

TITLE: Standards for Evaluation of Faculty and Academic Department Chairs

AUTHOR: Faculty Senate

APPROVAL DATE: April 14, 2023

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 14, 2023

PURPOSE: To establish standards identifying the procedure for faculty and academic department chairs evaluation

SEE ALSO:

REVIEWER: CAO, Academic Council, and Faculty Senate

REVIEW DATE: Spring 2028 and every five years thereafter

OPERATING DETAILS:

1. All faculty members and academic department chairs must be evaluated on an annual basis. Evaluations must be completed by April 30, unless otherwise approved by CAO. Each faculty member must be evaluated by the faculty member's department chair/director. Each academic department chair must be evaluated by that department chair's dean, both as teaching faculty and as administrator.
2. Each department's system for evaluation must be consistent with MUW's Promotion and Tenure review process, and in accordance with Policy Statements 1302, 1303, and 1304. Criteria to be used for teaching faculty during the evaluation include the following, with the greatest weight being given to the first criterion:
 - a. Excellence in teaching and advising as evidenced by demonstrated knowledge of the individual's area of academic appointment, ability to help students discover that knowledge in substantive and meaningful ways, updating knowledge and skills, designing new courses, regularly revising existing courses, and university-wide outreach to students.
 - b. Quality and extent of scholarly and professional activities, which may include research, writing, performing and other creative works, publications, presenting papers, professional and scholarly services, activity in professional organizations, and grant activity to funding sources outside the University.
 - c. Quality and extent of service to the department, College, and the entire University, which may include committee work; administrative duties, if assigned; involvement with student activities; and other means of maintaining and improving the ongoing life of the institution. Working with other people is essential to the

maintenance of a collegial environment; therefore, professional ethics, cooperativeness, resourcefulness and responsibility will be considered, as will service to the community at large.

3. Evaluations should include a qualitative or narrative assessment of the faculty member's performance in the three areas specified in part 2 above and should conclude with a rating of each area as well as an overall performance rating. The suggested performance ratings are:
DISTINGUISHED: Significantly exceeds standard expectations for faculty members; i.e., is truly distinguished among one's peers.
EXCELLENT: Exceeds standard expectations for faculty members in some areas and meets standard expectations in the remaining areas. GOOD: Meets standard expectations for faculty members.
MARGINAL: Needs improvement in some areas and meets standard expectations for faculty members in other areas.
UNSATISFACTORY: Needs significant improvement to meet standard expectations for faculty members; i.e, far from meeting standard expectations.
4. Evaluation of teaching must not rest exclusively upon student course evaluations. Faculty members' responses to comments made in course evaluations must be considered when course evaluations are reviewed as a part of the faculty evaluation process.
5. Each evaluation should conclude with specific plans and/or goals. If an overall rating of MARGINAL or UNSATISFACTORY is awarded, a written development plan must be established. As specified in PS 1312, three unsatisfactory reviews during a period of four years for a tenured faculty member may initiate the post-tenure review process.
6. The administrative performance of department chairs shall be evaluated by the appropriate dean. Administrators are evaluated with respect to all personnel matters on the basis of excellence in performance and the promise of continued excellence in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. Each performance review shall contain, at a minimum, a discussion of the administrator's (1) performance with respect to assigned duties, (2) professional development, and (3) future potential and expectations.
7. Each department chair may be evaluated by the faculty in that department and the dean may use this information in the evaluation of the administrative duties of the department chair.

Revised: 8/13/03, 2/6/07, 4/14/2023

Reviewed: 8/2018