DODGE FAMILY COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
ANNE AND HENRY ZARROW SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
The UNIVERSITY *of* OKLAHOMA

Faculty Policy Manual

This manual was voted upon and approved by Faculty March 4, 2024. Any further additions after this date will be noted and the voting date indicated.

Revised October 1, 2024

Contents

Purpose of Manual

The policy manual of the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work defines its principal mechanisms of governance including the Mission and Vision of the School, role of faculty in governance, standing committees and their membership, scope of responsibilities of committees, administrative structures of the school, as well as assessment and evaluation of performance.

Mission Statement

The Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work advances relevant and high-quality knowledge and values of social work practice useful in preparing competent social workers who can elevate the status of people, populations or communities that experience considerable vulnerability and injustice within Oklahoma and the broader society.

1.0 Policies Related to School Administration and Governance

The policies and procedures in this section relate to how policies themselves are created through the structure and functions of School administration, faculty committee structures, and faculty governance.

1.1 Policy Formulation, Evaluation and Renewal

Policy Statement

The Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work is committed to maintaining an organized set of relevant policies guiding the governance and actions of the School achieved through regular review, revision, and renewal of existing policies, modification of policies based on the changing situation of the School, University, and profession, and addition of new policies consistent with the strategic plan of the School.

Procedures

1. The Faculty Policy Manual will be available for faculty review.

2. Any faculty member may request a review and/or modification of policy or adoption of new policy. Th request/review will be assigned for consideration to the appropriate School committee who will bring their assessment and recommendation to the full faculty.

3. The Administration of the School be guided by the spirit and substance of the policy manual as guidance for the governance of the unit.

4. Faculty members discuss, vote, and approve amended components of the School's policies before implementation. Policy changes will pass by 2/3 majorities.

5. Administration may pilot new policies when reasonable and appropriate and will bring data related to this pilot to the faculty for assessment and formalization.

1.2 Membership in the School

Policy Statement

The OU Faculty handbook defines the regular faculty as all faculty members with regular appointments including tenure-track, tenured, and renewable term appointments at the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor.

Within the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work, those with regular faculty appointments (tenured, tenure track, ranked renewable term) and faculty appointed in unranked renewable term positions (non-temporary) are considered members of the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work faculty. This includes appointments of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor, Instructor and Lecturer.

1.3 Voting rights

Policy Statement

All faculty members in the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work share the rights and duties of faculty members including but not limited to the following:

- Involvement in faculty governance
- Curriculum development
- Participation/Leadership on school committees
- Eligibility for career development opportunities (for example applying for internal college and School support for professional activities)
- Voting on personnel issues (candidates for hiring)
- Voting on Committee A membership

1.4 Administration of the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work

Policy Statement

The School maintains an administrative structure to support the work of the School as a whole. The following is a list of the current administrative positions within the School. A list of each position with a detailed list of duties is listed in the Appendix.
- Director
- Associate Director

- Associate Director of Research
- Graduate Programs Director
- Undergraduate Programs Director
- Field Director
- Graduate Coordinators (Norman, Tulsa, Online)
- Undergraduate Coordinators (Norman, Tulsa)
- Field Practicum Coordinators (Norman, Tulsa, Online)

> Org chart

1.5 Appointment to Administrative Leadership

Policy Statement

Faculty in administrative leadership positions serve an important role related to the overall functioning of the School. These faculty work within support of the mission of the School by directing or coordinating programs and providing leadership for faculty as well as students. The Director and Associate Director are appointed by the College, but others follow internal procedures as follows.

Procedures

1. Opportunities for Program Director(s), Program Coordinator(s), and other administrative positions will be announced to all faculty.
2. The notice will include a description of the position, responsibilities, and any compensation/benefits of the position.
3. The Director, Associate Director, and existing administrative faculty will be assembled to review applications and select candidates.

1.6 Annual Assignment of Administrative and Committee Leadership

Policy Statement

Annually the School's Director will prepare a list of committee and other administrative assignments within the School, including the dates and times for faculty meetings for the academic year. They will also provide broad goals for committee work that is grounded in the mission and strategic plan of the School. All faculty are eligible for assignment to committee work, with the exception of Committee A which is determined by faculty vote.

Procedures

1. The Director will make committee assignments in consultation with the leadership team prior to the end of the current academic year, for service in the upcoming academic year.
2. Committee assignments will include an identified Chair as well as faculty members who offer expertise and diverse thought in a particular area.

3. Should a faculty member be unable or unwilling to serve in an assigned role, or if a faculty member is not assigned to a role of interest in service, the faculty member can consult with the Director about potential changes in assignment. These are not guaranteed to occur, although consideration will be made.
4. Faculty members who are interested in serving on a committee or other leadership roles in the School should inform the Director, preferably in August as committee assignments are being filled for the academic year.
5. Vacancies that occur during the academic year will be filled by appointment by the Director.

Policy History	Approved by SW faculty DATE

1.7 The Committees of the School

Policy Statement

Committee work is central to faculty governance and the democratization of the academy. All faculty members must be active in committee work.

The committee structure of the School of Social Work consists of several core committees. Ad hoc committees may be formed at the approval of the Director. Brief descriptions of the committees are highlighted below. Collectively these committees provide the governance structure for the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work.

Undergraduate Committee: to manage recruitment, admissions, advisement, student concerns, and program development for the baccalaureate program. The Undergraduate Committee is Chaired by the Undergraduate Program Director and members are faculty who teach in the baccalaureate program.

Curriculum Committee: to ensure that the curriculum is academically sound, relevant and responsive to the evolving needs of the community, consistent with the school's mission and goals, and it adheres the Council on Social Work Education's Education and Policy and Accreditation Standards. This Committee has several subcommittees, the Chairs of which compose the membership of the Curriculum Committee.

ARREA Committee (Admissions, Recruitment, Retention, Enrollment, Advising): the purpose of the ARREA committee is to maintain and improve the processes related to admission and recruitment of new students, enrollment in courses, as well as retention and advising for established students.

Field Education Committee: guides and manages the Field Education program at the BASW / MSW level and across all campuses. The Committee ensures EPAS compliance, creates and monitors School policies related to Field Education, and coordinates roles and tasks across teams. The Chair and/or co-chair are appointed by the Director. Members include Field Education Coordinators, Undergraduate and Graduate Coordinators, a CWPEP representative, student representative, *two* appointed faculty members, and one to two members from the practice community. While not considered a

subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee, proposals of major changes in Field Education are routed through Curriculum Committee before they are presented to Faculty for voting.

Committee A: to conduct annual evaluation of faculty and advise dean on personnel decisions.

Executive Committee: See below

1.8 Committee Meetings and Record Keeping

Procedures
1. Committee Chairs are responsible for leading meetings for the academic year, setting agenda for the meetings, and ensuring the recording and filing of minutes. The Chairs set committee meeting dates for the academic year annually no later than September 1st or prior to the first faculty meeting, whichever is earliest.
2. When possible, meeting times are convenient for both Norman and Tulsa faculty and scheduled.
3. It is the responsibility of faculty members to make themselves available for committee work.
4. Minutes are collected and posted on the established sites for each meeting.
5. All faculty will have access to all committee meeting minutes, with the exception of Committee A proceedings, which are confidential.

1.9 Voting and Approval Process, Committees

Procedures

1. If an individual is on a committee as a member, they have voting rights. This includes students, community members, staff, or other representatives who are officially on the committee. Each section below identifies the members of each committee and the process of voting on each committee.
2. Guest members invited for one-time meetings or for informational purposes only would not be eligible to vote.
3. Meetings are structured using Robert's Rules of Order. Voting requires a quorum (majority) of members present.
4. A margin of 2/3 is required for passage.
5. No single faculty member will be allowed to stall the process of any committee.

1.10 Executive Committee

Policy Statement

The Executive Committee serves an advisory and coordinating role for the leadership of the School. Members of the committee include the Director, Associate Director, Associate Director of Research, Directors of Graduate, Undergraduate and Field Programs, all program coordinators, and the Assessment and Simulation Coordinators. This committee is also responsible for enacting the strategic plan.

Procedures

1. The Director sets the meetings for the academic year and organizes the creation of meeting agendas.
2. Minutes are recorded and approved for each meeting.

Voting in Executive Committee

1. The Executive Committee does not vote on policies but provides advice and information to coordinators or committees on policy or other programmatic matters.

1.11 Strategic Planning

Policy Statement

The Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work maintains a strategic plan aligned with the priorities of the School, College, and University. The Executive Committee of the School is responsible for ensuring the currency and relevance of the strategic plan. The strategic plan serves as the administrative framework for action undertaken by leaders and leadership structures.

Procedures

1. An ad hoc committee will be responsible for developing and maintaining the strategic plan, and these faculty members will be appointed by the Director.

2. The strategic plan will remain in effect for 5-year periods, with renewal efforts beginning in the final year of the most current strategic plan. On occasion, the College or University will require a new strategic plan or updates to the strategic plan outside of this cycle.

3. The strategic plan is approved and reviewed by the Executive Committee and presented to the faculty.

1.12 Curriculum Committee

Policy Statement

The membership of the Curriculum Committee consists of a Chair (Director appointed), Chairs of all sub committees, and Program Coordinators. The purpose of the Curriculum Committee is to assess and evaluate the curriculum focusing on how well the curriculum includes and adheres to the competencies required by the current Educational Policies and Standards (EPAS), the stabilization of content across multiple course sections, and a viable and sustainable feedback loop for curriculum improvement and development. The Curriculum Committee encourages and facilitates curriculum innovation, assesses congruence between vision for social work program and program goals with the curriculum, assesses compliance with CSWE EPAS, and supports research, curriculum infusion/development, field innovations, and evaluation projects as they relate to social work education.

Essential tasks of the Curriculum Committee include:
- Maintaining the Core Program Syllabi for every course offered
- Mapping the content of the required courses to the EPAS competencies accordingly
- As needed, the Curriculum Committee recommends for approval, opposes, or recommends courses or modifications to curriculum
- Updates faculty on teaching innovations, relevant training and development opportunities
- Provides feedback on the annual assessment of learning and uses assessment data to improve curriculum.

Procedures

1. The Curriculum Committee Chair sets the meetings and develops meeting agendas for the academic year.

2. The Curriculum Committee Chair facilitates the development of annual goals for the Curriculum Committee that are linked to the assessment program, or other review processes (reaffirmation, reaccreditation, program review).

3. As needed, the Curriculum Committee recommends modifications in curriculum to the faculty.

Voting in Curriculum Committee

1. Some voting items require a full faculty vote following approval by the Curriculum Committee. These include substantive changes to the curriculum such as the addition or deletion of courses, changes in credit hours or practicum hours, degree requirements, or pre-requisites.
2. Other items are presented as information to faculty following approval by the Curriculum Committee. These include minor changes in courses such as assignments, textbook lists, minor content changes and approval of elective courses.

Subcommittees of the Curriculum Committee

Undergraduate Committee
Chair, appointed by Director. Members are all instructors of undergraduate courses. This committee is responsible for all undergraduate courses including Introduction to Social Work.

MSW Foundation Year Committee
Chair, appointed by Director. Members are all instructors of the foundation year courses. This committee is responsible for all foundation courses including the Introduction to Integrative Practice Advanced Standing course.

MSW Concentration Year Committee
Chair, appointed by Director. Members are all instructors of the concentration year courses.

1.13 Admissions, Recruitment, Retention, Enrollment and Advising Committee (ARREA)

<u>Policy Statement</u>

The purpose of the ARREA committee is to maintain and improve the processes related to admission and recruitment of new students, enrollment in courses, as well as retention and advising for established students. The main priorities of this committee include:

- To strategize and improve retention and support of existing students
- To enhance the quality of advisement at all levels of social work education
- To maintain a strategy for nomination and tracking of student awards
- To oversee and develop criteria for internal student awards and competitions
- To suggest new program options and delivery (Saturday programs, outreach, special cohorts, part-time and flexible programs)
- To facilitate mechanisms for obtaining student feedback on all aspects of student life at the School
- Coordinate student recruitment efforts in the community and within the University as needed
- Oversee retention initiatives (such as holiday gatherings, advising events, etc.)
- Recommend improvements in the admissions process, enrollment, scheduling, assessment of the educational experience, advising and other essential functions related to students

Membership

Chair or co-chairs will be a combination of the Graduate and Undergraduate Coordinators and/or Program Directors on both campus sites. Members will include the two staff and a combination of 4-5 undergraduate and graduate faculty appointed by the Director.

<u>Procedures</u>

1. The Chair(s) sets meetings for the academic year and develops agendas for meetings.
2. The ARREA Committee annually develops/updates a recruitment/retention plan for the undergraduate and graduate programs.
3. The ARREA Committee is responsible for updating the undergraduate & graduate manuals.
4. The ARREA Committee reports admissions data annually to the Director and Associate Director.
5. The ARREA Committee coordinates with the assessment coordinator as needed for program assessment and improvement.

Voting in ARREA Committee:

1. Items that require a **full faculty vote** (approve by ARREA committee, then to full faculty for vote) are substantive changes to undergraduate and graduate policies (ex. admissions requirements or policy, dual degree requirements, program requirements or policy).

