

*OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST
University of Oklahoma
Norman Campus*

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans/Directors/Chairs
From: Nancy L. Mergler, Senior Vice President and Provost
Date: December 3, 2008
Subject: Annual Faculty Evaluations for the 2008 Calendar Year



In accordance with the OU Regents' policy since 1977, annual faculty evaluations are conducted for each calendar year. The policy requires individual units to establish their own criteria, subject to dean and provost approval, and to the general standards and limits enacted by the Regents. The process of this annual evaluation usually begins in December and ends in April. It is the policy of the University of Oklahoma (Norman Campus) that all salaried faculty, temporary and permanent, tenure-track and non-tenure-track, and renewable term be subject to the same performance evaluation process.

The basic process of faculty evaluation is described in Section 3.11 of the Faculty Handbook; Sections 3.6.1, 3.6.2 and 3.6.3 provide definitions of teaching, research and service. In 1986, the President approved a Faculty Senate recommendation that the evaluation process produce results that can be reflected on a uniform summary report. To serve this purpose, the Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation form (attached) and a one-page mini-vita (example attached) must be completed for each faculty member's 2008 evaluation.

I also request that each faculty member create or update their Expertise Profile in OU's Community of Science Expertise database at <http://expertise.cos.com>. This resource, provided by the Office of Research Services, is an indispensable online tool for publicizing OU's expertise in research and scholarly activities. You can use the COS Quick Form for Online CV to transform your Expertise Profile into a CV, export it to your word processor, add any additional criteria, and your mini-vita is ready to submit. For additional information about Community of Science's resources, please contact the COS Liaison, Ella Faulkner, at efaulkner@ou.edu or call 325-5868.

The Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation records the ratings of each faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, research scholarship/creative activity and service using a numerical scale ranging from 0.01, unacceptable, to 5.00, outstanding. The rationale section of this form should include a brief qualitative justification for the rating in each area. The mini-vita, which enumerates each faculty member's calendar year contributions, provides the basis for the qualitative assessment reported on the Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation form. Units may ask faculty members for additional details about their contributions and request the inclusion of mini-vita(s) for the previous year or two. **For those Faculty holding an endowed chair or professorship, we also request their mini-vita in electronic format. Please designate someone in your academic unit to ensure that the mini-vita is forwarded to the Provost Office. The department should forward the electronic version of the mini-vita to mjibson@ou.edu (Microsoft Word is the preferred platform).** The State Regents and the OU Foundation each require this information annually.

The evaluation should follow the criteria and procedures approved by each faculty member's academic unit. For faculty with appointments split across budget units, deans/directors/chairs should evaluate that portion of the faculty's effort within their own budget. However, Chairs, Directors and Committee A members are encouraged to meet jointly to discuss the person in a holistic manner. A listing of faculty on permanent split appointments **across** colleges will be mailed to you separately. Each dean is responsible for maintaining a list of faculty split appointments across budgetary units within their own college.

From the university's perspective, an important reason for the annual evaluation process is to determine the quality and productivity of academic units and colleges, and to assess their progress toward strategically identified goals of the University, the College and the academic unit. Therefore, as a part of the faculty evaluation process, each academic unit is requested to prepare a two-page mini-vita for the unit; and each dean, a five-page summary for the college.

According to University policy, the Summary Report of Annual Faculty Evaluation is to be submitted to the faculty member who should have at least one week in which to either meet with the chair/director and Committee A to discuss the evaluation or to respond in writing to the evaluation before it leaves the academic unit. All members of the unit should be provided with some means of interpreting the relative meaning of their evaluation (e.g., means and standard deviations for all evaluations in the unit, a report of ranking in terms of deciles, a listing of the rank order of the evaluations without names).

All annual faculty evaluations (summary report forms and one-page mini-vitas), unit mini-vitas and college summaries are due in the Provost's Office by April 3, 2009. The chairs/directors should send the summary reports and the unit mini-vitae first to their college deans, who in turn, will send them to the Provost's Office by the April 3 deadline. The deans will establish college deadlines for completion of the summary report forms by the departments. I will schedule a meeting with each dean in June/July to review the college's faculty and unit evaluations.

Additionally, **all post tenure review dossiers** are due in the Provost's office by May 29, 2009. The chair/directors should send the post-tenure review dossiers including the dated letter from the PTR Committee (Committee A) first to their college deans, who in turn, will send them to the Provost's Office by the May 29 deadline. The deans will establish college deadlines for their receipt of these dossiers.

For those few cases wherein the PTR committees indicated a "failure to meet expectations", the dean should hold the post-tenure dossiers until completion of the formal professional development plan; and then forward the entire dossier to the Provost's Office. A dean should alert the Provost's Office whenever a PTR committee within their college issues a finding of "failure to meet expectations" that requires creating a professional development plan.

Thank you for your assistance in making this evaluation process a useful one for faculty, academic units, colleges and the university.

Attachments

cc: President David L. Boren
Professor Steve Bradford, Faculty Senate Chair
Mechelle Gibson, Assistant to the Provost