**Format for Department Chair’s Annual Evaluation Reports**

These format guidelines give an overview of specific information that should appear in the Department Chair’s evaluation report~~.~~ All reports should be guided by the Disciplinary Statements adopted by the home department of the faculty member under evaluation.

Taking into account the faculty member’s selected weights and the department’s Disciplinary Statements, this report should discuss the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service. This report should include (1) a narrative synthesis of the faculty member’s overall performance, (2) an overall rating of the faculty member using the Standard Performance Rating Scale, and (3) a candid assessment of whether or not the faculty member being evaluated is making sufficient progress towards promotion and tenure in each area: teaching, scholarship, and service (with suggestions for improvement where warranted) and (4) a signature section for the Department Chair and faculty member being evaluated. The information appearing in the annual chair’s narrative evaluation for a faculty member will be drawn from (a) the faculty member’s Self-Evaluation Report, (b) student evaluations, and (c) the Department Chair’s evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service.

The following are the headings which should appear at the beginning of each evaluation area being discussed with the area weight listed to the right of the heading.

1). **Introductory Heading** -The introductory heading should appear at the top of the first page of the evaluation form and include the following information as listed below.

***Faculty Member's Name***

***Current Professorial Rank***

***Current Academic Year*  *Department***

**2). TEACHING Area Weight (50% to 70%) \_\_\_\_ \_**

*a) Classroom activities.*  Discuss classroom work as it relates to how knowledge in a faculty member's discipline is covered (e.g., categories, principles, summaries), how the specific content of a discipline is imparted (e.g., facts, examples), the development of general student skills (e.g., communication, critical thinking, creativity, mathematics), how student learning is motivated (e.g., stimulating curiosity, confidence, and task-specific motivation), measures of student performance (e.g., examinations, papers, presentations, other projects), and future plans for development in the area of teaching.

*b) Auxiliary teaching activities.*  Discuss evidence that grades have been submitted in a timely manner, supplementary instructional time provided outside of class, the supervising of student research projects, working with colleagues to develop curricula, and plans for future development in this area.

*c)* How has the information from your most recent evaluation been used to improve instruction?

*d)* Has sufficient progress been made towards promotion and tenure in the area of teaching?

\_\_\_\_\_Yes

\_\_\_\_\_No

\_\_\_\_\_N/A

Recommendations for improvement:

**3). SCHOLARSHIP *Area Weight* (10% to 40%) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

*a) Research.* Discuss scholarly research for the period of the evaluation. In particular, there should be emphasis on (a) how knowledge has been developed, (b) the application of existing knowledge used to solve practical problems, (c) the application of professional knowledge and skill to an artistic problem if applicable*,* or (d) the completion of a special program of intellectual development. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

*b) Publication.* Discuss scholarly works that have been disseminated within the faculty member's discipline. Examples across disciplines are exhibition of artistic work, editing grant applications, publication in scholarly journals, and publishing of works aimed toward student and general audiences. Also include comments on future plans for development in this area.

*c)* Has sufficient progress towards promotion and tenure been made in the area of scholarship?

\_\_\_\_Yes

\_\_\_\_No

\_\_\_\_N/A

Recommendations for improvement:

**4). SERVICE *Area weight*** (10% to 40%) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

A faculty member may work in any of the following categories in a given year.

*a) University Service.* Comment about on-campus service provided during the period, including activities such as academic advising (see Academic Advisement, Section III, Chapter 1), committee work (see Faculty Governance, Section I, Chapter 3), grant administration (see Faculty Research Policy, Section II, Chapter 7), or consultations supporting the work of staff or faculty. Quality of service is very important (e.g., serving actively on a small number of committees is more valuable than serving minimally on many committees). Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

*b) Professional service*. Comment on the nature, scope, and effectiveness of service to the faculty member's profession. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

*c) Community Service.*  Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of off-campus service during the period, including such activities as participation on professional committees and governing boards, providing consultation to schools, civic organizations, and government agencies, and providing leadership on public matters. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

*d)* Has sufficient progress towards promotion and tenure been made in the area of service?

\_\_\_\_Yes

\_\_\_\_No

\_\_\_\_N/A

Recommendations for improvement:

**5). Anticipated Area Weights for the Next Academic Year** - This section should only appear on the self-evaluation form. The following anticipated area weights as indicated below should be listed in this section.

*Teaching (50% to 70%)*

*Scholarship (10% to 40%)*

*Service (10% to 40%)*

**6). SYNTHESIS** - This section will only appear in a Department Chair, Peer Evaluation Committee, and Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluation. In this section, the evaluator(s) determine the overall performance rating of the faculty member for the period covered. The quality of performance is weighed in relation to the faculty member's area weights. The final evaluation should (a) adhere to the guiding principles, (b) reflect equity within the department and among departments, and (c) allow a reasonable degree of flexibility in how a faculty member orients his or her effort.

*a). Rationale of rating* - This section clarifies the relationship between the various performance areas as listed in the University mission statement and the overall performance ranking given.

*b). Overall rating of faculty member* - Listed below are the ratings a faculty member will be assigned.

Distinguished performance

Very good performance

Adequate performance

Deficient performance

Date Signature of DepartmentChair

Date Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member