

---

## Faculty Evaluation Resources

Focus: Annual Evaluations

### Literature Resources:

1. Abbott, A., Cyranoski, D., Jones, N., Maher, B., Schiermeier, Q., & Van Noorden, R. (2010). Metrics: Do metrics matter?. *Nature*, 465, 860-862.

The journal *Nature* polled 150 readers to gauge how they believe research metrics are being used at their institution and whether they approve of the practice. In the poll, 51% of respondents stated that they have changed their behavior because of the way they are evaluated. Further, 71% of respondents stated that they were concerned that their colleagues can game or cheat the systems for evaluation at their institutions. A majority of respondents (63%) were unhappy about the way in which some measures are used. In addition, *Nature* contacted provosts, department heads, and other administrators at nearly 30 research institutions worldwide to determine what metrics are being used and how heavily those metrics are being relied upon. The administrators indicated less reliance on the use of metrics than the researchers perceived. The article describes some challenges and limitations with regard to the use of metrics.

2. American Society for Cell Biology. *San Francisco declaration on research assessment*. Retrieved February 2, 2016, from <http://am.ascb.org/dora/>

The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) describes best practices for assessing research. The goal is to improve the way that the quality of research output is evaluated. The recommendations are aimed at funding agencies, academic institutions, journals, organizations that supply metrics, and individual researchers. DORA singles out the Journal Impact Factor (JIF) as deeply flawed. It calls upon the scientific community to adopt tools other than the JIF. Best practices include placing less emphasis on publication metrics and becoming more inclusive of research output other than publications.

As of February 2, 2016, 618 organizations and 12,789 individuals had signed the DORA.

3. Archambault, É., & Larivière, V. (2009). History of the journal impact factor: Contingencies and consequences. *Scientometrics*, 79(3), 635-649.

The authors describe how the building blocks of the dominant journal impact factor (JIF) came into being and argue that they were constructed fairly arbitrarily or for different purposes than those that govern the modern use of the JIF. The authors argue that the result is

a faulty method that is widely open to manipulation and misuse. They recommend re-designing the JIF to address its flaws.

4. Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems* (3rd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

This book emphasizes the need for objectivity in faculty evaluations in order to maintain the credibility of the evaluation system. This book is very well cited in the literature.

5. Ball, A., & Duke, M. (2015). How to Track the Impact of Research Data with Metrics. *DCC How-to Guides*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Digital Curation Centre. Retrieved from <http://www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/how-guides/track-data-impact-metrics>

This guide provides an overview of key concepts in impact measurement, as well as services and tools to measure impact. This includes traditional measures of impact (e.g., journal impact factor, *h*-index) and alternative metrics. It describes current issues and challenges in the field.

6. Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The author challenges the merits of a reward system that pushes faculty toward research and publication and away from teaching. He proposes that discovery, integration of knowledge, teaching, and service be viewed as scholarship. This is a seminal work that is widely cited in the literature.

7. Chisholm, M., Hayes, E.J., LaBrecque, S., & Smith, D. (2011). The role of faculty evaluation in transformative change. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 25(1), 36-42.

This article emphasizes the importance of having a shared sense in the academic work environment that the evaluation system is impartial and as objective as possible.

The authors state: "... even though evaluation rests on subjective judgments, institutions must nonetheless strive to realize and maintain among all those affected a shared sense that the system is at least impartial and as objective as possible." (p. 37).

8. Curry, T. H. (2006). Faculty performance reviews. *Effective Practices for Academic Leaders*, 1(2), 1-16.

The author provides specific guidance for academic administrators on conducting regular faculty performance reviews and writing performance appraisals. He emphasizes the need to

define an equitable workload, as well as performance criteria and standards, within each academic unit. He recommends using a faculty career development plan (with an annual update) as the basis for a faculty member's annual performance review. He asserts that the format for writing a faculty performance review should not be standardized. Instead, he states that the department chair or administrator must find a format that fits his or her leadership and communication style, as well as the culture of the program or department. He provides a model that can serve as a checklist in writing performance review letters. He provides examples of performance review letters for a professor who is performing well and for a professor with performance problems. Throughout the article, he emphasizes the importance of mentoring in faculty development.

9. e Costa, C. A. B., & Oliveira, M. D. (2012). A multicriteria decision analysis model for faculty evaluation. *Omega*, 40(4), 424-436.

