Faculty Evaluation Process

The performance of each faculty member of the Psychology Department is evaluated annually with respect to three criterion areas:

(a) Research and scholarship

(b) Teaching effectiveness

(c) Service

With respect to each criterion we focus on the quality and impact of the faculty member's performance.

These evaluations provide the basic data for:

(a) Feedback to the faculty member

(b) Assignment of merit salary increases

(c) Access to resources lodged in the Psychology Research Board. (The PRB will be a departmental account designed to support faculty scholarship by covering legitimate research costs, such as travel, subject pay, purchase of equipment and supplies and so on. Each member of the faculty will be allocated a specific amount to be used for these purposes. The amount allocated to each member of the faculty each year will be a function of the merit score resulting from the evaluation process).

The rest of this document explicates the criterion areas; the information used in the evaluation; the procedures by which the evaluation is carried out; and the procedures by which these ratings are translated into departmental, and USF, merit scores.

The Criterion Areas

Research and Scholarship refers primarily to contributions to knowledge that have been published, or submitted for publication, in peer-reviewed journals and other competitive outlets. The review takes into account work in progress; and work submitted, but mainly considers work in print. The form of publication - articles in refereed and prestigious journals, monographs, books, chapters, technical reports, unrefereed publications -- impacts somewhat our assessment of its merit; as are comments by the editorial reviewers, and by others citing the work. It must be stated clearly that the evaluation does not consist of the counting of published reports. Rather, it is the quality of the published research that is being evaluated. The raters are asked to judge the scientific merit of the work - its methodological soundness, its theoretical value, its overall impact for the problem area. We also try to take into account the relative difficulty and time problems involved in research in that particular area. For senior, well-established, investigators the location of the author's name in the authorship list is *not* a meaningful variable.

Teaching Effectiveness refers to both graduate and undergraduate (and, occasionally fellow faculty) teaching; it includes teaching in classroom,

19489

laboratory and field or clinic; it includes formal courses, research supervision and more informal consulting/advising. It includes course and curriculum development as well as course giving. Here, too, we are concerned with quality as well as amount. We try to evaluate quality by review of student evaluations, by gathering graduate student evaluations, by reviewing course outlines and syllabi, by noting selection as a thesis director, by quality of theses supervised; and the like. When appropriate peer evaluation can be used. The important point to emphasize is that it is student knowledge, and life change, that is our target as teachers. Popularity among students, as reflected by course evaluation ratings, is desirable but not determinative.

Service includes service to the department, college and campus; it also includes service to the scientific and professional community; and, in areas where it is appropriate, it includes service to the community. Here, we take into account memberships and chairmanships of committees (in the department, elsewhere on campus and such bodies as NSF study panels), and the effectiveness with which these committees' assignments have been carried out. In the case of service to the community, we are talking about service in one's capacity as a psychologist. To run for election to the school board is not counted as professional public service; to be a psychological consultant to the school board would be included.

The impact and recognition consequent on the faculty member's achievements in research/scholarship, teaching and service is a critical element in evaluation. Thus, evidence should be presented of the impact of the faculty member's work in the scientific-professional areas for which it is germane. It also includes evidence of recognition received - awards, election to honor societies, etc. - in the field. Faculty whose scholarly efforts focus, in part, on instruction in all its aspects can consider the success and recognition of their contribution to instructional development evidence for impact and recognition.

The Information Base

Each year, each faculty member is asked to provide a current progress report covering activities in the preceding three years. The report has three components:

1. A formal CV, covering the faculty member's entire career

2. A formal/narrative report covering the last three years

3. Two reprints, or manuscripts, representing work done in the last three years

The report must be submitted in a timely manner. Reports arriving past the deadline will not be considered and the faculty member will be assigned the lowest possible merit rating.

The formal/narrative report should be organized in 4 sections, each of which will begin with a listing of relevant data for the last three years in the category to be followed by a narrative, not to exceed 2 pages per section, in which the faculty member can explain the nature of the activities listed in the formal report. The sections are:

19489

1. **Research:** List of publications including "in press", "submitted" and "in preparation". Also, a list of current, recent, and submitted research grants. The narrative section should be used to explain the programmatic nature of the research, its place within the current development of the field and the directions in which the research program will presumably progress in the near future This section should present data that can be used to judge the impact of the faculty member's research program. Such data include, citations of work by others, and any other indications of its impact such as comments in reviews of the literature. Note that a scathing review by a theoretical adversary is also an indication of impact. . Also report a listing of honors and awards (both local and national and international) - election to memberships and offices of professional societies, membership on study panels and so on. Such data are relevant to the assessment of impact. The narrative section should place this evidence in the context of the field.

2. **Teaching**: A complete list of all instructional activities during the past three years should be in the formal section. Courses, enrollment in the courses, student evaluations, peer comments, and so on may all be used. List also all theses and individual projects supervised, advisees, course and curriculum development. Again the narrative section is provided so you can highlight the instructional activity that was, in your view, particularly important and interesting. Also report receipt of any teaching awards or special recognition of contributions in the area of instruction (e.g., publishing of textbooks.

