

Honors College Annual Faculty Evaluation Policy & Procedures

- 1. Each year, faculty will be invited to assess their activities and accomplishments in a statement of no more than 5 double-spaced pages (11 or 12 pt font). The statement should provide an overall assessment as well as specific details of their work under the three pillars of teaching, research and service.
- 2. Faculty work will be evaluated in the context of their annual workload plan, which established the percentages of effort expected in teaching, research and service.
- 3. The faculty self-assessment and annual workload plan will be reviewed by the Honors Faculty Review Committee of the Honors Council, which will submit a report of no more than one page to the Dean.
- 4. Annual evaluation of the faculty will be completed by the Dean, who will draw upon the report by the Faculty Review Committee.

Teaching:

- 1. The teaching section should state the percentage of workload expected in teaching for the year under review.
- 2. It should describe courses taught, successes and challenges, and give a general overview of student evaluations for each course.
- 3. This section should also describe instructional efforts such as developing materials for a new course, updating materials for an existing course, developing courseware or other materials for technology-based instruction, supporting students in co-curricular activities related to the academic mission, mentoring and supervising communication consultants.

Research:

- If the faculty member has an annual workload plan that includes a percentage of workload expected in research, this section should be completed. If not, it should be considered optional.
- 2. The research section should state the percentage of workload expected in research for the year under review.

Created April 3, 2025, by Dean Malin Pereira; endorsed April 11, 2025, by the Honors Council; reviewed June 2, 2025 by Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs Eric Heggestad.

- 3. The section should articulate a clearly defined research agenda related to their work in the College.
- 4. On average, the expectation is one research output per year for each 20% of workload effort.
- 5. Research products appropriate to Honors include: peer-reviewed and editor-reviewed publications and presentations at conferences. Measures of quality and impact can include journal acceptance rates, number of citations, circulation/download data and awards or special mention. Some of these may not be available until reappointment/promotion reviews but should be included in the annual review if available.
- 6. The College will recognize interdisciplinary research and may recognize non-traditional research products where appropriate.
- 7. Grant funding and submissions related to the teaching mission, participation in research teams and co-authorship are all appropriate research activities.
- 8. Given that research production should be assessed over a 3-year period, this section can also look back and ahead to assess where the faculty member is in terms of this longer window beyond the annual evaluation.

Service:

- 1. The service section should state the percentage of workload expected in service for the year under review.
- 2. It should document service activities such as: committee service or leadership roles in national or regional honors organizations, serving on Honors College committees to review course proposals or for academic events such as the Honors Research Symposium, writing letters of recommendation for students, serving on hiring committees, attending Honors College student & faculty events, recruiting and providing administrative oversight of an evaluative process such as selection. The College has no university-level committee expectations at present but those may be included over time.
- Faculty should note the hidden service work they do in their annual evaluations, referring to informal activities that are often not adequately cataloged and recognized.
 The College must ensure that all such activities are adequately recognized and rewarded.

Next academic year goals, Dean review, and workload setting:

1. At the end of the annual self-assessment, faculty members will submit their goals for the coming year in line with their expected workload distribution of effort. Those goals should align with their next comprehensive review (reappointment, promotion).

- 2. The Dean will review their annual self-assessment for the preceding academic year relative to their workload plan, as articulated in the previous year's annual review, and convey the workload plan for the coming year as part of the annual review.
- 3. As needed, the faculty member and/or the Dean may discuss changing the work plan. This may require a contractual change for non-tenure track faculty.