

Slippery Rock University

**Policies and Procedures
for Tenured Faculty Fifth-year
Performance Review and Evaluation**

REVISED 2022

Fifth-Year Performance Review and Evaluation Revision Committee

Ms. Mary Hennessey, Assistant to the Provost
Dr. Jason Hilton, President, SRU APSCUF, Professor of Education
Mr. Sean Macmillan, Associate Professor of Art
Ms. Lynne Motyl, Chief Human Resources Officer
Dr. Patricia Pierce, Professor of Exercise and Rehabilitative Science
Dr. Kurt Schimmel, Professor of Business

Signed **February 4, 2022**



Dr. Abbey Zink
Provost and Vice President
Academic Affairs



Dr. Jason Hilton
SRU-APSCUF
Chapter President

This is an Administrative Guide for the Fifth-Year Performance Review and Evaluation process. If there is a conflict between this guide and the PASSHE-APSCUF CBA, the CBA will apply

See Article 12 of the CBA:
Performance Review and Evaluation of Faculty
NB: References CBA July 1, 2019-June 30, 2023

The SRU Evaluation Dates and Requirements Chart can be located on the SRU Academic Affairs webpage under Faculty Resources and the SRU APSCUF website under Policies. Dates are also listed throughout the CBA.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| An Overview of the Slippery Rock University..... | 3 |
| Policies and Procedures for Tenured Faculty | 3 |
| Narrative | 4 |
| Categories for Performance Review and Evaluation | 4 |
| I. Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities..... | 5 |
| A. Teaching Faculty | 5 |
| B. Faculty Members Whose Basic Responsibilities Lie Outside of the Classroom | 7 |
| C. Faculty Members with Mixed Workloads..... | 7 |
| D. Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities | 7 |
| II. Continuing Scholarly Growth and Professional Development | 8 |
| III. Service: Contribution to the University and/or Community | 11 |
| An Overview of Faculty Member’s Responsibilities for Fifth-Year Review for the Tenured Faculty Member | 14 |
| An Overview of the Department Evaluation Committee’s Procedures | 16 |
| An Overview of the Department Chairperson’s Procedures..... | 17 |
| An Overview of the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager Procedures | 18 |
| Appendix: Optional Performance Review Checklist..... | 19 |

An Overview of the Slippery Rock University Tenured Faculty Member's Fifth-Year Performance Review and Evaluation

The process of faculty evaluation is perceived broadly as a means for extending opportunities for continuous professional development. The processes are intended to be supportive of a Faculty Member's desire for continuing professional growth and academic excellence. The faculty evaluation will contribute to the ongoing improvements of the academic programs of the university.

Although there are numerous purposes for faculty evaluations, the focus of the fifth-year performance review is upon professional development. The five-year performance review evaluation mandated by the CBA provides an opportunity to assist Faculty with this process. The Categories for Performance Review and Evaluation are Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth and Professional Development, and Service: Contribution to the University and/or Community. The fifth-year review is submitted through the University's digital process.

Faculty must assume the burden of providing evidence that all three categories for performance review and evaluation are addressed. For Faculty whose basic responsibilities lie outside the classroom, the duties and responsibilities of the position will be evaluated in place of Effective Teaching. For Faculty with mixed workload, both effective teaching and duties and responsibilities of the position will be evaluated. The evaluation of Faculty Members teaching distance education courses shall follow the same procedures and practices that apply to regular classroom courses.

The Faculty Member will be evaluated by the Department Evaluation Committee, Department Chairperson, and the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager. This document includes specific procedures for the fifth-year review. It also addresses procedures for Department Chairpersons, Department Evaluation Committees, and Dean/Associate Provost/Managers. The Appendix has a document checklist.

Policies and Procedures for Tenured Faculty

Each tenured Faculty Member shall receive a performance review evaluation from their Dean/Associate Provost/Manager no later than May 15 of their fifth year of appointment as a tenured Faculty Member and again no later than May 15 of every fifth year thereafter. In the event that a tenured Faculty Member is on leave during any part of their evaluation year, they will be evaluated the first year following their leave (Article 12). Subsequent reviews revert to the Faculty Member's original schedule.

