

Revised December 2016/January 2017 (editing changes January 2019)

SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Procedures

Annual Evaluation: The evaluation period is for one calendar year (January through December) and is not a cumulative record of a faculty member's performance. One exception is the rolling credit described below. The Faculty Evaluation will be initiated by the Department Head on an annual basis, at the end of the fall semester.

Each faculty member must complete the annual faculty evaluation form at the end of the Fall semester each year. Any faculty member who does not submit an evaluation form after two requests cannot be evaluated and subsequently cannot be considered for a raise. The evaluation procedure will be done at the middle of the Spring semester so that individual faculty receive their evaluations by the end of the Spring semester.

Process: Each faculty member will complete the faculty evaluation form; supply copies of any book or article manuscripts which are in press, but not yet published. Student evaluations are kept by the department as they become available. In addition to student evaluations, other evidence of teaching may be submitted: syllabi, texts, chair and membership on Masters and Ph.D. committees, the teaching of 485s and 685s, and work with master teachers who have observed a faculty member's classes to review teaching.

All faculty are expected to update their vitae at the beginning of each semester.

Each faculty member will be evaluated in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service. These areas will be weighted as follows, unless their appointment letter specifies otherwise:

	TENURED Standard	TENURED Advising and Coordinating	NONTENURED
Research	50%	40%	60%
Teaching	30%	30%	30%
Service	20%	30%	10%

Academic Professional Faculty:

Instructional Professors

Teaching 80%
Service and enhancing
instructional effectiveness 20%

Lecturers:

Teaching 95%
Service and enhancing
instructional effectiveness 5%

Salary increases will be determined by weighting the faculty member's scale score in each of these areas by the percentage the area contributes to the entire workload of the faculty member. These percentages are not to be considered absolute. They are approximate guidelines.

Medical/family Leave: If a person is on medical/family leave, merit scores for teaching and service should be calculated based upon the preceding 2 years the faculty member was in residence. Merit scores for research should be based upon the person's choice of either the present year's accomplishments or the mean of the preceding 2 years.

Research or other Leave: If a person is on research or other leave, merit scores for teaching and service should be calculated based upon the preceding 2 years the faculty member was in residence. Merit scores for research should be based upon the person's research accomplishments for the present year.

Standards

The faculty of the Department of Sociology are working to achieve the highest standards of the discipline. We wish to encourage appropriate faculty investment in long-range scholarship. Furthermore, we are aware of the year-to-year fluctuations in the size of the available salary pool. Thus the annual evaluation will give consideration to the quality of the overall record while placing primary focus on the efforts of the preceding year.

The evaluation will be based on the quality and quantity of the following types of work (the order of the items does not indicate relative importance; see appendix 2 for more complete description of categories above average, average, satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory):

Research:

- Original research and theoretical monographs
- Refereed journal articles
- Anthologies, edited books and special issues of journals
- Textbooks
- Book chapters
- Book reviews
- Funded grants
- Submitted grants
- Invited presentations and papers
- Papers given at meetings
- Research awards

Credit will ordinarily be given for published works in the year they are published. Rolling credit will be given for original book manuscripts. In order to ensure the historical compensation that such works merit, credit will be given in the year the book is in press and in the following year. (Published work and materials either in press or accepted for publication should be submitted to the Department Head as they are published or accepted so that they will be part of the faculty member's dossier at the time of the review.)

Individuals will receive credit for externally funded research held in the year of the evaluation. Special recognition will be given in the first year of an externally funded project.

Awards for distinguished scholarship will be given credit in the year they are received.

Teaching:

Advising Doctoral and Master's students
 Number of courses taught
 Teaching awards
 College Student Evaluations of Faculty Teaching
 Syllabi for courses taught
 Student advising at the graduate and undergraduate levels
 685s and 485s taught
 Reports of work with master teachers

In addition, other evidence of teaching such as that listed above may be submitted. Awards for teaching will be given credit in the year in which they are received.

Service:

Number and level of participation on committees:

Department
 College
 University
 Profession
 Editorial boards
 National review committees

Organization of major professional conferences:

National
 Regional
 State
 Local

Organization of sessions at professional meetings:

National
 Regional
 State

Discussant at professional meetings:

National
 Regional
 State

Community Service

National
 Regional
 State
 Local

Credit for service will be given for substantial and consistent service on Department Committees (e.g. the Department Council, Chair of Tenure and Promotion Committee), College Committees (e.g. the College Council, the Dean's Advisory Committee), for Professional Service (e.g. ASA committees, and major regional committees), and for Profession-Related Public Service Activities.

Awards for service will be given credit in the year they are received.

Annual Review

As mandated by University and System policies, an overall ranking of "Unsatisfactory" for the annual review of a tenured faculty member results from being rated as Unsatisfactory in any single category or Needs improvement in any two categories, regardless of the average numerical score described in Appendix I. An overall "Unsatisfactory" rating requires a report to the dean with a written plan (developed by the faculty member and the department head) for near-term improvement. A "Needs improvement" rating in a single category also requires an improvement plan, focused on the next year if for teaching or the next 3 years if for other areas. If milestones in this improvement plan are being met, subsequent years can remain "needs improvement," but if they are not being met, subsequent years must change to "unsatisfactory."

Three consecutive "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews for a tenured faculty member will initiate a Professional Development Review.

Periodic Peer Review

Every 6th year the annual review conducted by the elected Annual Review Committee will be designated a Periodic Peer Review for tenured faculty (the first will be 2021.) The procedures and performance rubric described above and in Appendix 2 for the annual peer review will not change.

An "Unsatisfactory" rating in any category or a "Needs Improvement" rating in any two categories will yield an overall rating of unsatisfactory, which will initiate a Professional Development Review. As above, "Needs improvement" in one category requires an improvement plan.

Professional Development Review

If a professional development review is required, the review will be conducted following the procedures outlined by the College and University. An exemption from this review is allowed if the department head and dean agree that there are substantive mitigating circumstances. If there are not, the review is conducted by an ad hoc committee appointed by the dean in consultation with the department head and the faculty member.

Appendix 1. Explanation of Sociology Department's Annual Review Process

This appendix details the steps involved in the sociology department's annual evaluation process, by which performance is evaluated and raises are determined. These general policies and procedures have been discussed within the department and voted upon. Discretion in any one year is granted to our elected department executive committee and the department head.

Annual Report and Evaluation:

a) Every faculty member is required to turn in an annual report. This report asks each person for evidence of his or her research, teaching and service.

b) The executive committee consists of 4 elected members and the department head. Faculty reports are randomly assigned to a first reviewer and second reviewer for discussion (and no faculty member reviews their own report). Each faculty person is discussed. At the end of the discussion of each of the areas, each committee person assigns an initial score—if the scores are more than one point away from the median score, there is a reevaluation. At the end of the discussion, each faculty member has a score for research, teaching and service (or in the case of Instructional faculty or lecturers, just teaching and service).

For each category, scores can range from 0 to 10.

The following categories guide our discussions (see appendix 2 for detailed descriptions of these categories):

Performance:	Scores
Above Average	8-10
Average	5-7
Satisfactory	2-4
Needs Improvement	1
Unsatisfactory/Inactive	0

To detail the process more fully:

a. EC members assign a first round of scores; individuals may change their initial scores based on discussion.

b. After first round scores are submitted to the group, the median of the scores is used to set the middle value of a three-point range of scores that can be assigned in a second round.

For example, if the EC members assign scores of 2, 4, 4, 5, and 8, the median score would be 4. Note that the median might not be an integer – the median would be 4.5 for the scores 2, 4, 5, 8.)

c. EC members cast a second round of votes. This second round of scores must fall within a range of plus or minus one point from the median score from the first round of votes. (For example, a median of 4 from round 1 would allow votes of 3, 4, and 5 in the second round of scores.)

All assigned scores are recorded. At least two EC members should record scores.

The Department Head compiles the assigned scores to obtain the faculty members average scores on research, teaching, and service.

The resulting average scores are used to prepare an "Overall Merit Score." This is a weighted average of the separate research, teaching, and service averages. The weights used depend on the nature of the faculty member's appointment (e.g., senior lecturers, untenured faculty, tenured faculty, tenured faculty in administrative positions, etc.) and rank.

The Department Head distributes the results to the members of the EC. The results are reviewed to inspect for anomalies or inconsistencies in scoring. Scores may be reviewed and revised by agreement of EC members.

EC members prepare draft letters for the faculty members for which they served as primary reviewers. The letters report the merit scores assigned and the substantive basis for the outcome.

The Department Head finalizes the letters and circulates them for comment. When all EC members are satisfied, final copies are circulated.

The Department Head prepares a summary of procedures to accompany the letters. The purpose is to provide an overview of the evaluation process and a context for interpreting evaluation scores.

The final letters and the accompanying summary materials are distributed to the faculty members.

The Department Head records the Overall Merit Scores in a database of ongoing merit review scores.

The merit scores for year 3 also consider years 1 and 2; so for example, the scores for 2013 will consider scores for 2012 and 2011. Year 3 is weighted more heavily than years 1 and 2.

Appendix 2. Descriptions of evaluation scores in each category

Research

Above Average 8.0-10.0

Scores in this category indicate outstanding performance. Examples of research records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: having a book published by an academic press published in this year; having a well-received peer-reviewed article appear in one of the very top journals along with other peer-reviewed work; receiving a major regional, national or international research award; having a major federal or prestigious private institution grant funded.

Average 5.0-7.9

Scores in this category indicate average performance. Examples of research records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: having a peer-reviewed article appear outside the top journals; having a book published with a nonacademic press without strong evidence of positive reviews or significant impact on the field; having chapters appear in edited volumes; submitting a high quality grant proposal to a competitive outlet with an indication of positive reviews.

Satisfactory 2.0-4.9

Scores in this category indicate performance at the basic level expected of faculty. Examples of research records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: showing clear signs of research activity such as research presentations at conferences, grant submissions, or demonstrated progress on a book project or other major research undertaking.

Needs Improvement 1.0-1.9

Scores in this category indicate performance below the basic level expected of faculty, but still showing evidence of research progress during the year. Examples of research records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: not having research publications, presentations, or awards, but showing evidence of progress on a major research project.

Unsatisfactory/Inactive 0-0.9

Scores in this category indicate that no significant research activity occurred during the year. Research records that would merit scores in this category include those that cannot demonstrate any significant progress compared to the previous year.

Teaching

Above Average 8.0-10.0

Scores in this category indicate outstanding performance. Examples of teaching records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: receiving a teaching award; exceptionally high student and peer evaluations of teaching while teaching a range of courses; exceptional graduate mentoring such as

chairing or serving on multiple committees that result in strong placement outcomes in the year being reviewed; investing an unusually large amount of time mentoring a large number of students above and beyond the performance of regular course duties; documentation of impactful pedagogical presentations or innovations; investment of an unusually large amount of time in teaching development with master teacher training opportunities and implementing innovations from that training.

Average 5.0-7.9

Scores in this category indicate average performance. Examples of teaching records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: positive student and/or peer evaluations and well documented syllabi while teaching the expected range of courses; graduate mentoring such as chairing one or more committees or serving on several committees; investing an average amount of time mentoring students above and beyond regular course duties.

Satisfactory 2.0-4.9

Scores in this category indicate performance at the basic level expected of faculty. Examples of teaching records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: completing the expected range of courses with lower than average student and/or peer evaluations; a small amount of graduate mentoring or no graduate mentoring.

Needs Improvement 1.0-1.9

Scores in this category indicate performance below the basic level expected of faculty, but still showing evidence of teaching effectiveness during the year. Examples of teaching records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: student evaluation scores that average below 2.5 over a two-year period as well as poor or absent peer evaluations from faculty observing the classes; numerous student complaints over a two-year period indicating that the faculty member is unable to communicate in the English language; syllabi that are inadequate or inaccurate.

Unsatisfactory/Inactive 0-0.9

Scores in this category indicate teaching that does not meet the professional standards of the discipline. Examples of teaching records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: failing to meet 10% or more of their classes without arranging satisfactory coverage; not providing updated syllabi for courses; student evaluation scores that average below 2.5 over a three-year period as well as poor peer evaluations from faculty observing the classes; numerous student complaints over a three-year period indicating that the faculty member is unable to communicate in the English language.

Service

Above Average 8.0-10.0

Scores in this category indicate outstanding performance. Examples of service records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: receiving a major regional, national or international service award; consistently going above and beyond expectations while serving in one of the major service roles in the

department, college or university; performing exceptionally time-consuming community, regional, national or international service for a professional organization; organizing a major research conference.

Average 5.0-7.9

Scores in this category indicate average performance. Examples of service records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: serving competently on department committees as well as performing some impactful community, college, university or professional service.

Satisfactory 2.0-4.9

Scores in this category indicate performance at the basic level expected of faculty. Examples of service records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: serving competently on department committees; evidence of effective service to the profession or community.

Needs Improvement 1.0-1.9

Scores in this category indicate performance below the basic level expected of faculty, but still showing evidence of service effectiveness during the year. Examples of service records that would merit scores in this category include but are not limited to: some activity on department committees, or some evidence of basic professional service involvement. Consistent lack of participation in faculty meetings.

Unsatisfactory/Inactive 0-0.9

Scores in this category indicate that no significant service activity occurred during the year. Service records that would merit scores in this category include those that cannot demonstrate any actual participation in department, college, university, community or professional service. No participation in faculty meetings.