

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

## ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA (AFEC)

### Philosophy: What We Value

We, the faculty, Committee A, and college leadership, of the Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture (GCA) aspire to create a diverse, equitable, and inclusive community where a wide range of skills and expertise are valued. We believe there should be ample latitude for individual faculty to contribute most in those areas where they can do their best, while being mindful of the mission and specific needs of the college (Unit) and its programs. Faculty should have a workload which is consistent with the expectations of a high level of overall effectiveness in teaching, research or creative/scholarly activity, and service. The principles outlined here reflect discussions among faculty and administration about our resources, goals, and assessment procedures. These guidelines grow out of and support the goals, aspirations and measures of our College's strategic vision.

The evaluation of faculty members' contributions, with multiple and diverse skills, to the missions of the division, the college, and the university is a complex process. The annual review process should allow wide-ranging contributions to our mission to be adequately assessed. It is expected that there be competence in executing the teaching assignments, scholarly work, and service undertaken. These are the criteria under which people are hired and continue in service to the students, their peers and professions, and the institution. There are certain expectations built into the execution of our work. Meeting threshold expectations is not meritorious, but rather a basic function of being a faculty member.

The assessment of performance of faculty during their probationary period is twofold. Progress-towards-tenure (PTT) letters are related to and distinct from annual evaluation letters. Annual evaluations assess the results of efforts within one calendar year. The PTT letter reflects a *cumulative* sense of accomplishment, impact, and trajectory. It should be noted that meeting threshold expectations on annual evaluations does not necessarily meet the qualifications required for tenure and promotion. The granting of tenure requires, per article 3.7.4 of the faculty handbook, "scholarly attainment, primarily but not exclusively through teaching and research or creative/scholarly activity." Furthermore, "[a] decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of high professional competence and performance measured against national standards. Tenure should never be regarded as a routine award." The assessment of performance shall be made reflecting the criteria set forth by the University Faculty Handbook and the GCA.

### Professionalism: What We Value

We seek to promote a safe, welcoming, and inclusive culture; in order to safeguard that vision, professional behavior shall be expected. All faculty members are required to conduct themselves in a professional manner within the GCA community and beyond. Faculty shall consistently exhibit appropriate personal and professional qualities for maintaining harmony and productivity in the university community and for achieving the University's missions of teaching, research, and service. Professionally communicated dissent on matters of the college and university is welcome and expected and should not be misconstrued as unprofessional behavior. The requirement that a faculty member demonstrate professionalism does not license faculty to expect conformity to their views. A pattern of behavior that is uncooperative, combative, disruptive, intimidating, subversive, defamatory, or bullying may demonstrate a lack of professionalism, and interfere with the mission of the Unit and University.

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

## Distribution of Efforts: Process

Unless approved otherwise by the Dean, the annual distribution of effort for the GCA is as follows:

### Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:

- Teaching =30-50% effort
- Research and Creative Activities = 30-40% effort
- Service and Outreach Activities = 10-20% effort

### Renewable Term Faculty:

- Teaching = 50-90% effort
- Research and Creative Activities = 0-10% effort
- Service and Outreach Activities = 10-25% effort

### Academic Directors, Associate Deans:

- Teaching = 20% effort
- Research and Creative Activities = 20% effort
- Service and Outreach Activities = 60% effort

It is recognized that adjustments to the weights can and will be made as special situations arise and these adjustments can be made through discussion with the faculty member, their division director, committee A, and the dean and should be agreed upon and made as early as possible in the calendar year. Recognizing that teaching activities are as important as research and creative activity efforts, when there are higher efforts in the teaching area, this increase should be offset by lower expected efforts in the research and creative activity category and the converse is also true.

To assist in the development of a research and creative activity agenda and recognizing different instructional needs across Divisions, efforts should be made to allow tenure-track faculty to be assigned to courses within their area of expertise, that will be repeated, and/or assigned different sections of the same courses. It is expected that Division Directors collaborate with faculty on teaching loads and assignments, identify the overall educational objectives of the course and provide details as to how it fits into the curriculum. Faculty of all ranks are expected to be effective educators.

The GCA considers professional development to be an important element in the training and support of faculty and works to ensure continued effectiveness and productivity in teaching, traditional research, creative activities, and service. This is of heightened importance in professional degree-granting programs such as those housed within the GCA. Professional development allows a faculty to maintain and develop a knowledge base that is both contemporary and relevant, both of which work to directly help achieve the GCA's and university's mission. As such, professional development activities are encouraged and valued and are important at all stages of a faculty member's career.

