

STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS, LINCHPIN FOR A FLEXIBLE
FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS:
EVALUATION OF BUSINESS FACULTY IN GEOGRAPHICALLY
DISPERSED SITES

Arnie Hilgert, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Business Administration / Higher Education
Northern Arizona University - Yuma
11843 Calle del Cid
Yuma, Arizona 85367
(520) 317-6417
(520) 342-2769 home
FAX (520) 317-6419
E-Mail: Arnie.Hilgert@nau.edu

STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS, LINCHPIN FOR A FLEXIBLE FACULTY
EVALUATION PROCESS: EVALUATION OF BUSINESS FACULTY IN
GEOGRAPHICALLY DISPERSED SITES

Arnie Hilgert, Northern Arizona University

ABSTRACT

The Statement of Expectations provides flexibility in the faculty evaluation process at Northern Arizona University. In addition, it is a win-win solution to faculty productivity, promotion and tenure. The Statement of Expectations is important for four reasons: the first, it has the flexibility to mitigate diverse needs; second it is geared toward individualizing professional performance evaluation; third, it provides a means for building community, institutional loyalty, and cooperation among academic units; and, fourth, it can serve as a mechanism to reduce anxiety and improve effectiveness. The Statement of Expectations for Business Faculty assigned to dispersed locations provides a mechanism to address local needs and still maintain the standards of accredited business degree programs. The Statement of Expectations moves faculty evaluation beyond organizational rigidities to operationalized flexibility.

STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS, LINCHPIN FOR A FLEXIBLE FACULTY
EVALUATION PROCESS: EVALUATION OF BUSINESS FACULTY IN
GEOGRAPHICALLY DISPERSED SITES

INTRODUCTION

A current trend in higher education is the focus on what is going on in college classrooms, and learning outcomes. In addition, external constituencies, such as parents, state legislatures, and taxpayers, are demanding more accountability and productivity from faculty. Discussions about faculty productivity, evaluation and rewards range from the issue of tenure, and the definition and measurement of faculty productivity, to the balance between teaching and the "publish or perish" standards for promotion and tenure. Much of these discussions focus on some small aspect of the question of faculty work, evaluation, and rewards. Some of the discourse decries the the "publish or perish" dilemma which assumes that publication rate is synonymous with, and the only criteria for, faculty competency and productivity. There is also discussion that bemoans the conflicts and tensions arising from the transformation of colleges and universities from small intimate work places of an independent professional professoriate to large complex organizations complete with the inevitable bureaucratic rigidities.

Literature on contracting for individual faculty performance and evaluation seems to be non-existent. A search of the literature on performance contracting for college faculty found that that literature is focused on unionized faculty work agreements which implies bureaucratic structures. However, if higher education is to move beyond the rigidities of bureaucracy and tradition-bound thinking, the notion of flexibility must become operative. This author believes that the Statement of Expectations used at Northern Arizona University (NAU) provides the basis for such a process.

The Statement of Expectations provides a flexible mechanism to individualize the evaluation of faculty performance, and to effectively address diverse institutional and career needs. It also provides a win-win solution to the question of faculty productivity and the promotion and tenure process. The document offers an integrative, flexible, common sense alternative to the use of rigid "publish or perish" criteria in the assessment of faculty productivity. In addition, the NAU Statement of Expectations has importance for higher education for four reasons. First, this model has the flexibility to address diverse needs. Second, it is a way to individualize professional performance evaluation. Third, the model provides a means for building community and an increased sense of institutional loyalty among faculty. Fourth, the model can serve as a mechanism to reduce faculty anxiety, and improve their effectiveness. This discussion will examine the role of the Statement of Expectations and the Professional Review File in the faculty review process at NAU. The general process at NAU - Yuma (a permanent academic center of the University) will be briefly described. Scenarios will illustrate how the Statement of Expectations can be used to meet diverse institutional and

performance evaluations, dismissal, etc. The NAU Faculty Handbook (1993) states that:

All faculty at NAU shall be reviewed by peers and administrators annually in accordance with the procedures set forth in II. B. below for the purposes of addressing renewal appointment, promotion, tenure and merit. The review shall focus primarily upon (1) Statement of Expectations, and (2) the Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Report. The annual review shall be based on the criteria and standards set forth below and on the cumulative record of the faculty member as found in the Professional Review File,...

Specifically, the NAU Faculty Handbook (1993) under the heading "Conditions of Faculty Service" states that:

1. Statement of Expectations. A Statement of Expectations, in accordance with the mission of the academic unit, shall be developed by the department/area for each Faculty member subject to review by the Dean. The statement shall address at least the following matters:
 - a. Clearly stated expectations of the faculty member in the following areas.
 - (1) Student-related responsibilities (to include at least teaching, advising, and supervising).
 - (2) Scholarly activity or other creative endeavors.
 - (3) Service to the profession, the university (including college/department/area) and to the community (local, state, national and international) as it relates to the mission of the university.
 - b. Expected performance levels needed for the faculty member to achieve renewal, promotion, tenure or merit. All faculty members shall be expected to be effective in student-related responsibilities.
 - c. Specifically stated expectations as to distribution of effort by the faculty member during the next annual evaluation period. Each department/area shall develop guidelines with respect to productivity expected. (Any

It is anticipated that Statements of Expectations for faculty members will differ based on the goals of the faculty member and the needs of the area, department, college or university. That statement shall be signed by the faculty member, department chair or equivalent (if applicable), and the Dean. The faculty member must return a signed copy of the Statement to the department chair or Dean within two weeks after receiving the statement. If the signed Statement is not returned within two weeks the Statement, as approved by the area/department chair will stand. The Statement may be amended from time-to-time by mutual agreement of the signing parties evidenced by a written statement signed by all parties. Normally, modification, if any, would follow the Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation.

Arizona Regents policy mandates that "...Guidelines and procedures within departments shall be flexible without undermining the uniformity of the whole system." The Faculty Handbook in turn outlines a provision for additional, written criteria, consistent with ABOR [Arizona Board of Regents] and University policy, to be developed by colleges, schools, and/or departments within the University. These additional criteria can be used to custom fit the Statement of Expectations and the professional review process to the diverse needs that exist in the colleges\schools and departments of a comprehensive university.

Under the rubric of the "Review Process for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure," the process and the Professional Review File are described. The consultative review process begins with this file. The Professional Review file is updated yearly by faculty with evidence of professional activities and achievements. It is also stipulated that a complete Professional Review File will include "...Initial Statement of Expectations document and any subsequent amendments..." The Statement of Expectations then becomes the document against which faculty performance in such areas as professional experience, recognition, creative and performance productivity, research and scholarly activity, University service, academic advising, community activities, teaching effectiveness, service to the profession, awards, peer evaluations, etc., are evaluated.

Statement of Expectations and Faculty Review Process
as Operationalized at NAU - Yuma

In the academic year 1992-1993, NAU - Yuma was granted the status and autonomy of any other school or college in the University at the undergraduate level. NAU - Yuma was organized as a non-departmentalized college with a multi disciplinary faculty (education, English, criminal justice, sociology, Spanish, psychology, etc., and business). That academic year was also the first academic

responsibility to students had been and is top priority. The NAU - Yuma Statement of Expectations Document, under the heading "Teaching and Advisement", stipulates that responsibility to students generally means teaching a full course load, advisement time equivalent to at least three semester hours with at least five hours per week office hours appropriate to student visitation, and adequate time to meet collegial responsibilities. In addition, NAU - Yuma faculty are expected to update and revise courses on a regular basis.

Professional growth and development is especially important for faculty at NAU - Yuma because Yuma is located in rural southwest Arizona where faculty members are relatively isolated from professional colleagues. The closest Universities are in Phoenix, and in San Diego, California, both approximately 170 miles from Yuma. The parent campus is over 300 miles away in Flagstaff. Faculty in Yuma are expected to be involved in professional development as outstanding teachers and scholars. Faculty can also expect support in the form of release time and financial assistance for travel and publication. University Professional and Community service is the third general area of evaluation for faculty at NAU - Yuma. Such service includes reasonable assignment to NAU - Yuma and/or University committees and the contribution of services based on professional expertise to community groups and agencies. The Statement of Expectations indicates the percentage effort in each of the three broad areas of evaluation. These percentages of effort are sufficiently flexible to accommodate the diverse needs of individual faculty and the University organizational unit.

NAU - Yuma Quality Indicators

Quality Indicators at NAU - Yuma under "Teaching and Advisement" include: the required student course evaluations; optional peer evaluations; course and curriculum development activities; the supervision of student teachers, field work experiences, independent studies, and internships; qualitative (what a faculty member actually does with the student to help him/her toward his/her academic and vocational goals) and quantitative measures (number of advisees) aspects of student advisement, presentations made outside the University such as lectures and workshops, local and national awards, and recognitions. Professional Growth and Development quality indicators include: attendance, participation and presentations at workshops Symposia and Conferences; invited textbook and article reviews, publications, productions and performances, grant proposal writing. The service component quality indicators are "Service on committees, panels, task forces, professional societies, community groups and agencies, etc."

NAU - Yuma Professional Review File

A complete Professional Review File (PRF) at NAU - Yuma includes information on the faculty member's professional experience in the form of an up-to-date vita, notices of appointment, and current and previous Statement of

sample tests, and peer evaluations, if desired. Evidence of advising effectiveness might include memos and letters written on behalf of students, notes from students, and some notation of how many students were advised and how many successfully completed their degrees. The faculty member can also include in his/her Faculty Review File material on any other awards or documentation of professional achievement, records of outside funding, and letters of support or reference from colleagues outside the University.

NAU - Yuma Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Process

Annual evaluation and initial recommendations for reappointment, promotion and tenure are made by the NAU - Yuma Committee on Faculty Status (COFS) to the Executive Director using the Faculty Performance Evaluation Report. The Executive Director then reviews the report and recommendations of the COFS and in turn conducts the Faculty Performance Appraisals.

The first step in the annual evaluation process begins with the individual faculty member. First, the faculty member does a reflective self evaluation which addresses what the faculty member achieved in the area of teaching, advising, professional development, and University, professional, and community service. In the area of teaching and advisement the faculty member notes percent of effort agreed to in his/her Statement of Expectations and comments on the courses taught during the year being evaluated, the feedback received from the student evaluations, and a grand mean of the student evaluations for each semester. Under the heading of advisement, the faculty member can include such things as the number of advisees, any complexities that may arise out of changes in the curriculum, restructuring of degree requirements, and grand-fathering situations, etc.. For the sections on professional development and service, the agreed to percentage of effort is noted for each, along with a descriptions of what was accomplished in these areas during the previous year. The self evaluation then goes to the COFS. The COFS committee evaluates each faculty member utilizing his/her Statement of Expectations Document as the relevant criteria, and his/her Professional Review File as the documentation. The committee makes its recommendations. The faculty member has five days to respond to those recommendations if he/she feels it is necessary, before the Executive Director is given a written summary of findings.

Next, the faculty member and the Executive Director together identify and discuss the faculty member's demonstrated strengths, and whether any improvements are needed. At this stage, the faculty member specifies how the Executive Director can facilitate the improvement or enhancement of his/her teaching /advising performance. The faculty member and Executive Director then summarize progress attained on goals and objectives for the appraisal period, and specify goals and objectives for the coming year. Both the faculty member and the Executive Director add their individual comments. When the appraisal is complete the faculty member, the Executive Director, and the COFS chair sign and date the document to acknowledge their participation in the process. The completed Faculty Performance Appraisal then becomes part of the faculty

undermining the uniformity of the whole system" can be used to address diverse professional and organizational needs and to individualize professional performance evaluation. The strength of the Statement of Expectations in the NAU Model is best illustrated by scenarios.

Scenario one: Dr. Jones is a third year probationary faculty member. In Dr. Jones' organizational unit, faculty are responsible for undergraduate students and the teaching and supervision of a large number of graduate students in their Master and Doctoral programs. As a result research is nearly as important as teaching. Dr. Jones' agreement with the department and University is reflected in his/her Statement of Expectations which stipulates fifty percent of effort will be placed on teaching and advisement, forty percent of effort will be devoted to professional development (research and scholarship), and ten percent of effort will be directed toward service to the department and profession.

Scenario two: Dr. Smith has just been hired for a tenure track position in an organizational unit where the focus is on undergraduate teaching. Dr. Smith is a brand new Ph.D. with no teaching experience. To reflect the teaching priority of the organizational unit and Dr. Smiths' lack of teaching experience, the Statement of Expectations stipulates that seventy five percent of effort will be devoted to teaching and advisement. This heavy weighting toward teaching will give Dr. Smith the time needed to develop courses and to concentrate on becoming a professor. The remainder of Dr. Smiths' effort is stipulated as twenty percent effort in the area of professional development (which will include specific faculty development activities in learning how to direct learning activities), and five percent in service.

Scenario three: Professor Brown is a tenured professor in an organizational unit where scholarship is the priority for senior faculty. The Statement of Expectations for Professor Brown reflects the priority for his/her research agenda. Professor Browns' agreement with the organizational unit and the University stipulates that twenty five percent effort will be devoted to teaching and advisement, seventy percent effort will be directed toward the advancement of a research agenda (professional development), and five percent effort will be directed toward service to the organizational unit.

EVALUATION OF BUSINESS FACULTY AT NAU - YUMA

The above has described the evaluation process for faculty of the interdisciplinary faculty at NAU - Yuma. The business programs are AACSB accredited, therefore, Statement of Expectations and evaluation of business faculty at NAU - Yuma are done jointly with the College of Business Administration on the main campus in Flagstaff. The yearly evaluation of NAU - Yuma business faculty starts with the preparation of the Statement of Expectations. Individual statements are prepared with input from the Yuma COFS,

evaluation. For this process the faculty member prepares a reflective self-evaluation of their performance during the previous calendar year. Performance goals are critiqued against Statement of Expectations for those semesters. Minor situational factors can also be addressed at this time. The faculty members' self-evaluation and professional review file (which contains the Expectations documents) are forwarded to the NAU - Yuma COFS committee, and to CBA for review by the committees on Scholarly Activity, Teaching, Professional Activity/Service. The COFS, and CBA committees simultaneously peer review the self-evaluation against the Statement of Expectations and the faculty review file, and give constructive feedback on faculty performance. In addition, each faculty member's performance is rated on a five point scale from (1) unsatisfactory to (5) highly meritorious in each of the evaluation areas and on overall performance. At this juncture the faculty members can respond to the evaluation if they feel that it is necessary. They have five days to rebut and his/her comments will be included with the peer evaluation when it is forwarded to the Deans. The joint performance evaluation is then forwarded to the Executive Director at NAU - Yuma, and to the Dean of CBA for their review. The Deans then make a joint evaluation/retention recommendation. Again, faculty member have the opportunity to respond to the evaluation and have their comments included with the evaluation. For untenured faculty members the evaluation and recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. If the faculty member is tenured, the evaluation is complete and becomes par of the permanent Professional Review File..

PROMOTION AND TENURE OF NAU - YUMA BUSINESS FACULTY Constitution of NAU - Yuma Promotion and Tenure Committees

The NAU Faculty Handbook (1988 appendix B p.2) stipulates that promotion and tenure committees have at least three members and that "membership...is restricted to tenured, full-time faculty". NAU - Yuma has thirteen tenure-eligible faculty members, and two tenured faculty members and is unable to constitute a promotion and tenure committee with only local faculty. Therefore, NAU - Yuma must use tenured faculty from the parent campus on their promotion and tenure committees.

Because NAU - Yuma has a multi-disciplinary faculty and the university requires strong disciplinary review for P&T, an individual committee is constituted for any NAU - Yuma faculty member seeking P&T review. (This exception to policy was granted by the Provost in 1994). The process for constituting the P&T committee starts with the NAU - Yuma faculty person who is seeking review. The faculty member asks tenured colleagues in his/her discipline if they would be willing to serve on this committee. Once willing tenured disciplinary faculty have been identified, the list is forwarded to the Executive Director at NAU - Yuma. The Executive Director then communicates with the proposed committee members' department chair and Dean to check their availability to serve. The list of willing, available, and approved faculty then become members of the P&T committee for that individual faculty member.

their professional review file for the CBA committee. The two committees conduct their review, vote and prepare a joint P&T recommendation. The faculty member under review then has five days to respond to the joint P&T recommendation if they wish to do so. Any response is forwarded with the committee recommendations to the dean's level of review.

The next step in the P&T process is a review by the Executive Director of NAU - Yuma and the Dean of the College of Business. The deans then prepare a joint P&T recommendation. If there is any disagreement at this level, the recommendation of the CBA Dean takes precedence. The faculty member under review has five days to respond to the dean's recommendations before the process moves to the Provost for his recommendation on P&T to the President. The faculty member again has five days to respond to the Provost before the recommendations are forwarded to the President. The joint, P&T review process with strong disciplinary representation provides another mechanism for College of Business to make sure that business faculty at NAU - Yuma satisfy AACSB guidelines.

NAU - Yuma and College of Business Joint Post Tenure Review

Business faculty at NAU - Yuma use the same joint disciplinary NAU - Yuma CBA annual evaluation process as outlined above for Post Tenure Review. The purposes of Post Tenure Review (outlined in the NAU ABOR. Conditions of Faculty Service Working Draft 1997 p.2-30 - 2-38) is to assess faculty accomplishments and to enhance performance with "predictable rewards," to make sure tenured faculty are performing their duties at a satisfactory level, and to identify and assist those faculty members whose performance may be less than satisfactory; to provide assistance to move them toward satisfactory or higher performance. The post tenure review is based on the faculty members performance with respect to their Statement of Expectations and Faculty Review File over the previous year, and overall performance within the context of the previous 36 month period. If the review of the tenured faculty member's performance is satisfactory or better the process is complete. If the performance review is unsatisfactory and the faculty member does not contest the appraisal or if administrative review upholds the evaluation, then the following applies.

The first rating of unsatisfactory in teaching must be addressed by the department/unit chair/director. They work with the faculty member to identify the difficulty/es and to develop a Faculty Development Plan. There are a number of strategies and resources that can be used such as reassigning the allocations of percent of effort for his/her Statement of Expectations assignments, providing faculty development support, helping the faculty member to get assistance in dealing with health issues that may be affecting his/her performance. The Faculty Development Plan is then incorporated into the faculty members Statement of Expectations, which becomes part of the criteria for his/her next years joint NAU - Yuma, CBA performance evaluation. If the faculty member in a Faculty Development Plan fails to improve his/her performance within a year, he/she must develop a Performance Improvement Plan. The

The Statement of Expectations provides flexibility in the NAU Model for faculty evaluation. This model is important for four reasons. First, it has the flexibility to address the diverse professional concerns of various faculty cohorts, while serving the overall mission of the institution. This is especially important for business faculty in geographically dispersed sites, because of the isolation the distant faculty from their peers in the College of Business. It is also important because program delivery needs of the non-traditional distance students are different from those of traditional residential student in the College of Business in Flagstaff. The Statement of Expectations allows for coordination across organizational unit boundaries to assure that AACSB standards are maintained, regardless of where CBA business programs are being delivered.

Second, the Statement of Expectations is an operational mechanism to individualize professional performance evaluation. It can also forge congruence between the mission of the institution, AACSB standards, the needs of the individual college/school, and the professional growth and development needs of the individual faculty member.

Third, the flexibility of the NAU Model mandated by The Arizona Board of Regents and operationalized by the Statement of Expectations is a powerful way to build a sense of community and loyalty to the institution. The sense of community and institutional loyalty come from active faculty participation in the preparation of their individual Statement of Expectations. For business faculty in geographically dispersed sites the NAU Model provides a crucial connection to the distant College of Business. In addition, the active participation of faculty in the joint review process of preparing the annual Statement of Expectations provides business faculty a greater sense of control and ownership of his/her career. Fourth, when the Statement of Expectations is viewed as a faculty member's plan of work, anxiety is reduced. Business faculty can then rechannel their energies into the enhancement of their professional work. The Statement of Expectation moves faculty evaluation beyond organizational rigidities to operationalized flexibility.

REFERENCES

Huseman, R.,McHone, W., Lewis, P. (1995). Faculty workload option plan. In S. Amin (ed.), Trends in Business: Readings (pp 266-273). Maryland U.S.A.: Academy of Business Administration.

Katula, R.A., Doody, A. (1990). The collegiality model: An alternative for evaluating faculty productivity. ACA Bulletin. 74, 74-82.

Northern Arizona University and Arizona Board of Regents Conditions of Faculty Service, Working Draft. Office of the Provost 12/31/97. Photocopy in authors possession.

Northern Arizona University Faculty Handbook Revised Fall 1993

Northern Arizona University NAU - Yuma Conditions of Faculty Service. September 1992. Photocopy in authors possession.

Northern Arizona University - Yuma Quality Indicators of Teaching and Advisement, Professional Growth and Development University and Community Service 1992. Photocopy in authors possession

Northern Arizona University - Yuma Faculty Performance Appraisal. 1994. Photocopy in authors possession

Savoie, M. J., Sawyerr O.O. (1991). Faculty promotions and tenure decisions: A proposed model. Journal of Education for Business. 66(5), 278-282.

Autobiographical Note

Arnie Hilgert Ph.D. has an entrepreneurial background in the ownership and management of manufacturing, retail and service businesses. She also has varied administrative experience in higher education which includes five years in the operations of an Executive Management Program.

Her academic qualifications include: B.A. in Management from Johnston Center for Individualized Learning at the University of Redlands; M.B.A. in Strategic Management and Marketing from The Peter F. Drucker Graduate School of Management at Claremont Graduate University; a M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in Higher Education and Adult Development from The Center for Educational Studies at Claremont Graduate Univeristy.

Dr. Hilgert is currently serving as Associate Professor of Business Administration and Higher Education. She teaches in the areas of Management and Marketing at Northern Arizona University - Yuma.

5/7/98

4987 words
Torontow.doc