

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

These Guidelines, if approved by the faculty as required by Article 10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), shall become effective immediately and be utilized to evaluate faculty performance.

INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth the procedures and standards to be used in the annual faculty evaluation process in the University of South Florida (USF) School of Social Work. The composition of the Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee (AFEC) and method of selection is detailed herein. This document stipulates the criteria utilized to determine ratings in assigned areas of responsibility. Finally, this document describes the procedures employed in translating the outcomes of the evaluation process into the distribution of merit salary increases. The contents of this document are in compliance with the provisions of Article 10 of the USF/United Faculty of Florida (UFF) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) currently in force. Please note – faculty may only be evaluated in categories with assigned FTE. The Faculty Activity Information Reporting (FAIR) system provides much of the data needed for annual evaluation purposes. If the FAIR system is employed to produce those data it must be recognized that additional information must be provided by the individual faculty member, either through updating the FAIR or through a supplemental document.

Certain principles have guided the construction of this document. They are as follows:

- (1) Social Work is a professional degree-granting program and as such places significant emphasis on instruction. In the evaluation of teaching, attention is directed beyond the University's standard student evaluation of instruction and includes consideration of other indicators of excellence in teaching.
- (2) In the evaluation of research/scholarship, equal credit is given to securing external competitive research grants as is given to peer-reviewed publication.
- (3) Social Work values the contributions of non-tenure earning faculty in the same manner as it values the contributions of tenure-earning faculty. Thus, non-tenure-earning faculty participate in the faculty governance mechanisms of the School, including participation in the Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee.
- (4) While this document provides specific criteria for the evaluation of the performance of assigned duties, it is recognized that deriving specific ratings is not totally formulaic and that the judgments of the evaluators are a key ingredient in the evaluation process.
- (5) Social Work is a professional discipline that places importance on public/community service. Thus most Social Work faculty will carry assignments in this area.

PROCEDURES

Timeline

The annual evaluation of faculty shall occur in the Spring term of each academic year and shall cover the calendar year immediately preceding it (for example: the annual evaluation conducted in Spring 2017 covers Spring, Summer and Fall terms of 2016). Materials shall be entered into the FAIR system no later than January 15 (Or earlier if announced at a faculty meeting by the Director). The evaluation committee will only review material that is submitted by that date.

Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee (AFEC) shall consist of five 5 faculty members (defined as anyone home-based in Social Work and occupying an E & G faculty line on at least a .50 FTE appointment, excluding visiting faculty) two of which must be tenured, two of which must be tenure-earning and one of which must be a permanent instructor in the school. The AFEC will be elected by the faculty during the first meeting of the academic year. One faculty member in each of the above-referenced groups will serve for two years and one faculty member in each group will serve for one year. In cases where faculty may not be available with the rank required as stated, faculty will vote on an alternative composition (majority vote). The Director and the Associate Director of the School are not eligible to serve on the AFEC. Non-tenure-earning faculty will participate fully in the evaluation process with the exception of the evaluation of performance in research/scholarship. At the first meeting of the AFEC a chair shall be elected (must be a tenured faculty member) and operating procedures established by the committee. Operating procedures shall not be in conflict with any provision of this document, with any provision of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) or with any provision of University Rules, policies or procedures. The AFEC shall be responsible, working in conjunction with the Director, for any classroom observations occurring during its term of service.

All faculty shall be subject to review by the AFEC. The results of the AFEC evaluation will be given equal weight with the Director's evaluation in the determination of merit salary increases.

Submission of Evaluation Materials

Each faculty member shall be provided with a standard University evaluation form covering the Spring-Summer-Fall term period under evaluation. This may be a hard copy form or an electronic form and shall include distribution of the assigned FTE. Here follows an example of a hard copy form where the School has entered the FTE data. The FAIR system contains considerably more sub-categories than is reflected in this example.