Interim evaluations may be conducted if judged necessary by the department or if required by the appropriate Dean/Associate Provost/Manager (Article 12).

The Evaluation Dates and Requirements Chart (located on the SRU Academic Affairs webpage under Faculty Resources and the SRU APSCUF website under Policies and can be found within the CBA) references dates for the fifth-year process.

Narrative

The narrative is an essential tool to contextualize faculty professional development and will become, arguably, the most important part of the evaluation and review process. It plays an essential role in allowing the Faculty Member to describe their Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibility, Continued Scholarly Growth and Professional Development, Service, and, if assigned, duties outside the classroom. It allows the Faculty Member to develop a storyline behind their actions, ensuring that no single success or disappointment is left to represent them without context. The narrative helps evaluators to see the Faculty Member in a holistic fashion.

Faculty should prepare their narrative knowing that it is the primary way through which reviewers will be evaluating their work, and that the evidence supplied in the report supports the claims made in the narrative. The Faculty Member should try to establish as many connections as possible. Connections made between teaching and scholarly growth, scholarly growth and service, teaching and service, or across all three, corroborate Faculty Member's focus on teaching excellence and general planfulness in pursuing their careers. Faculty Members should explain and clarify their roles and the contributions to the institution, profession and/or community.

Faculty should prepare their fifth-year performance review narrative to briefly contextualize their work and how they are meeting the requirements of the department and the University. Provide examples, statistics, and other documentation to demonstrate how the Faculty Member's position contributes to the functioning of the students, department, and field. Use the narrative as a chance to describe any extenuating circumstances that affected progress and explain specific contributions that otherwise might not be clear to the reviewers.

Effective fifth-year review narratives will vary in length depending on where a Faculty Member is in their career. For instance, a full professor may not need to list every accomplishment in order to establish themselves as a contributor to the ongoing improvements of the academic programs of the universities, while a Faculty Member who is preparing an application for promotion may use their fifth-year review narrative as a template for a future promotion application. In the narrative, focus on the key aspects of your teaching and fulfillment of professional responsibilities, continuing scholarly growth and professional development, and service without emphasizing minutiae. Effective narratives tend to fall in the 15- to 30-page range. Those that are shorter tend to struggle to provide enough context to evaluate the quality of the application, while those that are longer tend to cause key elements of quality to become lost in the quantity of what is written.

Categories for Performance Review and Evaluation

The following categories shall serve as the uniform system-wide basis for the evaluation of Faculty Members. The categories listed below shall be applied in the performance review and evaluation of Faculty. Under each category are listed some examples of data upon which

judgments can be made about the Faculty Member's performance relative to a given category. When evaluating data, evaluator(s) shall give greater weight to the quality of the performance reflected in the data, than to the quantity of the data.

I. Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities

Evaluation of Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities will be based on the variety of materials submitted as supporting evidence in the report and the discussion of these materials in the narrative. Depending on the work assignment, this evaluation will be based on the following three categories as outlined in the CBA Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities (Article 12). Faculty Members may also find helpful information about workload in Article 23.

- A. For teaching Faculty, the category is Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities (Section A below).
- B. For Faculty whose basic responsibilities lie outside the classroom, the category is the duties and responsibilities of the position and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities (Section B below).
- C. For Faculty with mixed workloads, the category is Effective Teaching, the duties and responsibilities of the position, and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities (Sections A and B below).

A. Teaching Faculty

Teaching is defined as the interaction that occurs between a Faculty Member and a student during which the student has the opportunity to learn, the student is enabled to learn, and/or the student is motivated to learn. Teaching occurs through both the delivery of formal course content and through interactions that are independent of coursework. Faculty will provide evidence that **may** include, but need not be limited to, the following areas of effective teaching:

Areas of Evaluation

1. Instructional design: Design will be evaluated based on the ability of Faculty to:
 - a. design effective instructional experiences and strategies necessary to foster student engagement and induce learning. Toward this end, Faculty should consider using (and explicitly identify in the narrative) high impact practices. This includes service learning, undergraduate research, global learning, collaborative learning, diversity learning, and writing-intensive activities, as well as powerful pedagogies, such as, but not limited to, Reacting to the Past, LGBTQI+, and experiential learning.
 - b. design and utilize multiple valid, reliable, and authentic means to assess student learning.
 - c. clearly communicate objectives, expectations, and/or assessment tools

via instructional materials.

