
Best Practices in Faculty Evaluation

Laying the Foundations

- For faculty under consideration for promotion, promotion with tenure, and/or reappointment
 - Share explicit expectations and timeline about process
 - Build formal mentoring program for faculty
 - Provide annual written feedback with goals and recommendations
 - Ensure all faculty have read and understand the criteria set for in the unit's Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document
 - Encourage faculty to work with OSU Impact Librarians to build the narrative of the impact of their research and creative activities
- For faculty evaluators
 - Clarify with all members of the committee of eligible faculty that they must evaluate the candidate's record independent of the number of years since date of hire or last promotion. More time does NOT necessarily mean more output.
 - Ensure all faculty evaluators have read and understand the criteria in the unit's APT document for the action under consideration (e.g., promotion with tenure, promotion, reappointment) and faculty category (tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, research, associated)

Evaluating Teaching and Mentoring

- Rely on BOTH quantitative and qualitative indicators
- Recognize that some written comments are coming from a biased perspective
- Consider ALL of the following metrics, where available
 - SEIs
 - Peer reviews of teaching
 - Undergraduate and graduate student outcomes
 - Mentoring records
 - Faculty candidate's narratives related to teaching and teaching evaluation



Evaluating Research and Creative Activity

- Considerations regarding impact factors
 - Acknowledge that impact factors and citations statistics are an imperfect tool for evaluating a scholar's success and "impact."
 - Whenever possible, use normalized citation metrics instead, such as the field citation metric.
 - Acknowledge that some forms of scholarship will have a greater impact if published in a subdiscipline journal with a lower impact factor.
 - Make sure that work performed across disciplinary lines (interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary) is given the proper value in the review. Reviews for faculty with joint appointments must include letter from chair/director of the joint unit/center and work must be allocated proportionally to the FTE appointment.

Evaluating Service

- Encourage candidates to describe the impact of all of their service, even when that service was informal (e.g., met with early career faculty and students from URG, which supports retention efforts)
- Acknowledge that cases where service "exceeds" expectations, it is likely and acceptable for research to "meet" expectations

COVID 19 Pandemic Considerations

- Recognize that faculty workloads shifted during the pandemic
- Recognize the work context for a faculty member
- Recognize that existing biases in metrics might have been exacerbated during the pandemic (e.g. teaching evaluations for online courses)
- Maintain expectations for quality in every category of the review, while acknowledging that some aspects of a dossier might look different due to things that are beyond control of the candidate

