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I. TEACHING

Teaching performance will be evaluated based on the following sources:

A. **Course Syllabi**: will be evaluated for clarity, rigor of assignments, depth, breadth, quality and appropriateness of course materials, and necessary components. Complete syllabi should include: a) **title, name, time and location of course**, b) **instructor contact information and office hours** c) **course description**, d) **learning objectives**, e) **readings and other course materials**, f) **number and type of assignments**, g) **course schedule**, and h) **methods of evaluating student performance, including point distribution**. A statement describing how the course meets the 4th hour of rigor is also expected. Statements regarding the college policy on academic dishonesty, learning disability accommodations, and instructor expectations for student conduct are strongly encouraged.

B. **Final Course Assignments** (e.g., final exam or final project/paper guidelines).

C. **Peer and Chair Observations**: one observation by the department chairperson will be done for each faculty member in two different courses every three years. A tenured faculty member from another department (usually another chairperson) will observe chairpersons. If any faculty member is evaluated as unsatisfactory in the area of teaching, his/her department chairperson will observe that faculty member at least twice in the subsequent year. Chairpersons will include the written report of their observations in the annual evaluation of each faculty member. In addition, the CAO and/or the department chair are permitted to observe any faculty member for evaluation purposes at his or her discretion.

D. **Student Evaluations**: student evaluations must be administered in accordance with the procedures as enumerated in the faculty governance and policy guide. Student evaluations for all courses taught during the previous academic year must be included.

Teaching Guidelines

An excellent teacher demonstrates thorough and current knowledge of the subject matter and uses that knowledge to effectively engage and challenge students. An excellent teacher is an effective communicator, using clear and organized presentations that are appropriate to the level of the course and making effective use of the class time. Creativity and innovation in the design and presentation of course material, where such creativity or innovation improves interest in the class assignments and aids in the students’ grasp of the material presented, is one manifestation of excellent teaching. Excellent teachers personally demonstrate the qualities of active, enthusiastic seekers in their disciplines. Setting rigorous academic standards for students and creating an environment where students are motivated to do their best work are important to the excellent teacher. An excellent teacher teaches at a variety of curriculum levels. Fairness and impartiality in evaluation and grading are essential.

An excellent teacher enjoys teaching and shows care and respect for students and the student experience, and promotes a positive learning environment. An excellent teacher is enthusiastic and conveys that enthusiasm to students. While maintaining high expectations and demanding student effort, an excellent teacher recognizes when students have difficulty mastering the material presented, offers help to individual students who appear to be struggling with the course but have not sought help. Providing positive feedback and constructive criticism and not being threatened by student questions and disagreement are important characteristics of an excellent teacher. An excellent teacher creates a scholarly environment where students are encouraged to think for themselves and develop their critical and analytical abilities.
(Faculty Handbook, p. 15-16, section IV.B.5)

To qualify for a Satisfactory raise, faculty must do the following:

- Administer/submit student evaluations in accordance with policy
- Distribute appropriate syllabi
- Hold office hours
- Maintain class meetings
- Use appropriate assignments and give sufficient and timely feedback
- Use appropriate teaching methods and maintain high academic standards
- Foster department curriculum development and assessment
- Convey a positive attitude toward students

To qualify for a Merit raise, faculty must demonstrate some of the following characteristics and practices:

- Develop creative, innovative teaching methods and instructional materials
- Cultivate critical, creative learning and develop innovative assignments
- Engage concentrators and non-concentrators at all levels (including General Studies)
- Develop innovative curriculum/academic programs (Honors, new concentrations)
- Foster interdisciplinary and liberal arts teaching and learning
- Provide effective student assessment and offer constructive feedback which fosters academic achievement
- Mentor students in academic/professional goals (e.g., graduate school, student teaching)
- Enhance and supplement classroom learning with outside educational opportunities (e.g., service-learning, conferences, field trips, cultural events)

III. SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

Scholarship will be evaluated based on Appendix E and supporting documentation. Some form of scholarship must be demonstrated on an annual basis. To qualify for a Satisfactory raise, faculty must demonstrate one or more of the following:

- Progress on a paper, book, exhibition, performance or other scholarly project (e.g., research or scholarly work which has the potential to lead to publication/presentation in a professional venue)
- Draft or submit a grant (including ACRE and PC grants towards scholarly activity)
- Participate actively in a professional scholarly organization or conference (this includes the AAUP)
- Supervise student scholarly work

On a regular basis (not necessarily annually) some form of scholarship should be completed. Some of these include but are not limited to:

- Publication/presentation of a peer reviewed paper, exhibit, performance or book/book chapter
- Professional conference presentation or other invited address
- Editing a journal or other scholarly publication or serving as a reviewer for a nationally or internationally recognized journal
- Submitting a grant to an external funding source
• Obtaining a major externally-funded grant
• Mentoring of student research projects, student exhibits, performances or other scholarly work
• Actively including undergraduate students in research activities in a manner that leads to the student’s participation in a professional presentation, publication, exhibition or performance
• Reviewing journal articles or artistic performances, exhibitions or other professional works on multiple occasions (e.g. for multiple journals) throughout the year

To qualify for a Merit raise, faculty must demonstrate exemplary activity in one area or distinctive activity in multiple areas. Meritorious scholarly activity is highly variable between disciplines and between years. The above is presented as a guideline, and is not necessarily an exhaustive list.

IV. SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY
NOTE: Faculty members will not be evaluated on this criterion during their first year.

Service will be evaluated based on Appendix F and appropriate supporting documentation. Some form of service should be demonstrated on an annual basis. To qualify for a Satisfactory raise, faculty must do the following:
• Attend assigned committee meetings regularly
• Serve on at least one active college committee; make oneself reasonably available for attendance at the committee meetings; participate adequately in the work of the committee
• Meet with advisees prior to registration and provide appropriate guidance
• Make oneself reasonably available for attendance at department meetings and for departmental committee work
• Attend full-faculty meetings regularly
• Faculty members will make every effort to attend Fall Convocation and Spring Commencement, and make an effort to represent the Department at Admissions and student honor and recognition events

To qualify for a Merit raise, faculty must demonstrate exemplary service in one area or distinctive service in multiple areas. These include, but are not limited to the following:
1. Contribute to college governance extensively (in time and quality of work)
2. Play a major coordinating role in contributing to the College’s cultural life and academic community
3. Demonstrate commitment to advising campus organizations
4. Perform professional outreach to external community

V. EVALUATION STEPS
1. CAO announces evaluation deadlines, names of faculty who must submit evaluations in current year, and makes necessary documents available.
2. The evaluation schedule follows. NOTE: All faculty are required to turn in their student evaluations every year to their department chairs.
   a) Tenured Faculty and fulltime non-tenure track faculty who have been at the College for more than six years who are not applying for merit pay and who were judged satisfactory in the previous evaluation submit reviews every three years. The evaluation will be inclusive of teaching, scholarship and service for the previous three years.
b) Untenured tenure track faculty submit reviews in the first, third, and fifth years from date of hire. (Note: This schedule is adjusted to coincide with pre-tenure reviews for those eligible for early tenure.)

c) Fulltime non-tenure track faculty whose contracts are continued beyond one year and are in the first six years of employment by the College submit reviews in the first, third, and fifth years from date of hire.

d) For Visiting Professors (one year appointment without potential for renewal), the evaluation process is optional.

e) Any faculty member who wants to be considered for merit in any given year must submit a full self-evaluation review regardless of whether the faculty member is up for review or not.

f) Faculty who are judged unsatisfactory are obligated to submit an evaluation every year until a satisfactory rating is obtained.

3. Faculty member administers student evaluations for each course.

4. Chairperson and others conduct classroom observations according to above schedule or at chairperson’s discretion.

5. Peer evaluations of chairpersons are sent to the respective chairperson and to the Academic Affairs Office (email to provost@alb.edu).

6. Faculty member compiles all necessary appendices, written materials and documentation.

7. Faculty member completes the Evaluation of Committee Chair form (Appendix C) for any committee on which he/she served and sends completed forms to the Academic Affairs Office (email to provost@alb.edu). (NOTE: Please submit directly to the Academic Affairs Office; do not place in binder.)

