

School of Writing, Rhetoric, and Technical Communication  
Faculty Annual Self-Assessment Report (SAR) Guidelines

(For further information on the annual evaluation process, see the Faculty Handbook, Section III.E)

**Part 1: Evaluative Summary**

Faculty member should list noteworthy accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Provide specific details and use full citations for publications. Indicate the rating (Excellent, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory) that best describes performance in each area. Indicate the relative weights for each area (see page 8).

**Teaching**

- \*
- \*
- \*
- \*

Self-evaluation rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage for Teaching? \_\_\_\_\_

**Scholarship**

- \*
- \*
- \*
- \*
- \*

Self-evaluation rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage for Scholarship? \_\_\_\_\_

**Service**

- \*
- \*
- \*
- \*
- \*

Self-evaluation rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage for Service? \_\_\_\_\_

## **Part 2: Supportive Documentation**

Use part 2 to provide information to elaborate on or clarify items in Teaching, Scholarship, or Service.

### **I. Teaching**

Include information about the following:

- Courses taught
- Independent studies, honors theses, graduate theses, internships directed, and practicums directed.
- Student evaluation summaries

Supporting Documentation: Although the following list of supporting documents is not intended to be exhaustive, faculty members' packets of supporting documents could include the following:

- Curriculum development activities
- New course development
- Team teaching
- Experimental courses
- Interdisciplinary courses
- Extensive revisions to courses
- Particularly innovative assignments
- Descriptions of instructional technology learned for inclusion in courses
- Class observations by colleagues, the AUH, and/or TAPS
- Discussion of student evaluations
- Attendance at or presentation of workshops or conferences devoted to the enhancement of teaching
- Teaching awards or other recognition of excellence in teaching
- Receipt of teaching grants from university, state, or national sources for instructional development

### **Ratings**

The ratings for teaching are *Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, and *Excellent*.

#### **Unsatisfactory**

An unsatisfactory rating indicates that the faculty member has failed to meet the requirements of a satisfactory rating.

#### **Satisfactory**

A *Satisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has satisfied the following criteria:

- Teaches relevant and well-prepared material
- Receives generally favorable student evaluations
- Responds to official letters from the AUH and AUPAC regarding the preceding academic year (Responses may include evidence of change stemming from the evaluation or a statement addressing points of disagreement.)
- Meets the “working conditions” of the university’s Faculty Handbook, III.H, that include advising students, keeping office hours, ordering textbooks, and administering final examinations at properly scheduled times. (NB: This item will be updated once the revised Faculty Handbook has been approved by the Board of Visitors, for some of the listed working conditions have been moved to other locations in the handbook.)

### **Excellent**

An *Excellent* rating indicates that the faculty member has met two or more of the following criteria:

- Receives very favorable student evaluations
- Develops new courses or significantly revises existing courses
- Demonstrates an exceptional contribution to teaching, such as
- Mentors teaching assistants (beyond coursework requirements)
- Mentors graduate assistants (beyond coursework requirements)
- Mentors Writing Center tutors (beyond coursework requirements)
- Conducts workshops related to teaching
- Engages in team teaching, teaching consultations, or guest lectures
- Engages in interdisciplinary teaching
- Develops innovative/creative teaching methods (beyond course revisions)
- Chairing theses or practicums.

## **II. Professional Development and Scholarly Achievement**

Document activities and accomplishments in professional development and scholarly achievements, using complete citations. Evidence of scholarly achievement may include the following:

- Publications in refereed journals, including online journals
- Publications such as books, monographs, edited volumes, including online venues
- Publications in creative and popular writing and/or publications in technical media such as manuals, computer documentation, hypertext or online help, or pedagogical/methodological training modules
- Publications such as book reviews and other (Note: Faculty members may elect to submit a publication in the academic year in which it was accepted for publication by citing it and providing a copy of the letter of acceptance.

Or, they may elect to submit the work in the year that it is published.)

- Conference presentations, online
- Conference presentations, local
- Conference presentations, regional and state
- Conference presentations, national, international
- Grants and Fellowships (include the name of project, funding organization, amount, duration of grant and purpose)
- Professional consulting, technical proofreading and editing, or proposal writing

Note: Publishing opportunities are increasingly varied, and may defy more traditional forms of categorization. The above list cannot include all possibilities for scholarship.