PROFESSOR WHOZIT'S TERM ASSIGNMENTS AND ANNUALIZED FTE (shown in whole numbers)

	SPRING	SUMMER ¹	FALL	TOTAL FTE (Spring/Summer/Fall)	ANNUALIZED FTE ²
Undergraduate Instruction	50	75	30	155	56
Graduate Instruction	25		20	45	16
Funded Research	15		40	55	20
University Governance	5		5	10	4
Public & Professional Service	5		5	10	4
TOTALS	100	75	100	275	100

¹ Standardize Summer Teaching to Session C by multiplying the number of credit hours taught by .125; thus the Summer FTE of .75 in the above example would equal 6 credit hours taught (6 x .125 = .750)

² Annualized FTE is derived by dividing the FTE in the "total" column by the aggregate FTE (275 in the above example) and multiplying by 100. **NOTE: If the FAIR system is utilized these calculations occur automatically; FTE are pulled from term AFD.**

If the FAIR system is utilized much of the information below will be provided electronically. It will be necessary to supplement the information in FAIR.

Instruction:

- A list of all courses taught along with student quantitative and qualitative evaluation data
- A list of thesis/dissertation committees on which faculty members served and contributions made plus contributions made in doctoral directive assignments
- A list of directed student courses
- A description of recognition of teaching (for example teaching awards)
- Teaching/training grants submitted and awarded as well as information on any funding received
- A full description of other instructional activities such as course or program development, curriculum work related to the Council for social Work Education (CSWE) accreditation

Research/Scholarship:

- A list of all materials developed for publication (articles, books, book chapters), where submitted, current status, information on publisher or potential publishers. A list of all materials published during the evaluation period and any work on revisions and galley proofs, information about the publisher.

- A list of presentations at professional meetings/conferences with information about the sponsoring organization and manner of selection of papers/posters presented (for example by invitation, via peer review selection).
- A list of all research grant proposals developed for submission, include information about agency/ foundation to which submitted, funding amount sought, brief description of the work plan (Note: teaching/training grants should be submitted under "Instruction").
- A list of grants/contracts approved for funding during the evaluation period and information about the funding agency and method of selection of your proposal. A list of unfunded research projects engaged or completed and future plans pertaining thereto. University Governance:

Service:

University Committees/Councils:

- A list of all department, college and university committees on which you served along with your leadership roles, special contributions. Faculty accountability for attending faculty and committee meetings are a part of the school's service requirement. Meeting with committees as scheduled shall be counted and evaluated by peers and the chair as these are required activities and reflected in the annual evaluation.

Public/Professional Service:

- A list of all service activities external to the University that directly benefit the profession/practice of Social Work, include service on boards, councils, commissions, leadership positions, special contributions and accomplishments.

Administration:

- List any administrative positions held, the duties of position, individual assessment of performance of those duties, particular contributions/accomplishments

Advising:

- Provide a description of advising duties, numbers of students served, special accomplishments/recognition

A failure to prepare and submit evaluation materials as described will result in a default rating of "unsatisfactory" by both the AFEC and the Director. Any assignment areas lacking substantial data in the materials submitted will receive a default rating of "unsatisfactory" unless the faculty member immediately provides requested information to the AFEC and/or Director. Under certain circumstances (such as illness of the faculty member or other serious unforeseen circumstances, the Director shall have the ability to grant an extension of time to faculty for the evaluation. However, for the AFEC to conduct the annual review of such a faculty member, the evaluation materials for the previous calendar year must be submitted to the committee no later than January 15th so that the AFEC can complete its work by February 1st.

RATINGS

Instruction

Instruction refers to classroom teaching (both undergraduate and graduate), computer-assisted instruction, directed studies, service on thesis/dissertation committees, course development and the

development/management of teaching/training grants. Some of these categories may appear in FAIR under Other Instructional Effort.

Instructional ratings must be based on more than student evaluation scores. The teaching evaluation must take into account any relevant materials submitted by the employee including the results of peer evaluations of teaching and may not be based solely on student evaluations when this additional information has been made available to the evaluator.” For example, a mid-semester assessment could allow the instructor to make improvements for the current class (although this cannot take the place of the official evaluation data). Examples of other methods to assess teaching effectiveness such as class notes, syllabi, student exams and assignments, peer observations, student mentoring/advising and any other materials relevant to the employee’s teaching assignment may also be submitted. Faculty may provide an explanation for low student evaluation ratings when circumstances beyond the control of the instructor may be responsible for the low student rating. In such cases faculty evaluation shall consider the additional information.

In order to receive an "outstanding" rating in Instruction, a faculty member must have attained a mean rating of at least 4.0 on the student evaluation of instructor items plus demonstrate outstanding achievement in instructional assignments as evidenced by demonstrated excellence in development of teaching/learning materials, securing teaching/training grants, development of an unusually high number of new course preparations, or special recognition of teaching excellence via teaching awards, or through classroom observation. If the student evaluation mean is less than 4.5 there must be unusually compelling evidence of excellence through the other mechanisms referenced.

In order to receive a "strong" rating in Instruction, a faculty member must have attained a

mean rating of at least 3.5 on the student evaluation of instructor items plus demonstrate very good achievement in instructional assignments as evidenced by demonstrated performance at a high level in development of teaching/learning materials, securing teaching/training grants, or special recognition of teaching excellence via teaching awards, or through classroom observation. If the student evaluation mean is less than 4.0 there must be unusually compelling evidence of excellence through the other mechanisms referenced.

In order to achieve a "satisfactory" rating in Instruction, a faculty member must have attained a mean rating of at least 3.0 on the student evaluation of instructor items plus demonstrate sound achievement in instructional assignments as evidenced by demonstrated performance of at least a satisfactory nature in development of teaching/learning materials, securing teaching/training grants, or special recognition of teaching contributions via teaching awards, or through classroom observation. If the student evaluation mean is less than 3.5 there must be unusually compelling evidence of performance that is at least satisfactory through the other mechanisms referenced.

If a faculty member fails to obtain a student evaluation mean of at least 3.0 on instructor items and in the absence of overwhelming information to legitimate a higher rating, the Instruction rating shall be "weak" or "unsatisfactory" as the performance merits at the discretion of the AFEC and the Director.

Research/Scholarship

Research/Scholarship refers to all forms of creative activity, both funded and unfunded, related to the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. It includes research related exploration, publication, and evaluation activities. Emphasis is placed on peer-reviewed publications and securing

of competitive external grants/contracts.

In order to categorize various areas of activity and provide a relative weighting to gauge accomplishment, the following schema shall be employed.

Level One Activities would include publication involving peer review and resulting in publication in respected media (for example, mainstream journals, respected publishers, proceedings of prestigious organizations and scholarly books). This category would also include securing of significant competitive grants and/or contracts. Teaching/training grants would be considered in the Instruction category. **Level Two Activities** would include book chapters, technical reports and non-refereed publication by a credible publisher or refereed publication in other than mainstream media. Professional papers would be included in this category and if later developed to refereed publication status meeting the standards of a Level One activity could be so considered in a subsequent evaluation period. Research grants/contracts of a less competitive nature or renewals not requiring major work would be considered in this category. Peer-reviewed and invited presentations shall be considered as level-two activities.

University Governance

University Governance refers to contributions made to the University through service on department, college, university or university system bodies or other activities that provide advisory support to general governance of said bodies. Such bodies would include but not necessarily be limited to, department, college and university councils or committees (standing or *ad hoc*) or to elective bodies such as college councils or the Faculty Senate. In order to achieve an "outstanding" rating in this category a faculty member must have assumed a major leadership role and produced documented

evidence of significant achievement in at least one major committee (or other organizational entity) activity or made significant documented contributions to the University via multiple service activities. In order to achieve a "strong" rating in this category, a faculty member must have made significant documented contribution to at least one major university governance endeavor or served as a significant contributing member to several university bodies.

In order to achieve a "satisfactory" rating in this category, a faculty member must have discharged all governance duties at an acceptable level (i.e., attended meetings on a regular basis, participated in the deliberations of the body on which the individual served).

Performance that falls below "satisfactory" in governance assignments shall be rated as "weak" or "unsatisfactory" depending upon the extent of the shortcomings in one's performance. For example, less than regular attendance and minimum participation might be considered "weak" while excessive absences and no participation might be considered "unsatisfactory."

Public/Professional Service

Public/Professional Service refers to contributions made to the profession of Social Work or to its practice in the community at no charge to the recipient. Such service would include, but not necessarily be limited to, service on social service planning bodies, fundraising bodies, program evaluation bodies, service on agency/organization boards, service on government appointed councils and committees, service on professional education or professional practice organizations (for example, CSWE, NASW, or other social service related professional bodies), service to publishers/professional bodies via book/abstract reviews. Service on behalf of organizations not specifically related to professional practice service or education (for example, service on partisan political bodies or church

bodies) will not be considered in this category. Neither shall compensated services be considered in this category.