2. Items that require an ARREA committee vote (approved by ARREA, informational to faculty) are minor changes in undergraduate or graduate materials or processes (ex. minor changes in bulletin, website).

Field Education Committee

Policy History	Approved by SW faculty May 10, 2013

1.14 Additional Team Meetings

Additional committees and workgroups are part of the day-to-day operations of the School. These may include team meetings and departmental huddles.

Procedures

Each campus (Norman, Tulsa, Online) has a weekly huddle meeting. This meeting consists of Director/Associate Director/Program Directors, Coordinators, and Admission/Enrollment Staff. The purpose of the huddle is to coordinate events, projects, questions, and student concerns in a team environment. The first part of the meeting is for communication about the work of the team, and people not working directly with students are dismissed when student concerns are discussed.

1.15 Committee A

Policy Statement

Committee A is sanctioned by the University (Section 2.8.2, Item a, Paragraph 2 of the **Faculty Handbook** — approved by the Board of Regents on July 28, 1993).

Membership.
Committee A is composed of **5** individuals that include the Director and four elected eligible faculty members. Eligible faculty members include tenured faculty and ranked renewable term faculty (at the rank of clinical associate professor or higher). Faculty appointed to the role of instructor are not eligible to serve on Committee A.

Committee A should also include:
- at least **two** tenured faculty at rank of associate or higher
- at least **one** member from each campus site (Tulsa and Norman)
- at least **one** ranked renewable term faculty member.

Terms.

It is the policy of the School that each elected member of Committee A shall serve for a term of two years. Committee A members may be re-elected for one consecutive term. A newly elected Committee A member assumes Committee A duties at the beginning of the fall semester, unless a special election is required due to the unexpected change in Committee A membership.

Responsibilities.
In the School of Social Work, Committee A provides "advice and consultation" to the Director in:

- Preparing annual faculty evaluations
- Preparing annual evaluations of staff
- faculty awards
- hiring of new faculty
- Increases in salaries for faculty
- Tenure, promotion, and annual reviews of progress of tenure-track faculty in their efforts to obtain tenure.

All Committee A members participate in conducting the annual evaluation of all faculty in the School, however, some of the Committee A responsibilities vary by rank:

- Only tenured faculty on Committee A complete annual evaluations, progress toward tenure letters, third year reviews and post tenure reviews of tenure track faculty.
- Tenured faculty only may vote on tenure
- Ranked renewable term faculty members may not vote on the tenure and promotion decisions of tenured and tenure-track faculty but they may vote on promotion decisions of renewable term faculty members. They also participate in the completion of the annual and comprehensive evaluations of renewable term faculty members.
- Only promoted faculty may serve on Committee A (tenured faculty and ranked renewable term faculty at the rank of clinical associate or clinical full professor)

Committee A shall meet during summer months as the occasion arises.

Procedures

Elections

Committee A Elections for the new Committee A members shall be in April. All regular faculty members will be eligible to vote for Committee A members. Election to Committee A shall be held according to the following procedures:
- The Director's office will send ballots to the faculty for electing the Committee A member. Members shall be elected by secret ballots (paper or electronic with provisions for absentee ballots) at duly called faculty meetings. The ballot shall list only of names of faculty members eligible for service on the committee.
- In the event no candidate receives a majority of votes for Committee A, a second ballot containing the names of the two persons receiving the highest number of votes shall be sent to the faculty.

Marked ballots shall be returned to Committee A in the same manner as described above. Results of the election shall be announced by memorandum to the faculty.
- Special elections for Committee A members may be held when the need arises (ex. If an elected member is unable to complete their term).

Policy History	Approved by SW faculty April 28, 2015

1.16 Annual Evaluation by Committee A

Policy Statement

Each year, faculty is required to submit materials for evaluation by Committee A in accordance to University policies. All faculty receive a written evaluation of their performance in the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service. The School values the opportunity for faculty to receive verbal feedback in a meeting with Committee A in addition to the written evaluation. Such a meeting provides the opportunity for answering questions, further discussion, and mentorship. However, this is an optional meeting if the faculty member is satisfied with the written report, with a few exceptions as follows to provide sufficient mentoring relative to tenure and promotion.

Procedures

At the end of the calendar year, the Director notifies all faculty members of the deadlines and requirements for annual evaluation. Faculty members should follow these instructions and submit all required materials in a timely manner. This includes entering data into the Faculty Activity System (FAS), Mini-Vita, an updated error-free CV, a checklist or activity report, and other supporting documents as requested. Committee A reviews these materials and provides a written evaluation to each faculty member.

Meeting with Committee A

Faculty may meet with Committee A to review the evaluation as specified below:
- All assistant professors on the tenure track are required to meet with Committee A to review the annual evaluation and to discuss progress toward tenure and promotion.
- All newly employed faculty members, regardless of rank or type, are encouraged to meet Committee A within the first 18 months of their employment.
- Committee A can request to meet with a faculty member in any given year to discuss performance concerns or other matters. This request can be at any time during the year, not just during the typical evaluation period.
- Any faculty member is able and encouraged to request a meeting with Committee A to discuss their evaluation and other matters pertaining to performance, tenure, and/or promotion as well as goals, resources, and feedback.
- Tenure track Faculty at the associate level are encouraged to meet with Committee A prior to submitting materials for promotion and/or plans for promotion.

- All ranked and non-ranked renewable term faculty who are considering promotion are encouraged to meet with Committee A prior to submitting materials for promotion and/or plans for promotion.

Policy History	Approved by SW faculty February 24, 2023

2.0 Policies Regarding Teaching

The following policies relate to the teaching role, expectations of teaching, and decision-making regarding teaching.

2.1 CORE Syllabus Policy

Policy Statement

Quality social work education depends on consistent instruction and measurement of the competencies required by the accrediting body, the Council on Social Work Education. Therefore, while we respect academic freedom, a degree of consistency must be present in our courses across multiple sections. This assures the students have the same opportunities to demonstrate competence through standard assignments and allows the School to evaluate progress. Therefore, the School utilizes a "core syllabus" that is determined through a committee process and contains the basic information that is required for all sections of the course. The core syllabus must constitute at least 50% of the course assignments, leaving room for faculty to add their own material according to their specific expertise.

Procedures

1. A core syllabi template will be maintained by the Curriculum Committee and updated with Provost required policy statements as well as committee determined categories that will be on all syllabi.
2. Members of the Foundation and/or Concentration Committees create assignments that are tied to the required competencies that will constitute at least 50% of the course assignments. They also recommend a textbook or reading list for consistent delivery of content through all sections of the courses.
3. Core syllabi are voted on within subcommittees, then sent to Curriculum Committee for final approval.
4. The Curriculum Committee Chair files the core syllabi in a way that all faculty can access them for use.
5. Should a faculty member wish to change a core assignment or other portion of the core syllabi, this should be addressed with the subcommittee and put back through the revision and voting process if the changes are substantial.

2.2 Faculty Course Leadership and Community Faculty Preparation

Policy Statement

For campus (not Online Program) courses, attempts will be made to assign a faculty who has previously taught a course, or who is familiar with a course, the responsibility of helping new instructors and/or community faculty. This is in effort to provide support for the community faculty but also assure greater consistency in course delivery.

Procedures

The Director / Associate Director / Program Director assigning community faculty will identify faculty who have previously taught the course. It is considered service and expected that faculty will be willing to assist in this way and provide the following types of assistance.

1. Add community faculty to a past version of the course so they can view materials.
2. Share materials such as power points, teaching exercises, classroom activities.
3. Discuss assignment expectations and instructions with community faculty.
4. Allow previous courses on Canvas to be copied to shell for community faculty.
5. Answer questions from community faculty about course content as needed.

2.3 Teaching Scheduling and Assignments

Policy Statement

The AHZSSW offers classes at both the undergraduate and graduate level and in multiple formats including day, afternoon, evenings, weekends, hybrid, and online. This policy provides the process, priorities, and guidelines for scheduling courses within the school.

Procedures

The following is the suggested process for scheduling courses:

1. Staff, Coordinators, and Program Directors work to create a tentative schedule of course offerings, formats, and times based on student numbers and needs. This is created in a large "Core Schedule" document that contains the planned courses for Norman, Tulsa, and Online teaching as well as other administrative information.
2. Teaching assignment meetings are scheduled with the appropriate administrative designee either individually or in small groups of faculty for efficiency. These meetings fall soon after Annual Evaluation meetings with Committee A, typically in early March.
3. Following the Teaching Assignment meetings, any courses in the schedule that still need an instructor assigned will be offered as potential overload to faculty. The School will adhere to College and University policies regarding overload teaching and faculty are expected to know their eligibility for overload.
4. Should courses still remain in need of teaching assignments, they will be filled by current community faculty or new community faculty as needed. Faculty of the School are always encouraged to suggest subject matter experts that would be excellent community faculty.

The following are special instructions in relation to teaching:

Scheduled Courses. The schedule at OU operates on a regular calendar and classes are scheduled up to 12 months before they begin. However, the view on Canvas is often just a repeat of previous terms as the official schedule is turned in approximately 6-8 months before the courses begin.

Faculty preferences. As a rule, faculty preferences will be honored as much as possible, however there will be times when certain courses will need to be taught by regular faculty and it will be the responsibility of the school administration to track courses taught and distribute courses fairly (i.e. evenings and weekends). Similarly, there may be instances where more than one faculty member has an interest in teaching a particular course. Where there is conflict, school administration will consider the following: faculty length of employment, faculty special needs (i.e. dependent care), and faculty teaching interests. Faculty in a "Lead Faculty" role may be prioritized. Occasionally, faculty will need to coordinate schedules with football games or with other faculty (as in the case of hybrid courses or special simulation activities). Attempts will be made to fill required courses first and to ensure regular faculty are teaching courses across different programs and formats so that no one program (part or full time) have higher percentages of community faculty. School administration will also attempt to reduce the number of course preparations for faculty with special attention to faculty on the tenure track.

Teaching in Program of Funding. Faculty are expected to teach courses in the program that funds their employment. For example, if a faculty member was hired into the Norman Campus program, their in-load assignments will be fully, or at least primarily, connected to Norman-based classes. However, on a limited basis, faculty may teach an online or alternate campus course due to a School need, despite that not being their funding campus. These exceptions are on an as-needed and case-by-case basis to ensure financial obligations are met. This policy is in place to remain in compliance with university expectations.

Teaching as Scheduled. Faculty are expected to teach the days, times, and formats that have been advertised to the students. While it may be necessary to occasionally move a course to an online format due to a weather event or emergency, courses should adhere to the specifications advertised.

(Revision approved 9-27-24)
Buy Outs. If Faculty have the funding to support the "buy out" of a course, or anticipate a change in scheduled teaching, they are required to communicate that as early as possible (to the lead academic administrator) and pay close attention to their upcoming assigned course dates.

Procedures
1. Faculty requesting a course "buy out" must submit the request via email to the lead academic administrator and the Financial Coordinator as soon as possible.

2. Funding for the "buy out" must be secured and the advance account assigned for the request to be approved. Exceptions are available depending on documented proof of funding and DFCAS approval.

3. Requests are not guaranteed to be approved, especially if fewer than three months are available before the class begins. Hiring processes for adjunct instructors may take longer

than this, so if an established instructor cannot be assigned, or if the instructor will not have sufficient time to prepare for the course, the request to be released from the course may be denied by the Director.

4. As required by the University, buy outs will require funding of 10% of the 9-month salary of the faculty member, plus the cost of fringe and the strategic plan tax.

Directed Readings/Independent Study. Directed Reading and Independent Study courses do not count as course assignments in the expected teaching load but may be included in annual evaluation. Directed Readings cannot replace a required course.

Elective Courses. The AHZSSW offers a variety of elective courses. Faculty will identify their interest in teaching an elective course primarily during the Teaching Assignment meeting.   School administration will make decisions about elective offerings based on current student enrollment.   New electives will be approved by the Director, Assistant Director, and/or Program Director and assigned a "rubber" number. The third time an elective is offered, it needs to be submitted by the developer to the Curriculum Committee for approval and submitted for a permanent number. This will need to meet college and university expectations. While electives are energizing and opportunities to showcase faculty expertise, it is also important that faculty teach the core required courses of the curriculum. Faculty may not be able to teach a full teaching load of electives.

Doctoral Program. (Pending launching of program) All instructors in the doctoral program must have approved graduate status through the OU Graduate College to teach at the doctoral level. Doctoral courses will generally be smaller in size than other undergraduate and MSW courses. Therefore, a rotating schedule of teaching in the doctoral program will be established to ensure fairness.

Online Program. Online courses are scheduled during the regular Teaching Assignment meetings. Faculty assigned to teach in the online program and will teach online program courses as in-load. As mentioned previously, requests to teach inload in a program not assigned to a faculty will be on an as needed and case by case basis to ensure fair financial reimbursement as the programs are funded differently.

Course Development, Online Program Only. When new courses are developed, there will either be a one-time development incentive paid to the faculty, or the faculty may develop the course in place of one inload teaching assignment. Faculty who develop the courses will be expected to sign a contract to create, teach, and revise this course on a timeline. New course development incentives will only be paid once, unless a case can be made that a course requires substantial revision.

