

## College of Social Work

### Evaluation Criteria Document

(Approved by CSW Faculty April 25, 2008)

(Revision Approved February 15 and April 19, 2013; April 22, 2016)

#### I. ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

(Amended by CSW Faculty April 22, 2016)

##### **General Criteria For Overall Performance Evaluations**

The performance of all faculty members, with the exception of those on personal leave of absence and/or those not being reappointed who have either received or are not entitled to receive a notice of non-reappointment, is evaluated annually by the Dean, and separately through peer review during the Spring Semester. Faculty members receive notification that the annual evaluation will be conducted during the Spring Semester and are requested to provide evidence of their performance in the form of a memo or report to support assigned duties for the preceding calendar year. The faculty member's Summary of Accomplishments Reports from FEAS, Assignment of Responsibilities, and provide the basis for the performance rating on the Peer Review Checklist form, and might include optional narrative commentary provided by the Faculty member supporting data and/or interpretive comments as appropriate.

Faculty Performance Evaluations are based upon assigned duties and responsibilities, taking into consideration the nature of the assignments and quality of performance. When reviewing a faculty member's performance, the following elements are considered if applicable to the assigned duties and responsibilities:

- Ability to teach in an effective manner through oral and written instruction;
- Contributions to research and other creative activity including effectiveness at securing external funding and timely completion of contractual obligations;
- Contributions in the area of service to CSW and the University; and
- Other University duties, contributions, and/or effectiveness as appropriate to the assignment.

Evaluations will be conducted according to the following criteria, consistent with faculty classification and assigned duties:

- **Meets FSU's High Expectations** – This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty and completes assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.
- **Exceeds FSU's High Expectations** – This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: high level of research/creative activity, professional recognitions, willingness to accept additional responsibilities, high level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the Department, involvement/leadership in professional associations, initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.

- **Significantly Exceeds High Expectations** – This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: highly significant research or creative activities; demonstrated recognition of the individual by peers as an authority in his/her field; securing significant external funding; attaining significant national or international achievements, awards, and recognition.

If an individual’s overall performance rating falls below “Meets FSU’s High Expectations,” specific suggestions for improvement should be provided to the employee. There are two performance rating categories for individuals who are not meeting expectations:

- **Official Concern** – This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty but is not completing assigned responsibilities in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university.
- **Unsatisfactory** – This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in his/her field of specialty and/or in completing assigned responsibilities.

As part of an individual’s annual evaluation, he or she will be provided with an annual “progress toward promotion” letter.

### **Specific Procedures For Peer Review**

Each faculty member will be evaluated by his/her peers within their respective Category. The peer review will use the criteria established by faculty performance evaluations and be conducted in accordance with a format and procedures decided by the relevant faculty. Peer review will be conducted simultaneously with the evaluation for meritorious performance. Tenured and tenure-track faculty will be reviewed in teaching, research, and service. Specialized faculty will be reviewed in teaching and service. Faculty will compare expected performance (Assignment of Responsibilities) against actual performance (Summary of Accomplishments from FEAS) to determine if expectations were met.

Results from this assessment will be forwarded to the Dean for inclusion in the annual review process. Individual faculty member responses to this evaluation can be communicated to the Dean during the annual review.

### **Assignment of Responsibilities (including summer criteria and procedures for supplemental summer appointments for 9-month faculty)**

An annual assignment of responsibilities is required by the university. These written assignments are agreed on between the Dean and the individual concerned, and normally include assignments in teaching, research, and service. Evaluation of the faculty member will be made on the basis of these mutually agreed upon assignments.

Changes in the assigned responsibilities may be made if college or university needs arise. Such changes will be made only after consultation and such changes will be made a matter of written record for purposes of evaluation.

Supplemental summer appointments for 9-month faculty shall be offered equitably and as appropriate to qualified faculty members in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 8.5 (b) (1) b.

The following procedures will serve as a guide for summer assignments:

1. *Teaching Needs*: Faculty appointments are based on who is qualified to teach the classes being offered.
  - a. Note: Faculty rank is not considered a deciding factor in determining summer appointments.
2. *Teaching Requests*: Faculty appointments are based on who is interested in teaching the classes being offered.
  - a. Note: Faculty who turn in their summer requests according to prescribed deadlines will be given priority in assignments.
3. *Conflicts or non-Assignments*: If there is more than one faculty member requesting the same course, or if there are more faculty than courses available, then those who do not receive a summer assignment are given preference the following summer.

