

**Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquacultures**  
**Annual Faculty Evaluation Process**  
**And**  
**Supplemental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**  
(approved: 16 June 2011)

Auburn University and the Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquacultures strive for excellence in faculty teaching, research, outreach extension and service endeavors. The department recognizes the need to identify guidelines and describe expectations for faculty activities in these areas. These guidelines will be used by the department for annual evaluations of all faculty, evaluation of faculty promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and Associate Professor to Full Professor, and evaluation for granting of tenure within the department. These guidelines are to supplement those outlined in the Auburn University Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3 which takes precedence over this document.

The Department represents a broad spectrum of disciplines. Scholarly activity appropriate to these academic disciplines, as well as to an individual's assigned responsibilities and rank, is expected of all tenured and untenured faculty and will be used to evaluate productivity of the faculty. Scholarly activity is defined broadly when considering efforts at institutions of higher learning and is most often captured in the concept of creating new knowledge and transferring knowledge to others.

Initial Appointment

A new faculty member's job assignments are recorded in their letter of offer. These assignments can be maintained during the faculty member's years as an assistant/associate professor, although they are reconsidered at each year's evaluation meeting and may be revised as needed. As programs develop, job assignments may change. Changes in job assignment are made in consultation with and approval by the department head.

Faculty Mentor

In consultation and agreement with each new faculty member, the Department Head will appoint a faculty mentor for each new faculty member. It is recommended that more than one mentor be selected to provide a broader perspective in supporting junior faculty. The mentor or mentoring team shall be chosen within the first year after appointment of the faculty member. The mentoring team may be changed at anytime by the request of the new faculty member or the mentor.

Annual Evaluations

Annual evaluation of all faculty members is conducted once per year before April 30 by the department head in an effort to assess faculty performance and to discuss future development. These evaluations will help faculty to plan activities for the coming year, identify deficiencies and provide a basis for differential salary adjustments when funds are available for that purpose. Annual evaluations are conducted as described in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook and are described more fully later in this document in the section titled "Annual Evaluation Process".

Typically, annual evaluations are based on calendar year cycles. Each faculty member will prepare an annual Faculty Activity Report. These performance reports are based on accomplishments of the previous calendar year and are due in the Department Heads office by February 1. Following a review of the material, the head will meet with each faculty member to discuss achievements, deficiencies, and plans for the coming year.

#### Promotion and Tenure Committee

Materials submitted by Assistant Professors and those who have not been granted tenure will also be reviewed by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T) on an annual basis. The Departmental P&T committee will be composed of 5 tenured faculty who hold the rank of Full Professor or Associate Professor. The committee will be elected by the tenured faculty from a slate of all eligible Associate Professor and Full Professor faculty members provided by the Department Head. At their first meeting, the committee will elect a chair who will serve for that year's deliberations and activities. In addition, during the first year of the committee members will be randomly assigned staggered terms such that each year 1 or 2 members will rotate off of the committee. After this initial committee structure is established, all new members will serve for a 3-year term. Materials to be reviewed will include the annual Faculty Activity Report, an updated dossier prepared in the format used by the University's promotion and tenure process, and any additional supporting materials that the head or the faculty member being reviewed deems appropriate prior to the review. A summary of the comments from the P&T Committee will be recorded in a written letter and presented to the faculty member by the Department Head during his/her annual evaluation.

As part of the third-year annual review of untenured faculty members, the head will also call for a discussion and vote on whether or not, in the judgment of tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward achieving tenure. This vote shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future but will be reported to the candidate as they assess their progress toward possible future tenure.

At the point when the untenured faculty member decides to go forward with a request for tenure and promotion, the same procedures as described for the third-year review will be followed, with the exception that the elected chair of the P&T Committee will also provide a summary letter that describes why the tenured faculty members do or do not favor promotion and/or tenure. The consensus letter will be made a part of the candidate's dossier.

## TEACHING

The act of transmission of knowledge to university students is designated as teaching and can include activities such as classroom and laboratory instruction, distance education, student advising, curriculum development as well as publications, presentations and extramural funding obtained for teaching and instruction. The department places a high value on teaching performance and candidates for promotion and/or tenure with teaching appointments are expected to demonstrate strengths in this area.

Formal classroom teaching is generally evaluated through a combination of student input and peer review. A faculty member's role in mentoring, participation in innovative teaching techniques, and publishing of instructional materials are all useful in demonstrating teaching performance. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness is complex and must not be based on any single source of data. As such, the following metrics will be included in the annual faculty review of the teaching appointment of each faculty member and will be used in the evaluation of a successful teaching program for P&T considerations.

- 1) All lecture/laboratory courses must be evaluated by the students enrolled in that course each term. Standardized assessments are used by the University and will be used by the Department. These assessments include a quantitative evaluation and written comments provided by students at the end of each course. Because evaluations are a required part of the P&T dossier, each faculty member must maintain them.
- (2) Peer review of teaching occurs on an annual basis for Assistant Professors and once every three years for Associate Professors. It is recommended that Full Professors be evaluated at least once every five years. The structure and process for such a peer evaluation is detailed in the document entitled "Protocol for Teaching Evaluation" from the Department Curriculum Committee (see Appendix 1).
- (3) Faculty with teaching and/or research responsibilities applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are expected to have directed (i.e., served as chair of the advisory committee) at least 1 graduate student to completion of their degree. Graduate student advising will be evaluated based on the productivity and eventual placement of the faculty member's advisees in their field of study. Productivity of graduate student advisees includes such things as publications, presentations, invited talks, grants, and awards received by the advisees.

Letters from former students are often a part of P&T dossiers but are not required for annual evaluations.

- (4) Productivity of undergraduates supervised by a faculty member also provides an indication of teaching and mentoring effectiveness. Metrics to consider include awards, presentations, and publications.
- (5) Publication of articles, books, book chapters, lab manuals, and electronic media, presentations of teaching methodologies at regional or national meetings, and the obtainment of grants for

the purpose of improving the departments teaching program are all methods of demonstrating scholarly achievement in teaching.

- (6) Receipt of College, University, or other prestigious awards in recognition of outstanding teaching represents scholarly achievement in teaching.

All faculty members with teaching appointments are encouraged to participate in teaching improvement opportunities, such as workshops, seminars, and self-study, as available.

### **Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor**

Teaching effectiveness is assessed from a candidate's contribution to the overall teaching mission of the University. The candidate must demonstrate (1) development of an effective teaching program, (2) commitment to student learning, and (3) effective advising to students. These may be evidenced by course evaluations and other documents or information that support teaching effectiveness as noted above. Based on the candidate's appointment, they should be actively involved in serving on graduate committees, including serving as chair or co-chair at the MS and Ph.D. levels. Advising advanced undergraduate research projects (e.g., Honor's theses, Undergraduate Research Fellowship awardees, Research Experiences for Undergraduate students) also demonstrates meritorious contributions to the department's teaching mission. Faculty members who do not have an explicit teaching appointment are encouraged to serve on graduate committees as support of the broader departmental teaching efforts.

## RESEARCH

Recognition of the importance and potential impact of a faculty member's research program is also important to the evaluation process. This recognition can come through publications and presentations at scientific meetings. A productive research program at a land-grant institution includes publications (peer reviewed journals, books, book chapters, reports, etc.), patents and inventions, presentations, and funding (grants and contracts). Assistant Professors seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must demonstrate a regional reputation with promise of a developing national/international reputation. Research productivity should be commensurate with a candidate's research appointment. The following activities are considered in the evaluation of productivity in the area of research:

- (1) The primary indicator used to gauge quality and quantity of research activity is peer-reviewed journal articles. There are a number of journals available for each of the various disciplines represented in the department. These journals vary in relative quality, impact, and readership. Faculty should always strive to publish in high quality journals but should also be sensitive to the particular audience for which the information is intended. Publishing in high quality journals will generally be linked with higher levels of scholarship. Assistant Professors wanting to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure should have at least one publication in one of the leading journals in his/her field.

The number of publications produced during a particular period of time is an important factor used during the evaluation process. There are differences in efforts required to publish quality information. These differences include such things as seasonal nature of some work, the types of organisms used in the research and their life cycles, and the complexity of the systems within which the research is conducted.

The order of authorship and percent contribution of each author are also important in the evaluation process. The order of authors and even total number of authors may vary with discipline and with the interdisciplinary nature of a particular publication. When considering publications produced by a student, the advising professor is normally listed as a co-author behind his or her student recognizing the mentorship role of the major professor. The percent contribution of co-author input is required in promotion dossiers and information concerning the order of authorship in the candidate's discipline should be included.

- (2) Dissemination of research results by other written means is also encouraged. Peer reviewed books and book chapters are recognized as a high level of scholarly achievement. The level of selectivity and effort involved in the review process is used during evaluations. Peer-reviewed articles might be considered a higher scholarly output than editor-reviewed articles, which represent a greater output effort than publications that receive no review. Each level of publication can have value but represents different levels of scholarly output.
- (3) The Department values and evaluates electronic publications and other digital work by the same criteria and as equivalent to print publications.

- (4) Presentation of research materials at professional meetings is also encouraged. Invited presentations at professional meeting carry more prestige than general presentations. National and international meetings often demonstrate a higher level of recognition than local and regional meetings.
- (5) Grantsmanship is important in the faculty evaluation process. Extramural funding allows faculty to build research programs that have increased potential to achieve national and international recognition. The source from which extramural funding is derived can indicate the level of scholarly activity required to procure the funding. Consequently, highly competitive sources which use review panels (e.g. USDA-AFRI and NSF) are considered more prestigious and will be linked with higher levels of recognition.
- (6) Patents, inventions, and other intellectual property are recognized as creative, scholarly activities and are to be included in the evaluation process.
- (7) Receipt of College, University, or other prestigious awards in recognition of outstanding research represents scholarly achievement in research.

#### **Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor**

To be promoted to Associate Professor, the candidate must demonstrate that he/she has the ability to continue to advance to the full Professor rank and that he/she has an emerging stature as a regional authority in his/her field. The individual's research program must show evidence that it is sustainable in terms of both funding and dissemination of findings. The quality and appropriateness of the publication outlets should be documented. The overall research portfolio of candidates for Associate Professor should be comparable to those of individuals at peer institutions with similar appointments.

## **EXTENSION/OUTREACH**

Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university or unit missions. Extension activities are considered those outreach activities that are funded directly by the Alabama Cooperative Extension System (ACES) and would be reflected in an individual's academic title and assignments. The department, in keeping with the University's Land Grant mission, recognizes and appreciates outreach activities.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department head. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, or in annual work plans during the year in response to unexpected needs and/or opportunities. Outreach activities may be local, regional, national, or international in focus. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Extension faculty must develop a strong in-state program that reflects a current and effective approach to a well-developed science-based education program directed towards the variety of non-campus clientele. Multi-state efforts are also strongly encouraged. The primary mission of the Extension Specialist is to provide programmatic support to County and Regional Extension Agents and Area Specialists. Support may also be provided directly to the public and individual clients; however this is a less efficient method of program delivery. Programmatic support involves both reactive and proactive approaches. Reactive effort involves response to individual problems or needs in a largely consultative mode. Reactive efforts are often the most satisfying work done by the specialist; however, the greatest impact for the largest number of clients comes from proactive work. Such work involves the development of educational materials, training of agents and volunteers, development and evaluation of demonstration projects, and participation in public meetings and workshops. As part of this proactive approach Extension Specialists are expected to participate in Priority Program Teams and help plan, design, carry out, and evaluate Extension Team Projects (ETPs). Specialists are expected to seek extramural support for ETPs or other parts of their extension program. Extension programming and accomplishments should be oriented to the job description and work plans of individual specialists.

While program development and delivery are critical elements of the job of an Extension Specialist, evaluation of program efficacy is a growing responsibility. Specialists are required to report both face-to-face and non-face-to-face contacts quarterly. When possible, the impacts of Extension efforts on the lives of the participants should be documented and reported. Impacts include economic factors, change in satisfaction or attitude, change in behavior or practices, etc. Reporting of impacts can be in the form of quantitative analyses or when quantitative approaches are not feasible, more anecdotal information such as success stories. All reportable information from contacts to impacts is auditable. Therefore Specialists must keep appropriate records to document this information.

The following metrics are used to evaluate a successful extension/outreach program:

- (1) Unlike research, journal articles are a relatively minor part of the output from most extension/outreach programs; however, an evaluation of the impact of an extension/outreach

effort or the description of a novel extension/outreach method published in the peer-reviewed literature would be an indicator of an increasing reputation of the Specialist.

- (2) Booklets, fact sheets, source lists, timely information releases, long-form videos, video clips, teaching materials (lesson plans, etc.) and other publications are examples of important outputs of an extension/outreach program. Officially numbered publications, which represent the most thorough publications with lasting value, must go through the review, approval, and editorial process of ACES.
- (3) Regional and national awards for extension/outreach publications, programs, and activities provide recognition of extension quality and accomplishment.
- (4) Extramural funding to support and enhance extension programming is an important indicator of effectiveness and reflects external support and creativity.
- (5) Clientele support for an extension specialist's program may be evidenced through requests for information and/or presentations, attendance levels at technology transfer functions, letters of recognition or appreciation, and other means of communication.
- (6) Program impacts should be documented, where possible.

Each extension faculty member should have at least one presentation or workshop per year evaluated by the participating audience. This evaluation should be included in the annual review document. Outreach metrics should include similar metrics as in the extension list above including such items as publications, presentations, recipient satisfaction and program impact.

### **Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor**

The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate: (1) a productive extension/outreach program as measured primarily by publications, electronic media, and presentations in professional and public meetings and workshops; (2) effective Extension program development including evidence of leadership, agent training, meeting administrative requirements (i.e., reporting, contributing to ACES needs, etc.), as well as delivery of relevant programs, publications, and presentations as measured by assessment tools such as peer and client evaluations, documented impact, adoption of products by other extension professionals, etc.; (3) documented expertise in candidate's specialty areas that meets the needs of constituents; (4) pursuit and acquisition of extramural and intramural funds necessary to support the candidate's extension/outreach efforts. The candidate for Associate Professor should demonstrate competence in the areas above comparable to others in the same rank with similar appointments in peer institutions. The individual should acquire a regional extension reputation.

## **SERVICE**

All faculty members are expected to participate in the operation of the department, college, and university by serving in various capacities (e.g., on committees, boards, panels, task forces, and commissions). This is broadly known as service. Service is recognized and encouraged by the University administration. All faculty members are also expected to further their disciplines by providing service to their professional societies by serving on committees, in various offices, and as editors and reviewers for professional journals or other professional publication outlets. Faculty members also are often asked to serve on study and review panels for governmental agencies and funding organizations. Although there is a reasonable limit to the extent of involvement in service (to be managed by the Department Head), it is reasonable for these tasks to occupy an average of 5- 10% of a faculty member's appointment. Certain assignments may require higher levels of service commitment, which should be approved by the Department Head.

As a rule, the department attempts to limit committee service during the early years of an Assistant Professor's career. Associate Professors are expected to demonstrate a broader range of service both within the university and in his or her discipline. This is considered essential to the successful operation of the department as well as for the development of a well-recognized program.

## **COLLEGIALITY**

In addition to productivity as discussed above, collegiality will be considered in the process of granting tenure. Collegiality can be defined as the ability for an individual to work productively with faculty, students, colleagues, staff members, and constituents in all environments impacted by the university. Collegiality encompasses the basics of the professional ethics of the academic world: respect for persons, integrity of intellectual inquiry, concern for the needs and rights of students and clientele, and awareness of workplace safety.

Collegiality should not be confused with sociability or likability, but rather it is the professional criterion relating to the individual's performance of his or her duties within an academic unit that are compatible and consistent with the unit's mission and long-term goals. Collegiality is a basic expectation of all employees and is essential in maintaining or improving the academic quality of an institution. Each faculty member must interact with colleagues with civility and professional respect. All faculty members should exhibit an ability and willingness, when appropriate to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks that a department group must often perform to see the completion of these task and participate with some measure of reason and knowledge in discussions germane to departmental policies and programs.

## ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The purpose of the annual evaluation process is threefold: (1) assessment of productivity for purposes of pay adjustment, promotion, etc., (2) identification of corrective measures to enable the individual to improve his/her performance, and (3) planning for the next year's activities. An annual statement of faculty responsibilities and expectations mutually agreed upon by the individual faculty member and the Department Head will be the basis of the annual evaluation by the Department Head. It will serve to update and amend the initial job offer letter. The evaluation outcome should provide a clear indication to faculty of their level of productivity in terms of teaching, research, extension, outreach, and service, where they stand relative to standards identified and described by the department head.

To enhance the resolution of relative performance for an individual, five categories of faculty performance ratings are included. These categories and points assessed for each are:

| <u>Category</u>      | <u>Points</u> |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Unacceptable         | 0             |
| Marginal             | 1             |
| Meets expectations   | 2             |
| Exceeds expectations | 3             |
| Exemplary            | 4             |

Faculty members are expected to show scholarship and productivity in all of their assigned areas on an annual basis. While an untenured faculty member who consistently achieves a 2.0 may stay through their probationary period, a minimum of 3.0 is typically expected to be successful through the Promotion and Tenure process.

In order to enhance uniformity of the review process, annual review documents will be reviewed separately by teaching, research, and extension/outreach and service appointments in succession for each faculty member and assigned a numerical score.

The overall score for an individual will reflect the average of his/her rankings for each component of the appointment weighted by the percent time allocated to each component.

$$\begin{aligned} &(\text{Points in Teaching}) \times (\text{Assigned teaching appointment}) = T \\ &(\text{Points in Research}) \times (\text{Assigned research appointment}) = R \\ &(\text{Points in Extension}) \times (\text{Assigned extension appointment}) = E \\ &(\text{Points in Outreach}) \times (\text{Assigned outreach appointment}) = O \\ &(\text{Points in Service}) \times (\text{Assigned service appointment}) = S \\ &\mathbf{Overall Score} = T+R+E+O+S \end{aligned}$$

Overall ranking will be determined by category as reflected by the overall score.

| <b>Category</b>      | <b>Points</b> |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Unacceptable         | 0.0 to 0.9    |
| Marginal             | 1.0 to 1.9    |
| Meets expectations   | 2.0 to 2.9    |
| Exceeds expectations | 3.0 to 3.49   |
| Exemplary            | 3.5 to 4.0    |

Appendix 1: Protocol for Teaching Evaluation  
(approved fall 2008)

**Protocol for Teaching Evaluation (Fall 2008)**  
**Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquacultures**  
**Auburn University**

1. All courses delivered by FAA faculty must be evaluated by Auburn University Teaching Effectiveness Survey every time each course is taught.
2. Peer review is to be conducted for all faculty with teaching appointments. The following timeframe is suggested. However, faculty could be evaluated more frequently if they chose so (i.e., going up for promotion, main changes in methodology, implementation of new courses, etc...)
  - 2.1. Peer review of professors must be completed every five years
  - 2.2. Peer review of associate professors must be completed every three years
  - 2.3. Peer review of assistant professors must be completed every year

Basic steps in the peer review process include:

- Identification of peer reviewers: the faculty members should identify one colleague from within the Department (must be a faculty with teaching appointment) and one colleague from outside (Biggio Center, College of Education, or CoSAM) to act as reviewers. In addition, one member of the Curriculum Committee should also be part of the peer review team. The Department Head should approve those reviewers before the evaluation process starts.