2.4 Lead Faculty (Online Program)

Lead faculty Model voted on by faculty 11/1/20

Policy Statement

The Online Program utilizes a Lead Faculty and Blueprint model. This is based on the need to provide consistent course material across multiple sections of courses and also support instructors delivering content.

Lead Faculty have the following responsibilities:
- Assure Course Quality
    - Maintain the Core Syllabus
    - Maintain the Canvas Blueprint
    - Review and Update the Course content and Blueprint regularly
    - Gather and incorporate feedback from facilitators
- Support Facilitators
    - Orient new facilitators to the course
    - Answer facilitator questions through the course
    - Assure facilitators are teaching core assignments with fidelity
    - Check canvas sites of facilitators
    - Evaluate facilitators (if needed)
- Teach the Course
    - Teach at least one section of the course per year

Facilitators have the following responsibilities:
- Update dates and schedule of individual section
- Lead Live sessions
- Form student relationships, respond to questions and emails
- Grade assignments
- Individualize if desired, but maintain core material
- Communicate to lead faculty about needs or recommendations

Procedures

1. Lead Faculty are generally faculty who originally developed the online course, however the appointment as Lead Faculty is just for one academic year.
2. If a Lead Faculty is unable to fulfill the responsibilities above, they can potentially not serve an additional year as Lead.
3. Replacement of Lead Faculty is by appointment of the MSW Program Director and based on expertise and experience with the course in need of leadership.

Payment Structures

Lead Faculty are responsible for submitting paperwork for payment as follows:

- Original Development of Course: $7000 ($3500 at initiation and $3500 at completion) or release of one course.
- Lead Faculty: Stipend is $1000 paid on July 1st of the CY, with an additional $250 per course that the lead instructor oversees in the AY.
- Regular faculty course payment for Overload = $7000
- Community faculty course payment for teaching in =$5000

Significant Course Revision

Policy Statement

While standard revising of the Blueprint for an online course is considered the responsibility of the Lead Faculty, the following criteria indicate a more significant revision:

New Primary Textbook. The course now utilizes a new text, not just a revision of the current textbook, or a new supplementary textbook. The course is heavily tied to the textbook with weekly readings so significant content of the online course must now be revised accordingly.
Video and Content. Lecture videos and written content must be re-recorded and/or new recordings and content must be created for 50% or more of the current material.
Assignments. While maintaining core assignments, at least 50% of additional assignments (such as discussion boards and quizzes) had to be rewritten or significantly altered. Rubrics may be created or significantly rewritten.

Procedures

1. When these criteria are met, the Lead Faculty is eligible to receive a one-time supplemental payment of $1500 upon completion of the revisions.
2. Faculty must inform the MSW Program Director they believe their revision qualifies.
3. Eligibility is confirmed by the MSW Program Director.
4. Faculty is responsible for submitting the paperwork for extra compensation.

2.5 Overload Teaching
(Revision approved 9-27-24)

Policy Statement

Faculty may teach additional courses beyond their assigned teaching for additional compensation. This is contingent on policies related to faculty funding, course releases, or other factors. It is the responsibility of the faculty to understand their eligibility to teach overload, the impact on their workload, as well as submit the necessary paperwork as required by college and university policy

Procedures

1. The School will follow University policy and guidelines on overload teaching. This may include limits on overload for faculty receiving additional funding, grant funding, and/or releases of inload teaching.
2. The administrator assigning teaching, after filling all inload assignments for all faculty, will then offer overload possibilities for unfilled course sections.
3. Overload will be offered to faculty currently teaching the courses and then to other interested faculty.
4. Faculty should make the administrator assigning teaching aware of their interest in overload teaching so they can be offered courses if the currently teaching faculty decline.

5. The administrator assigning teaching assigns overload, but the faculty is responsible for the paperwork, as well as knowing their eligibility.
6. Overload is not a guarantee as it is not always available, and if sections of courses are canceled, overload sections may be removed with short notice.
7. Courses remaining to be filled after faculty has been assigned overload will be filled by community faculty. Community faculty may not be removed for faculty wishing to have overload once a commitment has been made to the community faculty.
8. Faculty members who have documented teaching difficulties (as determined by Committee A or other internal mechanisms) may not be allowed to teach overload until those difficulties are resolved.
9. When the faculty member accepts payment for any overload course, they acknowledge that all inload courses for their contract year will be completed or covered. If inload courses are not completed or covered (for example through buyout) for any reason, including cancellation due to low enrollment, and overload payments have been received within the AY, the faculty member will be required to repay all overload payments and fringe contributions. Any unpaid balances unpaid at the end of the fiscal year will be turned over to collections.
10. If a faculty member teaches overload and for any reason does not meet their in-load obligation for the year, they *may* be ineligible to teach overload in the following academic year.

2.6 Ordering Textbooks

Faculty are responsible for identifying the textbooks that will be used their course(s) and then order these textbooks by the required deadline. Textbooks must be aligned with the Core syllabus. It is important to order the books officially through the OU systems, as students with scholarships and other funding sources must use these resources to order their books. Faculty need to login to the Faculty Portal link to add materials to courses or set them as "No Materials Required". https://facultyportal.textbooktech.com. Here is a link to a tutorial on YouTube: FacultyPortal Walkthrough - September 2023 (youtube.com) Faculty assigned to courses will receive an e-mail when it is time to adopt books. Faculty questions/troubleshooting can be directed to soonerbooks@textbookbrokers.com.

2.7 Teaching resources

The School offers occasional faculty development opportunities and training for teaching. The OU Center for Faculty Excellence is a fabulous resource for teaching and this center offers a regular schedule of teaching related development sessions (https://www.ou.edu/cfe). The Office of Digital Learning (https://www.ou.edu/digitallearning) supports the online program and online teaching and also offers development sessions for faculty. The course management system used by OU is Canvas and OU offers support for Canvas for both faculty and students.

2.8 Evaluation of Teaching

Annual Evaluation of Teaching

Refer to the annual evaluation policy for more information about how teaching is evaluated.

Student Evaluations

Students complete a student experience survey at the end of each class. When these are completed, faculty can login to the system using the OU 4X4 login and password. Occasionally on online course will send out a mid-term survey to obtain feedback on a newly developed or redesigned course. This data includes data from all sections of a course and are in aggregate.

Student Feedback

Students complete an extensive evaluation of the social work program (implicit curriculum) at multiple points in the curriculum. This data is compiled and then presented to multiple committees within the school annually. Data is also every year to the Provost's office (as required) and to the Council on Social Work Education. Student outcomes are required to be presented every year on the school website as required by the Council on Social Work Education. Finally, student feedback is also sought through feedback sessions that are held by coordinators and administrators throughout the year. On occasion, focused student surveys or focus groups are held if information is needed on a particular subject.

Other data and information about teaching and instruction. Occasionally, students will discuss concerns with an instructor to the school administration, staff, or other individuals in the university. Within the School, the general rule is that students are encouraged to discuss their concerns directly with the instructor. If the concerns are serious and the student mentions feeling unsafe, harassed, or discriminated against, the student is referred to the proper OU agency to handle such complaints. When there is a large volume of student complaints, or multiple student complaints from multiple sources, the Director, Associate Director, and/or appropriate program director may request to meet with the faculty member to discuss these concerns. When student concerns are likely to have a negative impact on annual evaluation, these concerns are shared with the instructor as soon as possible so that the instructor can employ methods to address these concerns.

3.0 Student Related Policies

The following policies are related to the faculty responsibilities to the students of the School, including participation in activities related to admission, governance, support, and interaction outside of the teaching role.

3.1 Student Governance and Participation

Methods of Student Feedback

Policy Statement

The School is interested in hearing the voices of students and employs a variety of methods to encourage students to share ideas about program improvement and participate in assessment efforts.

Procedures

1. Student participation on committees is encouraged. The Chair of a Committee is charged with identifying student representatives on the School's committees (Field, ARREA, Faculty Search, Undergraduate, Foundation, Concentration).

2. Students on School committees should be given specific roles and tasks, such as a task to solicit feedback from students regarding a topic being discussed.

3. Students participate in course evaluations, evaluations of Coordinators, staff, and leadership, program knowledge, and program satisfaction.

3.2 Responsibilities in Recruitment, Admissions, Advising, and Conduct

Policy Statement

The School recognizes the role of Faculty beyond the classroom as important influences in the growth and strength of the student experience. Faculty are expected to be active in efforts to recruit students, assist in the admission process, advise students, and participate in efforts to address student conduct.

Procedures

- Faculty are expected to participate in recruiting events, mention the School in their presentations, and be prepared to answer questions from potential students in the community as a representative of the School.
- Faculty are required to review admission applications as needed to make admission decisions.
- Faculty will be assigned advising responsibilities and should also advise informally as a mentor.
- Faculty will be asked to assist in matters of student conduct relative to the Student Performance Policy. This may include follow-up meetings as an advisor to address student behavior concerns. See Student Performance Policy for details on faculty role.

3.3 Academic Advising

Policy Statement

Academic advising is a key component to helping students succeed academically. Answering questions about enrollment, clearing academic holds, adding/ dropping classes or reviewing degree requirements are outside the role of typical faculty. For these types of questions students are encouraged to contact the campus specific program coordinator, admissions specialist staff person, or undergraduate students can also contact the College of Arts and Sciences advising designee.

Undergraduates are required to have an academic advising appointment during both the fall and spring semesters. Students are unable to enroll in the subsequent semester until these appointments take place.

Graduate students are not required to have an advising appointment to enroll. The campus specific Graduate Coordinator and admissions support staff will send out email/ canvas correspondence and often hold optional group enrollment sessions to prepare students for course selection.

Faculty Advisor Role

Faculty are asked to serve in a faculty advisor role to a group of specified students. These assignments are made by campus coordinators and admission specialists prior to the beginning of each academic year. As a faculty advisor it is recommended to reach out to your advisees at 2-3 touchpoints during each semester. A faculty advisor can be a resource for students who want to discuss items such as career pathways, applying to graduate school, research opportunities, or other areas of student/professional development.

Faculty advisors also are involved with students during the Level process. Faculty advisors play an important role of helping students understand the process and encouraging self-reflection on problem areas that led to the Level concern. Faculty (in the advising role) should remember their role is not to be the sole advocate for students in the level review process. All faculty in the process are advocating for the student. The process is not adversarial, it is collaborative and developmental.

Procedures

1. Campus Graduate Coordinators assign advisors at the beginning of the academic year making efforts to distribute students evenly among faculty and accommodate interests as much as possible.
2. Students may always request a change in advisor.
3. Online students are assigned a faculty advisor when deemed necessary by a Coordinator or requested. The program has a Career Advisor available to all students, and a Student Success Coach assigned to each student.

3.4 Admissions

Policy Statement

The School seeks emotionally stable individuals with a strong sense of personal responsibility and integrity. Specific desirable characteristics include strong evidence of communication and interpersonal relationship skills and problem solving ability, strong letters of recommendation which evaluate the student's academic achievements and suitability for professional social work practice, ability to work with and respect persons from diverse backgrounds, motivation for graduate work and a career in social work, commitment to issues of social, political and economic justice, and potential and desire to work effectively with diverse client groups

Procedures

1. Annually the Director and Associate Director will meet with Program Directors to discuss admissions goals and projected class sizes.

2. The School of Social Work follows the admissions policies and procedures of the College of Arts and Sciences, the University of Oklahoma Graduate College, and in accordance with the University of Oklahoma Graduate College bulletin and Undergraduate Bulletin.

3. Website admissions materials are updated on an ongoing basis.

4. All faculty are expected to be involved in reading and rating admissions files.

3.5 Student Orientation

<u>Policy Statement</u>

Prior to the initiation of the academic year in the fall the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work will host a student orientation to academic programs

<u>Procedures</u>

1. Undergraduate and Graduate Program Directors and Coordinators share responsibility for the execution of orientations.

2. The orientation to the School includes both informational sessions about programs and workshop content supporting student success.

3. Workshop content includes student conduct policies, orientation to essential academic skills, and professional development content.

4. The Program Coordinators gather periodic feedback and use this evaluative content in planning subsequent orientation programs.

5. Faculty are invited to attend orientations to welcome new students.

3.6 Graduate Research Assistants

<u>Policy Statement</u>

Graduate Research Assistants (GRA) provide an important service to the School in the form of supporting research activities for faculty scholarship. In turn, they are an opportunity to support a student financially as well as in providing valuable research experience that can greatly enhance their education. GRAs may support the School generally, may work with particular faculty, or may work on a particular grant funded project. GRA appointments range from 10-20 hours per week of employment, involve a stipend and limited employer benefits, and depending on program funding may involve a tuition waiver or a scholarship.

