

Annual Evaluation Template

West Virginia University School of Public Health

Adopted August 7, 2022

According to the West Virginia University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure, the written annual performance evaluation is required for all full-time and continuing part-time faculty members during their careers at West Virginia University. It is a critical element for the development of faculty members to provide them with a written record of past performance, accomplishments continuing expectations, and an ongoing critique of strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, the annual performance evaluation provides the basis of support for recommendations and decisions concerning reappointment, retention, promotion, and tenure as well as program assignments, sabbatical and other leaves of absence, and performance-based salary increases.

The annual evaluation should be related to one's assignment and performance, and should be both summative and formative. Therefore, statements in the review should be developmental and goal-oriented, and not necessarily limited to events of the immediate review one-year period. It is also to be a review of annual evaluation statements from previous years in order to assess whether suggestions for improvement have been addressed.

The purpose of this document is to provide Department Chairpersons in the School of Public Health overall guidance and uniformity to the annual review process. Like the annual review process itself, it is designed to be developmental, yet not prescriptive. Rather, its intention is to call attention to elements in the faculty member's annual review file regarding teaching, research, and service to maximize the effectiveness of this critical process.

This guiding document is broken into the sections that should appear in each faculty annual review letter. When appropriate, suggested language is provided. The first section should contain a summary of the faculty member's position, when they were hired, and a summary of the School of Public Health Promotion and Tenure Committee's ratings followed by the Department Chairpersons summary ratings.

For example, the opening summary might state:

"I have reviewed your 20XX annual review file as well as the recommendation of the School of Public Health Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee. You are an Assistant [Associate, or] Professor, Scientist, appointed in September 4, 20XX eligible for promotion is 20XX.

This year, our P&T Committee rated your contributions in teaching as **excellent**, your research as **good**, and your service as **excellent**. I concur with our Committee's ratings and congratulate you on another successful year. Details of this review are below, followed by goals."

It is possible the Department Chairperson may not agree with the P&T Committee's ratings in one or more of the three areas. In that case, this section of the annual review letter is the appropriate place to state that disagreement, whether the Department Chairperson believes the faculty

member performed better or worse than the P&T Committee ratings. Justification of those ratings will follow in the specific section of the annual review where there is disagreement. In addition, ratings should not be provided for faculty who do not have teaching, research, and/or service expectations (i.e., specialty track faculty) depending on the position under which they were hired and criteria outlined in their letter of hire or addendum to their original letter of hire.

It is important to remember that provided ratings affect potential salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement. In this regard, ratings of “excellent” or “good” are considered meritorious; however, not all faculty members should be necessarily perceived as garnering meritorious ratings in all areas during each review period. In some cases, faculty may be “satisfactory” or possibly “unsatisfactory,” especially when insufficient information is provided in any area. In these circumstances, a rating of “satisfactory” or lower is warranted.

TEACHING

The teaching section of the annual review letter provides an opportunity for the Department Chairperson to reiterate expectations verbatim from the faculty member’s offer letter (or addendum, if appropriate). Some specialty track faculty may not have teaching expectations outlined in their letter of hire (or addendum) and this should be reiterated in this section of the letter; however, demonstrated teaching efforts, such as guest lectures or mentoring students, that would typically fall under teaching should be highlighted and positively reinforced. In this section of the letter, the Department Chairperson might state:

“According to your appointment letter, “you will be expected to contribute significantly to the teaching mission of the Department of [named department] across the curriculum, at the undergraduate and graduate levels.”

It is important to separate effort from demonstrated evidence of teaching effectiveness in this section of the letter. Closely read the faculty member’s narrative first and evaluate the provided teaching evidence in the report. Specific areas to comment on in this section of the annual review letter will be:

1. Specific courses taught during the reporting period.
2. An overview of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) quantitative data for each course.
3. A summary of student qualitative comments, noting areas of strength and areas of concern across courses, when appropriate. Cite specific student quotes for added emphasis.
4. Emphasize and acknowledge demonstrated evidence undertaken to enhance productivity in teaching such as teaching workshops, peer evaluations, or similar activities. Cite specific peer evaluator quotes for added emphasis, when appropriate.
5. Take note of course alterations and/or curriculum development that enhances the time spent with students and/or on practical applications of instructional content.
6. Lastly, summarize demonstrated evidence of teaching effectiveness undertaken outside of assigned course instruction such as guest lectures, the mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students, participation on practicum or capstone projects, and/or dissertation committee membership.
7. In all cases, positively reinforce excellence and draw attention to areas in need of improvement. Areas noted as in need of improvement form a basis for teaching-based goals in the goals section of the annual review letter.