The authors propose a multi-criteria decision analysis model to address the challenge of implementing a transparent faculty evaluation system. This model is designed to address the entire range of academic activities and to be applied within and across distinct scientific areas. It was designed for and adopted by the engineering school of a technical university in Lisbon, Portugal.

10. Fairweather, J. S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 26-48.

Based upon a study of data from the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty 1992-93, the author found that only small percentage of faculty in all types of four-year institutions achieved high levels of output in both research and teaching. He asserts that this contradicts the common belief that each faculty member can achieve both simultaneously.

He concludes: "For most academic departments, the key to increasing teaching and research productivity may lie in looking for group solutions rather than on relying on each faculty member to increase productivity levels in teaching and research. Viewing faculty productivity as an aggregate across faculty members permits department chairs and departmental committees to combine the efforts of their individual members to achieve acceptable levels of productivity. Faculty who are less productive in research can increase the departmental average teaching productivity, whereas faculty who publish extensively can contribute to aggregate research productivity goals. In any case, the departmental or aggregate view of faculty productivity implies far more interdependence than is currently accepted as the norm for faculty behavior" (pp. 44-45).

11. Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). Standards of scholarly work. In *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate* (pp. 22-36). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

The authors propose and describe six standards by which to evaluate the quality of scholarship. The standards are clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique (including peer review).

12. Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, *520*, 429-431.

The authors describe the “Leiden Manifesto” for research metrics: 10 principles for best practices in metrics-based research assessment. This includes measuring performance against the research missions of the institution, group, or researcher. They assert that no single evaluation model is applicable to all contexts. They state that it is best to account for variation by academic field in publication and citation practices. The authors advocate for the use of several indicators rather than a single indicator to measure research performance, in order to avoid people gaming the system.

13. Huber, M. T. (2002). Faculty evaluation and the development of academic careers. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *114*, 73-83.

The author describes the growing global trend towards higher social and financial accountability for universities. She presents case studies of faculty at research universities who have made the scholarship of teaching part of their careers. She advocates for the acceptance of a broader definition of the term “scholarship” in academia.

14. Middaugh, M. F. (2001). *Understanding faculty productivity: Standards and benchmarks for colleges and universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

In this book, the author presents a new framework for analyzing faculty efficiency. He applies research findings to developing benchmarks of faculty productivity.

15. O’Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference?. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(5), 479-510.

The author conducted a national study of Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) of four-year institutions to investigate the impact of policy efforts to encourage multiple forms of scholarship in faculty roles and rewards. Campuses that initiated policy reforms to encourage multiple forms of scholarship were significantly more likely than their counterparts to report that teaching scholarship and engagement scholarship counted more for faculty evaluation, as well as to report a broader set of criteria used to assess scholarship. In addition, CAOs at campuses that initiated policy reforms reported a greater congruence between institutional mission and faculty priorities.

16. Priem, J., Taraborelli, D., Groth, P., & Neylon, C. (2011). *Altmetrics: A manifesto*. Retrieved February 2, 2016, from <http://altmetrics.org/manifesto/>

The authors argue for a new type of metric (altmetrics) to capture the heterogeneous nature of scholarly output and its impact on science and society. The authors list blogs, reference management systems (e.g., Zotero and Mendeley), and data repositories as potential sources. They describe the disadvantages of traditional metrics (e.g., peer-review, *h*-index, and Journal Impact Factor). The authors provide their view on how altmetrics can improve existing filters. For example, they note that altmetrics will track impact outside the academy and impact from sources that are not peer-reviewed.

17. Reich, E. S. (2013). The golden club. *Nature*, 502(7471), 291-293.

The author describes how the cachet of publishing in the most prestigious journals (e.g., *Science* and *Nature*) is under attack. He notes the rapidly changing nature of the publishing industry, including the push for open-access publishing. Open-access journals are attracting a growing proportion of submissions, thereby threatening the hold of the leading journals. Many scientists believe that too much attention is paid to the journals in which scientists publish rather than to the scientific merit of their work. Many argue that publishing in prestigious journals such as *Science* and *Nature* has too much influence over the careers of scientists. The author outlines arguments for and against the use of traditional metrics (e.g., the impact factor), particularly with regard to evaluating the quality of scientific work.

18. Roemer, R. C., & Borchardt, R. (2012). From bibliometrics to altmetrics: A changing scholarly landscape. *College & Research Libraries News*, 73(10), 596-600.