Procedures

1. During the Spring semester, new program applicants and currently enrolled students are informed of available GRA positions and sent an application.
2. Faculty should communicate with the Director / Associate Director related to needs for a GRA and possibilities related to potential GRA positions.
3. Each Spring, a list of Graduate Research Assistant positions is identified for the following Fall semester.
4. Each campus institutes a process for interviewing and selecting Graduate Research Assistants.
5. Interviews may take place throughout the year as GRA needs arise or change.
6. All students who are selected to become a GRA (funded by the CAS, Graduate College, Centers, Online Program, or Grants) receive an official offer letter that details the conditions of employment from the Director/Associate Director.
7. All efforts are made to hire GRAs to work within the programs they are enrolled (Campus Programs or Online Program)
8. Campus program Students/GRAs receive a stipend, employment benefits, and a waiver of tuition during terms they are an enrolled student and employed as a GRA.
9. Online program Students/GRAs receive a stipend, employment benefits, and a scholarship during the Fall semester of their appointment.
10. All Graduate Research Assistants complete HIPAA, FERPA, safety, and CITI training.
11. GRA appointments are generally for a Fall/Spring term but can be extended into the Summer or initiated at different times when circumstances arise that require these arrangements.

3.7 Student Conduct

Policy Statement

The Anne & Henry Zarrow School of Social Work has the responsibility to promote competent and ethical social work practice beginning with graduating quality students. The School maintains standards of student academic achievement and professional behavior (classroom behavior, professional behavior, practicum). Competent social workers must be able to demonstrate professional behavior in the work environment and adhere to the NASW Code of Ethics.

Procedures

1. *Students and faculty observe the procedures as outlined in the School's *Student Performance Policy.*
2. It is important to note that there are several institutional levels for student conduct review at the University of Oklahoma (University level, College level, Department/School level). Students are required to become familiar with the policies and procedures that govern their conduct at various levels.

3.8 Student Organization and Leadership Roles

Policy Statement

Student involvement in the life of the School through student organizations and leadership roles add to the learning experience and facilitates the preparation of students for subsequent professional involvement after graduation. The School fully supports the involvement of students in the culture and operations of the School and seeks to increase student leadership in all aspects of professional education and preparation.

<u>Procedures</u>

1. *Students receive an email in the Summer about potential roles in leadership available, including Student Association officer roles and student representatives on School committees.*
2. Program Directors, Coordinators, and/or Student Association faculty sponsors host a zoom meeting for potential student leaders to discuss expectations and participation. Efforts are made to assign roles based on student interests and skill sets.
3. Leadership in the Social Work Student Associations are campus specific, but generally members who were not in leadership positions their first year are invited to increase leadership the second year.
4. Participation may be requested in the following School committees: Admission, Recruitment, Retention, Enrollment, Advising (ARREA), Field Education Committee, Undergraduate Committee, Foundation Committee, and Concentration Committee.
5. The Chair of the committee will ask for recommendations from members of students that would be potential choices and will request participation from the student.
6. Participation in School committees may be part of an expectation for a GRA position.

4.0 Faculty Responsibilities, Contributions and Performance

4.1 Recruitment

<u>Policy Statement</u>

The Anne & Henry Zarrow School of Social Work seeks to recruit and hire faculty members of diverse backgrounds who contribute substantially and significantly to the local, state and national relevance, standing and distinctiveness of the school. Faculty are integral to the accomplishment of the School's mission and goals. Faculty includes tenure track, ranked renewable term, renewable term, and community faculty.

<u>Procedures</u>

1. The School of Social Work will recruit and hire applicants who meet the requirements of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and the University of Oklahoma.

2. The Director or Associate Director will appoint the Chair and members of the search committee in accordance with the rules and regulations of the University of Oklahoma as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

3. The search committee and Chair will follow all University trainings and adhere to all university

policies related to faculty searches.

4.2 Community Faculty Members

Policy Statement

The Anne & Henry Zarrow School of Social Work seeks to recruit and hire community faculty members of diverse backgrounds who contribute substantially and significantly to the local, state and national relevance, standing and distinctiveness of the School. Community faculty are integral to the accomplishment of the School's mission and goals.

Procedures
Recruiting

1. Decisions about community faculty hiring are made by the administrator who has oversight of teaching assignments for a particular campus. This may include Program Directors and/or Coordinators.

2. Community faculty are recruited in a number of ways. These include online ads to solicit interest, recommendations from other faculty, self-referrals from practitioners, or from unselected but strong candidates in faculty searches.

3. Attention is paid to hiring community faculty that provide diversity to the faculty and have the practice expertise to teach a particular course. This is demonstrated through the resume and interview process.

4. Potential community faculty are interviewed to assess their expertise and review the expectations of the position.

5. Recommendations and feedback from full time faculty regarding potential community faculty is valuable and considered when possible.

Onboarding

1. New community faculty are connected to a full-time faculty member who has taught the course previously and can assist in orienting the community faculty to the course.
2. This is not the same process as lead faculty (Online program) but may be considered part of a service obligation to assist community faculty.
3. If possible, this may involve several faculty who are part of the teaching mission of the course, both campus and online, to support the community faculty member as well as possible.
4. Full-Time faculty may provide such assistance as: copying Canvas shells, sharing an operational syllabus, sharing lecture presentations, notes, or classroom activities, and answering questions regarding the assignments or other areas of the content of the course. See section 2.2.
5. Questions regarding things outside of course content (i.e., Canvas mechanics, payroll

questions, etc) would be referred to the Coordinator or Program Director, or staff as needed.

6. Community faculty will be connected to orientation materials and field questions as needed about general matters, not content related.

7. Teaching assigning faculty are responsible for connecting community faculty to staff to help order textbooks, secure the core syllabus, and understand their classroom and time assignments.

8. Teaching assigning faculty will also provide the community faculty manual to newly hired community faculty via Canvas so that they are familiar with our curriculum, curriculum theory, core syllabi and teaching resources.

4.3 Faculty Sabbatical

Policy Statement

The School seeks to work with faculty members to enhance their teaching, research and service interests to foster their development and in service of the School's mission. This is accomplished through sabbaticals, mentoring, special awards, recognition, release time and other forms of support. Faculty interests are not static, frequently evolve, and reflect changes in interest, program changes, new practice technologies and program needs. Faculty development is needed to address these changes over time.

Procedures

1. Sabbatical applications deadlines are due twice per year, depending on when the faculty member desires the sabbatical time period.

2. Sabbatical applications will be evaluated on the basis of sustained accomplishment over seven years and based on the proposed productivity outlined in the application.

3. It is recommended that faculty meet with the Director/Associate Director and Committee A when considering a sabbatical to help with the application and planning.

4. Faculty will submit sabbatical application and documents to the Director and Committee A for approval in advance of the University due date so that all required elements of the application are completed prior to the deadline.

4.4 Continuing Professional Education

Policy Statement

The Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work maintains an on-going program of professional education and development for practicing social workers and health and human service professionals that strengthens the stature of the school within the state and regionally and improves the infrastructure of human services within the state of Oklahoma.

Procedures

1. The Continuing Education program develops and maintains a strategic and quality improvement plan guiding the structure, offerings, and implementation of the continuing education program and post-graduate curriculum.

2. Annually, the Coordinator of the program provides the Director and Associate Director as well as the faculty with a comprehensive report on the standing and quality of the continuing education program. The report also identifies objectives for advancing the quality and effectiveness of the program consistent with the overarching current program strategic plan and quality improvement plan.

4.5 Funding for Research Dissemination Travel

(Policy approved 9-27-24)

<u>Policy Statement</u>

Travel to conferences and other professional activities is important for all ranks of faculty. Research-focused faculty have additional responsibilities to disseminate knowledge and participate in scholarship related to their field of study. Presenting original research aids in the development of a national reputation as an expert in their area of scholarly focus and advances the school and profession. Travel is also essential to the Teaching-focused faculty who have responsibilities to enhance knowledge and discussion of emerging and effective teaching methods and disseminate knowledge in areas related to education. Administrative-focused faculty are similarly responsible for participating in national conversations on social work in higher education, leadership, and management.

To meet these goals, travel funds per fiscal year will be available as follows:

- All Full-time faculty within the AHZSSW can apply for up to $2500 for professional travel.
    - ο Preference will be given to requests supporting the dissemination of social work research.
    - ο Other options for travel support are possible and supported on an as-available basis.
- Faculty with significant research requirements in the weights of their annual evaluation are considered "*research-focused*" and therefore have a higher expectation of participation in research dissemination.
    - ο To support this, faculty that qualify as *research-focused* may request up to an additional $3000 per fiscal year to support dissemination related travel.
    - ο Faculty are expected to apply to, and exhaust, all other possible sources of funding before requesting the use of these additional funds.
- Faculty with significant administrative or teaching assignments who desire additional funding to meet their professional needs may request additional funding as needed, but it will be contingent on availability from other sources supporting the teaching and administrative missions of the School.

<u>Procedures</u>

1. Travel is to be requested through the University systems and pre-approved by the faculty's supervisor.
2. All travel must be in service to the faculty role in the School and is evaluated as such by the supervisor.
3. Any personal travel affiliated with the trip must be funded by the faculty themselves.
4. Travel expenses must be reported through University systems according to policy.

5. Faculty are responsible for tracking their own use of the available annual funds and will be aware that travel expenses and reimbursements may be denied if allotted funds are already expended.
6. Faculty are highly encouraged to explore and utilize other sources of funding for travel before requesting additional funds from the School.
7. Determination of significant emphasis in annual evaluation weight in research for eligibility for additional funds is to be determined by faculty's supervisor in the pre-approval process.
8. The additional funds for research focused faculty are based on availability and qualification.
9. All travel funding is "as available" and subject to change.

5.0 Assessment

5.1 Assessment Program

Policy Statement

The assessment program guides the School's assessment of program goals, mission, and explicit and implicit curriculum. The assessment program collects data and compiles reports for reaccreditation, program review, and other university or accrediting bodies.

Procedures

1. The Assessment Coordinator meets with the Program Directors and Coordinators, Curriculum Committee chair, and Director/Associate Director to determine assessment needs annually and develops a plan for the year.

2. The Assessment Coordinator develops an annual report of data to be presented to the faculty. This data is used for program improvement into the next year.

3. The Assessment Coordinator oversees the data collection and management of the School's assessment plan.

5.2 Assessment Framework and Scope

Policy Statement

The School is committed to the development of a comprehensive assessment program whose scope includes the capturing of data relevant to the advancement of mission integrity, strategic planning, tactical and annual planning, teaching and learning, research, service, and overall effectiveness of the School. Annually, the Assessment Program will offer a framework and plan that defines its activities for a given academic year.

Procedures

1. The lead designee annually will report to the faculty on the framework of assessment to address the needs of the school as influenced by changes in external and internal expectations, marketing objectives, accreditation needs, program development activities, and the continuous improvement objectives of the school.

2. The lead designee will communicate in his or her annual report to the faculty the scope of the assessment program and will highlight change or modifications that emerge from the previous academic year.

3. The lead designee will incorporate the assessment framework and the scope of assessment in the strategic plan and annual work plan of the Assessment Program.

5.3 Annual Cycle of Assessment

Policy Statement

The School's cycle of assessment begins in the summer semester with the initiation of planning activities leading to the formulation of an annual academic year plan for assessment and the refinement of the School's strategic assessment plan. In the Fall semester, the office will focus on the assessment of teaching and the student learning experience while spring semester will address the extent to which students' achieve outcomes of learning and professional development. Throughout the academic year, the office will address administrative assessment tasks pertaining to mission integrity, marketing, benchmarking, and strategic planning.

Procedures

1. In the summer prior to the start of an academic year, the lead designee for assessment will publish a calendar of assessment activities for a given year.

2. In consultation with the School's Director and Associate Director, the lead designee will ensure that the School's assessment calendar fulfills the expectations set for the office, the needs of administration, and the needs of the school.

3. The School's director will ensure that the Assessment Program possesses those resources it needs to fulfill its expectations and assessment activities as set forth in the annual calendar of the office.

4. By the end of an academic year the Assessment Program will conduct a summative evaluation of its activities over the course of the year and will evaluate (1) the extent of its progress, (2) accomplishment of specific objectives, and (3) principal outcomes.

5.4 Faculty Responsibilities in Assessment

Policy Statement

To facilitate the assessment of teaching, faculty members hold important responsibilities in the organization and presentation of their teaching materials including curriculum vitae, syllabi, assignments, evaluative data they generate, and their annual plans for the improvement of teaching.

1. Faculty members will ensure that their evaluation materials fulfill the Standards for the Preparation of Faculty Evaluation Documents to support subsequent assessment activities as they pertain to teaching, research, and service.

2. The quality of the documentation of faculty members will support the systematic assessment of the School's aggregate performance.

3. Faculty members will submit evaluative materials in a timely manner.

4. The materials faculty members submit for the purposes of assessment will also fulfill the School's need for the evaluation of each faculty member's performance as stipulated by annual review guidelines issued by the University of Oklahoma College of Arts and Sciences.

5.5 Continuous Accreditation Management

Policy Statement

The School maintains an active oversight of its accreditation status ensuring annually that it is meeting required standards and expectations of the Council on Social Work Education.

Procedures

1. Annually, by the end of the first semester of the academic year, the School, through the Executive Committee assesses changes in CSWE accreditation requirements and in the environment of social work education and updates the strategy for the active management and oversight of accreditation.

2. The Executive Committee updates its plan of action for the management of accreditation by the end of the first semester of the academic year and specifies plans for satisfying existing and anticipated accreditation expectations.

3. By the end of the academic year the Executive Committee will report to the Director and faculty the School's status relative to accreditation readiness, action steps the School has taken to strengthen its accreditation status, and limitations and needs the School possesses relative to accreditation readiness.

4. The Director of the School and the Executive Committee ensures by the end the academic year that the School's policy system incorporates those policy statements, procedures, and action steps the School requires to be in compliance with accreditation.

5.6 Reporting and Dissemination of Assessment Data and Findings

Policy Statement

It is the responsibility of the Assessment Program to report to the administration and faculty of the School as well as to the School's principal constituencies on assessment data across the domains of marketing, benchmarking, teaching, learning, mission integrity, research and service. The reports the

office prepares will produce information relevant to advancing the School's capacity for quality improvement. Dissemination of data will be driven by activities the office outlines in its annual work plan.

<u>Procedures</u>

1. Within the annual calendar guiding the work of the Assessment Program will be a stipulation of reporting periods in which key reports are disseminated to the administrators of the School, faculty, and key constituencies.

2. The office will ensure that the reports it generates for specific groups or people within the School meet their needs for performance, quality improvement and strategic or annual planning of their activities.

5.7 Utilization of Assessment Findings

<u>Policy Statement</u>

The Assessment Program will engage in an active program of utilization framing assessment data in ways that they can be employed directly in administrative decision making, program development, continuous improvement, and advancement of the principal programs of the School, particularly educational ones.

<u>Procedures</u>

1. The Assessment Program will identify principal overarching strategies guiding the advancement of the utilization of assessment data within the School.

2. In concert with the Director, Associate Director, and Executive Committee of the School, the lead designee for assessment will identify utilization objectives guiding the work of the office in a given academic year.

3. Reports the office produces will identify implications for the utilization of data in the advancement of principal School activities.

5.8 Improvement of the Assessment System

<u>Policy Statement</u>

The administrators of the School in partnership with the Executive Committee will undertake a program review of the Assessment Program every three years to ensure that the program produces useful data and merits the allocation of resources. To this end, the office will produce annually plans that incorporate self-assessment and aims and objectives guiding continuous quality improvement of the unit.

<u>Procedures</u>

1. The Director of the School will specify program review criteria and process governing the review of the Assessment Program.

2. The lead designee within the year in which program review is scheduled will produce a self-study for submission to the director of the school.

3. The Director will undertake the program review in collaboration with the Executive Committee of the school.

4. The program review will produce content relevant to the continuous improvement of the office and the lead faculty member will address each recommendation the director makes for the advancement of assessment within the school.

Section 6 removed for sperate vote after reorganization of institutes and centers

7.0 Administrative Position Descriptions

Director
As the highest authority in the School, the Director is ultimately responsible for all the operations of the School. The Director is the supervisor for all faculty, and has final authority related to all personnel, budget, hiring, assessment, and evaluation matters. The Director is responsible for maintaining accreditation with CSWE and compliance with all University policies.

Associate Director
The Associate Director assists the Director in all operations of the School and functions as a proxy for the Director in decision making. Traditionally, the Associate Director offices on a different campus than the Director and has responsibilities related to managing the campus faculty and staff on their home campus.

Associate Director of Research
The Associate Director of Research is responsible for mentoring new tenure track and other research engaged faculty in successful navigation of University systems to support original research.

Graduate Programs Director
This Director oversees the work of Program Coordinators and assures consistency between multiple campuses. The Graduate Program Director assists in student concerns and administrative functions related to the Graduate Program and is responsible for maintaining and enacting the policies of the Graduate Manual.

Undergraduate Programs Director
This Director oversees Program Coordinators and assures consistency between multiple campuses. The Undergraduate Program Director responds to student concerns and administrative functions related to the BASW program and is responsible for maintaining and enacting the policies of the Undergraduate Manual.

Field Director
The Field Director enacts the policies of the Field Program and oversees the work of Coordinators and the Field Team on all campuses. The Field Director is responsible for assuring field is considered in

administrative decisions as it often requires special arrangements and resources. The Field Director is the authority on placement decisions.

Graduate Coordinators (Norman, Tulsa, Online)
Campus Graduate Coordinators are responsible for recruiting, advising, supporting students with concerns, and enhancing the student experience of learning. This may include orientations, campus activity planning and information sharing.

Undergraduate Coordinators (Norman, Tulsa)
Campus Undergraduate Coordinators are responsible for recruiting, advising, supporting students with concerns and enhancing the student experience of learning. This may include orientations, campus activity planning and information sharing.

Field Practicum Coordinators (Norman, Tulsa, Online)
Campus Field Practicum Coordinators are crucial to creating and confirming field placements, ensuring educational goals are met, and functioning as a liaison to the community to support and build new opportunities. They assist the students of their campus in finding adequate placement and then oversee field liaison faculty who work directly with the students and field instructors. They provide trainings/orientations for field instructors and students to assure a quality experience.

8.0 Criteria and Responsibilities of Graduate Faculty Membership

Consistent with the Charter of the Graduate Faculty and the policies of the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work, appointment to the graduate faculty status shall be recommended to the Dean of the Graduate College by the Director upon recommendation of the Committee A (graduate faculty committee). Faculty interested in changing their status or renewing their status should petition such from the director who will solicit feedback from Committee A regarding the request. The school prefers that graduate faculty members have a Masters or Doctoral degree in the field of social work, although requests from faculty members from related fields will be considered.

Graduate Faculty Membership Criteria

Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work

Any academic unit offering courses or coursework in any College awarding an undergraduate degree on the Norman campus may appoint members of the Graduate Faculty. To make such an appointment, the academic unit must elect a Graduate Faculty Committee made up of members of the Graduate Faculty. (Graduate Faculty Charter, IV.1.a)

The Graduate Faculty Committee for the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work shall consist of Committee A which includes four elected faculty and the Director of the School.

Recommendations for membership in the Graduate Faculty will originate from the Committee. This committee will ensure that consistent criteria are applied to maintain the highest standards of quality in the Graduate Faculty.

Terminal degree(s)

Master's Degree in Social Work is considered the terminal degree for graduate appointments in the unit. The PhD, Doctorate in Social Work, Juris Doctorate, or Ed.D. are considered the terminal degree for tenure-track and tenured appointments, but are not required according to Social Work accreditation standards for graduate course instruction.

Justification: The Council on Social Work Education's (CSWE) Commission on Accreditation (COA) uses the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) to accredit baccalaureate and master's level social work programs (including ours here at OU). CSWE recognizes through its accreditation standards, the master's degree in social work is a sufficient and qualifying degree to teach in a social work program,

for both undergraduate and graduate level students. Current CSWE accreditation standards for baccalaureate and master's program faculty recognize the master's degree in social work as a qualification for teaching in a social work program. Two specific standards are cited below:

B3.2.4: The majority of the total full-time baccalaureate social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program, with a doctoral degree preferred.

M 3.2.4: The majority of the full-time master's social work program faculty have a master's degree in social work and a doctoral degree, preferably in social work. (EPAS, 2015)

Further, field directors and field instructors are also required to hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-master's social work practice experience.

Tested experience criteria: Graduate appointments may be considered for individuals who hold another Master's degree such as, but not limited to a MPA, MPH, MHR, etc. According to CSWE accreditation standards, these faculty must have a minimum of two years of experience working in their professional degree and field/area of practice. Clients may include micro, mezzo, and macro levels such as individuals, families, groups, communities, organizations, or in policy work.

Appointment process

Permanent or Regular Faculty

Permanent faculty members in the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work include renewable term, ranked renewable term, and tenured and tenure track faculty. Graduate faculty appointments for permanent faculty members are made at the time of hire by Committee A. The School of Social Work also has many regular faculty members at the instructor or lecturer level. When terms expire, permanent faculty are re-reviewed and re-appointed as appropriate.

Community Faculty

Community faculty (adjunct faculty) are reviewed and appointed at time of hire, and the school is dependent on these positions.

Affiliate and Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty and affiliate faculty are appointed as graduate faculty by their request or when they are assigned to teach in the graduate program. They are reviewed and appointed by Committee A.

Term: The normal term for regular members (permanent faculty) of the Graduate Faculty is five years. Terms for community faculty are two years. Terms for Affiliate and Emeritus faculty will depend on the duties assigned to them for a maximum of two years.

Appointment criteria:

Graduate Faculty Appointment	Research, Scholarship or Creative activity Required	Other Criteria
RM0 SM authority to teach classes	No	PhD in Social Work or related field, DSW, Juris Doctorate or EDD, or Master's Degree in Social Work
RM2 SM authority to chair non-thesis master's committees*	2 years, post MSW, professional practice experience in the field working directly with clients at the individual, families, groups, communities, organizations, and/or policy areas, which is how social work's accrediting body defines practice experience. With verifiable agencies, systems, and workplaces that verify their practice experience.	PhD in Social Work or related field, DSW, Juris Doctorate or EDD, or Master's Degree in Social Work from an CSWE accredited program in social work. Appointment as a regular faculty member in the school (instructor/lecturer/ranked renewable term/tenure track).
RM3 SM authority to serve on doctoral committees and/or chair master's thesis committees*	To obtain or retain RM3 status, a faculty member must have a record of current research, scholarly, or creative activity (see details below).	PhD in Social Work or related field, DSW, Juris Doctorate or EdD Full time faculty appointment at the following ranks: (1) tenure track OU faculty appointment, (2) Ranked Renewable Term Faculty with doctorate, (3) Lecturers with doctorate, (4) OU Emeritus faculty with equivalent graduate faculty privileges before retirement

*Appointments of SM faculty to chair committees and/or count toward the departmental majority require review by the Graduate Council Graduate Faculty Membership Subcommittee and approval of the Graduate Dean, based on three criteria: close association with the unit hosting the graduate program, permanence, and credentials comparable to regular Graduate Faculty members with the same graduate privileges.

Professional practice: Professional practice refers to employment in the social work field for a total of two years after the MSW degree is awarded. This is consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (4.2.2) of the Council on Social Work Education that state: *"faculty who teach*

social work practice courses have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE accredited program and at least two years of post-master's social work degree practice experience in social work." Practice is defined as work within a human service agency, nonprofit system, governmental agency, or related organization that allows for direct work with individuals, families, groups, communities, organizations, and/or policy.

Current research, scholarly, or creative activity: As is demonstrated by their record, to justify eligibility for chairing master's thesis committees' faculty must possess a PhD or the equivalent degree, and have a record of current and continuous scholarly productivity which clearly demonstrates their competence as a scholar/educator in the discipline. Active scholarly productivity is defined as at least two of the following products annually at the quality and frequency defined in the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work's Annual Evaluation criteria (1) peer reviewed publications, (2) peer reviewed presentations/posters, (3) invited presentations at conferences, workshops or academic or research institutions, (4) research related service such as service on an editorial board, serving on national/international research related committees, (5) receipt of grants or contracts for research support, (6) designed and implemented a graduate level course at OU or other Universities, or demonstrated qualifications for graduate instruction as a teaching assistant or though preparation of instructional materials used in graduate level courses.

Teaching and mentorship expectations: Educators who qualify for graduate level instruction in the School of Social Work must have a clear and convincing record of ethical and effective teaching skill or be able to articulate evidence to support the expectation of such abilities in accordance with the standards of the profession.

Regular performance review: All appointed faculty will participate in the annual review process which includes extensive evaluation of their teaching practice throughout the calendar year. Community (adjunct) faculty will have consistent performance reviews performed and be renewed on a semester-by-semester basis dependent on teaching efficacy.

Retention/renewal criteria and process: Appointed faculty who have been previously evaluated as qualified to teach in graduate programs will remain doing so pending each year's annual evaluation and a successful documentation of consistently positive performance. At the discretion of Committee A throughout the evaluation process any faculty member who fails to meet expectations in the areas of research and teaching will be placed on a performance improvement plan, and potentially removed from inclusion in status for graduate level education. Community (adjunct) faculty performance will be reviewed on a semester-by-semester basis and these appointments will be terminated if the faculty

member fails to meet expectations during performance review. "Fails to meet expectations" is defined by poor performance as assessed by peer review, annual evaluation, student evaluation, or other data used for review of faculty performance during the annual evaluation.

Standards and process for rescission of graduate faculty appointments or selected privileges:

As outlined in the Graduate Faculty Charter (Article IV, Section 3.c.), in "certain cases, such as those of professional incompetence, dishonesty, or failure to fulfill professional duties related to Graduate Faculty membership, a member may have some or all privileges on the Graduate Faculty rescinded prior to the end of the term of appointment. This is an exceptional event and should be undertaken only after other administrative remedies have failed."

Possible grounds for rescission of a Graduate Faculty appointment include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1)   Scholarly misconduct, as defined in the Faculty Handbook (section 3.26.1).
(2)   Failure to fulfill a Graduate Faculty member's academic and/or graduate mentoring responsibilities (academic responsibility is defined in Faculty Handbook section 3.2.2).
(3)   Failure to adhere to Graduate College policies or University policies relating to graduate education.
(4)   Failure to meet expectations as assessed by peer review, annual evaluation, student evaluation, or other data used for review of faculty performance.
(5)   Violation(s) of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics.

Committee A will review the grounds for rescission or a change in graduate faculty privileges and make a recommendation to the Director. The Director will inform the faculty in writing, of the decision to terminate the graduate faculty appointment or change in graduate faculty privileges. This recommendation will also be forwarded to the Graduate College Dean.

9.0 Annual Evaluation Policies and Procedures (approved 2023)

Introduction

The mission of the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work is to advance relevant and high-quality knowledge and values of social work practice useful in preparing competent social workers who can elevate the status of people, populations or communities that experience considerable vulnerability and injustice within Oklahoma and the broader society. This mission is central to what faculty do every day. To this end the School offers two degree programs: the undergraduate major in social work leading to Bachelor of Arts and a graduate program leading to Master of Social work. The

mission and goals of the School are consistent with the goals of professional social work education and with those of the University of Oklahoma.

The mission statement of the School is the nexus for the School's activities and is the standard against which the School's success is evaluated. The Faculty Evaluation and Development: Policy and Procedures document emanates from the mission statement.

Faculty member development and evaluation are part of a continuum. Leadership and responsibility for both of these activities rests with the Director and Committee A. Consistent with our focus on goals and goal attainment, all faculty, are required to formulate workload annual plans that help to guide the preparation of materials for annual evaluation and tenure and/or promotion. Annual workload plans constitute a formalized tool designed to help faculty plan for successful academic careers and to help the School meet its goals. Plans are updated annually. The plans are not rigid and inviolate, but rather convey a thoughtful, planned series of activities that is understood, endorsed and supported by the School.

Senior faculty members are also encouraged to mentor untenured faculty in research activities. Mentoring may range from inclusion on projects and scholarly work to consultation and advice. Goals, feedback and support are necessary ingredients to effectiveness. The School's Faculty Evaluation and Development: Policy and Procedures document seeks to explain the formal process for feedback and evaluation of faculty in the School.

The School's evaluation and development process will adhere to the procedures, policies, and intent of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty are to be familiar with this Handbook, in with the content of Section 3 "Faculty Policies and Information." Evaluation of faculty performance is carried out by Committee A.

The importance of direct (face-to-face, if possible) communication in faculty evaluation and development is recognized. As such, individual faculty are encouraged to request to meet with Committee A for evaluation or faculty development issues. In the same vein, Committee A is encouraged to request to meet directly with faculty members about any concerns or questions. These meetings are encouraged both during the formal evaluation period and at other times in the year.

9.1 Annual Evaluation Procedures

The annual evaluation period is the calendar year. Annual Evaluation of faculty performance is carried out by the School's Committee A. It is the responsibility of faculty members to submit evaluation materials at the appropriate time to Committee A. Committee A assigns scores in each area (teaching, research, and service). These numbers are then multiplied by weights to derive an overall number that is a quantitative summary of performance in the evaluation period. In making annual evaluations, Committee A uses the evaluation form provided by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). It is recognized that this form may change from year to year. The current form has five rating categories, each of which applies, to all three areas. These categories, ordered from highest to lowest are outstanding; very good; good, meets expectations, marginal, and unacceptable. These categories and scores correspond to the scoring used on the required annual evaluation form by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Score Range   Label

5.0	Outstanding
4.0	Very Good
3.0	Good, Meets Expectations
2.0	Marginal
1.0	Unacceptable

In addition to a quantitative evaluation, Committee A produces a brief narrative summarizing performance. Faculty members who are candidates for tenure and/or promotion should recognize that annual evaluations, decisions to reappoint (or not to do so) for another year, and tenure and/or promotion decisions are each distinct procedures. In particular, the rating of good, meets expectations at annual evaluation will not guarantee a favorable recommendation on tenure and/or promotion. Annual evaluation, particularly in research, is designed to promote and award pipeline of research products, candidates for tenure and promotion should be aware that publications are required for tenure and promotion.

At the end of the calendar year, the Director notifies all faculty members of the deadlines and requirements for annual evaluation. Faculty members should follow these instructions and submit all required materials in a timely manner. This generally includes: entering data into the Faculty Activity System (FAS), Mini-Vita, an updated error-free CV, an activity report, and other supporting documents as requested. Committee A reviews these materials and provides an evaluation to each faculty member. All untenured faculty members are required to meet with Committee A to review the evaluation. Associate and Full Professors may request a meeting with Committee A.

Weights

As teaching and research are its primary areas of emphasis, faculty members will devote approximately equal resources to each. Thus, about 40% of the faculty member effort will be devoted to teaching and 40% to research. About 20% of effort will be directed to service. These percentages are intended to be guidelines rather than rigidly set standards. They may shift some according to factors such as: 1) the talents and interests of faculty members, and 2) the particular demands (needs) in the three areas of teaching, research, and service.

The typical percentages of effort are based on teaching as anchor, where 10% of effort is devoted to each in-load course taught. The other two weights are variable, although the school makes recommendations about efforts in the three categories to be consistent with expectations by position and rank. For example, the service expectations increase as one progresses through the tenure track and ranked and unranked renewable term faculty members typically have a higher service expectation than tenure-track faculty members. Percentage of responsibility allocated to service is typically 10% for tenure seeking faculty and ranges from 20-50% for renewable term faculty and tenured faculty members. Faculty may adjust weights based on teaching releases, administrative responsibilities, research responsibilities or other duties that warrant changes in weights. All tenure track faculty members must develop a teaching track record over the tenure track. Thus, a faculty member on the tenure track cannot *fully* opt out of teaching and instruction even when possessing external funding that could substitute for teaching responsibilities.

Weights affect the annual evaluation numeric summary because performances in each area (teaching, research, and service) are multiplied by these weights. Weights should also be considered in making evaluative judgments. For instance, suppose that two faculty members

produce identical research products in a given year but that weights in research differ. In this situation, the faculty member with the *lower* weight in research should garner the higher rating in this area because the same work was accomplished even though a lower proportion of total effort (as indicated by the lower weight) was directed towards research. This same principle applies to teaching and service ratings. Weights should reflect actual work responsibilities. Where a request for non-standard weights is made, the Director and Committee A will negotiate with the individual faculty member regarding responsibilities and assignments.

The following chart reflects the allowable weights for teaching, research and service within the school.

	Service	Teaching	Scholarship
Tenure track, years 1-3	10%	40%	50%
Tenure track, years 4-5	10-20%	30-40%	40-50%
Tenure track, associate professor	20%	30-50%	30-50%
Tenure track, full professor	20%	30-50%	30-50%
Ranked Renewable term, clinical assistant	20%	70-80%	0-20%
Ranked Renewable term, clinical associate	20%	70-80%	0-20%
Ranked Renewable term, clinical full	20%	70-80%	0-20%
Unranked Renewable term	20-30%	70-80%	N/A

*Note, any faculty members with administrative roles (add 10-20% onto service weight)

All weights (percentages) must sum to 100. Committee A will support requests for weights other than the standard weights only where such weights do not adversely affect the School's ability to carry out its mission. The assignment of non-standard weights in a given year does not guarantee that these are extended into the next. Changes in School needs or, perhaps, a request for non-standard weights by another faculty are factors that might need to be considered. Faculty requesting a change in weights must make a written request to Committee A by the end of a particular semester. The Director and or Committee A will work with tenure track faculty members to realign weights and workloads in the event of a change in their academic duties. Any changes in distribution must be approved by the Dean.

9.2 Meeting with Committee A

Faculty may meet with Committee A to review the evaluation as specified below:
- All assistant professors on the tenure track are required to meet with Committee A to review the annual evaluation and to discuss progress toward tenure and promotion.
- All newly employed faculty members, regardless of rank or type, are encouraged to meet Committee A within the first 18 months of their employment.
- Committee A can request to meet with a faculty member in any given year to discuss performance concerns or other matters. This request can be at any time during the year, not just during the typical evaluation period.
- Any faculty member is able and encouraged to request a meeting with Committee A to discuss their evaluation and other matters pertaining to performance, tenure, and/or promotion as well as goals, resources, and feedback.
- Tenure track Faculty at the associate level are encouraged to meet with Committee A prior to submitting materials for promotion and/or plans for promotion.

- All ranked and non-ranked renewable term faculty who are considering promotion are encouraged to meet with Committee A prior to submitting materials for promotion and/or plans for promotion.

9.3 Evaluation of Research

Research is conceptualized broadly and is better described by the term *scholarship*. It is recognized that scholarly work may advance theory, empirical knowledge, social policy, and/or social work practice. Contributions in all these areas are viewed as vitally and equally important. The term research can be further expanded to encompass *creative activity*. For instance, the development of a highly innovative computer software program or of a pioneering practice intervention model may be considered in the research area. The School encourages collaboration among faculty members on research projects and seeks to develop a climate supportive of research and creative activity. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches are encouraged.

Though research is conceptualized broadly, scholarly publication remains the key mechanism for evaluation in this area. Committee A will consider factors such as: quality and prestige of journal/publisher; sole versus lead versus co-authorship; the candidate's role in the work product; the pertinence of the work to social work; scientific and/or scholarly sophistication and rigor; evidence of interdisciplinary collaborations; senior collaboration with junior faculty members, whether presentation was original research/intervention vs. review of literature; impact factors of research record etc.

It is recognized that scholarly work in some areas may be more difficult to publish in "traditional," high prestige journals than work in other areas. And open-source publishing is valued equally if the quality of the journal or outlet is well established by its peer-reviewed status, standing in the profession, and impact factors. Though credit is given for evidence of ongoing progress in scholarship -- for instance, the submission of a paper for review in a peer-reviewed journal, substantial progress on a book, etc. – **predominant credit accrues in the year of publication**.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek financial support for their research and will receive recognition for their effort, products, and the achievement of funding. Grants from external sources, in general, will be evaluated more favorably than those from internal (University sources). Externally funded grants with a strong research and knowledge building focus hold more status than contracts for the provision of services, technical assistance, or training. Ordinarily, greater credit is given to larger grants (in terms of dollars) than to smaller ones. While an end in themselves, research grants are viewed as a route to a product, that product being the published paper or manuscript. It is recognized that availability of funding varies in different areas. This may be considered in evaluative decisions. More credit will ordinarily be extended to a funded grant than to an unfunded grant application. Yet, because grant solicitation is encouraged, some credit will be given to application, even if unsuccessful. Where a grant extends across more than one calendar year, greatest credit will be given in the year of receipt of the grant.

Evaluation of Research Rubric

Scholarly Product Value 1.0

- Awarded external research grant (for each year of grant), > $1,000,000
- Awarded external research grant > $50,000 (first year only)
- Awarded training grant/program development grant > $50,000 (first year only)
- Published a peer-reviewed journal article as one of first four authors
- Published an academic book
- Delivered invited keynote presentation at national or international conference
- Published an instructor's manual to accompany academic text
- Received a scholarly award

Scholarly Product Value .75

- Awarded external research grant any amount < $50,000 (second year and each successive year of grant),
- Awarded training grants/program development grants < $50,000
- Delivered invited keynote presentation at state or local conference
- Published a peer-reviewed journal article as author five or later
- Published a peer-reviewed research monograph or research report
- Published a chapter in a peer-reviewed book
- Presented at peer reviewed national or international conference (*Max 2, additional presentations count as .25*)
- Submission of book to publisher

Scholarly Product Value .50

- Awarded external research grant (Second year and on), > $50,000
- Awarded training grant/program development grant (second year and on), > $50,000
- Awarded internal grant, any amount
- Published (non-peer reviewed) research report/technical monograph, papers or book chapters
- Published a book review in a peer-reviewed journal
- Submission of book contract to publisher
- Presented at peer reviewed state or regional conference
- Submitted book revision to author
- Submitted peer reviewed article for publication
- Submitted grant proposal

Scholarly Product Value .25

- Published editorials or research comments in peer-reviewed professional or academic publications.
- Published contributions to scholarly blogs
- Published instructional software/computer program/non-print media/therapeutic games or interventions
- Submitted presentation for peer-viewed academic, professional, or pedagogical meeting
- Submitted a Letter of Interest for external funding
- Engaged community or other research partners to develop or refine research questions, improve study design, interpret data, and develop policy recommendations, or other interventions
- Disseminated information about scholarly research in the media
- Participated in professional development activities that build research skills

Score Range	Label
5.0	Outstanding
4.0	Very Good
3.0	Good, Meets Expectations
2.0	Marginal
1.	Unacceptable

9.4 Evaluation of Service

Service varies widely among faculty but can be categorized as service to the School, to the University or College, and to entities outside of the University including the profession and the community. While no level of service is viewed as more important than the other, all faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the school through service, and to be good citizens within the school. There are four areas of service relevant to all social work faculty: 1) service to the unit, Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work, 2) service to the University and College, 3) service to the profession, and 4) service to the community including human service or other organizations. While no level of service is viewed as more important than the other, all faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the school through service. Excellence in service is defined by the following characteristics: **leadership** (faculty member holds a leadership or major role), **scope** (international or national service), **selection** (faculty member elected or appointed to role), **reputation** (faculty is asked to provide external reviews, promotion reviews for other institutions, journal editing or reviewing), **import or value-added** (service is related to significant needs of the school, college, or university – assessment, self-study, program review).

Some examples of service at the four domains can are listed below:

- Service to the Unit (AHZSSW)
  - Committee/Task Force Chair or membership
  - Administration: Continuing Education/Graduate/Undergraduate program area coordination
  - Program planning and development
  - Authors departmental reports or documents
  - Coordinates a special service (e.g., assessment planning)
  - Special projects relevant to the School's mission.
  - Sponsors a student organization
  a. Obtain grants to improve programs and curriculum
  a. Mentors' faculty and/or students in significant ways (e.g. Honors program, Fulbright, presentations)
  - Supports the strategic plan work
  - Continuing education presentation
- Service to the University/College
  - Committee/Task Force Chair or membership
  - Serves on Faculty Senate
  - Sponsors or presents at faculty seminars
- Service to the Profession
  - Holds office in professional organizations (international, national, state, local)
  - Plans a conference or conference chair

- o   Reviews conference proposals
- o   Presents or gives invited talks
- o   Reviewer or editor of a journal
- o   Consultant to national, state or local agencies
- o   Service on local, state, national or international commissions, advisory boards or agencies related to the profession
- Service to the Community
  - o   Serve on agency boards
  - o   Organize fundraising events for local agencies
  - o   Develop new or enhance existing community resources
  - o   Advocacy, social justice or community building work

Not all service activities involve the same degree of leadership and responsibility. For instance, some committees may be very active and involve a great deal of commitment of time and effort from members, while others may not be currently engaged in active projects. Faculty are encouraged to evaluate themselves on their service based on the time commitment, level of responsibility, leadership role, degree of engagement or effort, deliverables, or other indicators that demonstrate the value of the activity for the particular faculty member. Faculty should add rows to the evaluation to list each of their contributions in an area. For instance, if a faculty member is on three School committees, each should be listed and ranked separately as the value of each may differ.

Faculty are encouraged to add brief descriptions if desired and may be asked to provide evidence to support activities. Faculty should consider saving email confirmations or documents that can verify service activities that go beyond what would be considered common knowledge of Committee A regarding service responsibilities and efforts.

For those with administrative responsibility, administrative tasks often overlap with School service tasks. Given this overlap, administrators are, almost by definition, more involved in school service than are other faculty members unless assigned administrative duties. As such, expectations for such service are higher for those with administrative responsibility than for others. Release time from teaching is also extended to those with administrative service responsibilities. Evaluation weights should reflect the actual balance of work.

Evaluation of Service Rubric

Service Credit 1.0
School
Chairing Curriculum Committee, Serving on Committee A, program coordinators, coordinator of a research center
College/University
Chairing, Directing, a major committee such as, Advanced Programs, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate.
Service Beyond the University
Editor of a journal
Leadership or office in International, State or Local Organizations
Service Credit .75
School
Chairing, Directing, Coordinating a School Committee (other than Curriculum Committee or Committee A)

Substantial contribution to a major school activity (i.e., authoring a section of program review or self-study) **College/University** Elected or appointed member of a college or university committee. **Service Beyond the University** Appointment or committee member in International, National, State or Local Organization. Co-editor/associate editor of a journal
Service Credit .50
School Co-Chairing a Committee Chairing a committee that met fewer than 3 times per year Led a professional development session for faculty **College/University** Membership on a University/College Committee, Center or Program **Service Beyond the University** Leading or organizing a conference track Tenure/Promotion Dossier Review Member of an editorial board
Service Credit .25
School Committee membership Presentations to students, colleagues or a continuing education event Review of grant proposals for a school award **College/University** College or university wide presentations, workshops, or seminars Review of grant proposals for a university award **Service Beyond the University** Review of a book contract Peer review of conference abstracts (over 15 reviews) Review for a peer review journal Peer review of conference abstracts (less than 15 reviews) Editorial board membership Consultant/training/service to National, State, or Local Agencies

Score Range	Label
5.0	Outstanding
4.0	Very Good
3.0	Good, Meets Expectations
2.0	Marginal
1.	Unacceptable

9.5 Evaluation of Teaching

The School seeks faculty members who are committed to teaching and to fostering a spirit of intellectual interchange and inquiry. Evaluation of teaching at the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work

recognizes the varied contributions faculty members make in instruction. The school recognizes that teaching occurs in multiple contexts across multiple domains and evaluation must account for a varied and nuanced account of individual teaching contributions. Teaching excellence is defined within four domains: **professional, inclusive, engaged, and applied.** Evidence for performance in teaching is multi-dimensional and includes: **a teaching narrative, peer review, and a teaching activities checklist.**

Professional teaching refers to the pedagogical knowledge and organizational practices necessary to design and implement a high-quality course or field practicum experiences, as well as the ability to communicate course/fieldwork expectations and tasks to students. This is further operationalized as being readily available, coherently organized, and providing high quality course or field materials (i.e., syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, field contract guides and handouts, grading, and clear articulation of course/field policy expectations). This domain also includes respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate or critical feedback. Examples of the evaluation of professional domain of teaching are included in the faculty annual evaluation checklist, the university's student experience survey, and peer evaluations.

Inclusive Teaching refers to the engagement and valuing of every student and attending to the social and emotional climate of the class/field experience. Faculty members demonstrate inclusive practices, through intentional and deliberated actions about the way they present themselves, content in the classroom/field, ancillary course/field materials, and through actions that draw on the strengths and diverse identifies of social work students. Instructional practices that ensure all students can participate fully, that their participation is desired and appreciated is an important element of inclusivity in teaching. Examples of the evaluation of inclusive domain of teaching are included in the faculty annual evaluation checklist, the university's student experience survey, and peer evaluations.

Engaged Teaching. Engaged teachers participate in ongoing professional development, experimentation, and reflection about teaching practices, content, and experiences. Engaged teachers are also connected to university and school conversations about teaching and learning. They are also engaged in school processes of revision of courses, field work experiences, and teaching practices to improve and develop teaching. They can reflect on multiple sources of data for improving teaching across the curriculum. Examples of the evaluation of engaged domain of teaching are included in the faculty annual evaluation checklist, the university's student experience survey, and peer evaluations.

Applied teaching. Applied teaching refers to practices that facilitate student learning through the direct application of skills. Applied teaching allows opportunities for students to apply knowledge and skills and translate these skills into simulated or real practice situations. These activities are typically hands-on, experiential, creative, rooted in real world settings and problems, and are occasionally related to independent research or directed reading projects established between student and teacher. Field practicum work is an example of applied teaching, where a student undertakes practical experience in an agency/organization under the supervision of another professional and faculty member. Another example might be service learning or civic engagement projects that are imbedded into a course or independent research projects that enable learners to cultivate an original intellectual or creative contribution to a discipline. Finally, applied teaching can refer to the ethical and professional expectations of social work practice. Examples of the evaluation of applied domain of teaching are included in the faculty annual evaluation checklist, the university's student experience survey, and peer evaluations.

The University of Oklahoma uses a Student Experience Survey (SES) to solicit feedback on teaching in the classroom. The SES questions ask students to describe their experiences in the course rather than assess the instructor or quality of the instructor. The SES has 5 main sections. These include: **Student engagement** (student interactions, time spent in course), **Course organization** (ex. clear expectations, organization of the instructor and the course materials, instructor preparation). **Student Learning Experience:** (ex. benefit of assignments/readings, ability of instructor to explain purpose of course/value of material, methods used to deliver material), and **Learning Environment** (level of support, empowerment, feedback, safety, inclusivity, respect). Faculty are asked to reflect on these areas in their teaching narratives that are submitted during annual evaluation.

Evaluation of teaching is the most complex of the three areas of evaluation. Requirements include: a teaching narrative and trends in teaching data, a peer evaluation/or evidence of mentoring junior faculty, and submission teaching data (SES, Field evaluation data, peer evaluations) into the Faculty Activity System.

The following includes the teaching rubrics, and associated rating forms for assessing the teaching narrative, and peer evaluation. If a university peer evaluation is used, Committee A will assign a point value to that assessment as is used in school peer evaluations. Faculty may include other activities not listed in the narrative or checklists for consideration.

Calculation of Teaching Score

The annual teaching score is comprised of three components:

(1) Teaching Narrative and teaching trends: Faculty member completes this narrative, and this narrative is examined by Committee A and given a rating. This includes trends in teaching data.
(2) Peer evaluation: Faculty member is evaluated by a peer evaluator and provided a rating of (0-5) OR evidence of peer review/mentoring in teaching narrative (0-5).
(3) Teaching activities checklist: Faculty member completes the teaching activities checklist and the final score on the checklist is verified and used by Committee A.

Calculation of Teaching Score

ITEM	RANGE	RATER
Evaluation of Teaching Narrative & Trends in Teaching Data	0-5.0	Committee A
Peer evaluation or Evidence of Peer Review/Mentoring	0-5.0	Peer Evaluator (peer evaluation) Committee A (evidence in narrative)
Other teaching activities and contributions	Wide range, depending on level of activity by faculty*	Self-calculated, score verified by Committee A
Total teaching score (0-5, mean of the following) = Rating of teaching narrative (0-5) + Peer Evaluation/Mentoring (0-5) + Teaching Activities Checklist (converted to 0-5)		

*total score is then normed to 0-5 scale, if no peer evaluation is required, it is not included in the calculation of the total score

Score Range	Label
5.0	Outstanding
4.0	Very Good

3.0	Good, Meets Expectations
2.0	Marginal
1.	Unacceptable

OU Social Work Teaching Narrative and Checklist (OU Social Work-TNC)

Prior to completing the Teaching Narrative, please review your SES, Peer Evaluation, Field Liaison evaluations, and any other teaching related information that would inform your responses on your narrative. Please enter your narrative following each prompt.

Teaching Narrative & Teaching Trends			
Summary of Teaching Data			
Classroom Teaching **Include directed readings (with enrollment) below**			
Semester	**Course**	**Enrolled**	**Summary of student experiences**
SWK 5555-001 (format – OTG, online, hybrid)	**Name of Course**	**#**	**(example: Course organization was clear, instructor was prepared, course content was beneficial to learning, students were engaged and challenged. Learning environment was supportive, etc.) (could also include a couple of student quotes)**
Field Liaison			
Semester	**Course**	**Enrolled**	**Summary of student experiences (and score)**
Other teaching/mentorship of students not listed above (PHD student mentorship, directed readings, publishing or presenting with students, direct supervision of a GRA on grant or other project, or other activity not captured above)			
Activity	**Description**		
Rate and discuss the OVERALL data trends in the space below and provide examples from evaluation data. (Examples: how do you assess the trends on your student experience, peer evaluation, or other data? outstanding, very good, good, etc.) Is there one course that is better than another?			
Please briefly comment on the data you used to assess your teaching and learning (i.e. this could be the SES, peer evaluation, field evaluation data, your own evaluation, etc)			

Please rate your performance and contributions to the following areas of teaching: professional, inclusive, engaged, and applied.
How did you use data to improve your teaching or courses in the past year?
Peer mentoring of teaching (if applicable). Please describe the peer mentoring of regular or adjunct faculty in the area of teaching. (for example, peer review, support of junior or adjunct faculty in substantive ways)
Meets expectations: conducting one peer review of teaching, or evidence on one substantive mentorship activity in teaching domain
Next year: **What are your teaching for this next year?**

Committee A Teaching Narrative Rubric

5	**Use of Feedback:** Responded to feedback DURING the semester, along with actively reflecting on feedback to strengthen teaching in the classroom and field. Used additional resources to develop plans. Evidence of significant improvement and/or sustained excellence in the classroom or field. **Scope of Teaching:** Strong evidence of broad teaching contributions in most or all of these areas: teaching across levels or content areas (including field), interprofessional education, directed readings, independent studies, publishing/presenting with students, teaching in another department, serving on dissertation or theses committees, or any other teaching related activities. **Trends in Teaching Performance:** Trends in SES, field evaluations, and/or other data reveals excellent and strong performance in the classroom/field.
4	**Use of Feedback:** Identified areas of strength and areas for improvement. Used additional resources and/or supports to strengthen teaching. Evidence of improvement or sustained solid teaching in the classroom or field is evident. **Scope of Teaching:** Some evidence of broad teaching contributions in two or more of these areas: teaching across levels or content areas (including field), interprofessional education, directed readings, independent studies, publishing/presenting with students, teaching in another department, serving on dissertation or theses committees, or any other teaching related activities. **Trends in Teaching Performance:** Trends in SES, field evaluations, and/or other data reveals very good performance in the classroom/field.
3	**Use of Feedback:** Analyzed feedback from multiple sources to <u>assess</u> teaching and course goals, along with good evidence of self-reflection, including discussion of tangible ways for improvement in the classroom or field. **Scope of Teaching:** Some evidence of consistent teaching contributions in one or more of the following areas: teaching across levels or content areas (including field), interprofessional education, directed readings, independent studies, publishing/presenting with students, teaching

	in another department, serving on dissertation or theses committees, or any other teaching related activities. **Trends in Teaching Performance:** Trends in SES, field evaluations, and/or other data reveals good performance in the classroom/field.
2	**Use of Feedback:** Evidence of analyzing student or peer feedback results demonstrated, along with some evidence illustrating self-reflection on teaching or plans for improvement in the classroom or field demonstrated **Scope of Teaching:** Minimal evidence of evidence of teaching contributions in one or more of the following areas: teaching across levels or content areas (including field), interprofessional education, directed readings, independent studies, publishing/presenting with students, teaching in another department, serving on dissertation or theses committees, or any other teaching related activities. **Trends in Teaching Performance:** Trends in SES, field evaluations, and/or other data reveals problematic performance in one course/field liaison section taught by faculty member.
1	**Use of Feedback:** Minimally analyzed student or peer feedback results demonstrated, or some level of evidence illustrating self-reflection on teaching or plans for improvement in the classroom or field demonstrated. **Scope of Teaching:** Minimal or no evidence of evidence of teaching contributions in one or more of the following areas: teaching across levels or content areas (including field), interprofessional education, directed readings, independent studies, publishing/presenting with students, teaching in another department, serving on dissertation or theses committees, or any other teaching related activities. **Trends in Teaching Performance: Trends in Teaching Performance:** Trends in SES, field evaluations, and/or other data reveals problematic performance in more than one course/field liaison section taught by faculty member.
0	**Use of Feedback:** Did not analyze student or peer feedback to <u>assess</u> teaching and course goals related to improvement in the classroom or field

OU Social Work Peer Evaluation of Teaching (OUSW-PET)

9.6 Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A peer evaluation of teaching is a written assessment of a class observation (or recorded online course) or field teaching related activity. This evaluation often includes ancillary teaching materials such as the syllabus, Canvas Course Site, and other supporting documents or information provided by the faculty member. The goal of a peer review of teaching is to provide an opportunity for experienced faculty members to both support and improve faculty teaching efforts and the teaching mission of the school.

The following are teaching practices considered suitable for peer review:
- Classroom-based teaching (both face-to-face and synchronous online), or pre-recorded sessions
- Teaching or leading field labs
- Teaching or facilitating a simulation
- Leading or presenting material during a field orientation and/or other field related trainings
- Field unit meetings, seminars, or other trainings
- Other related teaching-based activities (special trainings, guest lectures)

FP 18Click here to enter text.

Recommended Schedule of Peer Evaluations

Instructors	Ranked Renewable	Tenure Track
• Instructors: one per year until promotion to associate • Associate Instructors: 1-3 until promotion • Distinguished Instructor/Lecturer: as needed	• Clinical Assistant Professor: one per year until promotion to associate • Clinical Associate Professors: 1-2 peer evaluations until promotion to full • Clinical Full Professors: as needed	• Assistant professors: one per year until promotion to associate • Associate Professors: 1-2 peer evaluations until promotion to full • Full Professors: as needed

Recommended Process for Conducting Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations are conducted by experienced faculty at a higher rank. For teaching, this means that that rank is more relevant in the qualification for evaluating teaching than tenure. Experienced teaching faculty within the school are defined as Associate and Full (tenure track) Professors, Associate and Full Clinical (ranked renewable term) Faculty members, and Associate and Distinguished Instructors & Lecturers (or Instructors with 3 or more years of teaching experience).

Process

The faculty member who requires an evaluation should communicate with an experienced teaching faculty and request that they conduct a peer evaluation. A mutual time and date are established.

The evaluating faculty member should be provided with the following:

- Syllabi, PowerPoints, in-class exercises, or other materials developed by the faculty member for instruction
- Access to the course on Canvas. Since OU expects for syllabi (at a minimum) to be posted on Canvas and most professors use canvas for the organization of course materials, it is recommended that the peer evaluation include a scan of the Canvas site. To accomplish this the faculty member under review should add their reviewer to the site as a "Teaching Assistant" and unenroll them when the review is submitted.
- The date, time, and location (or link) to the teaching event

In all cases, peer reviewers should be introduced or introduce themselves to the class and explain that they are there as part of the school and university's ongoing efforts to get feedback and improve the teaching mission. In the case of small group exercises or breakout rooms in zoom, ensure the evaluator is assigned to a group so that they can observe the activity.

Ideally, the evaluator and the faculty would meet two times. First, a brief meeting to orient the evaluator to the course, ensure the evaluator has access to all necessary class times and materials. It should also include a brief overview of the faculty members' teaching goals and specific areas of feedback requested. Some suggested questions/topics for this meeting might include overview of the

course and specific strengths or challenges, general teaching goals and areas of focus, ideas regarding student learning and efforts to foster learning, etc.

The second meeting would be to review the written peer evaluation. The second meeting should focus on the strengths and suggested areas for teaching improvement. The evaluator should ask the faculty member what they (or the school) could do to help them with teaching.

The faculty being reviewed should be able to provide corrections to any factual errors in the written peer review and be provided the opportunity to acknowledge with their signature that they have read the review. Then, one copy of the written peer review, signed and dated by the reviewer shall be formally submitted into FAS and retained by the faculty member. All written peer reviews (and any responses) shall be included in the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching for the purpose of annual evaluation, contract renewal, promotion and/or tenure, and are to be carefully reviewed by Committee A.

The suggested template for the Peer Evaluation is included below.

OUSSW: Peer Review of Teaching Form OUSSW-PRT

Faculty Reviewed Click or tap here to enter text.
Faculty Evaluator Click or tap here to enter text.
Teaching activity description (name, type, level, etc.)
Click or tap here to enter text.
Did the instructor design the course/activity themselves, or is it a shared syllabus/curriculum used by multiple instructors across sections?
Click or tap here to enter text.
What modality is the teaching activity (face to face, remote, recording, online/asynchronous)?
If applicable, what parts of the Canvas course site did you review?
Click or tap here to enter text.
What other materials were you provided for review?
Click or tap here to enter text.

For each teaching domain, include multiple sources of evidence, including observations from the review of the teaching activity as well as the Canvas course site, materials provided by the faculty member, etc. Evaluating faculty should refer to the examples of activities within the domains of excellent teaching at the end of this document.
Professional Teaching:
Demonstration of knowledge, skills, and practices that facilitate a high-quality learning experience. This includes the ability to communicate course/fieldwork expectations to students.
Please provide 1-2 examples of professional teaching and any areas noted for improvement.
Examples observed:

Recommendations for improvement:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Inclusive Teaching:
Demonstration of effective engagement and inclusion of each student and attending to the social and emotional climate of the class/field experience.

Please provide 1-2 examples of inclusive teaching practices and any areas noted for improvement.
Examples observed

Recommendations for improvement Click or tap here to enter text.

Engaged Teaching
Demonstration of ongoing professional development, experimentation, and reflection about teaching practices, content, and experiences.

Please provide 1-2 examples of engaged teaching practices and any areas noted for improvement.
Examples observed:

Recommendations for improvement:
Click or tap here to enter text.

Applied Teaching
Demonstration of teaching practices that facilitate student learning through direct application of skills. This includes opportunities for students to apply knowledge and skills and translate those skills into simulated or real practice situations.

Please provide 1-2 examples of applied teaching practices and any areas noted for improvement.
Examples observed:

Recommendations for improvement: Click or tap here to enter text.

Summary

Please provide an overall score of your assessment of teaching/field work contributions of faculty member:

Outstanding 5 ☐	Very Good 4 ☐	Good, Meets Expectations 3 ☐	Needs improvement 2 ☐	Poor, Marginal 1 ☐

Peer Evaluator Signature
Date Click or tap to enter a date.

Faculty Member Signature Click or tap here to enter text.
Date Click or tap to enter a date.

9.7 Annual Evaluation Checklist

Faculty:
Please indicate the number of products, points, and location on the three checklists below. Under 'documentation location', indicate where evidence of the activity can be found (for example brief name and location (CV, MV, teaching narrative, etc)

Scholarship Checklist		
Scholarly Product Value 1	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
Awarded external research grant (for each year of grant), > $1,000,000 Abbreviated list: (for example: Publication, authors, journal name Or PI Grant name amount)		
Awarded external research grant > $50,000 (first year only), Abbreviated list:		
Awarded training grant/program development grant > $50,000 (first year only) Abbreviated list:		
Published a peer-reviewed journal article as one of first four authors Abbreviated list:		
Published an academic book Abbreviated list:		
Delivered invited keynote presentation at national or international conference Abbreviated list:		
Published an instructor's manual to accompany academic text Abbreviated list:		
Received a scholarly award Abbreviated list:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Scholarly Product Value .75	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
Awarded external research grant any amount < $50,000 (second year and each successive year of grant) Abbreviated list:		
Awarded training grants/program development grants < $50,000 Abbreviated list:		
Delivered invited keynote presentation at state or local conference Abbreviated list:		
Published a peer-reviewed journal article as author five or later Abbreviated list:		
Published a peer-reviewed research monograph or research report Abbreviated list:		
Published a chapter in a peer-reviewed book Abbreviated list:		

	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
Presented at peer reviewed national or international conference (Max 2, additional presentations count as .25) Abbreviated list:		
Submission of book to publisher Abbreviated list:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Scholarly Product Value	**Count**	**Documentation Location (CV, FAS)**
Awarded external research grant (Second year and on), > $50,000 Abbreviated list:		
Awarded training grant/program development grant (second year and on), > $50,000 Abbreviated list:		
Awarded internal grant, any amount Abbreviated list:		
Published (non-peer reviewed) research report/technical monograph, papers or book chapters Abbreviated list:		
Published a book review in a peer-reviewed journal Abbreviated list:		
Submission of book contract to publisher Abbreviated list:		
Presented at peer reviewed state or regional conference Abbreviated list:		
Submitted book revision to author Abbreviated list:		
Submitted peer reviewed article for publication Abbreviated list:		
Submitted grant proposal Abbreviated list:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Scholarly Product Value .25	**Count**	**Documentation Location (CV, FAS)**
Published editorials or research comments in peer-reviewed professional or academic publication. Abbreviated list:		
Published contributions to scholarly blogs Abbreviated list:		
Published instructional software/computer program/non-print media/therapeutic games or interventions Abbreviated list:		
Submitted presentation for peer-viewed academic, professional, or pedagogical meeting Abbreviated list:		
Submitted a Letter of Interest for external funding Abbreviated list:		

Engaged community or other research partners to develop or refine research questions, improve study design, interpret data, and develop policy recommendations, or other interventions Abbreviated list:		
Disseminated information about scholarly research in the media Abbreviated list:		
Participated in professional development activities that build research skills Abbreviated list:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
TOTAL		

Please use the space below to capture any additional data or information for Committee A:

Service Checklist		
Service Credit 1.0	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
School: Chairing Curriculum Committee, Serving on Committee A, program coordinators, coordinator of a research center Abbreviated list:		
College/University: Chairing, Directing, a major committee such as, Advanced Programs, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate. Abbreviated list:		
Service Beyond the University: Editor of a journal, leadership or office in International, State or Local Organizations Abbreviated list:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Service Credit .75	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
School: Chairing, Directing, Coordinating a School Committee (other than Curriculum Committee or Committee A) Substantial contribution to a major school activity (i.e., authoring a section of program review or self-study) Abbreviated list:		
College/University: Elected or appointed member of a college or university committee. Abbreviated list:		

	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
Service Beyond the University: Appointment or committee member in International, National, State or Local Organization, co-editor/associate editor of a journal Abbreviated list:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Service Credit .50	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
School: Co-Chairing a Committee, Chairing a committee that met fewer than 3 times per year, Led a professional development session for faculty Abbreviated list:		
College/University: Membership on a University/College Committee, Center or Program Abbreviated list:		
Service Beyond the University: Leading or organizing a conference track, Tenure/Promotion Dossier Review, member of an editorial board. Abbreviated list:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Service Credit .25	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
School: Committee membership, Presentations to students, colleagues or a continuing education event, Review of grant proposals for a school award Abbreviated list:		
College/University: College or university wide presentations, workshops, or seminars; Review of grant proposals for a university award Abbreviated list:		
Service Beyond the University: Review of a book contract: Peer review of conference abstracts (over 15 reviews): Review for a peer review journal; : Peer review of conference abstracts (less than 15 reviews): Consultant or Service to National, State, or Local Agencies Abbreviated list:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
TOTAL		
Please use the space below to capture any additional data or information for Committee A:		

Teaching Activities Checklist		
Teaching Product Value 1	Count	Documentation Location (CV, FAS)
Receipt of a university of college level teaching award Brief description of activity:		

High level contributions to advisement and/or mentoring students Brief description of activity:		
Teaching Product Value .75	**Count**	**Documentation Location (CV, FAS)**
Unit teaching award/recognition Brief description of activity:		
Major (>50%) course revision Brief description of activity:		
New Syllabus developed Brief description of activity:		
Development of new simulation Brief description of activity:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Teaching Product Value .50	**Count**	**Documentation Location (CV, FAS)**
Good contributions to advisement and/or mentoring students noted in teaching narrative Brief description of activity:		
New course preparation Brief description of activity:		
Developed new master course assignment Brief description of activity:		
Application of new teaching method in course Brief description of activity:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Teaching Product Value .25	**Count**	**Documentation Location (CV, FAS)**
Professional development training relative to classroom instruction (Max of 5 activities) Brief description of activity:		
Development of a new field placement (Max of 5) Brief description of activity:		
Minor (<50%) course text/materials or course reading changes Brief description of activity:		
Minor (<50%) course revision Brief description of activity:		
Use of simulation in course Brief description of activity:		
Providing instructional support to community faculty Brief description of activity:		
Other (not listed): Description:		
Total		
Please use the space below to capture any additional data or information for Committee A:		

10.0 Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures