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The current study consisted of a comparison of Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS) developed in 2001 and 2008 for the evaluation of the performance of faculty in the Western Kentucky University Psychology Department. BARS generally are less susceptible to various types of rating error than are other rating formats, and are highly relevant to the target job because they utilize behavioral examples of performance. Furthermore, BARS development requires the participation of job incumbents. In both 2001 and 2008, Psychology Department faculty members were involved in every phase of the development process of the BARS instruments addressed in the current study.

The new BARS format contains five broad categories of performance with 12 redefined performance dimensions within these categories. The faculty identified a number of new behavioral exemplars for each performance dimension. The new BARS offers several benefits over the previous BARS. Faculty, particularly newer faculty not involved in developing the 2001 format, should be more satisfied with the new instrument; faculty should perceive both the development process and the resulting instrument to be fair; and faculty should consider the instrument to be more valid because of their direct involvement in providing the content. Future research should be conducted to directly assess faculty perceptions of the BARS instrument and development process.
Evaluating Faculty Performance: A Comparison of Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales Developed for Western Kentucky University Psychology Department Faculty

Organizations are charged with the responsibility of evaluating their employees. Institutions of higher education have the need to evaluate their faculty members for many of the same reasons that private industry evaluates employees. University departments have the responsibility of ensuring faculty members perform to the standards necessary for accomplishing organizational objectives (Miller, Finley, & Vancko, 2000; Plater, 2001; Whitehead, Grider, Pritchard, & Spikes, 1998). Faculty evaluation, while very important for faculty who have not yet received tenure, also is important for maintaining good performance in faculty who have received tenure. Post-tenure review is concerned with evaluating faculty performance after a faculty member has received tenure at an institution. Faculty evaluation appraises the performance of a faculty member on a variety of dimensions, typically including teaching, research, and service (Dilts, Haber, & Bialik, 1994).

The present study involves the comparison of two appraisal instruments developed for the purpose of evaluating the performance of faculty members across different sub-disciplines within a psychology department. I first will discuss evaluating faculty performance, both before and after receiving tenure, followed by a brief presentation of the literature on performance appraisal. Particular emphasis will be given to the development and usefulness of behaviorally anchored rating scales, the type of formats that were developed and utilized in the current study. Additionally, the literature on organizational justice, particularly procedural and distributive justice will be reviewed as it relates to the process of developing a performance appraisal instrument.
Introduction to Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal is important to the successful functioning of organizations. As such, it is necessary to appreciate why and how performance appraisal should be used. Evaluating individual performance within an organization or an institution serves a variety of important functions for both the individual and the organization. Schneier and Beatty (1979) defined performance evaluation as the process of observing, identifying, measuring, and developing human behavior and performance in an organization. French (1974) defined performance appraisal as a process of continuous evaluation of the contributions made by individuals and groups working within an organization. French listed several uses for performance appraisal data including making decisions concerning training, pay increases, promotions, and discipline. Latham and Wexley (1994) considered counseling and developing employees in ways that increase their productivity and that maintain successful workplace behavior to be the key reasons for using performance appraisal. Schein (1988) identified four principal reasons for using performance appraisal:

1) to make personnel decisions (e.g., promotion, selection, transfers, termination, etc.);
2) to ensure that the right number of people and right mix of talents are in the organization for the future;
3) to identify employee developmental needs and to facilitate career counseling;
4) to improve employee productivity and performance.

Schein (1988) summarized the performance evaluation process as observations of employee behavior which are compared to some criteria that have incorporated distinct
levels of good, average, and poor performance; through this process a judgment of that behavior is made.