2. Instructional delivery: Delivery will be evaluated based on Faculty's ability to:
 - a. clearly communicate information, concepts, and techniques.
 - b. engage students.
 - c. promote or facilitate learning.
3. Innovation in teaching: An important activity of the successful teacher should be to experiment with new or different teaching methods to match the ability and interests of students with the changing needs of the curriculum, market, and/or needs of the communities.
4. Instructional management: Instructional Management will be evaluated based on the quality of execution of logistic and record keeping duties involved with teaching. This includes, among other things, timely distribution of quality feedback to the student.
5. Engagement in assessment and accreditation efforts: Document and explain the Faculty Member's participation in the continuous assessment and accreditation cycle inclusive of assessment planning and development, data collection, evaluation and analysis, action planning, and resource allocation.

The following are evidence that **must** be included in the fifth-year Performance Review and Evaluation:

1. Student Surveys of Course Effectiveness for all courses that comprise the regular contractual academic assignment (excluding overload) for the Fall semester of the fifth-year per the University official record.

It is the responsibility of the Faculty Member to ensure that Student Surveys of Course Effectiveness are administered for all courses taught per the official University record and that both summaries of these surveys and student comments are included in their report. If Student Surveys of Course Effectiveness are not included for all courses, the Faculty Member must acknowledge this fact and explain why these were not included.

*To ensure student privacy, the following shall apply: (1) Department of Art: each studio course within the 200-400 level shall be assigned one course number for student evaluation purposes; (2) Department of Music: each applied music area and each music ensemble within the 100-400 level shall be assigned one course number for student evaluation purposes; (3) Department of Dance: each combined technique class (Modern, Jazz, Ballet, etc.) shall be combined for student evaluation purposes.

2. One peer observation of teaching during the Fall semester of the fifth-year and one peer observation of teaching before February 15 of the Spring semester of the fifth-year, both completed by the Faculty Member's Department Evaluation Committee. One Chairperson classroom observation of teaching completed by the Faculty

Member's Department Chairperson during the Fall semester of the fifth-year. The three observations must be completed on the approved form(s).

3. A representative sample of course syllabi and other student materials, such as assignments, assessments, etc.

B. Faculty Members Whose Basic Responsibilities Lie Outside of the Classroom

For all Faculty whose basic responsibilities lie outside the classroom, the duties and responsibilities of the position will be the category used in place of Effective Teaching. The following evidence must be included:

1. An official job description that will be the basis of the evaluation (Article 12).
2. A substantiated narrative by the Faculty Member of their abilities in meeting responsibilities of the position as described in the official description.

C. Faculty Members with Mixed Workloads

When Faculty teach courses and have responsibilities outside of the classroom for which they receive an alternate work assignment or course release (including contractual or non-contractual reassigned workload), effective teaching coupled with the duties and responsibilities will be evaluated collectively (see sections I.A and B above).

Chairpersons will be judged based on the performance of position obligations as laid out in the CBA (Article 6). Administrative tasks carried out above and beyond those required by the course release agreement and CBA should be considered continuing scholarly growth and professional development and/or service.

D. Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities

This category involves the execution of professional responsibilities consistent with the objectives of the University. Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities will be assessed as part of the performance review by the Department Evaluation Committee, Department Chairperson, and Dean/Associate Provost/Manager. The Faculty Member should also provide evidence of their performance of these basic responsibilities. The Department Evaluation Committee, the Department Chairperson, and the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager will use their respective evaluations to indicate to what extent the Faculty member has met professional responsibilities which include, but need not be limited to the following:

- provides quality student advisement;
- provides prompt, and when possible, advanced reporting of any changes in class hours or classrooms assigned;

- prepares for and meets assignments, with timely notification to the proper authority in case of absence;
- maintains office hours in accordance with Article 23;
- fairly evaluates and promptly reports student achievement;
- reports promptly and in advance, if possible, absence due to illness;
- accepts those reasonable duties assigned within the field of competence;
- preserves and defends the goals of the University with the right to advocate change;
- recognizes and attempts to meet department goals and stated standards of performance with the right to advocate change;
- willingly accepts University, college, or department work assignments; and
- completes University, college, or department work in a timely manner, and at a high level.

If the Department Chairperson or Department Evaluation Committee indicates that a Faculty Member has failed to meet these basic responsibilities, evidence must be included to verify the finding. Generalities are not acceptable for judging fulfillment of professional responsibilities.

II. Continuing Scholarly Growth and Professional Development

Continuing scholarly growth and professional development are valued in that these efforts enhance the educational experience, enliven the intellectual climate on campus, provide external funding to support the educational mission of the institution, aid the community, and provide opportunities for students to grow as scholars, professionals, and citizens. All reviewers should recognize the University's role as a teaching University. Reviewers will recognize, consider, and appropriately reward Faculty who commit to the time-consuming processes of student and/or community engagement in continuing scholarly growth and professional development.

Scholarship is defined as the discovery, integration, application, and/or advancement of knowledge through research, creative accomplishment, community engagement, and/or professional endeavor, as well as sharing the results of those activities. Scholarship should be related to one's discipline, designed to enhance the educational experience within the discipline, and/or the Faculty Member's teaching professional responsibilities. Scholarship also includes professional growth and recognition, and is often used to help community members solve problems and/or meet needs.

Professional development is the engagement in teaching and program enhancement that Faculty undertake for developing and improving skills to better meet the needs of students, curriculum and the University.

The CBA and local agreements between Slippery Rock University's Administration and Faculty recognize continuing scholarly growth and professional development occur through diverse activities (see Article 12). Faculty will provide evidence that may include, but need not be limited to, the following non-prioritized list (nor are ALL items expected to be included):

- development of experimental programs (including distance education);
- papers delivered at regional, national, or international meetings of professional societies;

- regional and national awards related to the discipline;
- offices held in professional organizations;
- invitational lectures given;
- participation in panels at regional, national, and/or international meetings of professional organizations;
- grant acquisitions, submission of grant applications or proposals (external, PASSHE, internal);
- editorships of professional journals;
- participation in juried shows and/or premier performances;
- program-related projects;
- quality of musical or theatrical performances; reviewed musical, dance, literary, or theatrical performances, exhibition, production, and/or publication of electronic media;
- participation in one-person or invitational shows;
- consultantships;
- research projects and publication record (or accepted for publication--substantiated by letters of acceptance);
- additional graduate work beyond the minimum requirements for the rank;
- contribution to the continuing scholarly growth or professional development of one's peers;
- performance of accreditation work that leads to professional development;
- innovations in teaching, advising, and/or initiatives that enhance student success;
- inter-University and intra-University program development;
- obtaining or maintaining professional licensure/certification relevant to one's discipline;
- participation in teaching-related professional development;
- evidence (tangible product) of long-range or sustained research that has not yet yielded a publishable result but is consistent with the Faculty Member's chosen path of research (e.g. longitudinal research resulting in a data set or a record of peer-reviewed grant writing);
- development/presentation of workshops, panels, institutes, seminars, meetings, and so forth in areas of professional competence;
- testimony of experts in the discipline or related professional expertise;
- exhibitions;
- scholarly participation in panels at national, regional, and/or international meetings of civic organizations;
- participation in organized workshops, institutes, seminars, symposia, short courses, etc. related to professional expertise;
- participation in professional organizations that advance a professional field or discipline;
- refereeing manuscripts or grant proposals submitted to journals, professional meeting committees, and so forth;
- using professional expertise for the creation, modification, and/or dissemination of services, intervention programs, training programs, formal policies, legislation, and/or other public policy solutions aimed at helping SRU's stakeholders and communities;
- collaboration with and/or participation in community organizations or activities in which

