

Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures

University of Washington Department of Computer Science & Engineering

Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures

January 1995

This document outlines the faculty review procedures carried out regularly within the department. The first section deals with the standard review, which is performed annually for each faculty member. The second section deals with additional aspects of the review applicable in cases of possible promotion and tenure. The final section addresses merit salary evaluations.

1. Annual Review of All Faculty

The full scope of activities of all faculty is reviewed annually. As a convenience, these activities are often partitioned into teaching, research, and service components, although many standard activities straddle these distinctions.

1.1. Teaching Activities

1.1.1. Basic Procedures

The teaching efforts of all faculty are reviewed each Spring quarter, so as to coincide with the faculty's preparation of annual activity reports. (See Section "Research and Service Activities.") These reviews are intended to serve the department's internal purposes, and to satisfy the College requirement for collegial evaluation and the University requirement for peer evaluation as well.

The review of an individual faculty member is conducted by a committee (typically consisting of two members) appointed by the Chair during Autumn quarter. Early identification of the review committee is necessary to allow for interaction between the faculty member and the committee during the academic year preceding the review. All faculty are eligible to serve on all committees, independently of rank.

An explicit goal of the review procedure is to encourage discussion among faculty of approaches to teaching, and to provide exposure to different methods. Thus, each faculty member benefits both from being reviewed and from reviewing others.

1.1.2. Information Sources

One source of information for these reviews is student evaluations. For this reason, all faculty are required to obtain the standard University teaching evaluation for every graded course. At the time peer evaluations are to take place, the department supplies each reviewing committee with historical data on student evaluations for all courses taught by the faculty member. This historical data is intended to provide part of the context in which to consider the student evaluations.

Additionally, each faculty member, independently of rank, is required to write a short self-evaluation of each course taught, with the goal of providing information useful both in evaluating the successes and failures of that offering of the course and in improving future offerings of the course (by the same or other faculty). These self-evaluations should be written promptly after completion of the course, typically shortly after the student evaluation information has been returned.

The final principal source of written documentation to be reviewed is course materials. These include course outlines, specially prepared handouts, class notes, homework and examination questions, term project descriptions, and reading assignments. Online information need not be submitted in hardcopy form.

Classroom visits are not required as part of our procedures, but faculty are encouraged to take advantage of these on a periodic basis. Such visits could be requested of members of one's reviewing committee, of other faculty not on the committee, or of external parties such as CIDR. Such visits are strictly for the benefit of the faculty member, and any written commentary becomes part of the record and part of the review procedure only if it is introduced by the faculty member.

1.1.3. Teaching Review Outcomes

Each review committee examines the materials described above, as well as any others submitted by the faculty member, and then meets with the faculty member to discuss the record. This discussion constitutes the College required collegial review. Following those discussions, the review committee prepares a written evaluation to be sent to both the Chair and the faculty member. This written report satisfies the University requirement for annual review of teaching. The report also becomes part of the official record of the faculty member, and serves as one component of the information assembled for the annual review, described in Section "Annual Review."

For any faculty member without teaching responsibilities in a given year, this is noted explicitly in his or her file.

1.2. Research and Service Activities

Early each Spring quarter, each faculty member prepares a short summary covering all activities during the past twelve months. (Appendix "Annual Activity Report Example" gives an example template.) The report should contain basic quantitative information (such as papers prepared and published, grant applications and their status, professional service activities, etc.), as well as a

short qualitative statement by the faculty member. (Because teaching activities are reviewed in detail by a subcommittee, the report need contain only the basic information about that activity.) A current CV should be attached to the activity report.

1.3. Annual Review

During the latter part of Spring quarter, the department Chair holds a private meeting with each faculty member, regardless of rank. These meetings afford the opportunity for dialog concerning goals and perceptions. From the Chair's perspective, three sources of information provide the basis for the discussions:

- First, the Chair has access to the written materials prepared by all faculty, as described above.
- Second, Assistant and Associate Professors (as well as faculty of equivalent ranks in the research and instructor streams) are discussed in a series of faculty meetings attended by faculty of higher rank. In preparation for these meetings, two-person review committees are appointed for each Assistant and Associate Professor. These committees review the record and draft evaluation letters. (Additionally, they consider "plausibility of promotion." This is discussed in the next section.) The faculty meeting discussions consider the review committee report, as well as the written materials submitted by the faculty members, the report of the teaching evaluation committee, and the information gathered among colleagues during the normal course of working together.
- Third, the Chair has revised the evaluation letter for each Assistant and Associate Professor (as well as faculty of equivalent ranks in the research and instructor streams) and has provided this letter to the faculty member in advance of the meeting.

Following these meetings, the evaluation letter, perhaps annotated as a result of the discussion, is placed in the faculty member's permanent file.

2. Promotion and Tenure Reviews

All faculty below the rank of Professor are eligible for promotion each year. Additionally, a reappointment decision must be made for an untenured faculty member on an initial three-year contract during his or her third year, and a tenure decision must be made for an untenured faculty member during his or her sixth year. In both these mandatory cases, the necessary reviews must begin during Spring quarter preceding the mandatory year.

- Initial consideration of each faculty member eligible for promotion is made as part of the annual review described above. In particular, the two-person review committee assigned to the case considers whether further investigation of the promotion case is merited, and presents a recommendation during the faculty meeting in which the faculty member is discussed. For those faculty deemed plausible candidates for promotion, the review committee works with the Chair to review the record in more detail.
- As a result of this more detailed review, a decision is made at a meeting of the faculty of higher rank about whether or not to explore promotion further. If the judgment is affirmative, then the (possibly reconstituted) review committee works with the Chair to

select internationally prominent researchers in the candidate's area from whom written evaluations will be solicited. (The candidate is allowed to suggest names, some of which may be used. However, in all cases an attempt will be made to include internationally prominent reviewers not on the candidate's list.)

