

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 1 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 05/02/08

POLICY Annual Performance and Post-Tenure Reviews

A. Basic Policies for Peer Review

Each year's evaluation will be made on the basis of the previous three years of work. Faculty who have been employed less than three years at the School of Social Work will be evaluated on their performance to date, with performance prorated accordingly. In making its evaluations, the Annual Performance Evaluation Review Committee will review the submitted materials and make performance recommendations to the Director.

Submitted materials should include the category under which the faculty member is fulfilling criteria and documentation of the person's accomplishments where necessary. For example, for a peer reviewed article either a copy of the published article or a letter of acceptance can be used for documentation. Teaching scores will be compiled by the office of the Director and supplied to the review committee.

The School of Social Work annual performance evaluation review will be conducted in accordance with the deadlines and procedures established by the College of Public Programs and the University.

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 2 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

B. ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR ROLLING THREE YEAR PERIOD - SCHOLARSHIP

UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	MERIT	HIGH MERIT	EXCEPTIONAL MERIT
Little or no evidence of scholarly activity in any of the categories (see attached list)	Evidence of scholarly productivity that includes at least 1 unit of merit	Evidence of scholarly productivity that includes at least 2 units of merit	Evidence of significant scholarly productivity that includes at least 3 units of merit	Evidence if exemplary scholarly productivity that includes at least 4 units of merit

2 units of scholarship merit –

1 scholarly book, or
External funding of \$60,000 or more

1 unit of scholarship merit -

1 edited book, or
1 text book, or
External funding from \$20,000 up to \$60,000

.75 unit of scholarship merit -

1 refereed article

.50 unit of scholarship merit -

1 book chapter, or
1 revised book, or
Internal funding, or
External funding under \$20,000

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 3 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

C. ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR ROLLING THREE YEAR PERIOD - TEACHING

UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	MERIT	HIGH MERIT	EXCEPTIONAL MERIT
Failure to meet required teaching responsibilities or three year average > 2.00	Faculty member maintains acceptable teaching performance, meets required teaching and field liaison responsibilities, and maintains a teaching evaluation score average between 2.00 and 1.61	Evidence of strong teaching performance that includes at least 2 units of merit and maintains a teaching evaluation score average between 1.60 and 1.41	Evidence of very strong teaching performance that includes 4 units of merit and maintains a teaching evaluation score average between 1.40 and 1.20	Evidence of outstanding teaching performance that includes 6 units of merit and maintains a teaching evaluation score average < 1.20

1 unit of teaching merit –
Foundation, Ph.D., BSW), or

Be a chair of a concentration (ADP, PAC,
Create a new course, or
Substantially revise an existing course that is then approved, or
Lead person for one or more CSWE accreditation standards/chapters, for a whole curriculum, or for one sequence, or
Chair to completion a dissertation or thesis

.75 unit of teaching merit -

Chair of an on-going dissertation or thesis committee

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 4 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

.50 unit of teaching merit -

Lead Instructor responsibility, or
Attend a continuing education course to improve teaching skills, or
Supervise a field student to compensate for the lack of a BSW or MSW at the agency, or
Supervise a student in a for-credit Independent Study, or
Teach one course not taught within the last three years, or
Provide extracurricular teaching activities (e.g. film or speaker series, workshops), or
Member of an on-going dissertation or thesis committee, or
Teaching activities that are over and above the required teaching responsibilities and are not credited above (describe, document and justify)

Teaching score criteria used above must be reassessed by faculty every 3 years

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 5 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

D. ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR ROLLING THREE YEAR PERIOD - SERVICE

UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	MERIT	HIGH MERIT	EXCEPTIONAL MERIT
Faculty member fails to consistently perform required service or committee assignment; frequently fails to attend required faculty meetings	Faculty member serves competently on at least one committee per year and regularly attends faculty meetings and shows activity in community and/or professional service	Faculty member is active in departmental affairs, serves conscientiously and shows leadership in the unit that includes at least 2 unit of merit	Consistently demonstrates strong leadership at the unit or some combination of unit, college university, professional, and/or community levels that includes 4 units of merit	Consistently demonstrates exceptionally strong leadership at the unit or some combination of unit, college university, professional, and/or community levels that includes 6 units of merit

1 unit of service merit -

Editor of professional journal, or
Elected leadership in professional organization, or
Chair of a university or college committee, or
Chair of a SSW search or standing committee, or
Elected chair of community
board/committee/coalition/review panel
Refereed conference presentation

.50 unit of service merit -

Editorial board member, or
Member of a SSW search or standing committee, or
Member of a university or college committee, or
Member of a completed dissertation or thesis
committee, or
Regularly attended an additional curriculum
program committee, or
Advise a student group, or
Serve on a community
board/committee/coalition/review panel, or
Conference presentation, or
Service activities that are over and above the
required service responsibilities and are not
credited above (describe, document and justify)

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 6 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

E. Composite Annual Performance Evaluation score using 3 year averages

Scoring Scale

There are 5 categories with point values of:

UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	MERIT	HIGH MERIT	EXCEPTIONAL MERIT
5	4	3	2	1

There are three areas with the current percentage allocations for faculty:

Research 35%
Teaching 35%
Service 30%

Using a point system for each category, the faculty member would get a score for each of the three categories. The scores could be weighted for the percentages, and the total of the three weighted scores would equal the score for the evaluation period. This would also allow for a negotiated shift in responsibilities so that the weights could change on an individual basis.

Examples:

(A) Standard workload

A faculty member with a 2 in research, a 2 in teaching, and a 1 in service would calculate the annual score as follows:

$$(2 \times .35) + (2 \times .35) + (1 \times .30) = .7 + .7 + .3 = 1.7$$

If we use the 1 – 5 scale as above, the average of 1.7 would fall between High Merit and Exceptional Merit.

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 7 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

(B) Negotiated workload

Suppose a faculty member anticipates doing a great deal of service in the coming year and he/she chooses to emphasize service by negotiating a workload weighting of

Research 30%
Teaching 30%
Service 40%

Then the same scores as above, a 2 in research, a 2 in teaching, and a 1 in service would calculate the annual score as follows:

$$(2 \times .30) + (2 \times .30) + (1 \times .40) = .6 + .6 + .4 = 1.6$$

Using the 1 – 5 scale as above, this 3 year composite score would also fall between High Merit and Exceptional Merit

Negotiated workloads for the upcoming year should be prearranged with the Director as part of the Annual Performance Evaluation process and put in writing with the Written Performance Agreement that is filed each year with the faculty member's annual activity performance report.

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 8 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

F. FORMAT FOR REPORTING ANNUAL ACTIVITY

RESEARCH CHECKLIST - List research activities for each year and give full citations for articles, chapters, and books; attach first page of publications with publication date or letter of acceptance

YEAR	PRODUCTIVITY	POINTS
3 year point total		

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 9 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

TEACHING CHECKLIST - List teaching activities for each year

YEAR	TEACHING ACTIVITY	POINTS
3 year point total		

3 year average for teaching evaluation scores _____

SERVICE CHECKLIST - List service activities for each year

YEAR	SERVICE ACTIVITY	POINTS
3 year point total		

Policy and Procedure Arizona State University		Number SWK 506
Manual Social Work	Section Personnel	Page 10 of 10
Subject Annual Performance Evaluation Policy		Revised 5/2/08

G. WRITTEN PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT

College of Public Programs
Written Performance Agreement
Academic Year

NAME _____

1. TEACHING FTE _____

- Fall
- Spring

II. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES FTE _____

III. SERVICE FTE _____

We have discussed this performance agreement and agree on its contents.

FACULTY _____ DATE _____

DIRECTOR _____ DATE _____