

# Guidelines for PDP/PDR Process

---

## Introduction

The following guidelines are intended to assist faculty in preparing their professional development materials as well as assist departments in their role in the process. No information presented here supersedes the guidelines for evaluation given in Appendix G of the MnSCU/IFO Master Agreement, but rather is meant to supplement the examples and suggestions given in that document.

As part of the Professional Development Report, faculty members are asked to submit evidence. Please remember that evidence is in support of the narrative and should be included for the purpose of illuminating and/or documenting a claim. It is highly recommended to avoid the unnecessary inclusion of material that does not illuminate beyond the narrative. Additionally, please remember that PDPs/PDRs constitute a goal setting and reporting process and should not become such unwieldy documents that the process of preparing them interferes with the ability to accomplish the work itself.

In the feedback from the dean, a faculty member should expect to receive an overall assessment in each criterion as **meeting**, **not meeting**, or **exceeding expectations**. Below is some general advice on how to meet (or exceed) expectations in each category.

## Criterion 1

Each faculty member is asked to provide evidence of effective teaching. The type and nature of the evidence provided is at the discretion of the individual faculty member. However, in order to meet expectations in this category, a faculty member must:

1. Obtain some form of feedback on their teaching (e.g. students evaluations, peer evaluation, SCOT program, etc.).
2. Analyze and reflect on that feedback.
3. Describe appropriate changes implemented as a result of that feedback.

Additional analysis of student learning and continuous improvement of courses is also highly recommended. A faculty member may exceed expectations in the category through such analysis as well as through particularly difficult assignments, demonstrated commitment to the classroom and other avenues.

## Criterion 2

Research, Scholarly and Creative Achievements are considered broadly in this category. However, the department plays a large role in establishing acceptable levels of Criterion 2 activity. A dean simply cannot be an expert in each and every field within a college. As such, departments are asked to use their feedback in the PDP/PDR process to assist the faculty member in describing how that individual's research fits into the larger scheme of the discipline as well as comment on the quality and quantity of that work.

In order to meet expectations in this category, a faculty member must have work that contributes sufficiently to their discipline and demonstrate a commitment to disseminating that work to appropriate forums (e.g. publications, grant related activity, presentations, etc.). In some disciplines and for some faculty, contract activity, grant funding, industry projects, and applications of knowledge may supersede new knowledge creation and publications. Such a case would need to be made by a faculty member and their department.

### **Criterion 3**

All faculty members are expected to continue to develop as professionals and to document the steps taken towards that development in Criterion 3. In order to meet expectations in this category, a faculty member must demonstrate that they are continuing their development as both a teacher and a scholar.

Such reporting can include a listing of workshops and conferences attended, papers refereed, and other defined activities, but may also include a narrative description of certain activities, such as journals read, collaborations, and other less concrete endeavors. A description or analysis of how each activity supports future development is ideal.

### **Criterion 4**

Contribution to student growth generally refers to a faculty member's role in impacting student development outside of their normal teaching assignment. Factors that relate to meeting expectations in this category include:

1. Meeting department needs in areas such as undergraduate advising, advising of Master's papers, mentoring undergraduate research, advising student groups, and mentoring students engaged in competitions to name a few.
2. Mentoring students in their growth as professionals.

Many Criterion 4 accomplishments may count in other categories as well, particularly Criteria 5 and 2.

### **Criterion 5**

Like Criteria 4, a faculty member is minimally asked to demonstrate they are contributing to a well-functioning department in order to demonstrate the meeting of expectations. Over time, as a faculty member develops and attains higher rank, it is expected that the PDP/PDR will include leadership opportunities (e.g. chairing department committees, participating in college/university committees and task forces, etc.) as well as activities that further the department's curriculum and programmatic needs.

Our work in serving the region in terms of K-12 outreach as well as partnering with regional and national industry is certainly very appropriate as well. Such external activities and/or substantial university leadership can lead to being categorized as exceeding expectations.