3. **Service:** A listing of committee memberships, chairmanships, activities (department, college, campus, scientific and professional community); public service activities (where appropriate). The narrative section should describe the nature of the committee assignment highlighting when appropriate those committees that represented for you a heavy workload, or where your contributions were particularly significant

The Process

The Evaluation Subcommittee of the Executive Committee will conduct the evaluation. This subcommittee will consist of the Associate Chair, the Area Directors and the At Large elected members of the Executive Committee. The Associate Chair of the Department will chair this subcommittee. In the rest of this document the evaluation subcommittee will be called "the Committee".

The annual progress reports are made available to all members of the Committee. All committee members will read in detail all of the reports. All members of the Committee, other than the Chair, rate each faculty member on each of three scales: Research, Teaching, and Service. To avoid halo effects Committee members are instructed to read and rate all the reports in one category (scale) before they read the other categories.

The ratings will be given to the Chair. Each Committee member will rate each faculty member on each of the following scales: research, service, undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, and overall teaching. Committee members will leave blank any scales for which a faculty member does not have assigned duties sufficient to be evaluated. The arithmetic mean will be calculated for each faculty member across Committee members across each scale. Means will be calculated on those ratings that are not missing; data will not be imputed. These merit scores, and the distribution of scores across the department, will be reported to each faculty member and will be used internally to guide departmental actions. The scores will be translated so that ranges of the distribution will correspond to the scores reported on the University's evaluation forms, where merit

19489

ratings range from 1 to 5. The Committee will decide the mapping of standard scores to the USF numerical scale.

Upon standardizing and aggregating the scores, the Chair will examine the degree to which the pattern of ratings for any individual faculty member suggests that further discussion is useful. The Chair can call for a discussion by the Committee of the evaluation scores assigned to any member of the faculty.

Each faculty member will receive his or her mean Committee score for each of the scales (research, service, undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, and overall teaching). The evaluation committee will create profiles for teaching, research and service that are illustrative of ratings in the range of 4.5 to 5 and in the range of 4 to 4.5. Faculty members will also receive information on the distribution of Committee ratings (at a minimum, such information will include the mean and standard deviation of Committee ratings).

When reporting the outcome of the evaluation, the Chair will provide a narrative summary and explanation of the ratings. Each assistant, and associate, professor will meet with the Chair to discuss the ratings. The Chair will also be available to Full Professors who wish to discuss the outcome of the evaluation.

The arithmetic mean of the Committee ratings for each of the scales will be rounded to the nearest quarter point (e.g., 3.9 will become 4.0, 4.25 will remain 4.25). The rounded scores will be reported on the USF Annual Faculty Review Summary ratings form as the Committee ratings. The Chair will supply whatever ratings he or she sees fit on the USF Annual Faculty Review Summary form in the space provided for the Chair's ratings, but will not alter the Committee ratings.

For allocation of Departmental Research Support Funds, anyone with an average Research rating greater than or equal to 3 is eligible to get a share of research support funds. Each person's share will be proportional to the average research rating provided by the Evaluation Committee. Administrative professionals will complete an independent check of all computations to ensure that the numbers reported to the University and used in the allocation of merit raises and Research Support Fund are correct.

Evaluation Criteria.

Research and Scholarship:

How much research has the faculty member done, and published? Of what kind, (empirical studies, integrative reviews, theoretical development)? How sound? How creative? How has the research fared in the peer review process? Is it focused on one (or a few) problem area(s), rather than diffuse? Is it overly narrow, rather than providing contribution to a broader area? Is it programmatic, in that successive studies are conceptually related, rather than a "scattershot" of unrelated studies? Is it overly redundant - many publications based on same or overlapping data/ideas, rather than each publication being a new (even if related) contribution? How much of it is: articles in refereed journals; books and chapters in books; other kinds of published works? How often and how favorably has the work been cited? To what extent has the work stimulated the work of others? How well known are the faculty member of their work? Within what range (or breadth) is the work known? ? What notable offices has the faculty member been elected or appointed to? What honors have been awarded? (Include pre-doctoral and post-doctoral fellowships, honorific appointments, distinguished awards, etc.)

19489

Teaching Effectiveness:

What classroom teaching does the faculty member do? How is the teaching distributed among the different levels of instruction? Does the load include any labs? Grad courses? Seminars? How heavily enrolled are the courses? How many students, on the average, are supervised in individual projects? (Graduate and Undergraduate)? How many students have been served as: MA supervisor; MA committee; Ph.D. Supervisor; Ph.D. committee? How conscientious, how effective, is the supervision of student research?

What are student evaluations of the teaching (and what are the relevant data)? Has the faculty member received citations and awards marking the quality of teaching? Are there any contributions to course or curriculum development?

Service:

How active is the person in service of the Area and program; of other programs; of the department; of the CAS College; of the campus? What is the person's service to the professional and scientific community? Has the faculty member been involved in the peer review process? Is the faculty member a journal editor? What journals/agencies are "occasionally reviewed" for? What involvement does the record show in "community service or in "public service" activities that are related to the faculty member's area of professional competence

Rating Scales

For each criterion area, we use the USF rating scale:

Outstanding	5
Strong to Outstanding	4.5
Strong	4
Satisfactory to Strong	3.5
Satisfactory	3
Weak to Satisfactory	2.5
Weak	2
Unacceptable to Weak	1.5
Unacceptable	1