In general, to garner excellent ratings in teaching, faculty members must achieve overall SEI ratings that meet or exceed 4.00 (on a 5-point scale), in combination with other demonstrated evidence of teaching effectiveness. Excellent SEI ratings alone are not sufficient to garner excellent ratings in teaching.

Conclude the teaching section of the letter with a summative statement for the reporting year followed by a summative statement regarding the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure. For example, the Department Chairperson might state:

“In sum, I find your teaching performance for 20XX to be of high merit and rating a performance measure of **excellent**. In addition, I find that you are making appropriate progress toward the significant contribution in teaching required to be tenured and promoted to associate professor rank.”

RESEARCH

The research section of the annual review letter provides an opportunity for the Department Chairperson to reiterate expectations verbatim from the faculty member's offer letter (or addendum, if appropriate). Some specialty track faculty may not have research or scholarly expectations outlined in their letter of hire (or addendum) and this should be reiterated in this section of the letter; however, demonstrated research efforts that would typically fall under research should be highlighted and positively reinforced. In this section, the Department Chairperson might state:

“As stated in your appointment letter, “In the area of research, you will be expected to maintain an active research agenda in which the targets of the research are mainline professional journals and scholarly books and other publications in our field. This includes establishing “a research program with Co-Investigator, Co-Principal, or Principal Investigator funding commensurate with effort allocation.”

It is especially important to separate effort from demonstrated evidence of research effectiveness in this section of the letter. For example, submitted grants and peer-reviewed publications are positive efforts, but not demonstrated evidence of research effectiveness. Closely read the faculty member's narrative first and evaluate the provided research evidence in the report. Specific areas comment on in this section of the annual review letter will be:

1. The number of continuing grants and/or contracts and new grants and/or contracts received during the reporting period. Note the funding agencies to differentiate competitive funding sources from other sources, especially federally-funded grants, and the faculty member's role on all funded projects (e.g., as PI, Co-PI, Co-I, Project Personnel, etc.). It is reasonable to also comment supportively on submitted grants, however, for faculty required to secure competitive funding to be promoted and/or tenured, a reminder of that requirement is warranted in the absence of other funded research.
2. The number of published peer-reviewed manuscripts, in press manuscripts, books, book chapters, or other scholarly products during the reporting period. Note the faculty member's role on all published work (e.g., first or senior author, etc.). It is reasonable to comment supportively on submitted publications, however, for faculty with peer-reviewed research requirements to be promoted and/or tenured, a reminder of that requirement is warranted in absence other demonstrated evidence of scholarly activity.

3. The number of presentations given at regional, national, or international learned societies during the reporting period and the faculty member's role on the presentations.
4. Any scholarly activity that a faculty member participated in to maintain current in their respective field. This is especially important for specialty track faculty members that either have no FTE allocated to research, or for those where research is a "reasonable" contribution requirement for their position.
5. In all cases, positively reinforce excellence and draw attention to areas in need of improvement. Areas noted as in need of improvement form a basis for research-based goals in the goals section of the annual review letter.

Conclude the research section of the letter with a summative statement for the reporting year followed by a summative statement regarding the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure. This is also a good place to state that the Department Chairperson has reviewed the research activities and that they have not been published in predatory journals. This is a required element of the annual review process according to West Virginia University. For example, the Department Chairperson might state:

"In sum, I find your research performance for 20XX to be of merit and rating a performance measure of **good**. You have been resourceful in growing your funding sources and mentoring capacities. You have also continued to publish in peer-reviewed journals. I reviewed the research activities and can attest that the evidence is legitimate, and the research activities were not published in predatory journals. Although I find that you making progress toward the significant contribution of research, you must improve your participation in extramural federal funding as PI or Co-PI, which is required for promotion to associate rank for a faculty member in your track."

SERVICE

The service section of the annual review letter provides an opportunity for the Department Chairperson to reiterate expectations verbatim from the faculty member's offer letter (or addendum, if appropriate). Some specialty track faculty may not have service expectations outlined in their letter of hire (or addendum) and this should be reiterated in this section of the letter; however, demonstrated or noteworthy service that would typically fall under service should be highlighted and positively reinforced. In this section, the Department Chairperson might state:

"As stated in your appointment letter "you are expected to perform reasonable service responsibilities at a satisfactory level. Meritorious (i.e., beyond satisfactory) service contribution usually includes steady, on-going service to the department beyond sporadic committee work, along with some service to the university, the profession, and society."

