

FACULTY EVALUATIONS

LEANNE SHANK
GENERAL COUNSEL
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY
MAY 23, 2012
© 2012 WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

THE CHAIR

- Chair sets the tone and guides the process
- Chair must know role, duties and authority at every step
- Chair must communicate clear expectations upon hiring and throughout evaluation period
- Ongoing evaluations must be honest, objective and provide realistic assessment of one's work during the specified period of time
- DOCUMENT, DOCUMENT, DOCUMENT - for benefit of candidate, yourself and successor chairs

DUTIES, ROLE AND AUTHORITY

- **Know** the universe of rules that apply and your Role: Faculty Handbook and Published Institutional Procedures
- Understand and Communicate –
 - **No Promises** during hiring and through evaluations
 - Timing
 - Process
 - File Preparation and Contents
 - Institutional and Departmental Evaluation Criteria

EFFECTIVE ASSESSMENTS

- Avoid “conflict avoidance” syndrome
- Timely preparation, implementation and follow up
- Document, Document, Document

- Should never come as a surprise
- Update assessment as information is available
- Seek guidance when advisable

- Do not procrastinate if discipline or termination becomes necessary – political will and legal ability

INSTITUTIONAL CRITERIA

1. Teaching
2. Scholarship/Research
3. Service

- Aspirational Goals (e.g., “complete teacher-scholar”)
- Know the essential functions within each criterion
- Difference in weighting among the three – in written procedures or in practice?

- Have criteria changed since hire?
- Do department guidelines differ from institutional?

TEACHING

- Is excellence in teaching an overarching, core institutional principle?
- Weighting of student and colleague/peer evaluations
- Consistency in gathering and weighing evaluations

SCHOLARSHIP

- Quality and quantity of publications, placement
- Outside peer evaluations
- Evidence of sustainable and significant line of inquiry – productivity may not yet be fully demonstrated, but promising

ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP/SERVICE

- Know your institutional considerations
- Examples:
 - Enhances collegiality of the institution by cooperation with other faculty
 - Advising, Committee and Administrative work
 - Works with student organizations
 - Civic and professional activities and memberships

“COLLEGIALITY”

- Can be “third rail” of faculty evaluations
- Shared governance requires collaboration and positive interactions with colleagues
- Do not confuse congenial with collegial
- Do not use collegiality or service as pretext for unlawful discrimination
- Does conduct interfere with departmental or institutional business?
- Has candidate been warned?
- **DOCUMENTED?**

IDENTIFY UNDERPERFORMING FACULTY

- **Cannot or Will Not?**
 - If **Cannot** -- lack of skills may be improved with Mentoring
 - Improvement/Professional Development Plan
 - Tenure or Promotion Postponement
 - If **Will Not** – cut the cord early
- Personal or Medical Issues?
 - CAUTION: Work with HR
- Attitude?
 - Entrenched indifference – establish written expectations and DOCUMENT
- **NO SURPRISES**

FILE REVIEW: NOT- SO-UNIQUE ISSUES

- Misconduct
 - In Evaluation File? Disclosed to Review Committee?
 - Related to fitness as faculty member?
 - Violation of Institutional Policy?
- New Information
- Confidentiality
- E-Mail: “Evil, Eternal and Embarrassing”
- Watch for Assessment Creep – maintain objectivity

POTENTIAL CHALLENGES TO EVALUATIONS

- Discrimination
- Inadequate process
- Contract or standards-based
- Speech / Academic Freedom
- Tenure or reappointment denials will be upheld if published procedures applied fairly, consistently, and decision not tainted by discrimination
- You always want to look and be “**FAIR**”

CASE STUDY FOR DISCUSSION

- Maria Sanchez is in her fourth year of teaching in the Mathematics Department at YOUR UNIVERSITY (second term appointment - - next year will be her last year of that term appointment).
- Her teaching has always been average, and her research/scholarship is unremarkable.
- There have been a number of incidents in the past few years of inappropriate/uncivil behavior towards department staff, non-department faculty, and one incident involving screaming at a group of students.

EVALUATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT

- What can/should be taken into account as the Department considers whether to recommend reappointment?
- What may/must the file contain?
- What may/should the Department consider outside of what is in the reappointment file?
- What should you, as Department Chair, refer to as you consider these questions?
- Whom should you consult?

WHAT IF . . .

- Student Evaluations in the file are positive, but student grapevine is full of anecdotes that indicate otherwise?
- Others in the department have been reappointed with lesser scholarship?
- No one has ever addressed the uncivil/inappropriate behavior with Prof. Sanchez?
- The uncivil behavior was the subject of a harassment investigation, but the file is in the Provost's office and it involved students not in her department, so no one in the department was involved?

WHAT IF . . .

- The former Department Chair (who rotated off two years ago) made an ethnic slur about the department having “our very own latino” at the time of her first reappointment?
- Professor Sanchez has asked for family leave for the fall term of her fifth year to care for her elderly mother, who is terminally ill?