Within an organization it is particularly important for human resources management to have a well developed means of assessing employee performance to ensure that employees are as productive as they can be (Latham & Wexley, 1994). Two common methods of evaluating employee performance are through the use of either trait scales or cost-related outcomes. Trait scales, a frequently used approach, measure individual performance according to the degree to which the individual exhibits certain traits such as commitment, initiative, cooperation, leadership, or others (Latham & Wexley, 1994). This type of evaluation format is relatively easy to develop and can be used across essentially all levels of positions within an organization. However, this method of assessing performance is ambiguous at best, and individuals involved in assigning the ratings on the traits often exhibit low levels of agreement. Additionally, trait-based scales frequently are not directly job-related and, as such, are poor in comparison to other methods of performance appraisal (Schneier & Beatty, 1979). Cost-related outcomes, on the other hand, are quantitatively based, using bottom-line results for the organization such as profits and costs as measures of an employee’s performance.

A third approach to employee evaluation is behavior based. Appraisal measures based on specific job behaviors take into account the complexities of the work, including aspects of the job that are out of the control of the employee, more effectively than do trait scales or cost-related outcomes. Behavior specific appraisal systems are related to what the employee actually does on the job (Latham & Wexley, 1994). Raters may be able to provide more accurate ratings of individuals when evaluating specific behaviors
because the vagueness associated with the use of trait scales is avoided (Guion, 1998; Schneier & Beatty, 1979). Latham and Wexley also acknowledged that behaviorally based appraisal systems are effective in that they specify what an employee actually did to justify, for example, promotion or termination, while additionally identifying what an employee should or should not do to merit such outcomes. Furthermore, behavior-based appraisal systems appear to offer more specific feedback to employees and, subsequently, improvement in employee performance (Schneier & Beatty, 1979).

French (1974) recognized the need for a high degree of systemization in performance appraisal methods that are being used for such purposes as promotions and pay increases. He identified three key reasons for this need:

1) performance is reviewed over a period of time, not just current opinions about an employee;

2) any action resulting from the evaluation, if considered unfair, may result in defensive behavior on the part of the individual being appraised;

3) criteria for evaluation should include inputs from the individuals using the system and the individuals being rated in order to appear relevant.

Maroney and Buckley (1992) asserted that in order for a performance appraisal process to be successful, it must be participative, goal-oriented, and task-relevant.

Burke, Deszca, and Weitzel (1982) found that subordinate job level plays an important role in perceptions of the performance evaluation process and appraisal interview. They suggested that organizational level is significant because individuals at different levels in an organization have different expectations, goals, degree of participation in their work settings, and norms by which they evaluate their experiences.
In addition, these factors will influence how employees perceive their supervisor. Burke et al.'s study emphasized the role that individual differences may play in the performance evaluation process and interview.

The literature suggests that performance appraisal is necessary and beneficial for both the employee and the organization. Evaluating employee performance can benefit the individual by providing feedback and opportunities for advancement. At the organizational level, effective performance appraisal may lead to improved productivity on the part of the employee. The current study is concerned with evaluating faculty performance in a university. The next section reviews how faculty members are evaluated, in what areas their performance is assessed, and who typically evaluates faculty member performance.

Evaluating Faculty Performance

Formally evaluating the performance and work of faculty peers can be an unpleasant and difficult task, especially for department chairs. Many universities have unclear expectations and standards regarding faculty performance, which can be a considerable problem (Shedd, 2005). The formality of evaluating faculty performance has increased due to increased litigation and threat of litigation stemming from matters concerning course sufficiency and teacher's rights (Centra, 1979). Faculty members may resist ratings from administrators because they feel that successful teaching characteristics are indefinable and difficult to measure (Seldin, 1999; Centra, 1979). Shedd stated that vagueness and discomfort in the evaluation process can be eliminated by incorporating input from faculty members in the development of the performance
criteria. Miller, Finley, and Vancko (2000) expressed that it is imperative for faculty members to be involved in creating the procedures to enhance evaluation processes.

Dilts, Haber, and Bialik (1994) defined faculty performance evaluation “as a system of activities with specific individual and often organizational goals, identified rewards and sometimes punishments for individuals, substantive criteria upon which to determine whether goals have been attained, and procedures whereby evidence is gathered to which criteria will be applied to reach specific decisions” (p. 4). Appraisal of faculty performance is necessary for making personnel decisions and ultimately for providing students with a better education (Miller et al., 2000). Two major purposes of faculty evaluation are regularly identified in the literature: making decisions regarding promotion, retention, and tenure, and giving feedback for faculty development.

