**OSCE Faculty Evaluation Packet**

Name:

Academic Year being reviewed:

The purpose of the OCSE annual faculty performance evaluation is to encourage ongoing discussions between faculty and unit leadership concerning faculty performance and development toward skilled achievement by all faculty in the three academic pillars of teaching, research, and service. It is understood and expected that faculty will grow and develop in each of these areas as they progress along their career paths with the goal of reaching a skilled performance level. This review serves as a yearly check-in to help faculty and unit leadership align that growth and development with the mission and needs of the unit (i.e., department/school), college, and university, and with the individual desires, strengths, and talents the faculty member brings to the department. It serves as an additional performance touchpoint for pre-tenure faculty, and as a post-tenure review for faculty with tenure. Finally, the review provides a basis for merit pay adjustments, when university budgets allow for such adjustments to occur.

Faculty should review indicators at the end of this document, departmental expectation documents (as available), and the following sections of the faculty handbook regarding university expectations:

* II.K Course Syllabi and Student Performance Procedures
* II.S Office Hours
* IV.B.1.a Teaching Effectiveness
* IV.B.1.b Research/Creative Activities
* IV.B.1.c University/Public Service
1. **Overall Workload Expectations**

*Describe your workload and the expectations for the review year you and your chair agreed upon at the beginning of the academic year. Include a discussion of how your time was distributed between teaching, scholarship, and service. Insert a copy (picture) of your workload from the academic year being reviewed.*

**2. Teaching**

1. What was your assigned teaching workload percentage at the beginning of the evaluation year?
2. Reflect on what you have done this year in the classroom including what went well and what did not. Discuss indicators of your achievement in this area to demonstrate measurable outcomes of your teaching effort in the evaluation year. Examples of performance indicators are found at the end of this document.
3. How can you improve your teaching or enhance departmental program(s) through teaching next year (i.e., how do you plan to improve/develop your teaching ability, course materials/classes, or contribute to the develop of new courses or existing course designs)?

**3. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity**

1. What was your assigned research/scholarship/creative activity workload percentage at the beginning of the evaluation year?
2. Reflect on what you have done this year in scholarship. Discuss measurable indicators of your achievement in this area. Examples of measurable performance indicators are found at the end of this document.
3. Did you disseminate your scholarly work (when/where)? Was your scholarly work funded (funder/amount)? Was funding sought but not secured (funder/amount)?
4. How have you engaged students (graduate or undergraduate) in scholarly activity?
5. How can you improve your scholarly activity next year?

**4. Service**

1. What was your assigned service workload percentage at the beginning of the evaluation year?
2. Reflect on what you have done this year in service. Discuss indicators of your achievement in this area and specific outcomes of your service work as applicable. Examples of performance indicators are found at the end of this document.
3. Discuss your undergraduate advising load (graduate and/or undergraduate).
4. Were you able to engage students through your service activities? If so, how?

**Goals for Upcoming Year**

Faculty Member: What are your goals for the upcoming year? Explain your expected outcomes for the upcoming year regarding teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Goals should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound). Examples of ineffective goals are “continue working on my research” and “keep teaching my classes as I have”.

Material on the following pages is for reference in completing packet above.

**Suggested Indicators of Performance in the Areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**

*Note: This list is non-exclusive. The items outlined are more common indicators of performance.*

Teaching

* New course development
* Number of course preparations
* Major modification of course content or structure
* Professional development in the area of teaching

SITE data and evidence of use of feedback in adjustment of teaching (e.g., use of SITE comments to modify teaching)

* Incorporation of novel teaching methods (active learning, flipped classroom, technology enhancement, etc.)
* Attention to retention needs of particular populations (e.g., first-generation or URM students)
* Assessments that are early and frequent enough for appropriate student feedback
* Course material sufficiently prepares students for subsequent courses

Scholarship

* Peer reviewed publications
* Edited books and chapters
* Technical reports
* Manuscripts under review
* Internal/external proposals and funded grants
* Student internal/external proposals and funded grants
* Conference presentations
* Honors thesis direction
* Graduate thesis direction
* Student co-authorships
* Independent student research project supervision

Service

* Department committee membership or leadership
* College committee membership or leadership
* University committee membership or leadership
* Thesis committee membership
* Student advising (# of advisees)
* Public outreach (boards, workshops, consulting that use professional expertise)
* Journal editorships and reviewing
* Involvement in professional societies

Professional conduct (to be cited by dept. chair)

* Fulfillment of professional obligations in department (e.g., office hours, department meetings, appropriately available to students, meets deadlines, etc.)
* Sensitivity to ethical issues and university policies
* Treats students and colleagues fairly and with professional respect; maintains professional behavior toward students
* Adheres to ethical research practices

*General OCSE criteria for recognition at various levels on Annual Faculty Evaluations are listed below. All listings are inclusive, not exclusive, and are to be understood as typical evidence.* ***Accomplishing all items in the listings within a given range is not required; nor are other pieces of evidence or criteria excluded.*** *Departments may provide more discipline-specific indicators.* ***The faculty member may satisfy indicators from more than one level – the evaluated level should be the highest one which best matches most indicators.******Where Departmental criteria conflict with College criteria, Departmental criteria take precedence.*** *Criteria refer to the year in review, unless noted as “over time,” which implies a window of up to three years may be used.*

Each academic unit within Ogden College may have more specific language as it relates to expectations within each area. These unit guidelines are found on the [Ogden College Evaluation Guidelines](https://www.wku.edu/ogden/faculty-evaluations.php) page.

**TEACHING**

Distinguished:

* “Skilled” criteria plus:
* Receives teaching award for Department, College, University, or external entity.
* Development/disseminates pedagogical software, demonstrations, materials, publications.
* Receives external grant for improvement of pedagogical software, demonstrations, materials, methods.

Skilled:

* “Baseline” criteria plus:
* Takes initiative to prepare new classes and/or innovative pedagogy.
* Regular CITL Teaching Honor nominations.
* Demonstrates engagement in continuous improvement through SITE evaluation reflection and/or peer review.
* Directs honors theses, independent studies, or similar classes as needed.
* Consistently attends workshops or similar professional development to improve teaching.
* Occasionally applies for funding for development of teaching or laboratories.

Baseline:

* Regular preparation of lectures, organization of laboratories, and supervision of assistants.
* Preparation of standard courses new to the reviewee as assigned.
* Makes office hours available to students and meets those hours.
* Occasionally attends workshops or similar professional development for improving teaching.
* Occasionally receives a CITL Teaching Honor nomination.
* Demonstrates awareness of SITE evaluations and uses to improve teaching.
* Uses Blackboard regularly and well.

Unsatisfactory:

* Failure to meet classes on a regular schedule.
* Regular failure to respond to emails in a timely fashion.
* Failure to post grades by posted deadlines.
* Failure to make office hours available or repeated failure to meet office hours.
* Failure to be familiar enough with subject matter to discuss in a cogent, coherent manner.

**SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

Distinguished:

* “Skilled” criteria, plus:
* Publication in *Science* or similarly exclusive journal.
* Particularly competitive external grant/contract funded, or grant(s)/contract(s) with particularly large funding.
* Invited talk at a prominent national or international conference.
* An unusually high increase in h-index or similar publication measure for the discipline.
* Receives research award for Department, College, University, or external entity.

Skilled:

* “Baseline” criteria, plus:
* A collected body of published and/or accepted work that indicates high originality, productivity, or leadership over time.
* Internal grant funding; external grant or contract funding or highly-reviewed proposal; execution of a grant or contract.
* Invited talks at regional conferences.
* Directs research theses.

Baseline:

* Regular participation in scholarly, creative, or critical professional activity.
* Evidence of work in progress during the year.
* Presentation of work at professional meeting or colloquium.
* Student presentations of work completed under reviewee supervision.
* Submission/resubmission of original work for publication or sponsor reports.
* Submission/resubmission of internal and/or external grant or contract proposals.

Unsatisfactory:

* Failure over time to maintain an awareness of developments in professional field.
* Failure to contribute to developments in professional field with original work.
* Failure to involve students in or train students to perform original work in profession.
* Repeated failure to comply with grant and financial policies/procedures.

**SERVICE**

Distinguished:

* “Skilled” criteria, plus:
* Receives award for service/advising at Department level or above.
* Demonstrates an unusual degree of initiative or high degree of leadership in service.
* Receives a grant to develop a service project.
* Instructors: demonstration of active research agenda with outcomes and student engagement.

Skilled:

* “Baseline” criteria, plus:
* Demonstrates leadership in service to the department, college, or university, including, for example, serving as program coordinator or chairing committees.
* Contributes productively to the community or professional discipline.
* Demonstrates leadership in local community service or regional professional service.
* Properly advises cohorts of students and/or student groups.
* Produces letters of recommendation for students.
* Instructors: demonstration of an active research agenda.

Baseline:

* Regular and productive contribution in a collegial manner to the academic business of the department, college, or university.
* Properly advises students.

Unsatisfactory:

* Failure to provide service on a regular basis to department, college, university, or profession.
* Failure to attend and participate in at least one graduation ceremony per year.
* Misdirects assigned student advisees.