

College of Arts & Sciences

Annual Review of Faculty, Chairs, and Program Directors

RATIONALE

The annual evaluation of faculty members, Chairs, and Program Directors provides an important opportunity for personal and professional development and for evaluating continued progress toward excellence in teaching, research, service, and administration. The evaluation process should reflect the goal of personal and departmental professional development and ought not to be construed as punitive; therefore, the evaluations should include the personal interaction of the person being evaluated with those responsible for the evaluation.

Every full-time tenured, tenure-track, and permanent non-tenure-track faculty member, Chair, and Program Director is required to be reviewed annually. Because the annual review forms the basis of merit salary increases for full-time faculty and provides supporting information for tenure and promotion, it is imperative that the evaluation be thorough, based upon clear and public criteria, and honest. The person being evaluated should have ample time and opportunity to respond to the evaluation.

TIME PERIOD OF REPORT

The review will evaluate the previous calendar year's productivity (January 1 through December 31). Although the departments may set an earlier date, the Annual Activity Report should be submitted no later than **December 31**. The Chair will prepare the evaluations of the faculty for submission to the Dean's office by a date determined by the Dean at the beginning of each academic year, usually between **January 20 and February 15**. Chairs and Program Directors of Programs that report directly to the Dean must submit their own Annual Activity Report to the Dean by **January 31**.

THE ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT

An outline of the Annual Activity Report is appended to this policy and procedure document. Faculty with no administrative responsibilities should complete sections A through E and section G; the Chairs and other faculty with administrative responsibility should additionally complete section F. Program Directors without a tenure-track faculty appointment should complete all sections that are applicable.

Each faculty member will be evaluated by the Chair and, if it is departmental procedure, by a peer review committee. Chairs evaluate faculty who direct programs within their departments. The Dean reviews Chairs and Program Directors who report directly to the Dean. The Chair and the Dean jointly review Program Directors who report directly to the Dean if the Program Director also holds a faculty appointment in a department.

Although each category of the Annual Activity Report is self-explanatory, some further comments may be helpful.

- **Teaching**

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should include a list of courses taught, curriculum and pedagogical development, and “Blue” course evaluations. The narrative and written comments of students should also be included so that the evaluation is not simply numerical. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness such as teaching portfolios and peer classroom reports are encouraged. Such evidence may be required of all faculty by the decision of individual departments.

- **Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Endeavor**

Scholarly endeavors remain central to the University’s mission, and it is assumed that each tenured and tenure-track faculty member is engaged in them. Departments are responsible for defining what constitutes research-intensive and research-active status.

- **Professional Service**

Professional service includes, but is not limited to, the following: leadership roles in professional societies; workshop presentations; peer review of articles for professional journals; and service to the University, College, and Department. Activities not related to a faculty member’s professional role are not considered as part of professional service.

- **Administration**

Any person with an administrative appointment within or external to their home department should complete this section. Administrators should report on activities that pertain to their administrative responsibilities. They should describe any administrative initiatives that they undertook and report on their success.

DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

To facilitate the annual review of faculty, each department should develop clear and specific criteria for evaluating faculty performance and productivity. These standards should establish consistent written norms and procedures to be applied throughout the Department.

The Department may establish a peer review committee to review the annual report of the faculty member and to assist in evaluation. If the Department also has a rank and tenure review committee, the same committee may serve both functions if the Department desires.

Faculty should have the opportunity to have their classes observed by peers acceptable to them and to their respective chairs. The results of such classroom observation should be included in the annual review of the faculty.

The annual evaluations should include consideration of the workload of each faculty member with respect to the categories of teaching, research, service, and, if relevant, administration, so that the evaluation assesses the proper balance of expectations and quality of work. While typical workload distribution for research-intensive faculty may be 12 Workload Units Teaching, 9 Workload Units Research/Scholarship/Creative Endeavor, and 3 Workload Units Service, each faculty member is encouraged to work with their respective chairs to establish a workload balance that accurately reflects their efforts as tied to annual performance goals.

Teaching evaluations should include the examination of student ratings of instructors and courses. Student ratings should be obtained for all courses, both undergraduate and graduate, each time they are taught, and are to be submitted to the Department Chair as part of the Annual Activity Report.

PROCEDURES

Faculty complete their annual reports using the attached format. The Chairs set due dates no later than December 31, which will provide sufficient time for review.

If there is a peer review committee, the committee evaluates the individual faculty member's Annual Activity Report, writes their report, and if the faculty member requests, meets with the faculty member to discuss their peer evaluation. The faculty member should be provided a copy of this peer evaluation and be given the opportunity to respond in writing.