- there is significant use of one's expertise;
- public presentation of scholarly knowledge for academic or applied professional purposes;
- articles, performances, productions, and exhibitions produced by students under the supervision of the Faculty Member;
- Faculty creation of data, policy analyses, resource guides, technical reports, research reports policy memorandum, and other analytical products that apply faculty expertise to benefit the common good of the community and other stakeholders;
- the presentation of expert knowledge for applied professional and/or public service purposes;
- the undertaking of a program evaluation to assess and/or ensure the success of a program at mitigating a community's social problems;
- significant pedagogical contributions (e.g., materials and activities) in the form of new methods of teaching innovative curriculum structures;
- establishing rigorous frameworks for peer and student review of teaching, mentoring, research, applied scholarship, and/or community engagement;
- other activities that advance knowledge, synthesize knowledge, apply knowledge, and/or disseminate knowledge, including maintaining professional licensure; and
- any other data agreed to by the Faculty and Administration at local Meet and Discuss.

The listing of acceptable forms of evidence of continuing scholarly growth and professional development does not indicate a hierarchy of value for advancement. Additionally, the explicit enumeration of acceptable forms of evidence in the list above shall not be construed to deny or disparage the existence of other acceptable forms of evidence. For example, the CBA accepts “participation in juried shows and/or premier performances,” but does not address the creation of juried shows or premier performances. Reviewers should accept “creating a juried show” as evidence of continuing scholarly growth and professional development.

This non-comprehensive list of acceptable evidence includes activities and artifacts that cover the four Boyer Categories of Scholarship: Discovery, Integration, Application/Engagement, and Teaching and Learning (Boyer, 1990). Acceptable evidence of continuing scholarly growth submitted for review should represent at least one of the four categories of scholarship. Boyer defines the four categories as follows:

| | |
|---|--|
| Boyer's Categories of Scholarship (found in Boyer, E. L. (1990). <i>Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate</i> . Princeton University Press, 3175 Princeton Pike, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648.) | |
| Type of Scholarship | |
| Discovery | Original research that advances knowledge |
| Integration | Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across Time |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Application/Engagement | Use of knowledge to solve problems in any number of domains (social, political, economic); putting knowledge to work; moving from theory to practice, and from practices back to theory |
| Teaching and Learning | Systematic study of teaching and learning; the transmission of knowledge for the benefit of external audiences and to enrich practices in higher education |

The discussions of Boyer’s Categories of Scholarship serve to alert both the Faculty and reviewers that the CBA and local agreements accept a wide array of artifacts as evidence of continuing scholarly growth and professional development. In other words, scholarship extends well beyond traditional journal article, chapter, and book publication. Note, too, that the CBA does not prioritize or favor specific (acceptable) forms of evidence of continuing scholarly growth and professional development.

Areas of Evaluation

Faculty are not required to classify each piece of evidence of continuing scholarly growth and professional development according to the four Boyer categories mentioned above. However, classifying the activities may help focus evaluations on the appropriate characteristics. When assessing the quality of continuing scholarly growth and professional development, reviewers should analyze one or more of the following features of activities:

1. Complexity and intellectual rigor of the activity or artifact.
2. The time commitment invested in the creation of the activity or artifact.
3. The quality of the writing. Writing should meet professional standards, communicate effectively, and be logically consistent.
4. The ability of the activity to advance discipline, teaching, and/or professional knowledge and/or otherwise have the capacity to meet the goals served by discovery, integration, application, and/or teaching.
5. The extent to which Faculty provide student growth opportunities through their continuing scholarly growth and professional development.