### Supporting Documentation

Although the following list of supporting documents is not intended to be exhaustive, faculty members' packets of supporting documents could include the following:

- An announcement of a conference or workshop organized by the faculty member
- Letters of acceptance of an article or book for publication
- A research grant proposal or a letter of acceptance of proposal
- A conference paper published in a conference proceedings
- A review, an article, or a book in published form

### Ratings

The ratings for professional development and scholarly achievement are *Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, and *Excellent*.

#### **Unsatisfactory**

An unsatisfactory rating indicates that the faculty member has failed to meet the requirements of a *Satisfactory* rating.

#### **Satisfactory**

A *Satisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has satisfied one of the following criteria.

- Presents at a refereed/juried state, regional, national, or international conference, including recognized online conferences
- Participates in at least one professional conference (state, regional, national, or international) in the discipline. "Participation" may come in the form of a panel discussion, focus group, or other comparable activity
- Prepares and submits scholarly papers for presentation at refereed/juried state, regional, national, or international conferences; articles; or books for publication. A draft should be submitted in this report

- Consults in the faculty member's academic discipline
- Serves on an editorial board of a leading state, regional, national, or international academic journal or serves as editor of an online journal.
- Prepares research grant applications or proposals
- Organizes or makes presentations at local workshops
- Publishes notes, reviews, or short entries in academic or professional journals, books, or reference publications
- Receives a research grant or funding at the college or university levels
- Receives awards or other honors for excellence in scholarship from the college or university.

### **Excellent**

An *Excellent* rating indicates that the faculty member has satisfied one or more of the following criteria:

- Receives a research grant or funding of state, regional, national, or international significance
- Receives awards or other honors for excellence in scholarship from state, regional, national, or international organizations in the faculty member's field of research or teaching
- Publishes one or more articles in a refereed journal, edited book or in an online venue. This includes recognized online journals or letters of acceptance of an article for publication (Note: publication of two or more articles in a single year can be counted for two years.)
- Publishes an essay in an edited book that employs a refereed system or letters of acceptance of an article for publication
- Edits a state, regional, national, or international journal centered on scholarship that is widely recognized as a leading regional publication in the field
- Edits technical manuals, instructions, or websites
- Edits a book or textbook by a publisher that employs a third-party refereed system or some other form of objective evaluative procedure for determining the merit of the work or letters of acceptance of a book for publication (Note: The publication of such an edited work automatically qualifies the faculty member for a rating of excellent in the first year of its citation and at least satisfactory for the subsequent year.)
- Publishes a monograph or book printed by a publisher that employs a third-party refereed system or some other form of objective evaluative procedure for determining the merit of the work or letters of acceptance of a book for publication (Note: The publication of a monograph automatically qualifies the faculty member for a rating of excellent the first year of its citation and at least satisfactory for the subsequent year. The publication of a book automatically qualifies the faculty member for a rating of excellent for the

first and second year of its citation and satisfactory the third year.)

### **III. Service**

Faculty members must include in the report a list of the committees on which they have served, indicating their committee roles.

- University committees
- College committees
- WRTC committees
- Advisees, graduate and undergraduate
- Other, including service outside the university.

#### **Supporting Documentation**

Include copies of documents that illustrate achievements in service, such as letters of appointment, thanks, special recognition, and committee reports.

#### **Ratings**

The ratings for service are *Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, and *Excellent*.

#### **Unsatisfactory**

An *Unsatisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has failed to meet the requirements of a *Satisfactory* rating.

#### **Satisfactory**

A *Satisfactory* rating indicates that the faculty member has satisfied the following criteria:

- Participation in the regular business of WRTC, including regular attendance at scheduled WRTC committee and faculty meetings
- Service on two committees, at least one of which must be in WRTC
  - *Note:* A combination of two comparable special assignments, either internally or externally, may be substituted for one committee assignment. Some activities might include serving as an academic adviser, an adviser to a student organization, an active member of a community-literacy project, a presenter at on-campus workshops, or a consultant.

#### **Excellent**

An *Excellent* rating indicates that the faculty member has satisfied two or more of the following criteria in any category.

(*Note:* The following lists are neither exhaustive nor restrictive. Both the quality of the work and the demands of activities may qualify a faculty member for a rating of *Excellent*.)

#### **Internal Professional Service**

- Directing at least two on-campus workshops

- Serving on a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Chairing a WRTC, college, or university committee
- Collaborating with colleagues to enhance, administer, or coordinate existing programs
- Developing new on-campus programs that contribute to the enrichment of WRTC, the college, or the university
- Organizing on-campus activities that contribute significantly to the enrichment of WRTC's mission

#### External Professional Service

- Serving as reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting, a conference (local, regional, national, or international), a journal, or a book
- Serving as program organizer/chair for a professional meeting or conference (may count as scholarship or service, but not both)
- Serving as an officer, executive, or board member of a professional association (local, regional, national, or international)

#### Community Service

- Participating on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or task forces
- Developing classes or workshops for groups outside the university
- Participating in service to the community

## Assigning Relative Weights to the Evaluation Categories

Assigning relative weights to the evaluation categories provides Writing, Rhetoric, and Technical Communication faculty members with flexibility in representing their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the past academic year. The weight that faculty members assign to each of the three categories should reflect how they have allocated their time and energy over the past academic year. The weighting distribution may be changed from one year to the next to reflect changes in faculty members' interests and opportunities in teaching, scholarship, and service.

When faculty members submit their SAR, they should indicate in "Part I: The Evaluative Summary" the percentage weights they would like assigned to each category in evaluating their performance. The minimum weighting for each category are as follows:

Teaching:	40%
Scholarship:	10%
Service:	10%

When determining the weighting distribution for the SAR, faculty must use increments of 5% within each category and be certain that the total percentage equals 100%.

To arrive at a recommendation for merit increases, the Academic Unit Head (AUH)

- Reviews the SAR and evaluates performance in teaching, scholarship, and service according to the criteria for each category.
- Assigns a rating of *Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, or *Excellent* for the faculty member's performance in each category.

After the AUH has evaluated each faculty member and prepared an annual evaluation letter which includes the AUH's ratings in the areas of areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, the AUH meets with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation. Annual evaluations and faculty members' meetings with the AUH must be completed by October 1<sup>st</sup> of the academic year.

A faculty member may appeal his or her annual evaluation to the AUH. If the faculty member is unsatisfied with the AUH's response to an appeal, he or she may make subsequent appeals to the Academic Unit's Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) and, afterward, to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters.

For further information on annual evaluation appeals see the Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.4.g. For information on salary adjustments, college allocation procedure, and academic unit allocation procedures see Faculty Handbook, Sections III.E.4.j, III.J.2.c, and III.J.2.d respectively.

## Determining Merit Increases through the Merit Allocation Mechanism (MAM)

The MAM is designed to be objective, based on the ratings assigned faculty members by the AUH in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service multiplied by the percentage weights assigned by faculty members to each of the areas. All annual evaluations, meetings between faculty members and the AUH, and appeals, if any, must be completed before the AUH employs the MAM to determine merit increases.

### MAM Formula and Distribution Tiers

An *unsatisfactory* rating = 0

A *satisfactory* rating = 1

An *excellent* rating = 2

For example, based on the above scale, an annual evaluation break-down might resemble the following:

Teaching:	50 (weighting) x 2 ( <i>Excellent</i> )	= 100
Scholarship:	30 (weighting) x 2 ( <i>Excellent</i> )	= 60
Service:	20 (weighting) x 1 ( <i>Satisfactory</i> )	= <u>20</u>
	Total:	= 180

(Note: Total points possible equals 200.)

The amount of funds available for merit increases is derived by totaling all fulltime faculty members' annual salaries and multiplying that total by the merit increase percentage to determine the merit pool (MP). For example, if the merit increase approved by the Virginia legislature is four percent, then  $MP = \text{sum of annual salaries times } .04$ .

The following formula will be used to determine each faculty member's merit increase. Faculty members should keep in mind that whereas they may earn an *excellent* rating in any or all of the evaluated areas, the overall annual-evaluation ratings are limited to *satisfactory* or *unsatisfactory*. Merit increases are only available to faculty members who earn an overall *satisfactory* on their annual evaluations.

### Distribution Tiers

Tier 1: Once the MP has been determined, the MP will be multiplied by .60. All faculty members who earn an overall *satisfactory* will receive an equal portion of MP times .60.

The remaining .40 of the MP is then divided in half, a *Tier 2 half* and a *Tier 3 half*.

Tier 2: All faculty members who earn 151 to 200 points on their annual evaluations will have

an equal portion of the *Tier 2 half* added to the merit increase they received in Tier 1.

Tier 3: All faculty members who earn 181 points to 200 points on their annual evaluations will have an equal portion of the *Tier 3 half* added to the merit increase they received in Tier 2.