8. Chairs of committees complete the Evaluation of Faculty Committee Member form (Appendix D) and send completed forms to the Academic Affairs Office (email to provost@alb.edu). (NOTE: Please submit directly to the Academic Affairs Office; do not place in binder.)

9. Faculty member completes Appendix G and sends completed form to the Academic Affairs Office (email to provost@alb.edu). (NOTE: Please submit directly to the Academic Affairs Office; do not place in binder.)

10. Chairpersons complete Chairperson Evaluation Form (CEF, Appendix B) for each faculty member in their department.

11. Chairpersons send completed CEF to faculty member and schedules a meeting to discuss the CEF with each faculty member. The purpose of this meeting is for the chair to provide direct feedback to the faculty member and to discuss goals for the upcoming academic year.

12. After meeting with the chair, the faculty member signs the CEF “in agreement” or “in contention.” The CEF and any explanatory letter from the individual faculty member are submitted along with the faculty member’s portfolio to the Academic Affairs Office.

13. If the CEF is not signed, it will be returned to the chairperson.

14. If the faculty member signed the CEF in contention, the CAO will hold a meeting with the chairperson and the faculty member to discuss the matter. If no satisfactory resolution can be arrived at, the CAO will make the final decision.

15. CAO evaluates materials submitted by chairpersons for each faculty member.

16. The CAO will place each faculty member into one of three categories: Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Meritorious as outlined on pp. 3-6. To qualify for a satisfactory raise, faculty must be satisfactory in teaching, scholarship/professional activity, and service.

16. CAO calculates Salary Increases

a. Salary determinations are based on three factors: a performance factor, a cost of living adjustment (COLA) factor, and additional funds as determined by the board of trustees
and the administration in order to achieve favorable comparability with peer institutions as well as other goals associated with the strategic plan of the College. Salary increases based on any of these factors become part of the faculty member’s base pay for the following contractual year.

b. A COLA will be paid to all faculty members except for faculty members who have not submitted performance material or who fall into the unsatisfactory category. Exceptions to the policy requiring faculty to submit self-evaluations may include persons on sabbatical leave, on family or medical leave, or on a phased retirement plan as stated in the Faculty Handbook, Section VIII.A, p. 40.

c. For those faculty who have applied for a merit raise and who have been recommended for such by their chairpersons, the CAO will determine if each faculty member has met the requirements for merit. Amounts will be based on the number of faculty eligible for merit pay and the total merit pool available.

17. The CAO sends recommended compensation increases to the President for approval.

18. The CAO notifies each individual member of the following information:

a. Evaluation category
b. Receipt of merit, if applicable.

c. Increase for the faculty member (actual dollar amount).

d. For those faculty members falling into the unsatisfactory category, the CAO will provide a detailed written statement of deficiencies to the faculty member and to his/her chairperson. Within two weeks of receipt of this notice, the faculty member must meet with the CAO and the chair to identify specific goals for the faculty member to achieve in the following year to redress the deficiencies and the resources needed to facilitate achievement of goals. The CAO and/or chair will meet with the faculty member on a periodic basis to assess and facilitate progress. Any faculty member who falls into the unsatisfactory category will be prohibited from teaching overloads in the day program or ADP until such time as that faculty member is no longer in the unsatisfactory category. Exceptions would only be made in exceptional circumstances and with approval from the CAO, in consultation with the chairperson.

19. Post-Decision Discussions and Appeals

a. Each faculty will be afforded the opportunity to meet with the CAO to discuss the outcomes of his or her evaluation. The Chairperson may be present at this meeting at the faculty member’s discretion.

b. A faculty member can appeal the faculty evaluation outcome to the Faculty Appeals Committee within thirty days of receipt of evaluation from the CAO. This appeal process will hold all materials and outcomes of meetings confidential. The Faculty Appeals Committee will make a recommendation to the CAO. The CAO will then make a recommendation to the President. The President will notify the faculty member of his or her final decision with regard to that faculty member’s evaluation outcome.

20. The President has final determination of faculty compensation.

21. Amending the Process: The Professional Council (PC) will review the faculty evaluation and merit pay system on an ongoing basis. The PC may establish an ad-hoc committee to review the system. Any changes for the coming academic calendar year are to be introduced to the faculty for approval no later than May.