



— ASSOCIATED —
COLLEGES OF THE SOUTH

Preparing Faculty To Be Evaluated: Supplemental Material

This supplemental material offers helpful background information and implementation guidance for those looking for additional support.

Preparing Faculty for Successful Evaluations: Isn't doing one's job enough?

Clarity of expectations and transparent systems with procedural accountability is critical, and indeed it is the essence of this guide's sections 1 – 9. And, retaining, promoting, encouraging and inspiring faculty bring vitality and innovation into the community created within any institution. Preparing faculty well for successful evaluations (and thus effective performance in their jobs) constitutes great faculty development work and ultimately increases institutional objectives, reduces cost of turn-over, and strengthens the caliber of education provided to students.

This implementation section serves as context for the [Ready-to-Implement Workshops](#) already in the Toolkit. Consider skimming this full section before evaluating what approach best fits your institution. Reminder that this section depends on an institution already having clear definitions for teaching, research/scholarship, and service (see earlier sections). Each institution's timing and sequencing of workshops will be determined by internal contexts including normal review cycles, existing faculty development programming, and readiness of an institution's alignment between processes/requirements and stated values. Links to those sections have been included throughout for leaders choosing to verify where their context best fits.

Materials here are organized to match the related Toolkit workshops sequenced in the same order. Overall, each institution needs to define how and through what office(s)/program-structure they will be implementing some or all of the sequence (presumably part of an existing or emergent faculty development structure). For example, would it be done through the faculty development offices, through departments, through something like a teaching and learning center, or another vehicle? As ownership emerges, procedural design will be needed overall such as whether the workshop(s) will be required professional development for all faculty members or voluntary? Within those decisions' structure, the following 7 sections can be used to support adaptation and implementation of the related Toolkit workshops.

Reminder to be highly intentional about seeking facilitation for these workshops – ideally the facilitator is a trusted member of the community with skills at fostering honest and open dialogue, eliciting authentic questions, and transparently naming any inconsistencies that might emerge (with a reliable pledge to continuously improve the process through feedback and updates). Include such a person from the beginning in the overall coordination team for this initiative! If you do not have such a facilitator in your community, reach out to ACS for networking among other schools for suggested alternative approaches.

Return to this overview as needed to re-orient towards overarching strategic priorities.

Workshop I. Cracking the myths around the evaluation process: An orientation to the evaluation process

Before the workshop, all evaluation process documents should be in alignment and readily available to all faculty. The department in charge of annual evaluation and pre-tenure/tenure/promotion reviews should act as a centralized source for collecting and then sharing the documents. Examples of documents or resources that

would be used to define the evaluation process could include the faculty handbook, job descriptions, job advertisements, annual evaluation forms and statements, etc.. Another relevant resource would be materials from previously evaluated faculty members; these materials should be thoroughly vetted by the department in charge of annual evaluation/promotion reviews. This workshop would be most relevant for first-year faculty, but it could be applied to faculty members across all ranks to help learn what is valued in the evaluation process.

During the workshop, faculty members will engage in self-reflection that will provide faculty members the opportunity to discuss their own work and how it aligns with the evaluation process. Participants will also gain a deeper understanding of the purpose and process for faculty evaluation with all current administrators that evaluate faculty.

After completing the workshop, faculty members will be encouraged to continue to ask questions about the evaluation process to avoid misconceptions and future “myths.”

Workshop II. Reviewing supporting materials: Teaching

Before the workshop, participants will gather evidence for the teaching area of evaluation including pedagogies, evaluations, and self-reflective questions. Therefore, organizers of the workshop should provide in advance examples of pedagogical techniques and how to describe these techniques in conjunction with course learning goals/objectives. Some of this evidence will include artifacts (worksheets, activities, videos, labs, lectures, etc.) to accomplish course learning goals/objectives.

If the institution has a format for how staff in academic affairs discuss and evaluate course evaluations, a template mimicking that format should be shared with faculty members prior to the workshop. Reflective questions that are used for annual self-evaluation should also be shared prior to the workshop. Some examples of these questions are available in the workshop outlines. At least one of the questions should focus on the types of pedagogical techniques used in a course and the reasoning behind the technique. Another question to include should focus on use of inclusive pedagogies.