The authors describe general resources related to bibliometrics and altmetrics, including Google Scholar Citations, SCImago Journal and Country Rank, and Scopus. They describe altmetrics resources, including altmetrics.org, Impact Story, PLoS Article Level Metrics, Publish or Perish, and ReaderMeter. In addition, they describe examples of scholarly peer networks; resources for bibliometrics research support; blogs and media; and organizations, conferences, and electronic lists related to research metrics.

19. Sorcinelli, M. D. (2000). *Principles of Good Practice: Supporting Early-Career Faculty. Guidance for Deans, Department Chairs, and Other Academic Leaders*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED450634>

This booklet is based upon the "Heeding New Voices" study, a yearlong series of structured interviews with new faculty and graduate students aspiring to be faculty members around the United States. The goals of the study were to give voice to those who are just beginning their academic careers and to provide guidance for the senior faculty, chairs, deans, and others in

higher education responsible for shaping the professoriate of the future. The booklet includes ten principles of good practice.

The first four principles, aimed at improving review and tenure processes, are as follows: *Good Practice Communicates Expectations for Performance*, *Good Practice Gives Feedback on Progress*, *Good Practice Enhances Collegial Review Processes*, and *Good Practice Creates Flexible Timelines for Tenure*. The author includes bullet points with details below each principle, as well as examples of how the practice is implemented at existing institutions of higher education.

Guidance includes helping faculty set realistic goals that match the mission and resources of a given unit, as well as align with the central missions of the college/division and institution. The guidance promotes the use of more encompassing criteria for annual reviews and tenure that more fully document, recognize, and reward teaching, professional service, and outreach. In an annual review, it recommends providing honest and constructive feedback to early-career faculty on their progress toward tenure. During a faculty member's first year, it recommends structuring the annual review more toward development than toward evaluation.

20. Townsend, B. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2007). Workload issues and measures of faculty productivity. *Thought & Action*, 23, 7-20.

The authors investigated several indicators of workload and faculty productivity from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) data set and from the 2004 NSOPF data set. They examine the changes in these indicators over time for public institutions, and they break the results down by faculty at different institutional types (e.g., liberal art institutions, comprehensive institutions, and research institutions).

See the data in Table 2 (average hours for a faculty work week), Table 3 (total number of classes taught), Table 4 (total classroom credit hours), Table 6 (number of articles in refereed journals in the last two years), Table 7 (number of articles in non-refereed journals in the last two years), Table 8 (number of presentations in the last two years), Table 9 (number of books, textbooks, and reports in the last two years), and Table 10 (number of patents and software in the last two years).

A comparison of the data from 1993 and 2004 is informative. In addition, the data are valuable as rough benchmarking measurements for the given indicators (which are not widely available) at different types of institutions.

21. Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

This report focuses on the many components of internal and external faculty service, which are often unrecognized as an important part of faculty work. The author notes that service is difficult to quantify and that faculty often do not receive much direction from their department when they are considering service loads. She advocates changing faculty reward structures (e.g., faculty evaluations) to better recognize service, and she emphasizes the need to reflect campus priorities. She advocates for an expanded view of scholarship, including service. The author asserts that faculty and administrators need to work together to determine how to use engagement in service to meet the institutional mission. At the end of the report, she provides a series of questions to help shape a university's research agenda for engagement.

22. Webber, K. L. (2011). Measuring faculty productivity. In J. C. Shin, R. K. Toutkoushian, & U. Teichler (Eds.). *University rankings: Theoretical basis, methodology and impacts on global higher education* (pp. 105-121). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.

The author describes factors and indicators used to measure faculty productivity. She describes the challenges of measuring faculty productivity. She asserts that emphasis on different measures of faculty productivity should be discipline-specific. Figure 6.1 (on p. 110) shows several measures of teaching, research, and service productivity. She points out that there are fewer measures of faculty productivity for teaching than for research. She states that for every hour spent in the classroom, a faculty member may spend three to five times the number of hours preparing for class and advising students. However, the other hours of preparation and advisement are often not included in the discussions of faculty effort. The author points out that measures of campus and community service receive the least attention and vary the most widely among the areas of faculty productivity (research, teaching, and service).