## **II. Merit Criteria and Method For Distribution of Merit Salary Increases**

### **SYSTEM FOR MEASURING MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE**

#### **Definition**

The College of Social Work's definition of meritorious performance is that which: a) meets or exceeds the individual duties as represented in the Summary of Accomplishments when compared with the expectations delineated in the AOR; and b) meets or exceeds the expectations for the position classification and department. Faculty are evaluated as: 0 = does not meet criteria; 1 = meets the criteria; 2 = exceeds criteria; or 3 = significantly exceeds criteria. Faculty must be considered as having met criteria (i.e., score of 1 or higher) in all areas (i.e., teaching, research, service) in order to be eligible for merit.

With respect to *teaching*, some examples of meritorious performance might include:

- instituting a creative way to present or structure course material or assignments
  - utilizing an innovative technique or style
  - supervising Directed Individual Studies and/or Tutorial courses
  - receiving a high proportion of "excellent" ratings by students of a field instructor/liason on field evaluation forms
  - receiving a college, university, or other noteworthy recognition for teaching or advising
  - having responsibility for the field supervision of one or more students when not employed in the Field Office
  - serving as a Chair or committee member for doctoral students or candidates
  - serving as a teaching mentor for doctoral students
  - securing external funding in support of educational activities
- With respect to *research and scholarship*, some examples of meritorious performance might include:

- publishing or submitting scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles (either conceptual or empirical) beyond those required on the AOR
- publishing a non-edited book
- gaining attention for scholarship that is deemed particularly noteworthy (e.g., citations, invited publications, key note addresses)
- winning a scientific or scholarly award
- securing external grant funding in order to conduct research that contributes dollars to the College of Social Work's budget
- serving as an editor of a scholarly, peer-reviewed journal
- serving as a research mentor (e.g., assistantship, grant application, or undergraduate research awards) for students

With respect to *service*, there are several areas to be considered: 1) local or state community service that is on behalf of the College of Social Work; 2) service to the College of Social Work; 3) service to the University; and 4) service to the profession or professional societies. Some examples of meritorious performance might include:

- non-paid work with or on behalf of community agencies or groups
- serving on a Governor's appointed task force or statewide advocacy committee
- serving in a leadership role on a local, state, or national committee
- giving professional workshops/trainings or colloquia that are based on professional activities such as research or teaching for which an individual is not paid
- serving as a leader on a College or University committee
- serving on a high number (compared to peers) of College and/or University committees
- presenting peer-reviewed papers at professional meetings
- serving as a leader in a professional association
- securing extensive funding for a community-based project(s)
- serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization
- serving as the chair of a certificate or specialized study program

### **Merit Procedure**

All faculty (except adjuncts and courtesy) will be reviewed for merit using annual evaluation materials. Peer review for merit will be done within category. Results are compiled by the Faculty Affairs Committee and forwarded to the Dean.

The Executive Assistant to the Dean will compile merit application folders to include the following materials:

- 1) Summary of Accomplishments from FEAS
- 2) Copies of teaching evaluation summaries that are required by the University
- 3) Assignment of Responsibilities
- 4) Any additional accomplishments

**Evaluation**

Tenure-track faculty will review the merit documents of tenure-track faculty members. Specialized faculty will review the merit documents of specialized faculty members. Each area on a faculty member’s assignment of responsibilities will be evaluated for meritorious performance using the combined criteria of quality and quantity. For tenure-track faculty the areas of evaluation are: teaching, research and scholarship, and service. For specialized faculty, the areas of evaluation are: teaching, service, and research where applicable. Faculty performance will be evaluated in each area appropriate for their assignment. Faculty will be considered eligible for merit within each area separately.

**MERIT RATING** (Circle one response in each row)

0=does not meet; 1 = meets; 2 = exceeds; 3 = significantly exceeds; NA = Not Applicable

|                          |   |   |   |   |    |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|
| Teaching                 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| Research/<br>Scholarship | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| Service                  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA |
| Annual Peer<br>Review    | 0 | 1 |   |   |    |

**Faculty Affairs Committee**

The Faculty Affairs Committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the Dean in accordance with the College of Social Work’s bylaws and this policy, “System for Measuring Meritorious Performance.” The Faculty Affairs Committee will receive the ratings of merit reviews given by tenure-track and specialized faculty members of their peers, and rank them from highest to lowest within the categories of faculty (tenure-track and specialized) and performance. Tenure- track faculty will be reviewed for teaching, research, and service; specialized faculty will be reviewed for teaching and service. The ratings and rankings will be made available to the Dean each year for consideration in assigning merit pay increases, whether or not discretionary funds are available for distribution. Previous rankings of meritorious work in years when funds were not available may also be considered by the Dean in years when they are.