Faculty members will need to be ready to discuss and provide evidence for how they work to continually grow as a teacher. Faculty members will also need to compile their course evaluations--both quantitative and qualitative data. (Note: See other sections of this guide and the Toolkit on problems with evaluations and potential alternatives.) Much of this evidence will be the beginning of an open tenure file.

Prior to the beginning of these activities, it will be important to develop ground rules for the conversation; this includes what is shared or perhaps more importantly not shared outside the conversation. One of the other important ground rules is to remember to speak from one’s own experience. This is often referred to as the local and personal perspective.

During the workshop, participants will be asked to develop their critical reflection skills. Participants will not only engage in an activity where they assess their own course evaluation but they will also begin to think about their own strengths and weaknesses. The workshop must help faculty members discuss their own identity and how that impacts the student comments found on course evaluations. Therefore, it is important that the design and facilitation of work done towards this objective include a framework and tools helpful to empower faculty whose identity might be adversely contributing to hidden (or explicit) biases in others. The faculty is not “the problem;” tools for mitigating bias are needed.

After the workshop, the group should discuss if they would like to continue the conversation with additional support for writing their statement.

Workshop III. Reviewing supporting materials: Research and scholarship

Prior to the workshop, participants should gather and bring materials including the faculty handbook, their job description/advertisement, their CV, and their research statement (from their job application or an updated one) and a summary of their mentorship of students in research or creative work. Participants should also come to the workshop having reflected on their core values and beliefs about their scholarly work and the directions in which they hope to take their scholarship in the future.

During the workshop, participants will be asked to summarize their scholarly work, reflect on how that work has aligned with their values, and think of ways to grow and build on their scholarship going forward. This activity can be used by faculty as they write their research/scholarship statement and in crafting professional development goals.

Workshop IV. Reviewing supporting materials: Service

Note: Consider reviewing this Implementation Guide's section 7 on service.

This workshop design assumes a variety of stakeholders are coordinated in their processes, practices and expectations including involving faculty documenting and evaluating faculty service activities, etc. The effort should include senior leadership of the institution, enrollment division, academic affairs, faculty, HR, retention units. Offices that deal with faculty development and reviews and new faculty orientation should be involved in planning and implementing this workshop.

To prepare for this workshop, organizers should create a full picture of the institutional landscape and the factors that impact faculty evaluation in areas of service. Conversations about what counts and what does not must be clear and the metrics must be written down. (See section 4 on Alignment of Values section to evaluate where your institution is in that process). For example: institutions need to have clearly defined what "effective" service means (in type, quantity and quality) at both the institutional and the departmental level, have aligned that clarity between all places service gets documented, including the Faculty Handbook and appointment letters, and have considered an institution wide tracking (i.e. a service form of some kind) for faculty to annually log service (also viable as a means for evaluating who is doing what forms of service). Attention should also have been given to analyzing "hidden"/ "invisible" forms of service and how those forms can be integrated/equalized including examples like informal advisees, working groups, guest lectures in peers' classrooms, letters of recommendations, in-house faculty development programs, etc. Documenting service loads per faculty and defining the terms for service overloads increases faculty trust and institutional readiness for this work.

Specifically, organizers need to attend to workshop-logistics such as:

- Food for workshop.
- A form with a sample list of all the types of service.
- A sample folder for participants to see how someone has documented their service work over time
- A location appropriate for putting together small discussion groups.
- A facilitator who is especially capable of drawing out faculty in conversation and openness.

As with most workshops, organizers are encouraged to establish rules of engagement for conversation and an agreement overview. While these documents will differ by institution, consider constructing yours in writing to strengthen the expectation that faculty will interact in supportive ways, mutually encouraging each other's success, collaboratively supporting each other's process, and collectively achieving service goals as they build

partnerships through the workshop.

Prior to the workshop participants should review the section of the Toolkit [Key Areas of Inconsistency & Concern in Faculty Evaluation](#) and read the document [“Summary of Analysis of Faculty Evaluation Documents”](#) from the ACS website. Participants should write down their questions. This can be used in the group discussion conversation about the “Value of Service” during the workshop.

Consider what the reward for participation might be (if any). Is participating in this workshop included in the faculty evaluation system as a positive? Is it beneficial for receiving some sort of additional funding for other activities?

Create an assessment system to determine the effectiveness of the workshops. Some suggested questions/metrics might be:

- What future service work does the faculty member plan to participate in?
- Were there areas of service that they were participating in but were not getting credit for? If so, do they now have a way to better document their contribution in this area?
- Do faculty feel more comfortable now articulating service goals they had
- not thought about pursuing?
- Do faculty have a stronger commitment to the institution as a result of the investment in helping faculty develop their own professional development plan?

To implement this there needs to be a push for faculty to really have clear guidelines about service at the institution. The institution's culture around service will make this either something people will invest their time in or not. Many have heard “no one fails to get tenure over service.” If that is the institution's attitude, then it will be hard for people to engage fully in this type of training.

Reminder 1: This work depends on a climate – or creation of a climate – in which people feel safe doing and encouraged to do self-reflection and sharing out of insights and challenges. Specifically, an effective process depends on people brainstorming new ways of defining, documenting and re-directing-to-others service opportunities (including ability to discuss service opportunities which they enjoy but that others don’t see as “valuable”).

Reminder 2: Faculty need to see how they can clearly assess and document the impact their service work had on the institution. Faculty benefit by being equipped to include this impact statement in their overall statements of service (presumably submitted in an evaluation package). And, because faculty need to keep relevant data, training faculty how to best document their service (and impact) within this institution should start happening when faculty arrive on the campus (i.e. at new faculty orientation), not only immediately before they are to be reviewed.

Reminder 3: Attend to this same process and need for documentation and impact assessment regarding “invisible” service to the institution (explore this again in earlier section on “hidden” service). People need to understand practical ways to document and assess the impact of “invisible” service to the institution.

Workshop V. Crafting a successful path forward: Professional goals and action plan

Note: For professional goals and planning to be taken seriously by faculty (and thus to be aligned with and of value to the institution), campus culture needs to embrace faculty – like students – as life-long learners. Faculty need to experience an integrated push to continuously develop themselves. For example, senior leadership

through to the most junior faculty member embraces professional development; professional development is embraced as beneficial to individuals' careers; and language gets consistently used emphasizing the partnership between faculty and institution (e.g., "We are investing in you to be the best YOU, you want to be."). That in turn impacts the success of the institution as faculty maximize their capabilities in many areas. Effective schools tout a variety of positive implications (e.g. Communications can discuss how faculty have developed into leaders and lead national initiatives dreamed up from their IDP; Enrollment can recruit students by letting people know that our faculty spend time investing in themselves so they can bring the best student experience to the classroom; etc.)

The Office of Faculty Development is an obvious place for the workshop to be hosted. For example, they likely have the most content experience relating to the additive value of this (or an adaptation of the one recommended here) being included in faculty training for faculty mentors and mentees. The effort would be particularly valuable to faculty members preparing for reviews and promotion.

Stakeholder groups to engage in deciding what and how to integrate this workshop include senior leadership of the institution, enrollment division, academic affairs, faculty representatives, human resource department, and any retention units.

The messaging should come in different stages. Senior leadership should convey the message that faculty development is supported, strongly encouraged and benefits the institution overall. Faculty development offices should convey messages that faculty development is valuable to faculty as we seek continued growth. These offices should also convey that faculty development is valued and encouraged at the institution.

Organizers will need to consider the following types of specific logistics and resources: food for workshops, an appropriate location for putting together small discussion groups, a facilitator who is especially capable of drawing out faculty in conversation and openness, and rules of engagement for conversation and an agreement overview. There may need to be a written form that explains what is needed or at the very minimum a strong overview to set expectations on how faculty will interact with each other and support each other in achieving their future goals by serving as partners in the workshop.

Reminder 1: Clarify rules for engaging with each other during workshops. Using or adapting rules for engagement that encourage constructive interactions can increase participants' ability to receive feedback in constructive ways relevant to the work's objective.

