



Faculty Performance Appraisal Guidelines

PREAMBLE

Faculty members are required to prepare an annual report. The Faculty Activities Report (FAR) serves as the basis for an annual performance appraisal. This document is intended as a guide for faculty to prepare the FAR and for department/unit chairs/director to evaluate faculty performance.

The FAR is due to the chair/director by April 30. Appraisal of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service will be made by chairs/director after reviewing the FAR and accompanying documentation. **The annual appraisal of faculty performance will be made in reference to “satisfactory” completion of activities listed in the Annual Faculty Assignment (AFA). Activities listed in the AFA must reflect all the duties of the faculty. It is the responsibility of the chair/director and the faculty to ensure all assessed activities correspond to the annual faculty assignment.**

In compliance with the BOT/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), an annual written evaluation will be provided to faculty within 45 days after the end of the academic term for that year’s faculty assignment.

PRINCIPLES

The principles stated below underlie faculty performance appraisal.

The functions of the Robert Stempel College of Public Health & Social Work (the College) are teaching, research, and service. Faculty in the College will engage in activities in each of these areas, unless otherwise assigned. The performance appraisal will be measured according to the assignment in each area. The College differential faculty assignment policy allows for differential workload assignments and faculty appointment classifications. Faculty assignments may be weighted differently in the appraisal of the three elements of teaching, research, and service. Faculty performance expectations increase in relation to progression through the academic ranks and tenure/non-tenure status.

Performance expectations and performance appraisal will be related to the criteria for granting tenure and promotion and the faculty member’s differentiated assignment. In other words, yearly performance appraisal factors must be congruent with criteria for faculty progression through the ranks and the criteria for achieving tenure if applicable. Faculty should consult both the FIU and the College tenure and promotion policies.

Upon completion of the annual faculty activity report, faculty will receive an assessment of their performance for teaching, research, and service respectively. A summary statement indicating overall level of performance will also be provided. If a faculty member is rated “not satisfactory” in one or more areas, the chair/director and the faculty member will develop a plan to ensure future satisfactory performance.

Faculty assignment must be made by the chair/director before the start of each academic year. Should there be concerns on the part of the faculty member about the assignment, disagreements should be discussed with the Dean or the Dean’s designee.

The annual faculty assignment and annual faculty activity report serve as the core for faculty evaluation in the RSCPHSW in all departments. Unless otherwise stated by the university guidelines, faculty appraisal for merit should be based performance over the past three years to reflect merit for sustained performance.

TEACHING

Teaching is a fundamental requirement of the University and its faculty. Teaching spans a range of activities and occurs in many different contexts. For the purposes of performance appraisal teaching includes courses, seminars, clinical and laboratory supervision, tutorials, and student advising.

The chair/director evaluates faculty members according to their assigned duties, number of courses taught, number of course preparations, number of students taught, class size and other criteria, such as new preparations, independent studies, doctoral dissertations, internships, self-evaluations and continuous improvement.

Faculty are expected to design and implement a broad range of learning experiences in order to facilitate and direct the attainment of specific learning objectives in the context of their teaching assignments. Faculty are required to be available to meet with students to discuss academic matters.

Faculty are required to show evidence of class preparation by providing course syllabi, including outlines, competencies, course objectives, evaluation criteria, and bibliographies to chairs/directors. Course syllabi must be consistent with program and curricula objectives.

Faculty are expected to continuously review and update course materials and instructional methodology to reflect current knowledge in a substantive area. Faculty are expected to continuously enhance teaching by introducing new materials and teaching innovations.

Performance appraisal of teaching may also include evidence of a faculty member's development. Development may include attending instructional development courses

While not the only means of appraising teaching performance, student evaluations will be considered. Student evaluations will be reviewed for each course taught by a faculty member during an academic year. Student evaluations will be considered in the context of:

- Class size.
- Grade distribution.
- The instructor's experience with the course.
- The nature of the course; quantitative, theoretical, clinical, etc.
- Any information the instructor may wish to provide with regard to difficulties or issues encountered during the teaching of the course.
- New modes of delivery, creative/innovation, new course development.

Rating performance

The levels of performance for appraising teaching will be determined in reference to the following criteria:

- The quality of course syllabi (conformance with FIU criteria and yearly updates).
- The quality of course assignments.
- The degree to which course syllabi address the curriculum objectives of a program.
- The breadth and depth of assigned readings and appended bibliographies.
- The overall satisfaction of the faculty's performance as measured by student evaluations.
- Number and type of graduate (master's, Ph.D.) committees chaired, frequency of meetings, and progress of student.
- Number and type of examination committees chaired.
- Number and type of memberships on graduate committees.

Rating of unsatisfactory

A rating of unsatisfactory will be given for evidence of one or more of the following:

- Unapproved absences
- Frequent tardiness
- Failure to provide an acceptable course syllabus
- Unavailability to students outside class
- Failure to provide grades on time
- Over extension of "incomplete" grades

- Failure to accurately complete grading forms
- Receipt of consistently low student teaching evaluations
- Complaints from students and peers about teaching performance, supervision of students and/or field education/clinical instruction
- failure to post and observe office hours
- Complaints about failure to respect student diversity
- Violation of University policies regarding sexual harassment.
- Failure to comply with Department, College, and University policies

Rating of satisfactory

A rating of satisfactory will be given for evidence of the following:

- No evidence of unsatisfactory teaching
- Course syllabi conform with University policies and procedures
- Course syllabi are clear and well organized
- Course competencies are clearly stated
- Course objectives are stated and are consistent with program objectives
- Course content is consistent with the catalogue
- Evidence of participation in student advising at the department level (not limited to courses taught)
- Student ratings near or at the mid point
- Required office hours are posted and observed
- Grades are submitted on time
- Limited use of "incomplete" grades consistent with University policy

Ratings of good, very good and excellent

Ratings of good, very good, and excellent teaching require all of the criteria for a satisfactory rating with evidence of the following additions.

- Current text, readings, and course content
- Well-defined course objectives
- Clear assignments
- Demanding instructor and student workload
- Exposure of students to technology as tools
- Equitable grading structure
- Specific and appropriate assignments for the level of the course
- Use of innovative technology,
- Helpful and appropriate visual aids and hand-outs
- Tests and grading are fair, relative to content, and meet student expectations
- Assigned grades reflect a full range
- Peer review of syllabi and classroom delivery
- Awareness of students' progress and concerns
- Evidence of availability to facilitate student learning beyond the classroom
- Maintaining office hours,
- Responsiveness to students
- Improvement over previous year
- Changes added by professor
- Substantiated efforts by professor to improve teaching
- Evidence of student mentoring and leadership

RESEARCH

Research, scholarship, and other activities leading to the development of knowledge and professional practice are expected of faculty in the University. The concepts of research, scholarship and creative professional activity are to be evaluated under the heading of research. Importantly, work to be included as research must meet the two criteria of **peer review and dissemination** in scholarly journals and books. Consideration will be given to the quality of the journal in which an article is published. Where creative professional activity is to be appraised, the same principle of peer review with written appraisals must be provided to be considered as research. If peer reviewed and disseminated, audio visual teaching aids, computer software, academic materials, and other educational products may be considered as research.

For the purpose of determining levels of performance in the appraisal, a distinction will be made between work in press and work published. "**Work in Press**" is work accepted by a peer reviewed journal or publisher awaiting publication. For the purposes of appraisal, work in press will be documented by a letter from a publisher indicating that the work has been accepted for dissemination (publication). "**Work Published**" is peer-reviewed work disseminated through accepted means in print or electronic format.

In consideration of the level of performance for completed work, differential weighting may be assigned to co-authored (co-edited) or first authored publications versus sole-authored (sole-edited) publications. Specifically, in the submission of the Faculty Annual Report, the faculty member will be required to submit the estimated or agreed upon percentage contribution to the work in press and/or completed work. In addition, quality of the publication outlet will also be taken into consideration. Where possible, faculty should indicate the impact of the outlet. If available, quality of outlet should be indicated by the accepted appraisal of the discipline or impact factor. This is applicable to work to be published, innovative professional practice, and research proposals.

Rating Performance:

Rating research performance will be determined in reference to the following criteria:

- A research grant, funded research project, contract research, university funded research (differential consideration to the size of the grant and the rigor of the competition will be given), training grant (funded first year will be considered research, subsequent years will be considered teaching)
- An unfunded or self-funded research project
- Unfunded research proposals
- Publication of an authored book
- Publication of an edited book
- Publication of a co-edited or co-authored book
- Revised editions of books
- Editorship of a scholarly journal
- Editorship of a special issue of a journal and/or a symposium
- An article in a refereed journal
- A book chapter
- Major published research reports
- Peer reviewed poster or conference presentation
- A paper published in refereed conference proceedings
- Peer reviewed research based production and dissemination in non-print media, such as preparation of film, video tape, or computer software

% Research Effort Assignment	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
75%	Four (or more) peer-reviewed publications in higher impact outlets <i>and</i> funded research grant as Principal Investigator (> \$100,000) <i>and</i> submitted application (>\$100,000)	Three peer-reviewed publications in higher impact outlets <i>and</i> one or more peer-reviewed abstract published <i>and</i> research grant (Co-I) funded (\$50,000 - \$99,000) <i>or</i> submitted application (\$50,000 - \$99,999)	Two peer-reviewed publications <i>or</i> two peer reviewed abstracts published <i>and</i> research grant/contract as co-investigator (\$50,000 - \$99,999) <i>or</i> submitted application (\$50,000 - \$99,999)	One peer reviewed publication <i>or</i> abstract published <i>or</i> research grant/contract as co-investigator (<\$50,000) <i>or</i> submitted application (<\$50,000)	None
50%	Three peer-reviewed publications in higher impact outlets <i>and</i> research grant funded as Principal Investigator (> \$100,000) <i>or</i> submitted application (> \$100,000)	Two peer-reviewed publications in higher impact outlets <i>and</i> peer reviewed abstract published <i>and</i> research grant funded (Co-I) (\$50,000 - \$99,999) <i>or</i> submitted application (\$50,000 - \$99,999)	One peer-reviewed publication <i>or</i> one peer reviewed abstract published <i>and</i> research grant as co-investigator (\$50,000 - \$99,999) <i>or</i> submitted application as co-investigator (\$50,000 - \$99,999)	Non-peer reviewed publication <i>or</i> non-peer reviewed abstract <i>or</i> research grant as co-investigator (<\$50,000) <i>or</i> submitted application as Co-investigator (<\$50,000)	None
25%	Two peer-reviewed publications in higher impact outlets <i>or</i> research grant of >	One peer-reviewed publication in higher impact outlets <i>and</i> one peer reviewed abstract	Non-peer reviewed publication <i>and</i> non-peer reviewed abstract <i>or</i> research grant	Non-peer reviewed publication <i>or</i> non-peer reviewed abstract <i>or</i> research grant	None

	\$30,000 and submitted application as principal investigator or co-investigator	published or research grant funded (Co-I) or submitted application	as co-investigator or submitted application as Co-investigator	as co-investigator or submitted application as co-investigator	
--	---	--	--	--	--

Rating research

Appraisal of research, using ratings from unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, excellent, and outstanding, will be given based on the annual faculty assignment, department/school expectations, and norms in the discipline.

Service

Service encompasses a variety of expectations for faculty contribution to the ongoing maintenance and development of the College and the University. In units with a strong professional focus, there is a need for participation in community service. Such community service may include membership on local, state, national and international committees, academic consultation and advisory committees. Service expectations vary with rank. Junior faculty are expected to perform less service than more senior faculty. Service expectations increase as rank increases.

There are also a number of activities classified under service, which relate to an individual's scholarly expertise and pursuits. A combination of Service activities is expected but commitment to various categories may vary year to year. Any activity for which the participant receives remuneration is considered consulting outside activity rather than service.

Service Activities

- Participation at School and Department faculty meetings, convocation and graduation.
- Active membership or chair on committees within the College and University
- Active participation or chair on Community Committees at local, state, national and international levels
- Serving as a reviewer for a book/ journals or grants
- Active service as a member of an editorial board or grant selection committee
- Serving on NIH, CDC, or Foundation Grant Review Panels, study sections or special emphasis review panels.
- Non-peer reviewed publications including articles in newsletters, newspapers, magazines, etc.
- Chairing or assuming a leadership role at a conference or a session at a scholarly or professional conference
- Interviews in the media, speeches, contributions to public proceedings, etc.
- Consulting/Advising a government, service agency, or community group.
- Consulting/Advising on accrediting or educational review boards.
- Active participation in professional organization(s)

Unsatisfactory

A rating of "unsatisfactory" will be assigned to faculty whose annual performance is characterized by no active contribution to the College and University and the community at large

Satisfactory

A rating of “satisfactory” will be assigned to faculty whose annual performance is characterized by minimal contribution to the College and University and the community at large. Service on a department committee is minimal service.

Good

A rating of “good” will be assigned to faculty whose annual performance is characterized by service above a satisfactory contribution. Service on multiple department committees or a combination of Department, College, and University committees is good service.

Very Good

A rating of “very good:” will be assigned to faculty whose annual performance is characterized by service above the contribution for good service. Combinations of service on Department, College, and University committees, community committees, review for peer reviewed journals, service on grant review panels, and service on national and international professional committees is excellent service.

Excellent

A rating of “excellent” will be assigned to faculty whose annual performance is characterized by service above the contribution for excellent service. Combinations of service on department, College, and University committees, community committees, review for peer reviewed journals, service on grant review panels, and service on national and international professional committees is outstanding service.