

February 19, 2019

Geology Department Evaluation Procedures

The Geology Department will evaluate candidates for promotion, tenure, or otherwise in accordance with the current Faculty Code and this document. Each of the steps outlined below will be included in the evaluation process.

The Department will conduct evaluations during the first and second years of a faculty member's term for tenure line faculty; this will be conducted by the Chair of the Department, and will consist of a review of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations during that time period, ongoing discussions with the evaluatee regarding the evaluatee's developing role in the Department and the University, as well as the evaluatee's professional activities. A written report shall be sent to the evaluatee and to the dean.

Three-year Assistant Professor evaluations will be conducted by the Geology Department. Three-year evaluations of Associate Professors who are not candidates for tenure or promotion will be conducted by the Department Chair unless the evaluatee elects to proceed with a full review as described in Chapter III, Section 4 of the Faculty Code. Evaluations shall be based on performance in the following areas, listed in the order of importance: (1) teaching, (2) professional growth, (3) service to the University, and (4) needs of the Department and University.

Five-year Full Professor evaluations will be conducted by the Department Chair as described in Chapter III, Section 5 of the Faculty Code unless the evaluatee elects to proceed with a full review as described in Chapter III, Section 4 of the Faculty Code based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance: (1) teaching; (2) professional growth; (3) advising students; (4) participation in departmental and university service; and (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise.

Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Specifically, decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance: (1) teaching; (2) professional growth; (3) advising students; (4) participation in departmental and university service; and (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise. Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. In addition, appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral, or other equivalent terminal degree. Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas. Promotion shall be made only after evaluation of the faculty member in the manner provided in Chapter III of the Faculty Code.

The service previous to tenure is a trial period in which the faculty member's fitness for tenure is tested. The essential criterion for the awarding of tenure is the appraisal of excellence as a professional, rather than measurement of the faculty member's ability to avoid some deficiency. Specifically, the factors to be considered in making the tenure decision are: 1) proven excellence in teaching, (2) distinct evidence of professional growth, (3) a record of service to the department and university and (4) the needs of the department, school, or program and the university. Unless there is affirmative evidence of excellence in areas (1) and (2), a record of service in area (3) and demonstrated need in area (4) of this paragraph, tenure should not be granted. All persons participating in the evaluation for tenure and in the tenure decision shall be guided by these criteria.

Responsibility for demonstrating that the evaluatee has met the standards for tenure rests with the evaluatee.

Instructors will be evaluated on the basis of their performance in the area of teaching, professional development, advising students, and departmental service, although university service and scholarly activity may be considered.

Evaluation Procedures

An alternative evaluation procedure may be selected by Full Professors and Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank. The streamlined evaluation will be approved or denied by the department chair and the dean and conducted as described in Chapter III, Section 5 of the Faculty Code. The department chair, in consultation with the dean, will approve the streamlined evaluation procedure based on information from student evaluations, class visits, and previous evaluations. The evaluatee will prepare a file as described below and submit it to the department at least one month prior to the evaluation date. All department colleagues will have the option of reviewing the file. After reviewing the file, the department chair will write a letter of evaluation and submit it to the dean along with the evaluatee's file. The evaluatee will also receive a copy of the department chair's evaluation letter.

Full evaluations for Instructor, 3-year Assistant, 3-year Associate, 5 year Full, promotion, and tenure evaluations will be conducted as follows:

1) The candidate being evaluated will prepare a file that will be available to other faculty in the department during the evaluation process. The evaluatee will be responsible for scheduling the student evaluations for the appropriate time period (see below); the evaluatee is also responsible for compiling the evaluations and including them in the file that is to be submitted to the Department. This file is to include:

- a) a written statement of teaching philosophy and long and short-term professional objectives;
- b) syllabi, examinations, student evaluations, and any other pertinent material for all courses given by the evaluatee during the evaluation period (this means the most recent two semesters taught before the evaluation for Instructor, 3-year Assistant, 3-year Associate, 5 year Full, and promotion evaluations, and the most recent four semesters taught before tenure evaluations).
- c) evidence documenting professional growth and activities;
- d) information concerning successful advising;
- e) information concerning university, department, and community service;

2) All tenure line faculty members and ongoing instructors who are not on leave or sabbatical will read the file.

3) All available tenure-line members of the faculty and ongoing instructors will observe the evaluatee in the class room more than once during the evaluation period. However, the Department encourages class visits on a continuing basis. Members of the department must document when they visited particular class meetings.

4) Any faculty member may obtain additional information concerning the evaluatee through class room visitations, informal discussions with alumni, informal discussions with colleagues, and informal discussions with the evaluatee.

5) All faculty members participating in the evaluation will then, based on the assembled evidence, determine if the candidate meets University and Departmental criteria. Each should write a letter with a specific recommendation to be submitted to the departmental chair or to the Dean of the University as specified in the Faculty Code.

6) All faculty members participating in the evaluation will meet to discuss individual recommendations and will arrive at a departmental recommendation without the evaluatee being present.