III. Service: Contribution to the University and/or Community

Service is defined as voluntary, elected, and/or appointed activities that contribute to the internal community, external community, institution, and/or profession. Faculty should be a part of the University community and participate in service to the shared governance and operations of the institution. Moreover, the impact of Faculty service should be primary in the evaluation of this category, as the best service is not mere participation but expressions of dispositions of leadership, initiative, application of expertise, and/or sustained commitment to achieve a collaborative purpose. Projects for which Faculty have received an alternative work assignment or specific compensation from the University (i.e., a release from teaching, monetary reward, or

waiver of other contractual duties) shall not be considered service. Indeed, excellent service often complements and helps advance teaching and/or continuing scholarly growth and professional development, but, while frequently related, is distinct from those other areas of evaluation (Article 12).

Note that Faculty will provide evidence that may include, but is not limited to, the forms of evidence of accomplishments listed below. The listing of areas or forms of evidence of accomplishment does not indicate a hierarchy of value for advancement.

- **Internal community service and engagement** - Significant (non-course, non-program) advising, mentoring and/or management contribution to student organizations or activities; and/or significant contribution to internal community service and/or engagement.
- **External community service and engagement** - Evidence of accomplishment in this area includes voluntary contributions to professionally based, community-engaged organizations that are reasonably related to one's discipline and/or expertise. Evidence of community service includes but is not limited to efforts at establishing mutually beneficial (reciprocal) partnerships with the community that seek to increase community leadership and/or capacity for solving problems; meeting community needs by supervising or mentoring community engagement activities; developing internship programs; implementing intervention programs; training community members and groups; and/or significant contribution to external community service and/or engagement.
- **Institutional service** - Evidence of accomplishment in this area includes the quality of voluntary service to:
 - Department/Program – development of new course(s) or program(s); quality of curriculum development; documented participation in assessment and accreditation cycles; committees; advisory boards; training or assisting other Faculty Members in the use of distance education technology and other processes; mentoring of Faculty Members to guide them during the tenure and promotion processes; development of internship programs; and/or significant contribution to department/program service other than covered in items above.
 - College – committees; advisory boards; development of new course(s) or program(s); quality of curriculum development; training or assisting other Faculty Members in the use of distance education technology and other processes; and/or significant contribution to college service other than covered in items above.
 - University/APSCUF – committees, advisory boards, colloquia, and/or task forces; participation in college or University governance or on APSCUF committees; training or assisting other Faculty Members in the use of distance education technology and other processes; special individual assignment; delivery of training to other Faculty Members that leads to improved teaching effectiveness, research, or service; development of new course(s) or program(s); quality of curriculum development; and/or significant contribution to University governance

other than covered in items above.

- PASSHE - committees, advisory boards, colloquia, and/or task forces; and/or significant contribution to the State System other than covered in items above.

- **Professional service** - Evidence of accomplishment in this area includes the quality of voluntary service to professional organizations such as committee work and other responsibilities that contribute to the function, advancement, and/or maintenance of the organization, service to governmental agencies related to the area of expertise; and/or significant contribution to professional service other than covered in items above.

ALL areas and evidence items listed above are NOT expected to be included. Note also that inclusion of a form of evidence in one area does not preclude its inclusion under another area.

Areas of Evaluation

When assessing the quality of service, reviewers should analyze one or more of the following features:

1. Complexity and intellectual rigor of the service.
2. The time commitment invested in the service.
3. The professional quality of any artifacts and/or activities designed and/or implemented as a result of the service.
4. The ability of the person serving to meet the goals of the service activities.
5. The magnitude/importance of the service activities for the group served.

An Overview of Faculty Member's Responsibilities for Fifth-Year Review for the Tenured Faculty Member