Three universally targeted components for faculty evaluation are teaching, research, and service (Dilts et al., 1994). However, a survey of department heads reported that community and public service are rarely rewarded (Centra, 1979; Whitman & Weiss, 1982). Braskamp (2005) identified and described four dimensions, expanding on the three areas previously mentioned, that faculty performance appraisal should address:

1) teaching – includes instructing and developing learning plans;

2) research and creative activities – includes conducting research and editing and managing other works;

3) outreach / professional practice / engagement – includes conducting applied professional practice and circulating professional knowledge;
4) *citizenship* – includes making contributions to the campus and other societies and institutions.

Seldin (1999) conducted a survey of academic deans at four-year liberal arts colleges to examine what criteria for faculty evaluation were considered to be more significant factors. Classroom teaching was considered to be the most important factor when evaluating faculty performance. Table 1 identifies 13 different criteria and the percentages of academic deans that considered each criterion to be a major factor in faculty evaluation.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>MAJOR FACTOR</th>
<th>NOT A FACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teaching</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advising</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus committee work</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service in rank</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity in professional societies</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of graduate study</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing job offers</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of honors program</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation (government, business)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Braskamp (2005) suggested two dimensions that should be considered in faculty evaluation: merit and worth. Braskamp defined *merit* as the degree to which faculty
compare to others regarding their productivity in the aforementioned areas of performance. He defined *worth* as the value that each faculty member brings to the organization.

The individual charged with assessing faculty performance has many important considerations to ensure a fair and accurate evaluation, especially when decisions regarding promotion and tenure are being made. Braskamp and Ory (1994) identified five goals that universities should strive for as the foundation for effective faculty assessment:

1) assessment incorporates individual perspectives and organizational goals;
2) evaluation methods or forms capture the complexity of the faculty work;
3) summative and formative evaluations are utilized in conjunction to reflect the uniqueness of faculty members;
4) assessment is used to communicate institutional goals to the faculty members; and
5) assessment encourages faculty members to seek feedback from their peers.

Departmental administrators are typically in a good position to evaluate the performance of faculty members because they have the required knowledge in the discipline. They are able to judge such faculty responsibilities as an instructor’s knowledge in a particular field, selection of course objectives, thesis supervision, and research involvement (Braskamp, Brandenburg, & Ory, 1984). Faculty members grant more credibility to the evaluation of research activity because it is seen as easier to assess in a fair manner. However, little credibility is given by faculty members to assessments
of teaching effectiveness because this area of performance is often evaluated based on student ratings (Braskamp & Ory, 1994).

To improve the quality of the ratings from administrators, it is important to provide them with explicit criteria for performance evaluation through the stipulation of specific behaviors and indicators for assessment (Whitman & Weiss, 1982). Whitman and Weiss stated that clear criteria for evaluation will help make the appraisal process more fair and relevant for those involved. In addition, individual departments should aspire to set specific standards and expectations to ensure that faculty members accept the system and that fair comparisons are made (Shedd, 2005; Centra, 1979). For example, if comparisons were made regarding the publication of journal articles, discipline would need to be considered because publication rates differ across fields of research (Centra, 1979). With specific expectations of performance at the onset of any review period, there is a lower probability of discrepancy between faculty members and administrators over the evaluation results (Shedd, 2005).

