Annual Faculty Evaluation
Overview of the Process

- Based on calendar year activities/achievements
- Before end of February faculty receive an invitation by the Dean’s Office to log in an electronic database (https://ucsci2.uchc.edu/Faculty/)
- Dr. Caibin Zhang, (czhang@uchc.edu) manages log in access, and adds new faculty at the end of each year as advised by Human Resources
- Faculty enter information on annual activities according to goals set the previous year, perform a self evaluation (scoring 1-3), and submit to the Chair
- Scoring categories include: Teaching/Education, Research/Scholarly, Intramural Service, Extramural Service, Administrative Service, Faculty Practice
- Faculty will have some assigned % effort in one or more of these scoring categories, it is advantageous for faculty to have effort and contributions in more than one category
- Each scoring category is weighted by the % effort assigned to it, to determine an overall faculty evaluation score
- By end of March in each year Chairs meet with respective faculty, review achievements in each category, assign an overall score (1-3), and set goals for next year
- Chairs nominate faculty for a score of 4 for further review by the Dean’s Advisory Council (DAC)
- In April or May of each year the DAC members convene with AAUP representatives to review, calibrate and finalize the evaluations across all SDM units

Sources:
Annual faculty evaluation guidelines approved by DAC, May 7, 2008
Annual faculty evaluation protocol, 2017
Faculty effort allocation in the SDM can be broadly categorized in: Mainly Teaching or Mainly Research

Mainly Teaching: 45+8=53% of our faculty

Mainly Research: 23+3=26% of our faculty

- >=50% teaching: 11%
- >=50% research: 3%
- teaching>other: 8%
- research>other: 23%
- administration>other: 10%
- other, or community center: 3%
Most faculty in the SDM will receive an Overall Score of “3” annually

- Overall Score of “3” corresponds to “Meets or Exceeds” expectations
- Other descriptive terms for this score might include: excellent, very good, as desired, as expected
- In context this should be the expected outcome for the majority of faculty provided that goal setting matches the abilities of the faculty member
- <20% of faculty in the SDM will receive an Overall Score of 1, 2 or 4 annually

Sources: Annual faculty evaluation guidelines approved by DAC, May 7, 2008
Annual faculty evaluation protocol, 2017
Five year SDM statistics (2017-22)
“Major Effort in Teaching”: Outstanding “4”

• Definition of “4”: Performance significantly above stated goals in teaching, unexpected or surprising outstanding performance in area other than teaching

• Examples (one or more of the following):

• Competitively awarded prestigious regional, national or international award

• Exceptional new training program (or major modification), undergraduate or graduate course, or CE course development which generates a significant interest in the dental community

• Development of innovative clinical care modality which improves patient care and student training

• Scholarly activity well above stated annual goals (unexpected when most effort in teaching)

• Significant multiyear new research funding (unexpected when most effort in teaching)

Sources: Annual faculty evaluation guidelines approved by DAC, May 7, 2008
Annual faculty evaluation protocol, 2017
SAPC guidelines
“Major Effort in Teaching”: Marginal “2”-Needs Improvement

• Definition of “2”: lack of expected (based on stated goals) achievement in teaching that cannot be compensated by better achievement in other areas as stated in annual goals.

• Examples:

• Poor clinical annual student/resident evaluations (e.g. lowest quartile or bottom 3 faculty with comments) in the past year

• Poor course evaluations (average overall score 2 or lower) in the past year- if course Director

• Poor overall student didactic evaluation (e.g. lowest quartile or bottom 3 faculty with student comments) in the past year

• No significant research award, scholarship or service to compensate for one of the above

Sources:   Annual faculty evaluation guidelines approved by DAC, May 7, 2008
Annual faculty evaluation protocol, 2017
“Major Effort in Teaching”: Fails to meet “1”-Problematic

• Definition of “1”: Fails to meet (based on stated goals) achievement in teaching that cannot be compensated by better achievement in other areas stated in annual goals.

• Examples:

• Very poor clinical annual student/resident evaluations (e.g. lowest quartile or bottom 3 faculty with student comments), past two or more years

• Very poor (average overall score 1 or lower) course evaluations past two or more years -if course Director

• Very poor student didactic evaluation (lowest quartile or bottom 3 faculty with student comments), past two or more years

• No significant research award, scholarship or service to compensate for one of the above

Sources: Annual faculty evaluation guidelines approved by DAC, May 7, 2008
Annual faculty evaluation protocol, 2017
“Major Effort in Research”: Outstanding “4”

• Definition of “4”: Performance significantly above stated goals in research, unexpected or surprising outstanding performance in area other than research

• Examples:
  • New competitively awarded multi-year grant above the prospective goals stated in annual evaluation
  • Significantly higher scholarly output than stated in goals
  • Competitively awarded prestigious national or international award/patent

Sources: Annual faculty evaluation guidelines approved by DAC, May 7, 2008
Annual faculty evaluation protocol, 2017
SAPC guidelines
“Major Effort in Research”: Marginal “2”-Needs improvement

• Definition of “2”: lack of expected (based on stated goals) achievement in Research that cannot be compensated by better achievement in other areas as stated in annual goals.

• Examples:

• No extramural funding and no grant submissions in the past year but continues original research publications as stated in goals, and

• No outstanding achievements in other areas that significantly exceed goals in research area

Sources: Annual faculty evaluation guidelines approved by DAC, May 7, 2008
Annual faculty evaluation protocol, 2017
“Major Effort in Research”: Fails to meet “1”-Problematic

• Definition of “1”: Fails to meet (based on stated goals) achievement in research that cannot be compensated by better achievement in other areas stated in annual goals.

• Examples (one or more of the following):
  • No research funding and no grant submissions for the past two years
  • No scholarly publications for the past two years
  • No outstanding achievements in other areas that significantly exceed goals in that area

Sources: Annual faculty evaluation guidelines approved by DAC, May 7, 2008
Annual faculty evaluation protocol, 2017