1. Update and maintain professional report throughout the five-year period to be used for the Performance Review and include the following materials:
 - The narrative
 - Current curriculum vitae
 - Peer classroom visitations for teaching Faculty:
 - (1) Schedule **one** peer classroom visitation with the Department Evaluation Committee during the **Fall** semester prior to the fifth-year report.
 - (2) Schedule **one** peer classroom visitation with the Department Evaluation Committee by February 15, during the **Spring** semester of the evaluation year.
 - (3) Include the **two** (mentioned above) peer classroom visitation reports in the fifth-year report.
 - (4) Distance Education courses should be visited/evaluated using the DE Peer Observation Form which can be located on the SRU-APSCUF website (Article 12).
 - Department Chairperson classroom visitation for teaching Faculty:
 - (1) Schedule **one** Chairperson classroom visitation during the Fall semester prior to the fifth-year report.
 - (2) Include the **Chairperson** classroom visitation evaluation in the fifth-year report.
 - (3) Distance Education courses should be visited/evaluated using the DE Peer Observation Form which can be located on the SRU-APSCUF website (Article 12)
 - Student Surveys of Course Effectiveness for teaching Faculty:
 - (1) Arrange for a colleague to administer student surveys for **ALL** courses that comprise the regular contractual academic assignment (excluding overload) per the University official record for the Fall semester of the evaluation year.
 - (2) To ensure student privacy, the following shall apply: (1) Department of Art: each studio course within the 200-400 level shall be assigned one course number for student evaluation purposes; (2) Department of Music: each applied music area and each music ensemble within the 100-400 level shall be assigned one course number for student evaluation purposes; (3) Department of Dance: each combined technique class (Modern, Jazz, Ballet, etc.) shall be combined for student evaluation purposes.
 - (3) Both summaries and comments from student surveys in all regular contractual academic assignment (excluding overload) courses during the Fall semester of the year of evaluation must be included in the fifth-year report.
 - For teaching Faculty, a representative sample of course syllabi and other student materials, such as assignments, assessments, etc.
 - For non-teaching Faculty and Faculty with mixed workloads, an official position description for non-teaching responsibilities.
 - A statement on Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities as explained in the categories for performance review and evaluation.

- Evidence of Continuing Scholarly Growth and Professional Development as explained in the categories for performance review and evaluation.
 - Evidence of Service as explained in the categories for performance review and evaluation.
2. Submit fifth-year report through the University's digital process by **March 1**.
 - The Department Evaluation Committee and Chairperson shall provide Faculty Members with a reasonable opportunity to discuss their evaluation (Article 12).
 - Fifth-year Faculty Members may provide a written response to the Department Committee, the Department Chairperson, and/or Dean/Associate Provost/Manager evaluation and such response will be submitted through the digital evaluation portfolio.
 3. The Faculty Member may request meetings with the Department Evaluation Committee, the Department Chairperson and/or the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager at appropriate points in the evaluative process, such as the following:
 - A meeting with Departmental Evaluation Committee to discuss its final report prior to its submission of the report to the Department Chairperson and the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager;
 - A meeting with the Department Chairperson to discuss their report prior to its submission to the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager;
 - A meeting with the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager to discuss their written performance review prior to the final report.
 4. For evaluation dates and deadlines, please refer to the locally approved SRU Evaluation Dates and Requirements (located on the SRU Academic Affairs webpage under Faculty Resources and the SRU APSCUF website under Policies).

An Overview of the Department Evaluation Committee's Procedures for the Fifth-Year Review of the Tenured Faculty Member

The Department Evaluation Committee shall carry out its functions in the fifth-year performance review and evaluation process with proper regard for the rights of fifth-year Faculty to both substantive and procedural due process.

Each department shall select a committee to assist in the evaluation function (Article 12). No Faculty Member shall serve on their own evaluation committee or as a member of the Department Evaluation Committee for a member of their immediate family or person residing in the same household as the Faculty Member.

The Department Evaluation Committee will verify that all required materials are included in the fifth-year Faculty Member's report before submitting its evaluation to the next level for review. If the fifth-year report is deemed incomplete, the Department Evaluation Committee Chairperson will notify the Faculty Member and provide instructions on how to address missing information.

The Department Evaluation Committee shall utilize the required materials and other data that the Department Evaluation Committee has deemed pertinent (Article 12) and prepare a written evaluation addressing professional development of the fifth-year Faculty Member in each of the Performance Review Categories.

The Department Evaluation Committee shall provide the Faculty Member with a reasonable opportunity to discuss their evaluation prior to submitting the report to the Department Chairperson and the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager.