Regardless of the method used to assess faculty performance, making any personnel decisions (including those concerning promotion and tenure) has legal implications. Performance evaluation needs to be unbiased and relevant to the job. Courts are generally more concerned with these two criteria than with the specific evaluation method or performance criteria. The courts have identified eight prescriptions for performance appraisal to meet legal requirements (Barrett & Kernan, 1987; Cascio, 1991; Cederbloom, 1982; Field & Holley, 1982; Greenberg, 1986; Hauenstein, 1998; Landy, Barnes, & Murphy, 1987; Malos, 2005; Malos, 1998; Mero & Motowidlo, 1995; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Werner & Bolino, 1997):
1) Standards for performance evaluation should be based on an analysis of the job requirements;

2) Performance standards must be communicated to employees and raters;

3) Employees should be evaluated on specific dimensions of job performance rather than on a single overall measure;

4) Performance dimensions should be defined in behavioral terms and supported by objective, observable evidence;

5) Raters should be trained to properly use the performance appraisal system;

6) Documentation of evaluation should be required;

7) A formal appeals process should be established; and

8) Some form of corrective guidance should be provided to assist poor performers in improving their performance.

Administrators need to be prepared to demonstrate that an evaluation procedure and subsequent performance ratings are valid and that the criteria included in the system do not discriminate between faculty members on characteristics that are unrelated to the job (Centra, 1979). A performance appraisal process that lacks validity, that is, one where faculty are discriminated on factors unrelated to successful performance of their job, may result in low commitment and high fear on the part of the faculty, which in turn could lead to high turnover rates or legal action. Thus, individuals responsible for evaluating a faculty member's performance should behave ethically and acknowledge faculty rights.

While it is necessary that performance appraisal formats meet various legal standards, it is also important that performance appraisal formats are capable of
evaluating faculty members who are already tenured as well as faculty members who are striving to obtain tenure status. As faculty members at different levels are evaluated for a broad range of reasons, it is necessary to have a system in place that can be used to appraise the work of tenured employees as well as untenured faculty. The following section discusses the evaluation of tenured faculty members.

*Post-Tenure Review*

Although post-tenure review is not a new topic, it still receives some attention in the literature. Licata and Morreale (1999) broadly defined post-tenure review as “a systematic, comprehensive process, aimed specifically to assess performance and/or nurture faculty growth and development” (p. 5). Many individuals, including the general public, politicians and administrators, hold the opinion that faculty members decrease their productivity after achieving tenure. This perception persists despite a lack of research demonstrating any decrease in faculty productivity once tenure is awarded (Whitehead, Grider, Pritchard, & Spikes, 1998). Post-tenure review is important for the effective functioning and survival of the tenure system in the university setting. Post-tenure review is central to continuous faculty improvement. Post-tenure review is particularly valuable for maintaining overall institutional strength and adaptability (Plater, 2001).

The issue for many, nonetheless, is that post-tenure review seems to be contrary to the original purpose of tenure, that is, to enable faculty members to voice academic opinions that differed from those of the administration or popular opinion. This belief is based particularly on potentially unfavorable consequences, such as termination, that may result for tenured faculty members deemed unproductive (Kelley, 2000). Tenured faculty
members may be resistant to post-tenure review because of its potential disciplinary nature and because it may challenge the tenured status of faculty members. In order for faculty members to accept post-tenure review policies, well-developed criteria for evaluation should build the foundation of the post-tenure review system (Licata & Morreale, 1999). O’Meara (2004) reported that many studies have revealed that faculty members are resistant to post-tenure review because they believe it will threaten conventional faculty values and institutional traditions. In her study examining the factors that influenced faculty beliefs concerning post-tenure review implementation, she found almost 75% of faculty members, department chairs, and committee members to be in agreement in their opinions regarding post-tenure review, most of which were negative. Additionally, she found the history and context of the institution to be a significant issue affecting faculty beliefs about the purposes of post-tenure review. With a history of a lack of trust between faculty and administration, faculty perceived post-tenure review as a form of surveillance by administration, rather than a form of development or assistance. The study revealed that providing feedback to tenured faculty members decreased their feelings of autonomy, which for many faculty members is an important characteristic of their work.

As in other organizational settings, methods for appraising the performance of tenured faculty in universities can be either summative (e.g., for personnel decisions such as recognition or reward) or formative (e.g., for professional development). Evaluations should be and usually are a combination of both (Licata & Morreale, 1999). However, Redmon (1999) contended that because administrators and faculty members may not have a clear understanding of why a performance appraisal system is in place, using both
summative and formative evaluative methods could complicate a system by trying to judge and assist simultaneously. 

Aper and Fry (2003) conducted a study comparing post-tenure review suggestions of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) with the policies in place at graduate institutions. The AAUP position is that faculty development should be the main reason for post-tenure review. A relatively large sample of individuals from private and public higher education institutions with graduate programs completed a survey regarding post-tenure review policies and practices. Ninety-four percent of the institutions awarded tenure, 46% used a post-tenure review system, and 30% were in the process of implementing one. The majority of the institutions involved faculty members in establishing the criteria for evaluation. Most of the institutions, however, had not conducted a cost/benefit analysis to determine the effectiveness of the post-tenure review practices. Aper and Fry also found some disagreement between faculty members and administrators regarding whether post-tenure review was for faculty development or managerial decisions. It is important for graduate institutions utilizing a post-tenure review system to identify the purpose of the system and to determine how effective it is in achieving that purpose.

The present study compares two performance appraisal formats developed for both pre-tenure and post-tenure faculty evaluation. The specific formats addressed in the present study are Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales, a type of performance appraisal instrument discussed in further detail in the next section.
Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales: Development and Benefits of Usage

Smith and Kendall (1963) developed the systematic process for the development of the evaluation form that eventually became known as behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS). Their form involved anchoring graphic rating scales with specific behavioral descriptions (Guion, 1998). Critical incidents, the anchors, are examples of what constitutes various levels of good and poor employee performance (Muchinsky, 2006).

The necessary steps for constructing a behaviorally anchored rating scale are listed below (Guion, 1998; Landy & Trumbo, 1980; Schwab, Heneman & DeCotiis, 1975; Smith & Kendall, 1963):

1) Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) identify and define the dimensions of the job that are necessary for successful performance.
2) SMEs generate critical incidents (i.e., examples of behaviors that illustrate good, average, or poor performance) for each dimension.
3) SMEs are given a randomized list of the critical incidents and asked to categorize the behavioral examples back into the given dimensions. This is termed retranslation, essentially a form of quality control, to ensure each critical incident is a clear example of the dimension it is to represent.
4) Guion identified a criterion of 80% agreement across the SMEs’ for an incident to survive retranslation and be retained for possible inclusion in the final instrument. Schwab et al. identified some percentage between 50% and 80% as adequate agreement for a critical incident to survive retranslation. However, another criterion may be identified prior to this step of the process.
5) Examples that survive the retranslation are grouped by dimensions and then rated by SMEs to indicate the level of performance reflected by that behavioral example. Means and standard deviations are calculated for the ratings of each item. The mean rating indicates the level of performance illustrated by the critical incident. Items with low standard deviations (indicating higher rater agreement) are retained to possibly become anchors on the final scale.

6) A rating scale is developed for each dimension of performance. The final scale includes a subset of the incidents that meet the criteria for inclusion. The final scale is anchored with examples of good, average, and poor performance, based on their mean rating from the previous step, that effectively describe behaviors that are related to a given dimension of performance. BARS are usually constructed in a vertical format.

Through the process of developing a BARS instrument, especially the participation of SMEs, it is believed that BARS enable evaluators to rate individuals in an equivalent manner across different situations. The equivalence of behavioral standards and expectations provided through the BARS format allows raters to make uniform interpretations (Jacobs, Kafry, & Zedeck, 1980). Smith and Kendall (1963) emphasized in their original study that the behavioral expectations serve as a common frame of reference for the raters. In addition, Landy and Trumbo (1980) stated that the procedure for BARS development helps to ensure careful scale construction. Accordingly, it may be easier to develop high quality BARS than, for example, a high quality graphic rating scale. Guion (1998) considered the time and effort to be well worth the result, which is a performance appraisal device that is more valid, reliable, and
easier to interpret. While the procedure for developing good BARS is time consuming, it has the significant advantages of involving workers and supervisors in its development and having high face validity for the raters and ratees (Landy & Trumbo, 1980).