The Chair, using these Annual Activity Reports (and peer review reports, in departments that have them), evaluates each faculty member with respect to faculty development, and, where appropriate, progress toward promotion and tenure.

The Chair communicates with each faculty member regarding the evaluation(s). In order for this process to be developmental, a meeting of the Chair with the faculty member is expected. The evaluation is prepared in written form and a copy is provided to the faculty member. The faculty member has the right to submit a written response to the evaluation. It is appropriate at this time to discuss the distribution of the faculty member's workload for the coming year and to establish performance goals.

After the faculty member has had the opportunity to meet with the peer review committee (if any) and the Chair, and has read the evaluation, responded (if desired), and signed it to indicate that it has been received and reviewed, the Chair sends the annual report, the evaluation, and any response to the Dean.

A similar process is followed for the Dean's evaluation of Chairs and Program Directors who report directly to the Dean

Appendix to Annual Review of Faculty, Chairs, and Program Directors

Annual Activity Report

January 1, _____ to December 31, _____

A. General Information

1. Name
2. Rank and department

B. Summary of Past Annual Performance Goals (from previous calendar year)

1. Summary of performance goals in the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Endeavor, Service, and Administration from the previous calendar year.
2. Reflection on previous year's performance in areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Endeavor, Service, and Administration.

C. Teaching

Include efforts in the area of DEI, such as curriculum development, inclusive pedagogies, accessible materials, and resources that amplify the voices of minoritized groups.

1. Listing of courses taught (include course numbers, credit hours, contact hours, and enrollment for graduate and undergraduate courses)
2. Evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g. peer classroom report(s), teaching portfolio, etc.)
3. "Blue" course evaluations. Please include your evaluations at the end of your report.
4. Self-evaluation of teaching
5. Curriculum development
6. Pedagogical activities
7. Pedagogical software development
8. Chair of Dissertation/Thesis committee
9. Advising/mentoring activities
10. Awards
11. Other

D. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Endeavor

Include accomplishments in the area of DEI, such as producing scholarship/creative work, leading scholarly and creative programs and initiatives, applying for external grants, and generating new knowledge that focuses on DEI and engages with equity and inclusion issues.

Where appropriate, include accomplishments that are recognized within the Department over multiple years (for example, the publication of a book).

1. Publications (with appropriate bibliographic citations)
 - a. Monographs and books
 - b. Textbooks
 - c. Peer-reviewed articles and papers
 - d. Book chapters
 - e. Conference proceedings
 - f. Non-peer-reviewed articles and papers
 - g. Research abstracts
 - h. Edited publications
 - i. Reviews of books or scholarship
 - j. Publications in press
 - k. Publications under review
 - l. Other
2. Professional/Academic Performances, Productions, or Exhibitions
 - a. Music composition
 - b. Publication of creative works
 - c. Production, performance, or exhibition of creative works
 - d. Recordings, film, TV or stage performances, audio broadcasts
 - e. Other
3. Community Engaged Research
 Community engaged research is artistic, scientific, and/or humanistic work that involves collaboration between Saint Louis University and the larger community (local, regional/state, national, global) in an effort to create new knowledge that benefits scholarship and communities alike.

Faculty may wish to consider whether their work contains at least one of these characteristics of community engaged research:

- Is the work directed towards persons, groups, or communities outside SLU?
- Does the work involve collaborative interactions that connect the university and the community through sharing knowledge?
- Does the work involve creative, pedagogical, or scholarly activities for the public good?
- Does the work involve the community as partners in knowledge production?

4. Grants and contracts (a) submitted and (b) funded (including amounts, starting and ending dates)
5. Presentations (e.g., invited lectures/speeches, conference papers/posters)
6. Awards
7. Work in progress (describe)
8. Other

E. Service

Include service in the area of DEI, such as participating in on-campus, off-campus, and professional DEI initiatives, engaging with minoritized communities, promoting DEI values to the broader public, and DEI-focused programming for students.

1. Professional
2. University
3. College
4. Department (include advising/mentoring activities)
5. Community
6. Awards
7. Other

F. Administration, if applicable

1. Administrative role
2. Summary of performance goals in the area of Administration from the previous calendar year
3. Reflection on previous year's performance in the area of Administration

G. Future Annual Performance Goals

Describe performance goals in the areas of Teaching, Research, Service, and Administration (if applicable) for the upcoming academic year.