By the applicable date (see Evaluation Dates and Requirements Chart located on the SRU Academic Affairs webpage under Faculty Resources and the SRU APSCUF website under Policies; dates are also listed throughout the CBA), the Department Evaluation Committee submits the evaluation to the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager, Department Chairperson, and Faculty Member through the University's digital process.

An Overview of the Department Chairperson's Procedures for the Fifth-Year Review of the Tenured Faculty Member

The Department Chairperson shall carry out their function in the fifth-year review and evaluation process with proper regard for the rights of the Faculty to both substantive and procedural due process.

No Department Chairperson shall provide a Chairperson evaluation of themselves or an evaluation of a member of their immediate family or a person residing in their household (Article 12). The department shall select another Faculty Member in the department acceptable to the Department Faculty and Management to substitute for the Department Chairperson.

The Department Chairperson will evaluate fifth-year Faculty based on their knowledge and personal observations of each Faculty Member's performance, the evaluation of the Department Evaluation Committee, and the materials submitted by the Faculty Member. If any required materials are missing, the Department Chairperson may notify the Faculty Member and provide instructions on how to address missing information.

The Department Chairperson shall prepare a written evaluation addressing professional development of the fifth-year Faculty Member in each of the Performance Review Categories.

The Department Chairperson shall provide the Faculty Member with a reasonable opportunity to discuss their evaluation after which the Chairperson shall submit, independently of the Department Evaluation Committee, an evaluation to the appropriate Dean/Associate Provost/Manager.

By the applicable date (see Evaluation Dates and Requirements Chart located on the SRU Academic Affairs webpage under Faculty Resources and the SRU APSCUF website under Policies; dates are also listed throughout the CBA), the Department Chairperson will submit the evaluation and recommendation to the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager, Department Evaluation Committee, and the Faculty Member through the University's digital process.

An Overview of the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager Procedures for the Fifth-Year Review of the Tenured Faculty Member

The Dean/Associate Provost/Manager shall carry out their function in the fifth-year performance review and evaluation process with proper regard for the rights of Faculty to both substantive and procedural due process.

No Dean/Associate Provost/Manager shall evaluate a member of their immediate family or a person residing in their household. The President or the President's Designee shall select another Dean/Associate Provost/Manager as a substitute to provide the performance review.

The Dean/Associate Provost/Manager shall review the material submitted by fifth-year Faculty Member and:

- the data supplied by the Department Evaluation Committee.
- the data supplied by the Department Chairperson.
- any other relevant and substantiated data gathered by the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager provided that such other data is disclosed to the Faculty Member and that the Faculty Member is afforded an opportunity to respond to the data.

The Dean/Associate Provost/Manager shall provide the Faculty Member with an opportunity to discuss the performance review. This discussion shall be specific and detailed, and clearly set forth those areas of performance, if any, which require improvement. A draft of the performance review will be provided to each Faculty Member prior to discussion with the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager.

By the applicable date (see Evaluation Dates and Requirements Chart located on the SRU Academic Affairs webpage under Faculty Resources and the SRU APSCUF website under Policies; dates are also listed throughout the CBA), the Dean/Associate Provost/Manager will submit the detailed evaluation to the President or the President's Designee, the Department Evaluation Committee, the Department Chairperson, and the Faculty Member through the University's digital process.

Appendix: Optional Performance Review Checklist

5th Year Performance Review

Faculty Member's Name: _____

| Materials Included | Completed (√) |
|--|---------------|
| Narrative | |
| Current Curriculum Vitae | |
| Student surveys of course effectiveness for all regular load courses Fall Semester | |
| Peer Classroom Visitations (1 Fall semester, 1 Spring semester before February 15) | |
| Chairperson Classroom Visitation (1 Fall semester) | |
| Representative Sample of Course Materials | |
| Official Position of Non-Teaching Responsibilities (If applicable) | |
| Evidence of Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities | |
| Evidence of Continuing Scholarly Growth and Professional Development | |
| Evidence of Service | |

The intention of this optional form is to assist the Faculty Member to better assure a completed report and does not need to be included as a part of any evaluation report.