The author describes commercial database applications that enable faculty to maintain their teaching, research, service, experience, and professional development records. Administrators may use these systems for several purposes, including benchmarking faculty productivity. Two vendors are Digital Measures (<http://www.digitalmeasures.com>) and Sedona (<http://www.sedonaweb.com>). In addition, Academic Analytics (<http://www.academicanalytics.com>) collects data that clients can use for strategic planning purposes. It publishes a Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index (FSPI).

23. Wilsdon, J., Allen, L., Belfiore, E., Campbell, P., Curry, S., Hill, S., ... & Johnson, B. (2015). *The metric tide: Report of the independent review of the role of metrics in research assessment and management*. Retrieved from <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/metrictide/Title.104463.en.html>

In April 2014, the Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management was set up to investigate the current and potential future roles that quantitative

indicators can play in research assessment and research management. This report from the Higher Education Funding Council for England critically examines the potential uses and limitations of research metrics and indicators in detail. It explores the Review's findings on issues with the use of metrics within institutions and across disciplines.

## **Benchmarking Resources from Specific Universities:**

1. Michigan State University. (n.d.). *Annual Performance Review Tenure System Toolkit*. Retrieved February 1, 2016, from <http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/annual-performance-review-tenure-system-toolkit>

This toolkit includes a number of valuable resources for unit administrators and faculty.

For unit administrators, it includes an extensive checklist of best practices for the faculty annual performance review. This checklist emphasizes that a fair and equitable workload policy, as well as performance expectations for each faculty member that are consistent with the goals and objectives of the unit, are critical to effective faculty evaluation. It also includes a checklist of best practices for constructive feedback during performance reviews, with examples of language to use to convey specific feedback.

For individual faculty members, the toolkit provides a separate checklist of best practices for the annual performance review process. It provides best practices prior to faculty review and items to discuss during faculty review. It provides additional guidance to mid-career faculty in the annual performance review process. The guidance promotes the pursuit of professional development and leadership opportunities.

2. Sampson Jr, J. P., Driscoll, M. P., Foulk, D. F., & Carroll, P. S. (2010, April 26). Successful faculty performance in teaching, research and original creative work, and service. Dean of the Faculties Office, Florida State University. Retrieved February 1, 2016, from <http://www.erp.fsu.edu/content/download/25448/163336/file/performance.pdf>

The objective of this paper, by the Dean of the Faculties Office at Florida State University (a research university), is to clarify the elements of successful faculty performance in teaching, research and original creative work, and service. Some of the stated elements are outside of the typical standard criteria for evaluation in these areas. Elements of successful performance in teaching include effectiveness in managing multiple course sections, effectiveness in mentoring students, effectiveness of academic advising, using research and original creative work to enhance teaching, and using service to enhance teaching. Elements of successful performance in service include mentoring faculty (especially tenure-earning assistant

professors), consulting (either compensated or pro bono), providing community service, and applying current course content to continuing education offerings.

3. University of Michigan Gender in Science and Engineering Subcommittee on Faculty Evaluation and Development. (2004). *Report from the Gender in Science and Engineering Subcommittee on Faculty Evaluation and Development*. Retrieved from <http://advance.umich.edu/resources/GSE-FacEvaluation-2004.pdf>

This committee report from the University of Michigan states that annual review information should be collected from all faculty in a standardized manner within all departments and colleges. The committee has distilled what it believes are best practices into a Faculty Annual Review form (see “Faculty Activity Report” in Appendix A of the document). It recommends that the weighting of each area be tailored in each department or discipline. Further, it recommends that such weighting be made explicit to faculty members.

For the “Service” component of the Annual Review, the form prompts faculty to include both formally assigned service and informal activities. The form includes the item “Mentoring of faculty and students (in addition to graduate students you are supervising).” Under that item, it prompts faculty to (a) list the names of any junior faculty for whom they read and provided feedback on a draft version of a manuscript and (b) list the names of any junior faculty to whom they were assigned to be a mentor.

4. University of Michigan STRIDE Committee in collaboration with participants at the FASTER Workshop held in May 2012. (2015). *Evaluating Faculty: Faculty Annual Review Guidelines*. Retrieved from <http://advance.umich.edu/resources/FASTERAnnualReviewGuidelines.pdf>

This document was developed by the University of Michigan STRIDE Committee in collaboration with participants at the Friends and Allies of STRIDE Toward Equity in Recruiting (FASTER) workshop held in May 2012. The groups met for two days to discuss their own experiences with the annual review process as well as the literature outlining best practices, pitfalls, and recommendations. They distilled this into the guidelines in this document.