In order to achieve an "outstanding" rating in this category, a faculty member must have assumed a major leadership role in a professional organization (for example, NASW, CSWE or any number of state or local organizations) and provide documented evidence of significant accomplishment. Documented significant accomplishments in several public/professional service activities may also merit an "outstanding" rating.

In order to achieve a "strong" rating in this category a faculty member must demonstrate significant contributions to a social service or professional organization through such mechanisms as volunteerism, board or committee service.

In order to achieve a rating of "satisfactory" in this category, a faculty member must document at least one substantive contribution to a social service or professional organization.

If one's contributions in a public service capacity are marginal or cannot be documented or are marked by considerable absenteeism the rating in this category would be "weak" or "unacceptable" as determined by the AFEC and the Director.

Administration

Administration refers to those duties which carry programmatic planning, management and evaluative responsibilities. Administrative duties will be assigned in a limited number of circumstances. Normally within the School of Social Work, the Director,, Associate Director, Director of Field, BSW Program Chair, MSW Program Chair, and principle program coordinators or center directors will carry administrative assignments. With regard to the Director of the School of Social

Work, annual evaluation for his or her performance by the AFEC will be restricted to teaching and research performance, as the Dean of the College conducts an annual evaluation of Chairs/Directors. The Director of the School will evaluate any faculty who has administration as part of their job assignment.

In order to achieve a rating of "outstanding" in this category a faculty member must demonstrate exceptional leadership and accomplishment.

In order to achieve a rating of "strong" in this category a faculty member must demonstrate significant accomplishment in the performance of administrative assignments.

In order to achieve a rating of "satisfactory" in this category a faculty member must demonstrate at least minimum success in the performance of administrative duties.

If a faculty member's performance in administrative assignments does not meet minimum standards of performance the AFEC and the Director must determine the extent to which the faculty member has failed to meet performance standards. In worst case scenarios the actions or lack thereof of the faculty member will have caused harm to the School in which case the rating should be "unsatisfactory." In scenarios with fewer negative consequences a rating of "weak" would be justified.

Academic Advising

Academic Advising refers to those activities specifically related to advising students on matters pertaining to career choices, program choices, course selection, and scheduling. Advising specific to a course in which a student is enrolled is the duty of the instructor of record and is considered as part of instruction.

In order to achieve a rating of "outstanding" in this category, a faculty member must consistently demonstrate exceptional dedication to the advising function, consistently impart sound and accurate information and see a number of students proportionate to the assigned FTE. In order to achieve a "strong" rating in this category, a faculty member must demonstrate competence in every aspect of the advising assignment. In order to achieve a "satisfactory" rating in this category a faculty member must demonstrate at least minimal accomplishment of advising duties. This rating would be applied only to those individuals who perform at the lowest acceptable level.

Ratings of "weak" and "unacceptable" are reserved for individuals who do not meet minimum standards of performance. The distinguishing factor between these two ratings is a matter of degree and in fact both represent a level of performance that cannot be tolerated since both would result in harm to students.

Leave of Absence with Pay

Leave of Absence with Pay refers to sabbatical and other supported leaves where specific products are required or expected. (The exception is faculty on leave of absence with pay for disability, FMLA, using his/her accumulated leave. Leave of this nature of course is not subject to evaluation.)

Faculty on Leave of Absence with Pay shall submit full accounts of their activities for the supported period including the nature of the leave, intended accomplishments, work plan and accomplishments. Ratings shall be based on matching intended accomplishments with products/outcomes.

OUTCOMES

Applying the rating schema defined in the preceding section the AFEC and the Director, independent of each other, will evaluate each faculty member and assign a rating of "outstanding," "strong," "satisfactory," "weak," or "unacceptable" in each category of assigned duties. Ratings that fall between categories are permissible as reflected below. Each faculty member will receive a quantitative annual evaluation score derived according to the following 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

Approved by Dean Julianne Serovich, May 24, 2017

Reviewed by Vice Provost Glover, August 14, 2017, accepted with recommendation to become effective after faculty vote on November 27, 2017.