



**To:** TT Math Faculty

**From:** Esther Billings

**Re:** Instructions for 2023 Annual Evaluation – including submission of Faculty Workload Report (FWR)

**Date:** December 8, 2023

[link to this memo](#)

The purpose of this memo is to provide details about information to include for submission for our annual evaluation (merit review) which includes submission of your 2023 Faculty Workload Report (FWR—formerly called Faculty Activity Report or FAR), CV, and optional supplementary materials. Email your FWR, CV, and any supplementary materials as separate PDF file attachments to Ana ([vanbraga@gvsu.edu](mailto:vanbraga@gvsu.edu)) by **5PM on Friday, January 12.**

**Creating the FWR (Faculty Workload Report) form:** Access the FWR form on Digital Measures (renamed watermark:faculty success) [here](#): Log in using your GVSU credential. Add in relevant activities related to 2023.

**Teaching:** When you fill in teaching (for calendar year) include sp/su if you taught and be sure to also note workload credit for math ed courses since it is different from published credits and indicate workload credit of 0 (workload 0 - counted as significant focus) if you taught a course for significant focus)

**Reflections:** Scroll to the bottom of the main page, click Reflections, and click Add New to create a 2023 FWR entry. Add “reflections” for each section of the FWR. You must enter your reflections in Digital Measures.

**Run Report:** From the main menu page, select the button “rapid reports” located on the top right and then choose Faculty Activity Report - University to generate the report.

#### Overview of Process:

- **Documents to Refer To:** The 2023 FWR will be used for annual evaluation procedures ([SG 3.07](#)) In our 11/29/23 TT department meeting, we voted to waive the right of peer review and we updated the annual review evaluation criteria. We will continue to use our [Procedures for Annual Evaluation of Regular Faculty \(v1.4\)](#) to guide our process. Please read through this document to familiarize yourself with the merit review process and what is required. Criteria for annual merit evaluation can be found in the newly revised Section IV the [Evaluation Standards and Criteria for Personnel and Annual Review](#) (v4.1, starting at bottom of p.7). The Merit Review Committee (MRC) (Lauren, Akalu, Jon, Matt and Esther) will review your materials as outlined in our [procedures](#) document.
- **Materials to Submit:**
  - **FWR:** Download 2023 Faculty Workload Report (FWR), then save as PDF file titled (last name-2023FWR) and email to Ana along with your additional files (updated CV and any supplemental materials):
  - **CV:** The CV you submit should include work from at least the last 5 years (as relevant)
  - **MRC Conversation (optional):** If you are interested, please fill out this [short survey](#). In addition, when emailing your FWR, CV, and (optional) supplementary materials to Ana, also indicate in your email whether or not you plan to sign up for a MRC conversation. This will expedite the scheduling process.

The memo's following pages provide reminders of what to include. Please let me know if you have questions.

**MRC Recommendations:** Here are a few highlighted points from our [procedures](#) and MRC recommendations to keep in mind as you create your FWR and any supplementary material

- **Numbered Criteria:** For your convenience, the MRC has numbered the items in the evaluation criteria tables so that if you want to refer to criteria directly, you can cite the associated number.
  - [Numbered Teaching Evaluation Criteria](#)
  - [Numbered Scholarship Criteria](#)
  - [Numbered Service Criteria](#)
- **Describe/Elaborate on** any activities/times spent on activities the MRC might be unfamiliar with, either by providing detail on the FWR or explaining via supplementary material.
- **Teaching Reflection** (Include in FWR reflection—and/or as part of reflection in supplementary material)  
**Criteria:** Professors are expected to demonstrate effective teaching and several aspects of teaching excellence; Associate Professors are expected to demonstrate effective teaching and at least one characteristic of excellent teaching; and Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate many of the qualities of effective teaching. All faculty should also reflect on trends in LIFT surveys within and between courses.  
**To help the MRC find evidence that you have met expectations, please include the following structure for your teaching reflections:**
  - *[required for all faculty]* In 2023, I demonstrated characteristics of effective teaching in the following ways:
  - *[associate professors need at least one; full professors need several; optional for assistant professors];* In 2023, I demonstrated these characteristics of excellence in teaching:
  - In your structure above, use the teaching criteria on pp. 11-12 in our [Evaluation Standards & Criteria for Personnel & Annual Review \(numbered version\)](#) to frame your discussion. It is helpful to MRC reviewers when faculty quote criteria directly. *For example, if you want to highlight ways you have focused on “developing students problem-solving skills and problem-approach behaviors”, you can either quote or index the criteria (A.III.5)*
  - Analyze/reflect over student LIFT feedback, noting any themes and areas of strength or improvement. Be sure to include a response to significant patterns of concern raised in student evaluations and provide context from which to interpret those student concerns. [\(III.9a\)](#)
  - Describe aspects of your teaching over the past year that you believe have been most successful in promoting student understanding and engagement.
- **Reassigned Time (RT):** Report of results of reassigned time (as relevant) [\(III.9d\)](#) and discuss progress made and/or results of RT work
- **Follow Up on Prior WPS Feedback:** Please comment on progress made to address any recommendations specified in your written performance summary from the previous two years, if applicable [\(III.9e\)](#)
- **Significant Focus (SF):** Report significant focus (SF) progress or results from W23 and F23. Include a description of how SF time was used, including the number of credit hours for each category used and outcomes [\(III.9c\)](#). If your FAP/FWP (F23) plans were modified, note changes (and describe how you utilized your SF).
- **Scholarship:** Indicate scope and work done related to scholarship in 2023.
- **Service:** Indicate scope and work done related to service in 2023.

### Submit any relevant supplementary material.

- For more information about optional supplementary materials, see the [Procedures for Evaluation of Annual Faculty \(III.7\)](#) . This [link has a sample of supplementary material](#) (submitted in 2022 to extend a reflection about teaching and make a case for exemplary and used with permission).
- **Exemplary:** As per [Procedures, III.9e](#), faculty members are responsible for making the case for an exemplary rating by explaining what accomplishment satisfies the criteria for an exemplary rating see [Evaluation doc, IV.A-F](#) (you may do this in writing as part of the supplementary material or sign up for a MRC conversation with members of the MRC). See [link for supplementary material including exemplary rationale](#) (on p.2 from last year—shared with permission); please use the [numbering system in this document](#) to indicate clearly which criteria you believe you have met. For example, if you got a teaching award, write “T.1: I received a teaching award” and then provide details.

A note about interpretation of “exemplary” through publication: a publication does not automatically mean an exemplary rating. Remember, if you are getting significant focus in scholarship, it is expected you will be disseminating your work and will have at least one product from the Advancement of Knowledge category for every accumulated 18 significant credits.

### Sign Up for Merit Review Committee (MRC) Conversation (Optional):

- You also have the opportunity to sign up for a conversation with members of the MRC. Purposes of a MRC formal conversation include: discussion of how you've met criteria, reflection over challenges, rationale for exemplary rating, or providing clarifying information. Esther Billings, Matt Boelkins, or Jon Hasenbank will facilitate these conversations, and the MRC subgroup (3 members) will be present for each conversation. More information on MRC conversations is given in [IV.4](#) ( top of page 3). If interested, sign up for a MRC conversation no later than January 12, 5pm by [completing this short survey](#). You will receive a followup response assigning you a particular date and time. If you have any questions about the conversations, contact Esther or a member of the Merit Review Committee.