The document includes a letter from the Provost, to her colleagues, that urges those who are evaluating faculty to fully recognize the broad range of entrepreneurial, outreach, and creative activities in which faculty engage. Such activities often have not traditionally been considered in faculty evaluations or may include creative activity that is not in the form of traditional scholarship (e.g., creating service learning and action-based learning opportunities for students, creating new instructional methods, and engaging in creative performance).

The document includes principles such as ensuring that the annual review process is fair and transparent, with review criteria that are based upon department and institutional goals, vision, and values. The document recommends a number of practices, such as periodically reviewing the annual review procedures and criteria, discussing the goals of the annual review process with faculty before the process begins, and providing evaluation committees with education about unconscious bias.

5. University of Minnesota. (2015). Performance reviews at the University of Minnesota. Retrieved February 1, 2016, from <http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/toolkit/performance/reviews/>

At the University of Minnesota, the process and procedure for annual faculty reviews are determined at the level of the collegiate and departmental units. However, they must be consistent with the requirements that the tenure regulations specify. This website provides information on preparing for performance reviews, assigning performance ratings, and conducting the review meeting.

The guidance includes providing each employee with informal feedback throughout the year, so that employees know how they are performing and are not surprised by their performance reviews. It also includes obtaining feedback from those who are affected by each employee's work. It provides advice on how to make comments in the written performance review more descriptive. It describes a number of common rater errors that occur during the performance review process. The guidance provides several tips for conducting the performance review meeting.

6. University of Nevada, Reno. (2007). Academic Faculty Evaluation "Tool Kit." Retrieved February 1, 2016, from <http://www.unr.edu/x18960.xml>

This guide is intended to provide ideas, suggestions, and possible best practices for evaluating academic faculty members. It states that departments (or in certain cases, colleges) should agree on and clearly articulate the relative importance of various activities with regard to merit. Priorities for awarding merit may differ across departments, as well as within departments across faculty ranks. Departmental or unit priorities must be clearly articulated, and evaluation priorities must be aligned with each department's mission or unit's mission. It lists common pitfalls to avoid. It recommends that each unit specify the relative importance of different types of teaching activities toward meeting the unit's mission. Then, it recommends that the unit assign corresponding weights to each type of activity in the individual faculty evaluations.

It recommends that when particular contributions to a unit's teaching mission require an unusually high amount of effort, that the additional quantitative aspect be taken into account. Examples include larger courses, new preps, unexpected changes such as increases or decreases in student enrollment, supervision of numerous teaching assistants, being flexible

and accommodating when asked, devoting extra time to professional development of teaching effectiveness, and mentoring new faculty.

In the annual evaluation of research, scholarly, and creative work, one of the relevant considerations is the quality and impact of scholarship/presentations (as opposed to the number completed). For service activities, it recommends that each unit determine the relative importance of certain types of service activities, by identifying each as “major,” “moderate,” or “minor” depending upon a set of criteria.

Academic faculty have “role statements” that outline their plan of work for a year. Role statements are cooperative agreements between faculty members and the chair or department. A sample role statement is on pp. 20-21. The guidance in this document states that all role statements should contain the percent weighting for teaching, research, and service. When an individual is up for evaluation of any type, the role statement should be used for expectations.

7. Winston-Salem State University. (2014). *Faculty Evaluation Manual*. Retrieved February 2, 2016, from <http://www.wssu.edu/administration/office-of-the-provost/academic-and-administrative-units/faculty-affairs/documents/fac-eval-manual-rev-oct-14.pdf>

This document provides a detailed history of the development of the faculty evaluation process at Winston-Salem State University (WSSU). It is based heavily upon a review of the literature and a review/adaptation of evaluation systems developed at other universities. This manual outlines the evaluation of the components of teaching, research, and service. Advising and mentoring of students falls under teaching activities. The review process follows a general framework, but each department may customize it to some extent in order to meet its needs.

See Appendix A for a “Responsibility List” for implementing the faculty evaluation system. See Appendix D for evaluation instruments (e.g., “Student Evaluation of Academic Advisor,” “Mentoring Evaluation Form,” “WSSU Teaching Evaluation Rubric for Faculty,” and “WSSU Service Evaluation Rubric”).