Reminder 2: Consider the culture of participation at your institution, including whether or not some form of reward is needed for faculty to engage in this development process. For example, if faculty development engagement is already rewarded within the evaluation system, help participants know how to document their engagement. At other institutions, engagement in faculty development opportunities might be positively related to a faculty member's candidacy for receiving funding or additional support in other activities. Think creatively.

An assessment system should be in place to determine the effectiveness of the workshops. Some suggested metrics might be:

- What changes did faculty implement in their professional career?
- What new skills did they learn (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats (SWOT) analysis, Individual Development Plan (IDP), etc....)?
- Do faculty feel more comfortable now articulating goals they had not thought about pursuing?
- How has the workshop impacted faculty making transitions in their career to new activities or from pre-

tenure to post-tenure?

- Do we see an increase in job satisfaction in the faculty who participated in the workshop versus those who did not)?
- Do faculty have a stronger commitment to the institution as a result of the investment in helping faculty develop their own professional development plan?

Institutions should consider whether they want to follow up on these by putting resources towards faculty development in identified areas of interest, by creating a check-in plan to follow back up with faculty, or another avenue to determine if people are implementing what they learned. This could have very positive effects if follow through is encouraged and maximized.

Reminder 1: A critical piece to implementing this workshop is to include an overview on how to create the climate needed for people to be self-reflective and open to sharing out. This is essential to create space for positive and effective feedback. The sections for the “Feedback and Brainstorming” and the “Pre-Mortem Discussion” portions of the workshop require a level of vulnerability that can be impeded by an environment of people not prepared to value others goals and objectives, or who don’t communicate in a fashion that is positive and helpful for all those who hear.

Reminder 2: A final critical piece is showing faculty how they can incorporate aspects of this Individual Development Plan into their documents and statements which they will submit for their evaluation packages.

Workshop VI. Writing a letter of self-evaluation: the reflective narrative

Note: This workshop does not explain what content to include in the letter of self-evaluation. Criteria will differ across campuses. Faculty are encouraged to consult their University's faculty handbook prior to starting the workshop to determine the benchmarks for success in each category under evaluation, most typically teaching, research and scholarship, service and professional goals. Consider asking your Chief Academic Officer or Tenure and Promotion Committee for strong sample letters to serve as a template.

Before the workshop ask participants to carefully review the materials they produced in the workshops for teaching, research and scholarship, service, and professional goals and action plan making note of important elements of those materials.

After completing this writing workshop, candidates undergoing evaluation are encouraged to share their statement with experienced evaluators such as their department chair, division head and/or associate dean for feedback on clarity and content (see giving feedback on materials below).

Workshop VII. Giving and receiving feedback on materials

Note: This workshop in particular depends on attention to how small groups are created. Be sure no potential conflicts of interest exist among small group members and/or presenters, coaches and/or facilitators present. To the extent possible, make sure faculty from the same departments are not in the same group. These measures are intended to increase privacy and to assure participants that guidelines across all domains are consistent. For the preparatory Workshop VI, consider asking your Chief Academic Officer or Tenure and Promotion Committee for strong sample letters to serve as a template.

This workshop is a peer-writing workshop meant to provide feedback on the clarity and content of the self-evaluation letter. This session is most effective if you are able to identify three to four participants who are writing self-evaluation letters. Ask each participant to provide each of their group members with a (digital) copy of their letter of self-evaluation at least one week before the session. Participants should carefully review and

provide clear, specific, actionable feedback on each group member's letter before the session. This feedback will be shared in the session.

Identify who will run the workshop. Make sure the person running the workshop is not in an evaluative role. Some facilitators might be the Director of a center for teaching and learning, a dean of faculty development, or a former member of the tenure and promotion committee.

Once participants have incorporated the feedback from their small-group members into their letters of self-evaluation and have generated a complete and more polished draft, consider asking experienced evaluators to read and provide feedback on letters of self-evaluation to one to three participants. Ideally, the experienced evaluators will read and provide written feedback and then meet one-on-one with each participant to review that feedback, answer questions, and address lingering concerns.