- Concurrently with this selection process, the candidate prepares a statement of research objectives and accomplishments.
- Letters soliciting external evaluations typically are sent by early summer. Each solicitation letter is accompanied by a curriculum vitae, selected publications, the candidate's statement of research objectives and accomplishments, and a cover letter from the Chair conforming to the College standard.
- During the summer, while waiting for the responses from the external evaluators, the candidate prepares a short statement of teaching contributions. Once this is available, the review committee conducts an in depth examination of the candidate's teaching and service record in preparation for the detailed discussions by the faculty of higher rank in the fall.
- When all data is available (early fall), the review committee examines the materials and writes a report summarizing the case. The faculty of higher rank then arrive at a decision through discussions in, typically, multiple meetings. The Chair may be charged in these meetings to obtain further information if so needed. A secret ballot is taken at the conclusion of the process.
- An affirmative or mandatory Departmental recommendation is reported to the College. Materials conforming to the College guidelines are then submitted to the College.

It is worth emphasizing that our Department makes personnel decisions as a "committee of the whole." An individual's review committee presents the case to the Department and may make a recommendation, but a final decision is reached only after thorough discussion among all eligible faculty. It is explicit that the review committee is not charged with "advocating" or "defending" the candidate, but rather with presenting the facts of the case.

3. Merit Evaluations

Because the schedule for salary recommendations typically necessitates reviews during Autumn quarter, these reviews have to be decoupled from those conducted annually during Spring quarter. However, the sequence of steps is basically the same in both cases.

- The written materials used for merit evaluations are the teaching evaluations, activity reports, and activity evaluations prepared during the previous Spring quarter (as well as those of previous years).
- A series of meetings is held where faculty of higher rank make recommendations concerning faculty of lower rank. (The Chair, in consultation with the Associate Chair, makes recommendations concerning the Full Professors.) In all cases, the recommendations are based on the achievements of the previous year, historical facts (such as inversions at hiring time), and overall progress.
- Final recommendations to the Dean are made by the Chair, who uses the recommendations of the senior faculty and the guidelines from the College in this process.

4. 1999-00 Updates

During the 1999-00 academic year, the Faculty Senate adopted revised policies and procedures for faculty review and promotion. The (minimal) effect of these revisions on CSE are detailed here:

- [1999-00 Revisions to Faculty Annual Review Procedures](#)
- [1999-00 Revisions to Faculty Promotion Procedures](#)

Appendices

[Annual Activity Report Example, Departmental Version](#)

[Annual Activity Report Example, Official College Version](#)

N.B. It's OK to use the College version, but it's essential to include the "Qualitative Statement" that's called for in the Departmental version.

From: Gaetano Borriello [gaetano@cs.washington.edu]
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2000 10:58 PM
To: lazowska@cs.washington.edu
Subject: Revised faculty annual review procedures

Here is a rough cut of what the Faculty R&R had in mind. Besides the very last point - taking notes during annual meeting on goals for coming year - it should basically be what we do now. The message to faculty is that their reflective statements are VERY important and they should take them seriously. Hitting the goals they personally have for the coming year and longer-term.

Let me know if you need further elaboration.

Gaetano

Yearly for ALL faculty:

- student evaluation of each regular course taught
- self-evaluation statement for each course
- peer evaluation of teaching
- activity report by faculty member
- comprehensive CV
- reflective statement

Process:

- two appointed faculty do peer review of teaching of each faculty member
- two appointed faculty do annual review of each assistant professor/lecturer
- executive committee does annual review of associate/full professors
- chair does annual review of executive committee members
- chair generates a letter to each faculty member based on reviews
- chair meets with each faculty member
 - discuss activity report
 - discuss reflective statement
 - discuss letter and any questions/inconsistencies
 - discuss goals for coming year if not in reflective statement
 - discuss long-term goals (where do you want to be in 5 years, what do you want your legacy to be)
- chair and faculty member leave meeting with list of goals for coming year based on notes taken during meeting

From: Carl Ebeling [ebeling@cs.washington.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2000 9:01 AM
To: Ed Lazowska
Cc: Gaetano Borriello
Subject: Revised faculty promotion procedures

Here is the process that was voted in. I'll summarize here and point out the delta from the current procedure (as I understand it). For the full text, see:

<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/announce/promotion.htm>

The deltas:

1) We give the candidate a written ****summary**** of the subcommittee report. I think this means we write down what we used to do verbally. The candidate can then respond to the summary. The idea behind this summary is allow the candidate to correct factual errors.

2) After the vote, this happens again, except the summary is of the faculty meeting discussion and recommendation. Again, the candidate can respond and again this would be to factual errors.

So there's more work for the chair (something that no one wanted), but lots of departments do not keep the candidate informed like we do.

=====

The process:

[no change]

The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

[no change]

A subcommittee of the faculty senior in rank shall make an initial written report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate.

[NEW]

The department chair shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, all names and vote counts shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

[no change]

The voting faculty of the candidate's department superior in rank to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record and to vote on the promotion question.

[NEW]

The department chair shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, all names and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

[no change]

If this recommendation is a departmental one, and if it is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit it all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation.