Chairs are responsible for evaluating faculty in their departments in accordance with the guidelines established in this document. Their evaluations are subject to review by the Dean and other administrative officers. The Chair’s evaluation should take into account the nature of the faculty member’s stated and approved objectives (as expressed in the Faculty Activities Plan). To the extent possible, the evaluation should be based on performance that is clearly documented on Faculty Activities Report forms, student evaluations, published material, etc.

Preliminary to the Chair’s evaluation, each faculty member will complete the Faculty Activities Report to be submitted to the Chair together with whatever supporting material the faculty member considers appropriate. Each faculty member should also the self-evaluation on the Faculty Activities Evaluation form and submit that form to the chair as well. Using this material and other appropriate information and data, the chair will evaluate each faculty member using the Faculty Activities Evaluation form. These evaluations will be discussed between the chair and the dean, and approved by the dean. When the evaluation process has been completed, the chair will confer with each faculty member in the department and discuss the evaluations as it pertains to that individual. The purpose of this post-evaluation conference is to insure that the faculty member is fully aware of his/her strengths and weaknesses in the various performance areas, as perceived by the chair and the dean subsequent to the post-evaluation conference. Copies of the Faculty Activities Plan and Report and the Faculty Activities Evaluation will be maintained by the faculty member, chair, and dean.

Chairs are to complete the forms as described above as faculty members. The first level of evaluation for them will be with the dean. Their administrative duties as chairs will not be evaluated through this means.

I. TEACHING

Since the first responsibility of the School of Medicine is education of its students, excellence in teaching should be continually encouraged and rewarded. The following factors may be considered in evaluating a faculty member’s performance in the area of teaching:

1) The general reputation of the faculty member as a teacher among students, departmental colleagues, and others in the university community.

2) Student evaluations of the faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher.

3) The degree of organization of the teaching process, as indicated by course syllabus, outline, handouts, etc.
4) Evidence that the faculty member keeps abreast of new developments in the field, revising course content and methodology as appropriate.

5) Evidence of the use of innovative approaches in instruction or of the development of new instructional techniques or materials.

6) Research and publication related to teaching/learning in the field.

7) Textbooks or other published materials indicative of teaching interest and effectiveness.

8) Accessibility to the faculty member by students.

9) Participation in the development and operation of the curriculum of the department.

10) Evidence of effort to improve teaching ability, or to develop new areas of competence.

11) Successful direction of theses, dissertations, or research projects.

12) Reputation as a teacher outside this university, as evidenced by invitations to speak or give workshops related to instruction at other institutions.

II. RESEARCH

The school of medicine faculty member is a teacher/scholar who communicates knowledge and adds new knowledge through research. Research should help contribute to the faculty member’s teaching and his/her ability to train students in research methods. Research productivity can be demonstrated through publications, presentations before professional groups, and success in obtaining research grants.

The following factors may be considered in evaluating a faculty member’s performance in research activities:

1) Books and monographs published or accepted for publication.

2) Articles published (or accepted for publication) in scholarly journals of national or regional prominence where such articles are subject to review by other reputable scholars in the discipline. Non-refereed articles and/or publications in local or state journals shall not carry the same weight.

3) Chapters in books, book reviews, editorial reviews for publishers of books, monographs, and journals.

4) Grants awarded to support research or other scholarly activities. Grant applications shall not be considered except as indicated below.
5) Papers presented at international, national, or regional meetings of professional organizations, especially when such presentation was of an “invited” nature and a principal feature of the meeting. Papers presented at state and local meetings should carry less weight.

6) Evidence of progress in research and other scholarly work that should ultimately result in publication.

7) Evidence of effort to improve research abilities or to develop new areas of competence.

III. SERVICE

Service includes all professional activities of a faculty member except teaching and research. It includes administrative service to the department, school, or university; service on committees for the school or university; service on state or national committees; and positions on editorial boards, student sections, and other advisory bodies.

The following factors may be considered in evaluating a faculty member’s performance in the area of service:

1) Service to the greater community: significant leadership activities in national and regional professional organizations and, to a lesser extent, in state and local organizations; presentations of papers or speeches to local or regional groups, professional consulting with governmental or civil groups.

2) Service to the university: outstanding service, especially in a leadership role, on university or school committees; significant contributions to student advisement.

3) Service to the department: administrative duties, maintenance and operation of departmental research facilities, and service to patients, hospital, and/or clinic that contribute significantly to the goals of the department and the school.
Chairs are expected to evaluate faculty as OU (outstanding), EX (excellent), GO (good), SA (satisfactory), MA (marginal), or US (unsatisfactory), the categories being described as follows:

OU  OUTSTANDING – those rare faculty whose performance is exceptional and greatly exceeds the university’s expectations.

EX  EXCELLENT – those faculty whose performance is distinctly superior in comparison to their departmental colleagues.

GO  GOOD – those faculty who fully meet the university’s expectations in virtually every respect, providing quality instruction and maintaining high standards in other performance areas.

SA  SATISFACTORY – those faculty who meet the university’s minimum expectations in all significant respects, but who rarely rise above these minimum norms.

MA  MARGINAL – those faculty who do not meet the university’s minimum expectations in one or more significant respects, whose performance is considered less than adequate, and of whom significant improvement is expected in future evaluation periods.

US  UNSATISFACTORY – those faculty who are deficient in one or more significant respects, whose performance is considered significantly less than adequate, and where significant improvement has not occurred in previously identified areas of deficiency since the last evaluation period.

It should again be emphasized that the evaluation must take into account the faculty member’s assigned and approved activities. For example, the publication of two articles in reputable (refereed) journals is a much more significant accomplishment for a faculty member with little or no time for research activities than for another faculty member with a major part of his/her time assigned to research.