



To: TT Math Faculty

From: Esther Billings

Re: Instructions for 2024 Annual Evaluation and submission of Faculty Workload Report (FWR)

Date: December 16, 2024

[link](#) to this memo

Purpose: 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 2024 Faculty Workload Report (FWR), CV, and optional supplementary materials. Email your FWR, CV, and any supplementary materials as separate PDF file attachments to Ana (vanbraga@gvsu.edu) **no later than 5PM on Wednesday, January 15.** **For planning purposes,** please let us know if you would like to request a MRC Conversation no later than **Friday, January 12** via this [survey link](#).

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 2024.

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. 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 2024 FWR entry. Add “reflections” for each section of the FWR. You must enter your reflections in Digital Measures and follow the character limits.

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

FWR Readability: After downloading the FWR report, (a) you may delete any empty headings (headings without activities) before saving the document as a PDF; (b) your 2024 FWP (Faculty Workload Plan) text is automatically included in the exported FWR report by Digital Measures. This text must be retained in the final document (c) Some faculty members have chosen to change the font color of the FWP text to differentiate it from the FWR reflections. While this is not required, the MRC appreciates efforts to enhance the readability of the report.

Overview of Process:

- **Documents to Reference:** The 2024 FWR will be used for annual evaluation procedures ([SG 3.07](#)) In our 11/11/24 TT department meeting, we voted to waive the right of peer review. We will 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 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, Filiz, Jon, Matt and Esther) will review your materials as outlined in our [procedures](#) document.
- **Materials to Submit:**
 - **FWR:** Download 2024 Faculty Workload Report (FWR), then save as PDF file titled (last name-2024-FWR) 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 interested please fill out this [short survey](#) by Friday, 1/12** (note earlier deadline than FWR deadline – needed for planning purposes). 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 For Preparing/Writing FWR

Below 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 you can more easily refer to criteria directly and 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.

Reflection Word Limit: Please follow the word limit specified in the Digital Measures FWR template.

TEACHING SECTION

Teaching Reflection must be included in the FWR reflection—and you have the option to add additional reflection on teaching in supplementary material.

Reflection Model/Example: See [this link for an example of a teaching reflection](#) (shared with permission) incorporating criteria/points outlined below. In this example, there is a thoughtful reflection on teaching—including reflection on things that didn't go as smoothly as expected—and the teaching practices/approaches are explicitly tied to the standards.

Teaching 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 reflect on any trends in LIFT surveys within and between courses.

- 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.
- To assist the MRC in identifying evidence that you have met expectations, you may consider using the following structure for your teaching reflections:
 - *[For all faculty] In 2024, I demonstrated characteristics of effective teaching in the following ways:*
 - *[optional for assistant professors; at least one for associate professors, and several for full professors] In 2024, I demonstrated these characteristics of excellence in teaching:*

OTHER SECTIONS OF FWR

- **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 W24 and F24. Include a description of how SF time was used, including scope of the work, the number of credit hours for each category used, and outcomes ([III.9c](#)). If your FWP 24 plans were modified and don't match what was imported into your SF section of the report, note changes including number of credit hours and describe how you utilized your SF).
- **Scholarship:** Indicate scope and work done related to scholarship in 2024.
- **Service:** Indicate scope and work done related to service in 2024.

SUBMIT ANY RELEVANT SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL.

- For more information about optional supplementary materials, see the [Procedures for Evaluation of Annual Faculty](#) ([III.7](#)) .
- **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 an exemplary rationale](#) (from 2022–shared with permission); please use the Exemplary [numbering system in this document](#) to indicate clearly which criteria you believe you have met. For example, if you received 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.

(Optional) SIGN UP FOR MERIT REVIEW COMMITTEE (MRC) CONVERSATION:

You have the option 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 follow-up 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.