- 7) The Department Chair will write and provide to the evaluatee:
- A list of those participating in the department's deliberations and those who submitted letters to the head officer.
 - A summary of the substance of the letters, except for open files.
 - A summary of the department's deliberations. The Departmental letter summarizing the deliberative process and recommendation will be signed by all participating faculty members; signature denotes agreement with the content, but not necessarily the conclusions, of the letter. The evaluatee will sign the letter as recognition of the content of the letter. A copy of that recommendation will be available to all geology faculty members.
- 8) All materials will be submitted to the Dean of the University and the Advancement Committee.

Evaluation Criteria

According to the Faculty Code the Geology Department must evaluate a faculty member on the basis of the following criteria:

- 1) Teaching
- 2) Professional growth
- 3) Advising
- 4) Departmental and University service
- 5) Community service
- 6) Needs of the Department, school, programs and the University.

The criteria used at each evaluation will be those specified according to the standards and requirements in the Faculty Code. Only those criteria specified in this document and the Faculty Code can be considered. The Department Chair will assure that each criterion is addressed in the departmental recommendation.

1) Teaching The following aspects of teaching will be considered in evaluating a colleague's teaching performance; however, this does not constitute an exhaustive list:

- a) A teacher must be prepared and competent.
- b) A teacher must choose material for the course taught appropriate to the needs of the particular class "audience" and the curricular requirements of the Department.
- c) A teacher must establish appropriate, well-defined objectives for each course, communicate those objectives, and establish methods for evaluating attainment of those objectives.
- d) A teacher must be current and revise courses to coincide with advances in the discipline, and with changes in the design of the Geology Department's curriculum.
- e) A teacher must organize the course well.
- f) A teacher must present course material efficiently, clearly, and in a manner designed to stimulate student interest.
- g) A teacher must be reasonably accessible to students outside the classroom.
- h) A teacher of geology must plan courses that integrate theory, laboratory, and fieldwork.

2) Professional growth may be established by a record of continuous progress toward goals established by the candidate and department. All evaluatees must provide evidence of activities in all categories a-c (below), while evidence of activities in categories d-e (below) is encouraged, but optional.

- a) A continuing research program is required. Because undergraduate research is a key element of the Geology Program for majors, participation in the Departmental undergraduate research program is critical. A faculty member should be willing and able to advise and direct undergraduate research programs. In addition, the faculty member should, when possible (depending on student availability, interest, and funding), include undergraduates as participants in their professional research.
- b) Peer-reviewed publication of scientific writing is considered meritorious, but not required. Publication may take the form of textbooks; grant proposals; scientific research papers; abstracts

of papers presented at professional conferences; articles on teaching in geology; and reviews of books, articles, and proposals. Examples of publications should be included in the evaluatee's file.

c) Currency in the professional literature and presentation of research at international, national, and regional professional meetings; at other universities; and presentation of research or topics of scientific educational interest to the public or University community is considered meritorious.

d) Membership and active participation in professional organizations and maintenance and development of professional contacts is encouraged.

e) Use of the University's sabbatical or leave program, including research and/or pedagogical development, may provide evidence of professional growth.

3) Each faculty member should participate in advising in order to establish and maintain a good advising system. The faculty member should accept an appropriate number of advisees and should actively maintain an interest in the goals of such advisees to graduation and beyond, or until the advisee decides to major in another department. Advising is not limited to formal advisee-advisor relationships, but should include one-to-one interaction throughout the academic year to further advisee academic and career growth. Advisors should discuss with students their goals, abilities, deficiencies, interests, and needs in helping the students plan their academic careers.

The faculty member should post and maintain regular office hours.

4) Departmental and University Service:

Geology faculty are expected to actively participate in the day-to-day operation of the Department and in the longer-term planning for the future of the Department.

Geology faculty are expected to be available to serve on standing and ad hoc University committees, and to serve when requested by the Dean of the University and the Faculty Senate in activities which further the aims and image of the Department and University (such as recruiting and public speaking).

Faculty will be evaluated on their willingness and ability to respond to ongoing and changing University and departmental needs; awareness of new directions in the Departmental and University curricula, and in the profession as whole; and on their willingness to develop new resources for use by the Department and University.

Evaluation of Departmental and University service should be made by examining the record of the evaluatee's service activity, and particular consideration should be given to the appropriateness and to the time commitment involved in such service activity.

5) Community Service includes other activities within the candidate's professional interests and expertise. While these activities are encouraged, they should not interfere with the faculty member's teaching, research, advising, and departmental and university service. Each faculty member is responsible for determining the appropriate level of involvement in this category. Evaluation of community service will be made by examining the record of the evaluatee's service activity, and particular consideration should be given to the appropriateness and the time commitment involved in such service activity.

Written and Approved by:

Michael Valentine, Geology Chair

Ken Clark

Kena Fox-Dobbs

Barry Goldstein

Jeff Tepper

Approved by PSC April 26, 2019