Faculty are not required to supply supporting evidence for all types of service performed. Therefore, there is some subjectivity in evaluating some service contributions. Nevertheless, service accomplishments, and especially for those where service is a "significant" contribution requirement for their position, should be discussed in the report narrative. Closely read the faculty member's narrative first and evaluate the provided service evidence, where appropriate, in the report. Assessing the quality of the service is paramount. Specific areas comment on in this section of the annual review letter will be:

1. Notable service achievements or recognition(s).
2. The number of committees served on in the department, school, and/or university.

3. Attendance at departmental meetings; graduation ceremonies; new student orientation sessions, dissertation defenses and capstone presentations, and awards ceremonies; faculty interviews; and scheduled school-wide meetings.
4. The types of service provided to the profession.
5. The balance between services performed against the faculty member's areas of significant contribution (if not service).
6. In all cases, positively reinforce excellence and draw attention to areas in need of improvement. Areas noted as in need of improvement form a basis for service-based goals in the goals section of the annual review letter.

Conclude the service section of the letter with a summative statement for the reporting year followed by a summative statement regarding the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure. For example, the Department Chairperson might state:

"In sum, I find your service performance for 20XX to be of high merit and rating a performance measure of **excellent**. In addition, I find that you are making appropriate progress toward the reasonable contribution in service required to be tenured and promoted to associate professor rank."

GOALS

Specific goals are useful and needed. The goals section of the annual review letter provides an opportunity for the Department Chairperson to offer useful guidance to the faculty member in the coming year. Before writing goals for the faculty member, note that faculty often state goals in their narrative. Pull those goals out of the narrative and incorporate them into the goals you may have for the faculty member. Another source of goals may also be the P&T Committee letter. It is also reasonable (and appreciated) if you reach out to faculty in advance of their annual review meeting and request goals.

If done well, the final goals then become constructive (and complementary in some cases) to the faculty member's own goals and developmental in nature. Goals in the annual review letter can then be shortened and used to form the basis of the workload plan document.

However, avoid the temptation to lower a faculty member's rating in teaching, research, or service based on whether they have achieved a goal from a previous year (or previous years). Remember, the Department Chairperson evaluates demonstrated evidence in teaching, research, and service, not goals. Thus, important goals can be reiterated and highlighted from previous years, however, they should not take precedent over the evaluation of demonstrated evidence.

For example, the Department Chairperson might state:

Teaching

"I encourage you to consider having your teaching rated by one of your senior peers. Peers can be either inside the department or someone qualified to perform a review from outside our department. I would consider having a peer review performed every year and several before considering applying for promotion or for entering the tenure track in the future. The department has a standardized form available to that can be modified to assist in this process.

It is important that you continue to demonstrate significant contributions in education.”

Research

“I am pleased to read in your narrative that you are seeking external mentorship for a planned NCI grant submission. I also note your funding has been slowly dropping over the last several review cycles, which is concerning. Faculty in your track must develop, submit, and secure competitive extramural grants as PI to seek for eventual promotion to full professor.

It is important that you continue to demonstrate significant contributions in research.”

Service

“Your level of service continues to be excellent, and your expanding professional service is an indication of a developing national reputation. However, I agree with our P&T Committee that to achieve teaching and research goals, you may want to consider trying to balance some of your in-kind activities.

It is important that you continue to demonstrate reasonable contributions in service.”

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Summary and Recommendations section of the annual review letter provides an opportunity for the Department Chairperson to highlight areas in need of attention to either the faculty member or the Dean. If there are no actionable items, this section can also be very short. For example, the Department Chairperson might state:

“Dr. Public Health, you are a highly valued faculty member and I recommend that your appointment be continued at the rank of Assistant [Associate, Full] Professor. Congratulations on another successful year. I am grateful to have you as a colleague and hope you will continue to make a difference in the department and school, and for our students. Our success depends on those efforts. Have a happy, healthy, and productive new year.”

In circumstances that require more immediate action, the Department Chairperson might state, for example (followed by the above paragraph):

“Your 20XX review reflects prior reviews you have received from both myself and our School of Public Health Promotion and Tenure Committee, which have rated your teaching, service, and research as excellent for the 20XX and 20XX review cycles. Given your accomplishments to date, and the potential for continued significant contributions in teaching, research, and service, I am recommending to the Dean that your faculty position be transitioned to a 9-month full-time tenure-track faculty position at the rank of Assistant Professor, Health Sciences Educator-Scientist Track, in the coming year.”