**III. SECOND AND FOURTH YEAR REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURES**

The second and fourth year reviews (2/4YR) are to ascertain whether an untenured tenure track faculty member in his or her second or fourth year at Florida State University College of Social Work has demonstrated sufficient pedagogical ability, progress in publication, and effectiveness in service to warrant a recommendation for continuation in a tenure-track position.

## **Second and Fourth Year Review (2/4YR) Procedures**

1. In the fall semesters of the reviewee's second and fourth years, the College of Social Work will initiate a second or fourth year review (2/4YR) as applicable.
2. A two-person Second (or Fourth) Year Review Committee (2/4YRC) will be selected from members of the promotion and tenure committee. Members will be drawn by lot from those not previously selected, and by like rotation thereafter until all necessary committees are filled.
3. The reviewee shall submit a current, comprehensive curriculum vitae and a portfolio containing the items specified below (see *2/4YR Binder* instructions).
  - A. The 2/4YRC will review the CV and portfolio materials.
    1. The reviewee's portfolio shall contain a Candidate's Statement modeled on that required for a promotion and/or tenure binder, addressing teaching, research, and service.
      - a. See Appendix C  
<http://fda.fsu.edu/content/download/31414/196226/Appendix%20C2012.pdf> of 2012 Memo for guidance on combining teaching research and service statements in a single document.
4. The 2/4YRC shall provide to the Dean a written evaluation including specific feedback and advice reflecting expectations for tenure and how the faculty member is progressing toward meeting those expectations [FSU CBA 15.3 (e)(3)].
5. The 2/4YRC's report is advisory to the Dean and will be included in the reviewee's tenure binder.

### **I. Teaching**

The reviewee's portfolio shall contain the following materials pertaining to teaching.

- A. Student Perception of Courses and Instructors (SPCI)
  1. A statement of teaching responsibilities for the full two or four-year period, listing courses, when taught, and to how many students; membership on doctoral committees; and
  2. A summary of SPCI reports for each course taught
- B. Classroom Visits
  1. The 2/4YRC shall make at least two classroom observations
- C. Student Survey (4YR only)
  1. The 4YRC shall survey students taught by the reviewee as part of his or her regular assignment of responsibilities. Undergraduate and graduate surveys will be administered and analyzed separately.

#### D. Teaching Criteria

1. The TYRC will assess the reviewee's teaching based on materials included in the applicable items above.

### II. **Research**

1. The reviewee's portfolio shall contain the following materials pertaining to research:

- a. Manuscripts published and/or submitted since the reviewee joined the CSW faculty. For each published work and submitted manuscript, the reviewee shall indicate on the CV whether or not the work has been (or is being) refereed. [The Graduate Policy Council defines a refereed publication as: a) the manuscript must leave the editorial office for independent review; b) the manuscript must have a chance of being rejected; and c) one should be able to find the publication on the shelf in a university library or online in association with a peer-reviewed online journal.]
- b. Copies of research grants or proposals or grants if the reviewee is either a principal investigator or investigator and has contributed to writing the proposal and/or the work done under the proposal.

2. Research Criteria

The following will be reviewed as evidence of research productivity:

- a. Publication of a refereed scholarly book by a university press or other press of reputable academic stature;
- b. Submission of a scholarship book-length manuscript to a press of reputable academic stature which will referee the work;
- c. Scholarly articles, including manuscripts accepted or submitted, all of which have been or will be reviewed; and
- d. Grant proposals.

### III. **Service**

The reviewee's evidence for service will consist of the relevant section of the Candidate's Statement and appropriate content as noted in the CV.

1. Service Criteria

In evaluating the reviewee's service, the committee shall take into account:

- a. The reviewee should have willingly undertaken a reasonable academic service assignment;
- b. The reviewee should have completed, in good standing, any service to which he or she was assigned or for which he or she volunteered, unless the reviewee was relieved of this responsibility for reasons other than the reviewee's failure to perform adequately in that role; and
- c. When a major portion of the reviewee's assignment consists of administrative duties, a survey of students immediately affected by the reviewee's functions may be administered.

## **IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURE**

### **A. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure Track Faculty**

The College of Social Work adheres to the procedures for promotion and tenure of ranked faculty as specified by The Florida State University, accessible at:

<http://hr.fsu.edu/pdf/Publications/UFFAgreement-CBA-2013-16.pdf>. Specifically, Appendix I of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Criteria are applied as indicated below.

#### **Teaching**

Effective college teaching is based on competence in subject areas taught and in learning practices, a commitment to student learning, and skill in promoting a productive learning environment.

##### *Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure*

A sustained record of effective teaching as indicated by required student evaluations, peer classroom visitations, and the Dean's review is required for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

##### *Promotion to Full Professor*

A sustained record of effective teaching at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels as indicated by required student evaluations, peer classroom visitations, and the Dean's review is required for tenure and promotion to full professor.

#### **Research**

Scholarship entails systematic inquiry into a subject or creative activity, attainment of a level of expertise, and communication of that expertise to others. In the case of an applied profession such as social work, others may include researchers, social service professionals in the community, and policy makers. A record of effective scholarship is evidenced by an independent line of scholarship that has led to peer-reviewed publications, resources to conduct research, citations by other researchers in peer-reviewed publications, and to a lesser extent, professional presentations.

##### *Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure*

A record of effective scholarship which shows the candidate's promise of becoming a leading scholar in an area of expertise is required for promotion and tenure to associate professor.

##### *Promotion to Full Professor*

An outstanding record of scholarship indicating attainment of national or international stature is required for promotion to professor.

#### **Service**

Service occurs in four arenas: college, university, community, and the profession. While all forms of service are valued, faculty members are encouraged to pursue service opportunities in a manner that is congruent with the mission of social work and the development of their research agenda (balanced with all areas on the Assignments of Responsibilities).

##### *Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure*

Service, especially outside of the college, is generally expected to be minimal for promotion to associate professor and tenure.

##### *Promotion to Full Professor*

For promotion to full professor, service is expected to be significant. The service record should provide evidence that faculty members have well-established national reputations in their field, as well as showing meaningful roles within the college and university.

## **B. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure Track Faculty**

Votes for promotion and/or tenure will be conducted in accordance with CSW Bylaws and University policies. Meetings of tenured faculty member groups (excluding candidates under review) appropriate for review of and votes on the candidate(s) under consideration will be held. Discussion and procedures of each meeting will be summarized and reported consistent with University policy, and conveyed as appropriate by the elected CSW representative to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

## **C. Criteria and Procedures for Promotion for Non-General Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

The College of Social Work adheres to the procedures for promotion of Specialized faculty as specified by The Florida State University, accessible at: <http://hr.fsu.edu/PDF/Publications/UFFAgreement-CBA-2013-16.pdf>. [Specifically, Appendix J of the Collective Bargaining Agreement](#). Criteria are applied as indicated below.

### **Teaching**

Effective college teaching is based on competence in subject areas taught and in learning practices, a commitment to student learning, and skill in promoting a productive learning environment.

#### ***Promotion to Teaching Faculty II***

A sustained record of effective teaching as indicated by required student evaluations, peer classroom visitations, and the Dean's review is required for promotion to teaching professor II.

#### ***Promotion to Teaching Faculty III***

A sustained record of effective teaching at the bachelor's or master's levels as indicated by required student evaluations, peer classroom visitations, and the Dean's review is required for promotion to Teaching Faculty III.

### **Research**

Scholarship entails systematic inquiry into a subject or creative activity, attainment of a level of expertise, and communication of that expertise to others. In the case of an applied profession such as social work, others may include researchers, social service professionals in the community, and policy makers. A record of effective scholarship is evidenced by an independent line of scholarship that has led to peer-reviewed publications, resources to conduct research, citations by other researchers in peer-reviewed publications, and to a lesser extent, professional presentations.

#### ***Promotion to Research Faculty II***

A record of effective scholarship which shows the faculty member's promise of becoming a leading scholar in an area of expertise is required for promotion to Research Faculty II.

#### ***Promotion to Research Faculty III***

An outstanding record of scholarship indicating attainment of national or international stature is required for promotion to Research Faculty III.

### **Service**

Service occurs in four arenas: college, university, community, and the profession. While all forms of service are valued, faculty members are encouraged to pursue service opportunities in a manner that is congruent with the mission of social work and the development of their research agenda (balanced with all areas on the Assignments of Responsibilities).

### ***Promotion to Teaching and Research Faculty II***

Service, especially outside of the college, is generally expected to be minimal for promotion to Teaching Faculty II or Research Faculty II.

### ***Promotion to Teaching and Research Faculty III***

For promotion to Teaching Faculty III or Research Faculty III, service is expected to be significant. The service record should provide evidence that faculty members have well-established national reputations in their field, as well as showing meaningful roles within the college and university.

## **VI. Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE)**

(<http://fda.fsu.edu/Faculty-Development>)

Every regular tenured faculty member who has been in rank for at least seven years since being promoted or since achieving tenure shall be reviewed once every seven years following the award of tenure or their most recent promotion, whichever is most recent. The purpose of this evaluation is to document sustained performance during the previous six years of assigned duties and to encourage continued professional growth and development.

Untenured faculty members, adjunct instructors, research associates, and specialized faculty are not eligible for evaluation in this process.

### **Procedures:**

1. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will appoint a subcommittee who will work in concert with the Dean to review the annual evaluations of any regular tenured faculty member of the department who has been in rank as an associate or full professor for seven or more years after the last promotion or after receiving tenure. The annual evaluations shall include all material included in the evaluation file for the faculty member.

2. The P&T subcommittee will recommend to the Dean one of the following for each person considered under the SPE. The person evaluated shall be given the opportunity to append a concise response to the evaluation before it is sent to the next level.

a. Any person whose annual evaluations have been satisfactory and without a rating of "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" or notices of "official concern" for that period (previous six years) shall be judged satisfactory in the SPE and shall not be subject to a performance improvement plan. (Note that "official concern" is a satisfactory evaluation with a warning that performance must improve in specific ways before the next evaluation in order to avoid an "inadequate" rating, thus those with notices of "official concern" will be judged satisfactory in the SPE but may be required to develop a performance improvement plan as explained below.)

b. A faculty member who received "Meets FSU's High Expectations" or better as an overall result on her or his Annual Evaluation Summary Form during

the previous six years shall not be rated below "Meets FSU's High Expectations" in the sustained performance evaluation, nor subject to a PIP. Faculty whose performance falls below "Meets FSU's High Expectations" in more than two of the previous six evaluations shall develop a performance improvement plan.

c. A person who is dissatisfied with the results of the SPE may file an appeal under the Annual Evaluation Appeal procedures in Section 5 of the Faculty Handbook.

3. The President of the University (or a designated representative) shall consider each recommended performance improvement plan. The President or representative shall give final approval for each performance improvement plan. Specific resources identified in an approved performance improvement plan shall be provided by the University.

4. After the performance improvement plan has been approved, the faculty member's supervisor shall meet periodically with him or her to review progress toward meeting the performance targets. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to attain the performance targets specified in the performance improvement plan. Progress shall be reviewed by the evaluation committee and reported to the dean on an annual basis until such time as the faculty member has achieved the performance targets. If the faculty member does not meet the performance targets in the specified time period, the supervisor shall initiate appropriate action.

5. As of December 2012, a successful SPE of a tenured professor adds 3% to the faculty member's base pay beginning with the new academic year contract. An electronic personnel action form (ePAF) must be completed and sent to Human Resources for this increase.

### **Evaluation File**

When the Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary has been reviewed by the appropriate reviewer, it will be filed in the faculty member's official evaluation file together with any attachments and the SPE when completed. The contents of the faculty evaluation file are confidential and are not to be disclosed except to the applicable faculty member, those whose duties require access, or upon order of a court of competent jurisdiction.

There should be one evaluation file containing all documents used in the evaluation process including the binder prepared for the purposes of tenure or promotion decisions. When evaluations and other personnel decisions are made, the only documents that may be used are those contained in the evaluation file. The custodian of the file is to give the faculty member a copy of any documents that are placed in the evaluation file. The faculty member should be notified of the identity of the custodian as well as the location of the evaluation file. Any notice of proposed disciplinary action should be sealed to prevent it from being integrated into the evaluation process or the evaluation file as well as any materials removed from the evaluation file pursuant to the resolution of a grievance.