

Policy Name: Faculty Evaluation
Approving Authority: Nursing Program Committee

Policy # AA-008
Approval Date: 6/20/2023
Date Last Reviewed: 6/20/2023
Next Review Date: 6/2024

Statement

The Faculty Evaluation Policy of Beal University Canada (“BUC” or the “University”) provides the standards for evaluating teaching faculty and the expectations for continuous improvement activities.

Purpose

The purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Policy is to ensure teaching faculty are appropriately evaluated to ensure they are providing quality instruction to the students at the University.

Roles and Responsibilities

The implementation of this policy is the responsibility of the Dean of Nursing. The oversight of this policy is the responsibility of the Nursing Program Committee, specifically for the nursing faculty. The Nursing Program Committee will review this policy on an annual basis.

Policy

The professional and academic values of our faculty are considered in the process of evaluation of faculty members. Faculty members will be evaluated in the following areas: teaching, scholarship, and professional and other contributions. Faculty members will compile a teaching collection (dossier) to document and summarize their teaching accomplishments, scholarship activities, and professional contributions. These will be evaluated on the basis of whether the faculty member addressed the comments to improve performance as well as assessing faculty accountability.

Related Policies and Documents

AA-007 Academic Promotion Policy

Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Addendum
Procedures on Faculty Evaluation

Procedures for Implementation

The Teaching Collection (Dossier)

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is conducted based on a faculty member's teaching collection (dossier). At minimum, the teaching collection should include:

- Faculty member's statement regarding their approach to teaching and learning (updated every three years);
- Goals for teaching in the year of evaluation;
- Listing of teaching responsibilities for the time under evaluation (previous three years);
- Evaluations of teaching effectiveness, using multiple methods of evaluation. This should include at minimum aggregated statistical information from student evaluations of courses. For each course, the number and percentage of students who completed teaching evaluations should be included. There is no obligation to include anecdotal or subjective student comments, but if this material is included, all comments received in the course evaluated must be included. The collection could also include peer evaluations of graduates/alumni, self-evaluations of teaching and learning, feedback from co-teachers. Evaluations of teaching could be both formative (i.e., content, process and design aspects of instruction) and summative (outcomes of instruction);
- Evidence of efforts that have been undertaken to improve teaching effectiveness;
- Summary of teaching accomplishments for the period of review, including awards, grants, and nominations.

Faculty will be evaluated in each of the following areas:

I. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching will include an assessment of the ability to teach in the classroom and by distance education (if assigned). Activities that are included in teaching encompass both direct and indirect contact with students. Those contacts in classes, courses, seminars, distance education courses, graduate supervision, as well as distance education course development are of paramount importance in the evaluation process and will be weighted more heavily than other activities that are considered under the category of teaching. Refer to evaluation levels included in these procedures.

As part of the evaluation of teaching relates primarily to direct student contact and supervision, other areas may be considered in the evaluation process. Students will be provided the opportunity after each course to evaluate both the program and the instructor of record and will be considered in the recommendations of the evaluating committee. The following list includes examples of activities that may be considered in the evaluation of teaching, but it is not intended to be prescriptive. It is not expected that each faculty member will engage in all of these activities. Rather, the listings are intended to provide examples of the types of activities that might be considered under the category of teaching rather than scholarship and/or other activities.

These examples include, but are not limited to:

- student evaluations of courses.
- peer evaluations of graduates/alumni, self-evaluations of teaching and learning, feedback from co- teachers.
- distance synchronous/nonsynchronous and face to face education course development.
- directed studies courses.
- mentoring of colleagues to improve the quality of teaching.
- policy development in relation to teaching.
- scholarship that enhances teaching effectiveness.
- involvement in the scholarship of teaching.
- development of auxiliary courses or curriculum materials.
- involvement in international student and/or professor exchanges.
- integration of technology into teaching.
- participation in teaching workshops.
- developing infrastructure to support students and teachers for practice and/or other teaching.

II. Scholarship

Scholarship is broadly defined and highly valued in this Faculty. The scholarship of teaching, integration, and application are valued as well as the scholarship of discovery (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997). In addition to the traditional controlled experimentation typical of the sciences, research may include but is not limited to studies using qualitative or interpretive methods, descriptive surveys, needs assessment studies, applied evaluation projects, theoretical work integrating the empirical work and hypotheses of others, ethical or philosophical work, model building, and literature surveys. Scholarship of teaching can be considered in either the category of teaching effectiveness OR research and scholarship.

Collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship is encouraged and valued in the faculty. As with single-authored work, faculty members will receive credit for multi- authored publications and research grants. The specific nature of the contribution to the project must be noted in the documentation. Similarly, with participatory action research, which involves partnerships with community members, the specific nature of the contribution to the project must be noted in the documentation.

Peer review is generally considered to be an indicator of the quality of the work. Hence, publications that are refereed are generally considered to be of higher value in the evaluation process. However, it is recognized that non-refereed publications make important contributions to disseminating knowledge and they, too, are encouraged. For non-refereed publications that make a significant impact on the field or discipline, evidence of the contribution (e.g., book reviews, citations, letters to the editor, etc.) may be provided to demonstrate the quality of the work.

It should be emphasized that not all possible contributions of a faculty member have been cited by these examples and, while variety is important, the *quality* of the contributions is of paramount importance. Publications will be given credit at the time that a letter of total acceptance has been

obtained. Acceptance subject to revisions will be treated as material “in preparation”. Materials that are “in preparation” will not be considered in the evaluation until they have been accepted for publication or presentation.

Publications, scholarly papers, and other evidence of research and scholarship may take the form of any of the following:

Examples of Scholarship

Examples of scholarship include, but are not limited to, the following:

- refereed publications (see below).
- unreviewed material (see below).
- films, videos, computer software.
- tests, questionnaires, or assessment instruments.
- research grants and contracts (see below).
- research proposals.
- conference presentations.
- invited addresses to professional associations/societies/community groups.
- editing a research or professional journal.
- developing a new practice technique.
- distance course development.

Peer-reviewed publications - These have been reviewed by peers prior to publication and are considered substantial evidence of scholarship. They can be in either paper or electronic formats. Examples are listed as follows:

- papers in refereed journals.
- books published by university or other publishing houses using referees in the publishing process.
- refereed chapters in edited books.
- abstracts and papers in published conference proceedings where a peer review process can be documented.
- films, videos or computer software where a peer review process can be documented.

Unreviewed material - These are publications, papers and other materials that have not been peer-reviewed prior to publication. Examples are listed as follows:

- unreviewed examples of those above.
- articles in association newsletters or journals.
- publications for clients.
- papers presented at scholarly or professional meetings.
- tests, questionnaires, or assessment devices.
- occasional papers.
- technical reports.
- briefs to governments or other bodies.
- reviews of scholarly articles and research grant applications.

Research grants and contracts - It is recognized that the process of application for funding is time consuming and is not always successful. For faculty members at the lower ranks in particular, or those who are beginning new research programs, consideration should be given to rewarding research grant/contract applications. It is also recognized that some research (e.g., philosophical or theoretical research) may not require funding.

It should be noted that peer review is important in assessing the merit of research grant/contract applications. The amount or size of the grant/contract is not as important as the fact that the contract/grant has been refereed and deemed worthy of funding. Credit for research grants and contracts will be given at the time that written confirmation of funding has been provided.

III. Professional and Other Contributions

Individuals may contribute to the University, their profession, and the community in a wide variety of ways, and every effort shall be made to consider other contributions such as those listed below. Professional experience and activity are considered particularly important to members of a professional school, especially insofar as they provide evidence of leadership and innovative contributions. Professional contributions are considered to be important in professional schools and should be rewarded.

Examples of "Other Contributions" are as follows:

- contributions to the development of the faculty or faculty member's Department.
- contributions to student life.
- student advisement/mentoring.
- community-based education, development, action, or advocacy.
- contributions on university committee assignments.
- contributions on university administrative assignments.
- advocacy for students, faculty members or community members.
- attainment of positive extra-university recognition.

The following are some examples of the many kinds of professional contributions:

- distinctive and important contributions to one's profession, learned societies, or commissions of inquiry.
- awards and fellowships from professional societies.
- workshops which have had a demonstrated impact on professional practice.
- program development, implementation and evaluation activities which have contributed to the profession or community.
- invited addresses to professional associations/societies/community groups.
- contributions to faculty, or University development, where the assignment is clearly related to one's professional competencies and standing.
- serving as a reviewer for accreditation, tenure and promotion files, external reviews, etc.
- policy development
- organizing a major conference.

Evaluation Levels of Teaching

1. *Indicators of Exemplary Teaching*

Exemplary teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. excellent quantitative and/or qualitative teaching evaluations for the previous three years.
- b. illustrations of innovation/creativity/change/development of course materials, including course outlines, assignments, methods of assessment, class exercises, or case studies.
- c. teaching beyond the traditional campus boundaries.
- d. teaching awards.
- e. high quality student supervision and committee membership
- f. significant involvement in co-op work term assessments where appropriate.
- g. creating an inclusive, respectful environment for all students.
- h. introduction of a new course to the curriculum or significant and substantial revision of an existing course.
- i. balancing support of students with providing a challenging learning environment.
- j. involvement in international student and/or professor exchanges.
- k. illustrations of commitment to teaching, mentoring, collaboration, team teaching, collegial support relating to teaching.
- l. mentoring of colleagues to improve quality of teaching.
- m. participation in teaching development activities.
- n. illustrations of commitment to improving the learning and teaching climate.
- o. scholarship that supports teaching, educational leadership, and innovation.
- p. examples of the use of technologies to improve learning and teaching.

2. *Indicators of Satisfactory Teaching*

- a. favourable student and/or peer evaluation as well as the absence of unsatisfactory performance.
- b. preparation for class.
- c. respectful treatment of students.
- d. provision of balanced constructive feedback to students.
- e. contributions to school/program curriculum development.

3. *Indicators of Unsatisfactory Teaching*

Unsatisfactory teaching may include, but not be limited to, some of the following factors including a continuing and significant pattern of:

- a. lack of preparation for class.
- b. cancellation of classes without giving notice or providing acceptable reasons.
- c. lack of availability for class or consultation.
- d. negative evaluation of teaching performance (from students, peers, or both);
- e. prejudicial or discriminatory treatment of students.

Evaluation Levels of Scholarship

1. Indicators of Exemplary Scholarship

Exemplary scholarship may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. refereed publications.
- b. development of new research programs and grant applications.
- c. presentations at scholarly or professional meetings.

2. Indicators of Satisfactory Scholarship

- a. an ongoing program of research and scholarship.
- b. evidence of dissemination of research and scholarship.

3. Indicators of Unsatisfactory Scholarship

Unsatisfactory research and scholarship may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. lack of publications or other scholarly activity.
- b. proven lack of scholarly integrity.

Evaluation Levels of Professional and Other Contributions

1. Indicators of Exemplary Performance

Exemplary performance may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. active participation in several University or faculty committees.
- b. leadership in a professional association/society.
- c. leadership in promoting a critical and productive academic culture.
- d. leadership in fostering an inclusive environment or curriculum.
- e. recognition/awards by community agencies or groups.
- f. community linkages that build on scholarly activity.

2. Indicators of Satisfactory Performance

- a. participation in one or more University or faculty committees.
- b. participation in activities that support the University or faculty.

3. Indicators of Unsatisfactory Performance

- a. lack of participation in other activities such as University or faculty governance structures or profession/community/societal contributions.

Reference:

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997). Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.