluation Board will review the portfolio, as described above in "Overview." In assessing quantity, the Board will take into account (1) the elected percentages for the year in question, (2) the department's statement of criteria for evaluation produced for that year--e.g. number of active committee memberships for service, number of publications for research, number of courses taught for teaching. In assessing quality, the Board will take into account the department's statement of criteria and a review of the data provided (publications, student evaluations and peer evaluations for teaching, reviews and significant references to works for publications, specific comments from colleagues on service). The significance and impact of the

faculty member's contributions will be evaluated globally, as a function of both quantity and quality of performance, viewed in the context of departmental expectations. The rating system will be that used in Promotion and Tenure procedures: Exceptional, Very Good, Good, Marginal, Poor.

Direct communication with the faculty member re: evaluation and continued professional growth.

- A. As stated in the overview, each faculty member will receive first a written evaluation, then have the opportunity for a personal discussion with the Chair regarding that evaluation. The faculty member may then also request to meet with the Faculty Evaluation Board.
- B. The written evaluation by the chair will be as explicit as possible, with--as appropriate-- recommendations for improvement, based on recommendations by the Faculty Evaluation Board. The format will follow the same format as in previous years, including a separate section on each category and referring to both quantity and quality of performance in each one. Ratings will be given, as indicated above.

Conflict Resolution/Review Process (in cases where there is disagreement concerning the evaluation).

- A. As stated earlier, each faculty member is expected to submit a self-evaluation with all relevant supporting documentation, and the Chair may add other relevant documents, informing the faculty member of the nature and quantity of such documents. In response to the Chair's evaluation, a faculty member may provide further documentation and comments.
- B. If the faculty member finds the Faculty Evaluation Board's decision unacceptable, s/he may appeal as specified in Section II.E. of the University Council Document on Faculty Evaluation.

Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation.

Departmental and Individual Professional Goals.

The Chair will work with each faculty member at the annual review (and thereafter) to assure that the review process fosters professional growth for that individual. The Chair will also apply the discussion and results of the evaluations to her/his efforts to build on the strengths of the department, to address weaknesses, and to set new or revised goals.

Differential Allocation of Effort.

Individual differential allocations of effort will be reviewed each year to allow for individual flexibility and to assure equal opportunity to each faculty member for new allocations while maintaining the ideal balance of 40-40-20 for the department as a whole.

Personnel Decisions.

The Chair will refer to annual evaluations as s/he reviews a faculty member's application for

sabbatical leave and the department committee's recommendation for promotion (and, as applicable, tenure) for a faculty member. As appropriate, the Chair will consult the evaluations over a period of years in considering possible reassignment of responsibilities: performance evaluation provides data for the selection of departmental officers, award recipients, directors of the summer abroad programs, etc.

Merit Salary Decisions.

The Faculty Evaluation Board's recommendations for merit salary allocations will take into account explicitly the results of the annual evaluation.

Faculty Development Opportunities.

1. Mentoring of probationary faculty members is formalized as follows.

The Department, in the spirit of collegiality and in order to ensure effective mentorship, will annually review the progress toward tenure of probationary (untenued but tenure track) faculty. This advisory review will be completed by April 10th of years one, two, and four of the tenure track appointment. To conduct the review, the Chair will appoint a subcommittee of the DCPT, consisting of the faculty member's official mentor and two other tenured professors from the Department. Membership of the subcommittee will rotate among tenured faculty members from year to year, with the exception of the faculty mentor, who will remain a member of subcommittee. The subcommittee will be appointed by October 1st of the review year. Members of the subcommittee should meet informally with the untenued faculty member throughout the year, as the need arises. By April 10th of the review year, the subcommittee will meet with the probationary faculty member to review his or her progress toward tenure, using the dossier or dossiers submitted for the annual merit salary evaluations.

In addition, the members of the advisory review subcommittee will do peer evaluation visits of classes, will review appropriate course data (syllabi, hand-outs, exams, etc.) provided by the probationary faculty member, and will suggest areas of strength and areas needing improvement.

2. It will be the responsibility of the Chair to guide all faculty members in considering committee memberships, in running for elected positions. Furthermore, the Chair will be expected to encourage collegial recognition of the importance of various kinds of service, helping to create an atmosphere conducive to participation in the important activities of university governance, fellowship committees, etc.

Appendices.

Appendix A.

A copy of our student evaluation of teaching instrument, along with a statement of the procedures we follow in carrying out the evaluations.

Appendix B.

Guidelines.

Appendix C.

Annual self-evaluation form.