- Information exchange between reviewers and faculty member: materials (syllabus, handouts, notes, presentation, quizzes, exams, optional teaching evaluations, classrooms and/or lab exercises) and at least one in-class and/or laboratory attendance (or review of distance education material).

- Meetings: instructor and reviewers should meet prior to evaluation and after evaluation. A brief report (including standardized Course Material Feedback forms) summarizing the evaluation will be written by the reviewers and discussed with the instructor, highlighting instructor's weakness and strengths. If problems are identified during the evaluation process, the reviewers will help the instructor in developing a plan to improve his/her teaching. The Department Head will receive a copy of the report.

*Suggested guidelines for peer review of classroom/laboratory:*

- Instructor should set up a meeting with the observers to discuss:
  - o An overview of class to date
  - o The instructor's overall course objectives and teaching philosophy
  - o How things are going to this point
  - o How well the students are prepared/motivated
  - o The physical or environmental factors affecting the class
  - o The teaching approaches being used and reasons for using them
  - o The instructor's goals for the class being observed
- Observers should review the course syllabus carefully before visiting the class
- The observers should arrive 10-15 min early and sit half way back, to one side of the class. It's not necessary for the instructor to introduce the observers.
- Class evaluation should last the entire class
- The observers should visit more than one class. Use the same procedures every time.

- All observers should use the same Class Instruction Observation Feedback forms (to be discussed in advance with the instructor. Forms can be customized by instructor/reviewers based on course specifics)
- Observe student behavior as well as instructor behavior
- Observers should meet with the instructor within two weeks of the classroom visit

All the above should be considered *formative* evaluation. If this information would be used as part of a candidate's dossier for tenure and/or promotion (*summative* evaluation) then the curriculum committee will review all teaching evaluation material accumulate to date and provide feedback to the Department Head.

3. In addition to the AU Teaching effectiveness survey and peer review, faculty evaluations may include other measures of teaching effectiveness such as: self-evaluation, optional student evaluations, assessment of learning, etc...

## Appendix 2: Timeline

The following schedule of events will be implemented for the development, evaluation and submission of Promotion and Tenure dossiers within the Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquacultures as allowed by the Provost office's published schedule.

March 15 – Consultation meeting between faculty member requesting promotion and/or tenure and the Department Head to initiate the process. Either the faculty member or Department Head may initiate this meeting. Following this meeting, the Department Head shall begin the development of the material identified in the Faculty Handbook Chapter 3, Section 11. C. 3. - Information to be supplied by the Department Head.

June 15 – Faculty member presents Department Head with completed dossier as per guidelines set forth in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3, Section 11. C. 2. - Information to be supplied by the Candidate.

July 1 – Department Head solicits external reviewers for evaluation of candidate as set forth in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3, 4/5/10, Section 11. C, 3.

August 15 – Receipt of letters by external reviewers to the Department Head

September 1 – Dossier to the voting faculty in the Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquacultures for review

September 15 –Department Head to call a meeting of all eligible faculty to confidentially discuss the candidate's dossier and take a secret ballot vote. Following the faculty meeting, the Tenure and Promotion Committee under the leadership of the elected chair will develop a consensus report incorporating the discussion from the faculty meeting. The consensus report of the faculty will be made a part of the dossier.

October 1 – Candidate dossier finalized, copied and submitted to the Dean of the College of Agriculture for College and subsequent University action.