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

## TEACHING: What We Value

The GCA supports inspirational teaching that guides students towards their professional goals and supports effective engagement in their communities. Towards this end, the college outlines a teaching workload policy, known as the “Policy on Faculty Course Load Management” that is a separate document from the AFEC.

## Evaluating Teaching

Teaching shall be evaluated according to five criteria: (1) student perceptions and feedback; (2) course materials, (3) learning outcomes, (4) professional development, and (5) other teaching. Each component will have a percentage weight with expected performance. Faculty members are to define and justify specific weights for the coming year in their annual self-evaluation. The Teaching Evaluation rubric outlines what constitutes a “Meets Expectations” rating. The five criteria of the teaching evaluation are:

### 1. Evaluation of Instruction (15% - 30%)

Student experience surveys (SES) reflect student perceptions and are not necessarily reflective of instructor performance. Thus, these must be used carefully in faculty evaluations. General guidelines and reminders for understanding student course evaluations include:

- Each division will determine the component(s) of the SES that will be considered
- Evaluations are only measurements of student perceptions of their experience
  - They cannot be considered measures of learning outcomes
  - They are not measurements of instructor performance
- While students may bring biases they have to evaluations, these biases likely do not account for the entirety of a student’s course evaluation and these evaluations therefore remain relevant
- Comparisons between faculty or between an individual to an average score are not meaningful.

Student experience survey comments will also be reviewed and considered for contribution to the score in this category. Team-taught classes will have separate course evaluations for each instructor. Faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of teaching in the form of in-class evaluations from mentors or Committee A members. These would be considered as evidence of the quality of instruction in this category.

### 2. Course Materials (20% - 40%)

Instructors will submit their syllabi that clearly indicate the intended learning objectives for each course. As the instructor and/or Division feels necessary, additional course materials or assignments may be submitted to demonstrate the quality of preparation consistent with professional accreditation requirements. Items such as teaching innovation, new teaching methods, development of new courses, incorporation of techniques to foster an inclusive environment in the classroom, community engaged project development, coursework that advances the university and college strategic goals, etc. will be taken into account in judging the merit of each instructor’s teaching. With any new teaching methods or techniques, it is expected that the instructor will provide an assessment to explain effectiveness and strategies for future improvement

### 3. Learning Outcomes (20% - 50%)

The most important measure of a teacher’s success is how well the students learned the material. This is demonstrated through the student work and is distinct from faculty intentions, expertise or preparations, which are measured by course materials. Faculty shall submit student work examples from representative assignments that support the intended learning objectives, as well as any materials necessary to satisfy the needs of the accrediting body of the division.

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

## 4. Professional Development (10% - 15%)

It is expected that each instructor will attend teaching development seminars or engage in other activities that relate to their teaching area(s). These efforts should be described in the Teaching: Self-Evaluation form, as well as goals for teaching professional development for the next calendar year.

## 5. Other Teaching (5% - 20%)

Common activities that fall under the “other teaching” category are listed below. Faculty should provide documentation of other teaching to further explain and support this work.:

- Advising graduate students, including serving on and/or chairing thesis and/or dissertation committees
- Coaching competition teams
- Conducting independent study or directed reading courses
- Coordinating, leading, or chaperoning field trips
- Community engaged teaching/learning
  - Peer reviewed publications resulting from these types of classes also contribute to research productivity
  - Technical reports, government publication, or official policy may also contribute to research productivity
- Teaching that supports strategic goals and initiatives of the College and University

The faculty self-reporting worksheet (appendix A of this document) includes a section for teaching which all faculty should complete each year as part of their annual evaluation. Please note that per the Provost’s memo dated March 27, 2023 faculty evaluations will not contain decimals for scores in individual areas (teaching, research, service). The following are the individual scoring levels, per the Provost’s memo:

5 Outstanding

4 Exceeds Expectations

3 Meets Expectations

2 Does Not Meet Expectations

1 Unacceptable.

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

## EXHIBIT: TEACHING EVALUATION RUBRIC

	5 Outstanding	4 Exceeds Expectations	3 Meets Expectations	2 Does Not Meet Expectations	1 Unacceptable
Student Evaluations 15-30%	Learning environment is supportive and inclusive; outstanding comments in regards to student learning (not likeability)	Learning environment is supportive and inclusive; very good comments in regards to student learning (not likeability)	Learning environment is supportive and inclusive; mixed comments in regards to student learning (not likeability)	Learning environment could be more supportive or inclusive; mixed comments in regards to student learning (not likeability)	Learning environment needs improvement; concerning comments in regards to student learning (not likeability)
Course Materials 20-40%	Materials indicates exceptional success meeting these criteria; the instructor is staying current with new knowledge and technology; successful innovation in teaching strategies; content designed to meet curricular needs and learning objectives; well-crafted assignments, schedules and syllabi.	Materials indicate above average success with most of the following criteria; the instructor is staying current with new knowledge and technology; content designed to meet curricular needs and learning objectives; well-crafted assignments, schedules and syllabi.	Materials indicates success meeting most of the following criteria; the instruction is staying current with new knowledge and technology; content designed to meet curricular needs and learning objectives; well-crafted assignments, schedules and syllabi.	Materials indicate a lack success meeting some of the following criteria; the instruction is staying current with new knowledge and technology; content designed to meet curricular needs and learning objectives; well-crafted assignments, schedules and syllabi.	Materials indicate serious concern with faculty's ability to meet some of the following criteria; the instruction is staying current with new knowledge and technology; content designed to meet curricular needs and learning objectives; well-crafted assignments, schedules and syllabi.
Learning Outcomes 20-50%	Student work produced exceeds expectations for the year level, accreditation requirements, and curricular needs	Student work is above average for the year level, accreditation requirements, and curricular needs	Student work meets learning objectives for the year level, accreditation requirements, and curricular needs	Student work indicates there are issues with some of the following: meeting learning objectives, meeting accreditation requirements, or meeting curricular needs	Student work does not meet learning objectives, accreditation requirements or curricular needs.
Professional Development 10-15%	Faculty set clear goals for teaching improvement, solicited classroom observations or other feedback, made outstanding and demonstrable progress towards goals, attended teacher training	Faculty set clear goals for teaching improvement, solicited classroom observations/other feedback, made significant demonstrable progress towards goals, attended teacher training	Faculty set goals for teaching improvement, solicited and received meaningful feedback, attended a workshop or seminar to improve teaching and made progress towards goals	Faculty did some of the following: set goals for teaching improvement, solicited and received meaningful feedback, attended a workshop/seminar to improve teaching and made progress towards goals	Faculty failed to: set goals for teaching improvement, solicited and received meaningful feedback; attended a workshop or seminar to improve teaching and made progress towards goals.
Other Teaching 5-20%	Faculty are engaged in a variety of other teaching activities and provide evidence their contributions are outstanding	Faculty are engaged in a variety of other teaching activities and provide evidence their contributions are very good	Faculty are engaged in other teaching activities and provide evidence their contributions are good	Faculty are engaged in other teaching activities but no evidence of their contributions are provided	Faculty do not engage in other teaching activities or evidence of ineffective contributions to other teaching activities are present

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

## RESEARCH AND CREATIVE/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY: What We Value

The production of new knowledge is a critical goal of a state-assisted research institution and is a fundamental responsibility of faculty as defined by the University of Oklahoma Faculty Handbook. As evaluations of annual research and creative/scholarly activity shall be based not only on quantity but on quality, competitiveness of outlets, and the reviews and responses by, and the impact on the intended audience.

The faculty of the GCA support article 3.6.2 of the Faculty Handbook which states, "To qualify as research or creative/scholarly activity, the results of the endeavor must be disseminated and subject to critical peer evaluation in a manner appropriate to the field in question." However, the GCA also believes that research or creative/scholarly activities in progress are important and should be considered (although not equal credit to funded projects or disseminated research) in this category. Continual *research in progress* which spans more than two evaluation periods without externally verifiable documented evidence of progress may not receive research/creative activity credit. Externally verifiable documented evidence of progress may include letters of rejection, revision, resubmission for manuscripts, book contracts with scholarly publishers, statements of submitted and granted external funding, data collection, and creative works in progress intended for peer-review.

Research or creative/scholarly activity shall be subject to external peer review. Clearly not all academic journals or professional venues are equal. The quality of the dissemination outlet is a matter of discussion and deliberation between the faculty member, and the evaluation committee. A list of journals or forums of peer-reviewed or other scholarly outlets compiled by faculty of each Division shall define the most appropriate venues for the dissemination of faculty research or creative/scholarly activity. Divisions and faculty shall be responsible for maintaining a current list of dissemination venues that aligns with the research and creative activity matrix and associated tiers. Those lists sponsored by individual divisions shall be shared with all other divisions and considered collectively as an appendix to the AFEC. Examples of what may be on these lists include journals, conferences, granting entities, awards venues, etc. in the disciplines and the tier rating for each. Note that lists are not all-inclusive. Individual faculty members shall discuss venues that are not on the list and determine, in conjunction with the evaluation committee, the appropriateness of the journal.

The essence of this section is that research or creative/scholarly activity is subject to external review. External review may be defined in four ways.

- 1.) A 'Double Blind Peer-Review' is one in which both the reviewer and the author are anonymous with neither having knowledge of who the other is.
- 2.) A 'Single Blind Peer-Review' is one in which the names of the reviewers are hidden from the author(s) although the reviewers may know the name(s) of the author.
- 3.) A 'Non-Blinded Peer Review' (also referred to as 'Open Review') is one in which both the author and reviewer(s) are known to each other.
- 4.) An 'Editorial Review' is when the work is reviewed solely by an editor that makes decisions about the submitted work. This process is typically non-blinded.

All four of these are acceptable forms of review, but only the first two listed shall be considered externally peer-reviewed and therefore carry more weight than the latter two.

Per the Provost's memo dated March 27, 2023 faculty evaluations will not contain decimals for scores in individual areas (teaching, research, service). The following are the individual scoring levels, per the Provost's memo:

5 Outstanding

4 Exceeds Expectations

3 Meets Expectations

2 Does Not Meet Expectations

1 Unacceptable.

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

In general, to earn a “meets expectations” score of 3 in research, faculty must meet a minimum level of accomplishment based on their distribution of research effort. Table 1. presents the productivity levels required for faculty to “meet expectations” based on their distribution of research effort. For tenure-track faculty in their first and second probationary year a lower level of research and creative/scholarly productivity may be acceptable to “meet expectations”, exceptions here will be determined by the evaluation committee,

Table 1. Minimum Research and Creative/Scholarly Expectations based on Distribution of Effort

Requirements to Meet Expectations (Score of 3)					
Distribution of Research Effort	Tier 5*	Tier 4*	Tier 3*	Tier 2*	Tier 1*
>80	Evaluation Committee Discretion				
70	-	-	3	-	-
60	-	-	2	1	-
50	-	-	2	-	-
40	-	-	1	1	-
30	-	-	1	-	-
20	-	-	-	1	-
<10	Evaluation Committee Discretion				

\*Tiers are described in Table 3

For faculty to earn scores in research and creative/scholarly productivity of 4 or 5 (beyond the “Meets Expectations” level, established in Table 1). Faculty earn additional points based on the tier of the accomplishment based on Table 2. The score resulting from this calculation will then be rounded to the closest whole number. Scores of .49 and below will round down, and scores of .50 and above will round up.

Table 2. Additional Scoring for Research and Creative/Scholarly Productivity

Additional Scoring (points above 3.0)				
Tier 5	Tier 4	Tier 3	Tier 2	Tier 1
1.0	0.6	0.3	0.05	0.025

\*Accomplishments in Tier 5 are scored at the discretion of the evaluation committee

For faculty who have minimum achievements higher than those referenced in Table 1. Their scores should include additional points based on the difference in the requirement in Table 1 and the additional scoring in Table 2.

Scoring examples:

- Professor Von Drake has a 40% distribution of effort for research, requiring one tier 3 and one tier 2 accomplishment each year to meet expectations.
  - With two tier 2 accomplishments, Prof. Von Drake would be assigned a score of **2** as the minimum requirement to meet expectations was not met.
  - With one tier 4 and one tier 3 accomplishment, Prof. Von Drake would be assigned a score of **4** (the difference between a tier 2 and tier 4 accomplishment is 0.55)  $3 + 0.55 = 3.55$ , which would round up to 4.
  - With two tier 3 and one tier 2 accomplishments, Prof. Von Drake would be assigned a score of **3** (the tier 2 and the first tier 3 accomplishment meet expectations and the 2<sup>nd</sup> tier 3 accomplishment is an additional 0.3 points ( $3 + 0.3 = 3.3$ ), which would round down to 3.

Effort, evidenced by submissions for peer-reviewed dissemination or recognition is expected of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Tables 3 & 4 below outline the various categories and weights of accomplishments, and shall serve as the college-wide basis for annual faculty evaluations of research

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558 and creative/scholarly activity.

The following should be considered with annual research and creative/scholarly productivity:

- An accumulation of Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 efforts may not be aggregated to achieve a research score in excess of 2, for a faculty member with a distribution of effort great than 20%.
- Any one accomplishment can only be counted once. For example, a conference proceeding counted as an accomplishment under “Publishing” that included a presentation of the work cannot also be counted as a “Presentation”.
- Previous peer reviewed publications with more than 30 citations may be counted once as a tier 2 accomplishment
- Faculty may receive credit for long term externally funded projects for the duration of the project as long as there is progress and the grant status is active.
  - The first year of an award will receive credit for the award, subsequent years will receive credit for funded research in progress per Table 3.
- Faculty may receive credit for book publications with academic presses, post publication, for up to three years. The number of years is determined by the evaluation committee based on the press and book.
- Annual expectations established here are not the expectations for promotion and tenure.
- The information in Table 3 are defaults, more specific details can be found in the Division appendices
- Dissemination venues that are not specifically found in each Division’s appendix can still count toward annual expectations. In these instances, faculty should consult with the evaluation committee and provide justification for which tier the venue falls under.
- While collaborative work is encouraged, the Research Matrix below reflects tiers for first or second author of publications or primary or secondary investigator on grants. We recognize that being the PI on a multi-million dollar grant is not equivalent to serving as a team member with 5% responsibility on that same grant. The evaluation committee will take roles and responsibilities into consideration when assigning tiers.

Table 3. Research/Scholarship Accomplishment Matrix

Tier 5	Tier 4	Tier 3	Tier 2	Tier 1
<b>Research Awards</b>				
Prestigious Awards*				
Book, Paper, Exhibit, Performance & Media Awards				
Prestigious residential fellowships (i.e. Getty, Mellon)	Scholar/Artist in residence or other residential fellowships			
<b>Publishing (Division Appendices Provide Greater Detail)</b>				
Peer-reviewed book publication via scholarly publisher	Textbook publication (Wiley or similar)	Chapter in edited peer-reviewed volume	Book proposal accepted by scholarly publisher	Book proposal submitted to scholarly publisher
Peer reviewed journal manuscript (Typical SJR >1 or per division appendix)	Peer reviewed journal manuscript (Typical SJR 0-.99 or per division appendix)	Peer reviewed journal manuscript (Typically no SJR or per division appendix)	Peer reviewed journal manuscript in revise & resubmit stage	Rejected or unpublished manuscripts
		Full paper, double blind review conference proceeding (or per division appendix)	Full paper, blind review conference proceeding (or per division appendix)	Full paper editor or non-peer reviewed; abstract only conference proceeding (or per division appendix)
		Article in prestigious editor reviewed industry magazine	Article in prestigious editor reviewed industry magazine	Article in an editor reviewed industry magazine
	Editing a Peer-reviewed book or collection of work	Editor of peer-reviewed special edition journal issue (including writing an introduction)	Published book review	Self-Published books
<b>Technical Reports, Government Publications, or Official Policy</b>				
<b>Funded Research</b>				
Prestigious external grant (NSF, NIH, NEA, NEH, etc)	Competitively awarded external grant		External grant proposal not funded	
External funding from a	Medium sized grant or	Small grant or other	In-kind donation from	



# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

prestigious sponsor or a large external grant (not competitively awarded)	other external funding (not competitively awarded)	external funding (not competitively awarded)	external sponsor	
	Competitively awarded internal grant in excess of \$15,000	Competitively awarded internal grant up to \$15,000	College of Architecture PRE Grant award	Internal grant proposals not funded
	Prestigious funded research in progress with substantial effort/progress	Funded research in progress with substantial effort/progress	Funded research in progress with low effort/progress	
<b>Intellectual Property</b>				
Relevant patent (granted) or intellectual property licensed	Relevant provisional patent (e.g. IT app licensed)	Provisional patent	Invention disclosure	
<b>Presentations</b>				
	Keynote lecturer at a major conference	Invited professional or academic presentation		

\*<http://www.ou.edu/research-norman/awards/recognition-programs-for-exceptional-achievements/awards-tiers>

**Table 4. Creative/Scholarship Accomplishment Matrix**

<b>Design Competitions (Commissioned Design Project)</b>				
Winning a national professional-juried design competition (blind review)	Winning a regional professional-juried design competition (blind review)	Placing in a professionally-juried design competition (blind review)	Entered but did not win/place in national or regional professionally-juried competition (blind review)	Entered but did not win/place in other competition (blind review)
<b>Dissemination</b>				
Publication of a monograph about one's design work in reputable press		Review of one's work in prestigious industry magazine	Review of one's work in prestigious magazine	
		Inclusion of one's design work in a major national exhibition		
<b>Creative Awards</b>				
National professionally-juried design award (1-15% acceptance)	Regional or State professionally-juried design award (1-15% acceptance)	Local professional-juried design award (1-15% acceptance)	Entered but did not win/place in national, regional, or state professionally-juried design award	Entered but did not win/place in other professionally-juried design awards
Fellowship (or similar) in national organization such as ASLA or AIA			Professional work that will be submitted for awards	

\*<http://www.ou.edu/research-norman/awards/recognition-programs-for-exceptional-achievements/awards-tiers>

The faculty self-reporting worksheet (appendix A of this document) includes a section for research which all faculty should complete each year as part of their annual evaluation. It provides further detail on individual accomplishments.

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

## **SERVICE: What We Value**

Service activities should support and enhance the faculty's scholarly stature and advance the interests and capabilities of communities (inside and outside of the University). Service activities stem from professional expertise relating to teaching, research, and creative/ scholarly activity.

According to the OU faculty handbook (Section 3.6.3), in general, evaluation of service is based on quality and effectiveness of performance related to:

- The public outreach and general welfare and efficacy of the Division, College, & University missions.
- The welfare and furtherance of the faculty's discipline.
- The faculty member's value, professional competence, or professional skills.
- The enhancement of university colleagues in their teaching, research, creative scholarly activity, and service outreach.

More specifically, service is considered as it contributes to the faculty member's discipline, to the University, and to the public at large.

Service is an essential part of the role of all faculty. By tradition and for many practical reasons, the expectations placed on faculty vary by rank. While situations within the College or a Division may necessitate service outside the norms laid out here, these situations must be acknowledged in annual evaluations and progress toward tenure letters. Also, due to the emphasis on research/creative activities and teaching at flagship research institutions, like the University of Oklahoma, we must ensure that faculty members' distribution of effort for service accurately reflect their service assignments, and that faculty service assignments must not exhaust a reasonable amount of time. For example, service assignments corresponding to a 20% distribution of effort should, at maximum, require 8 hours per week to accomplish. Lastly, we must ensure that service assignments be made strategically so as not to compromise faculty production in research/creative activities or teaching, especially for untenured faculty in their probationary period. When an individual's service load exceeds typical division and college needs (i.e., during accreditation, significant curriculum revision etc.), the individual's allocation of efforts should be adjusted to accommodate the extra workload. For tenure track faculty, the extra service load should be adjusted between teaching and service.

## **Service Expectations by Rank**

Term/Rank Renewable: Service assignments for Term/Rank Renewable Faculty shall be limited, especially relative to their tenure track peers. Term/Rank Renewable Faculty are primarily judged by their teaching and research/creative activities productivity and therefore, service should complement and never substitute for research/creative activities and teaching efforts. While the voices of Term/Rank Renewable Faculty are essential to the committee structures that provide for the shared governance of the College and the University, committee membership or efforts on College/Division/University initiatives for Term/Rank Renewable faculty should be limited to 1-2 committees maximum. Under normal circumstances, Term/Rank Renewable Faculty are expected to have support and not leadership responsibilities on committees or College/Division initiatives.

Tenure track faculty in their probationary period: Service assignments for tenure track faculty during their probationary period shall be limited, especially relative to their more senior tenured peers. Tenure track faculty are judged internally and externally by their research/creative activities and teaching productivity and therefore, service should complement and never substitute for research/creative activities and teaching efforts. While the voices of tenure track faculty are essential to the committee structures that provide for the shared governance of the College and the University, committee membership or efforts on College/Division/University initiatives for tenure track faculty should be limited to 1-2 committees maximum. When possible, these committee assignments should be connected to tenure track faculty's research/creative activity and teaching interests. Tenure track faculty should not typically chair any College committee, should not be expected to take on leadership roles on College initiatives, and should be shielded from all University service

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

commitments. Service to a faculty member's discipline or to society at large, which advance the faculty member's research/creative activities and teaching, may be encouraged if done so in ways that strategically advance that faculty member's career. These strategic decisions should be made in dialogue with the faculty member's Director and mentors inside and outside the College.

Service assignments for junior faculty which deviate from these norms must be acknowledged by Division Directors and Committee A in all annual evaluations and progress toward tenure proceedings. Additionally, Division Directors must create an accommodation plan which indicates how the junior faculty member's teaching and research/creative activities will be adjusted to offset the additional time spent on service activities when those activities exceed norms. These can include strategic plans which show how junior faculty service load will return to normal levels over a period of time, course releases, summer salary, etc. Simply raising junior faculty distribution of effort for service to accommodate extra service assignments is not sufficient. These plans are to be included in tenure dossiers as addendums.

Associate Professors with Tenure: Associate Professors with Tenure are expected to take on increasing amounts of service relative to junior faculty. It is expected that Associate Professors balance increased service responsibilities with continued excellence in research/creative activities and teaching. It is appropriate for Associate Professors to have membership in 1-2 College or University Committees; to chair committees; and to take leadership roles in College/Division initiatives. Opportunities for this type of service should be made available to Associate Professors as an essential element of effective faculty governance. The number of committee assignments should be dependent on faculty roles and responsibilities on those committees. It is also appropriate for Associate Professors to take on meaningful service to one's discipline and to society at large. For an Associate Professor, these roles often offer ways for faculty members to make positive impacts on society and should be encouraged in strategic consultation with one's Director and Dean.

Division Directors ensure that an Associate Professor's distribution of effort accurately aligns with the true amount of work the faculty member dedicates to service. Division Directors must also ensure that Associate Professors' service load is balanced with the teaching and research/creative activities needs of the unit. Deviations from these norms must be indicated in annual evaluations and included in the faculty member's promotion materials. As part of the annual evaluation process, Committee A will verify distribution of effort accurately reflects service assignments.

Full Professors with Tenure: Full Professors with Tenure are expected to take on the major share of service assignments in the College and the University. Full Professors are expected to balance service with excellence in research/creative activities and teaching. It is appropriate for Full Professors to have membership in 2-3 College or University Committees depending on their role and responsibilities on the committees; to chair committees; and to take leadership roles in College/Division/University initiatives. Opportunities for this type of service should be made available to Full Professors as an essential element of effective faculty governance. It is expected that Full Professors take on meaningful service to one's discipline and to society at large. For Full Professors, it is essential for faculty members to make positive impacts on society and these roles should be encouraged in strategic consultation with one's Director and Dean.

Division Directors strive to ensure that a Full Professor's distribution of efforts accurately aligns with the true amount of work the faculty member dedicates to service. Division Directors and Committee A must also ensure that Full Professors' service load is balanced with the teaching and research/creative activities needs of the unit. Deviations from these norms must be indicated in annual evaluations. As part of the annual evaluation process Committee A will verify distribution of effort accurately reflects service assignments.

Despite these guidelines, in a small college such as the GCA, the needs of the divisions and college must be met. As such, faculty of any rank may be needed to do more. In these instances, it is incumbent on the Director/Dean to justify the additional service and ensure the load has been spread equitably across the faculty taking rank into account. Further, service that is critical to the

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

needs of the division and college shall take precedence over outside service.

## Establishing Faculty Service Assignments

Faculty service is not expected to occur in every category in the matrix below, to the contrary, faculty should select service opportunities that support and enhance their individual teaching and scholarly/creative pursuits (examples are provided below). The evaluation processes and standards laid out here are predicated on clear and regular communication between faculty members and their Division Director. All faculty members' individual service assignments should be established in dialogue between the faculty member and their Division Director at the beginning of each evaluation cycle. If service assignments must be adjusted during the course of an evaluation cycle due to the needs of the College or Division or for a new opportunity for meaningful service outside of the university, faculty and directors must strategize on ways to balance the faculty member's time and effort. Additionally, new service assignments or any service assignment that goes beyond the norms and expectations established here must be recognized in all evaluation and promotion materials.

Finally, dissemination is foundational to service. Faculty serving on committees, groups, councils, etc. have the responsibility to report back to their division and the college on the work that is ongoing, and/or has been completed or undertaken. This dissemination is particularly vital when it occurs on the College and University levels. Failure to report back or disseminate pertinent information from service activities to the faculty member's division and the college will adversely impact scores.

Per the Provost's memo dated March 27, 2023 faculty evaluations will not contain decimals for scores in individual areas (teaching, research, service). The following are the individual scoring levels, per the Provost's memo:

- 5 Outstanding
- 4 Exceeds Expectations
- 3 Meets Expectations
- 2 Does Not Meet Expectations
- 1 Unacceptable.

## EXHIBITS

*\*\*The descriptions provided are based on a 20% service load\*\*\**

Table 1. Service Score Rubric

	5	3 - 4	2	1	0
Full Professor	5	3 - 4	2	1	0
Associate Professor	5	4	3	2	1
Assistant Professor / Lecturer	5	4 - 5	3 - 4	2 - 3	1 - 2
Role	Faculty is proactive in identifying and seeking solutions to advance the agenda. Faculty may be chair of the committee.	Faculty takes an active role when asked	Faculty attends and contributes in meetings, but does not take on responsibility.	Faculty attends meetings but does not consistently engage.	Little discernable activity
Participation and Workload	Faculty is proactive on committee, council or group in achieving the committee needs.	Faculty is an active attendee, contributing to discussion and achievements.	Faculty attends meetings and contributes but does not engage beyond the meetings.	Faculty is a member, but does not contribute or is frequently late or misses meetings.	Little discernable activity
<u>Initiative and special Tasks</u>	Faculty recognize needs independently	Faculty takes on assignments as requested and	Faculty accepts tasks and fulfills them with the	Faculty only takes assignments as required and may	Little discernable activity

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

	and proactively seeks solutions	completes them in a timely and professional	minimum effort required	not contribute as asked, outcomes may be delayed or low quality	
--	---------------------------------	---	-------------------------	---	--

The faculty self-reporting worksheet (appendix A of this document) includes a section for service which all faculty should complete each year as part of their annual evaluation. It provides further detail on individual accomplishments based on the scoring rubric above.

## Examples of service in each category

Within each category, the following are examples of service activities (This is not intended to be an exhaustive list).

Within the faculty member's discipline:

- City, state, national, or international organizations and commissions
- Advisory boards or agencies related to the faculty member's discipline or profession
- Academic review or accreditation boards
- Editing of professional journals or publications
- Reviewing books or professional journals
- Reviewing research grant proposals
- Refereeing research papers submitted for publication
- Participation in the organization of research conferences or professional meetings
- Holding office in professional or academic associations
- Committee service in professional or academic associations
- Review of external P&T packages
- Membership, especially in positions of leadership on special bodies concerned with teaching (accreditation or special commissions).

Within the division:

- Committee, council, or advisory group service or leadership
- Positions such as division director, graduate liaison, director of a program or special center
- Performance of functions relating to scholarships, internships, student organizations, or other division functions with require significant additional contact with industry or students
- Coordination and/or organization of:
  - Field trips
  - Receptions
  - Division Functions
- Curriculum development
- Curriculum assessment
- Program accreditation

Within the College

- Membership, especially in positions of leadership on committees, councils, or advisory groups
- Membership, especially in positions of leadership in bodies of faculty governance (Committee A).
- Positions such as associate or assistant dean
- Director of a program or special center
- Representing the college at national and international meetings
- Special assignments from College administration.
- Management of development of college laboratories
- Organization of events or conferences hosted by the College

Within the university:

# Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture

The University of Oklahoma GCA 830 Van Vleet Oval, Room 198, Norman, Oklahoma 73109 T: 405.325.2444 F: 405.325.7558

- Membership, especially in positions of leadership on committees, councils, or advisory groups
- Membership, especially in positions of leadership in bodies of faculty governance (faculty senate, graduate council)
- Representing the division, college, and university at regional, national, and international meetings
- Special assignments from university administration
- Organization of events or conferences hosted by the University

## To the public at large

- Professional consultation (when not included in annual evaluation materials as research that leads to discovery or dissemination of new knowledge)
- Service on local, state, national, or international commissions, advisory boards, or agencies (public or private)
- Participation in groups or programs sponsored by student, faculty, or community groups
- Participation in continuing education instructional activities including those sponsored through the College of Continuing Education
- Service in an organizational or advisory capacity for particular University programs
- Public relation activities that serve the University's interests such as appearances at a University representative before government bodies or citizen groups.

Adopted by Faculty: October 17, 2023

Approved by Dean: November 3, 2023

Approved by Provost: December 11, 2023

## **Appendix A**

See separate document: AFEC Faculty Self Reporting Worksheet