BARS have additional advantageous features in comparison to other appraisal formats. Raters may make slightly more accurate ratings using BARS as suggested by a comparative review of several studies, which found BARS to be generally less susceptible to leniency error and halo error than other rating formats such as mixed standard scales, graphic rating scales, and trait scales (Kingstrom & Bass, 1981). Campbell, Dunnette, Arvey, and Hellervik (1973) found that a BARS procedure produced performance ratings with less leniency error, less halo error, and less method variance than the performance ratings produced by the summated ratings method. Rarick and Baxter (1986) emphasized that BARS provide clearer standards of what constitutes good job performance, offer more accurate measurement because of employee involvement in the development process, provide better feedback on performance because they are based on specific behaviors, and are more consistent than other methods of evaluation. Jacobs et al. (1980) stated that through documentation of incidents of behavior, justification can be provided for performance evaluations using this instrument and strengths and weaknesses of employees can be identified.

Ivancevich (1980) investigated the consequences of BARS feedback on individual behavior and found that employees exhibited more positive attitudes and performed better when evaluated with BARS in comparison to employees evaluated with a trait scale. Beatty, Schneier, and Beatty (1977) found that behavioral expectation scales (BES), a term used interchangeably with BARS, are useful for identifying differing
perspectives between raters and ratees concerning past behavior on the job. Additionally, they found that BES may improve employee performance through the specification of job roles, evidenced when raters rated employees as improving their performance following the development of BES, and their use for performance feedback.

Participation in the BARS development process has been demonstrated to result in more acceptance and commitment to the scale. Silverman and Wexley (1984) found that employees were more satisfied with performance evaluation interviews and were more motivated to improve their job performance when they participated in the development of the BARS. They also found that those employees who assisted in developing the BARS found it to be a more useful tool and exhibited more positive reactions about the overall process when compared to a group that was not involved in developing their performance appraisal instrument. Friedman and Cornelius (1976) examined rater participation in scale construction and found that raters involved in the development of the instrument provided psychometrically superior ratings. Harrell and Wright (1990) conducted a study using a sample of auditors and found BARS to accurately reflect the work that is performed on the job. Additionally, the study found support for both the content validity and construct validity of BARS. In this sample, BARS also demonstrated very high reliability. Of equal importance was the finding that the BARS were readily accepted for use as a performance evaluation instrument and for use as a feedback device.

In sum, BARS are sound, useful instruments for appraising job performance. Although BARS have the disadvantages of a time-consuming and complex development process, individuals are generally receptive to its implementation. BARS can be
developed and used for evaluating all types of performance including that of faculty at higher education institutions. BARS may be more appropriate than a checklist for evaluating faculty performance because they incorporate specific behavioral examples that represent a larger domain of job performance behaviors. Selection of an appropriate evaluative tool for assessing performance is critical to its effectiveness and acceptance. The next section will discuss organizational justice as it relates to employee performance appraisal systems, particularly the BARS developed for the department involved in the present study.

Introduction to Organizational Justice: Procedural and Distributive Justice Reviewed

The construct of organizational justice refers to perceptions of fairness by individuals working within an organization. Organizational justice has been conceptualized as consisting of four dimensions: procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice, and informational justice (Colquitt, 2001). Organizational justice is relevant to many processes that occur within organizational settings. Dimensions of organizational justice, particularly procedural and distributive justice, are relevant to the development and use of any performance appraisal instrument, especially when the instrument is to be used for personnel decisions such as promoting faculty in a university department, as in the present study.

The following review of the literature will focus on procedural and distributive justice as they relate to the current research. Broadly, procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the procedure used to determine outcome distributions or allocations, while distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the outcome distributions or allocations (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). The
instruments addressed in the present study directly involved faculty members in the process used to develop BARS appraisal instruments, thus faculty should perceive the process used to develop the instrument and any of the associated outcomes that may result from the implementation of the BARS format as more fair.

Before specifically discussing procedural and distributive justice, I will briefly discuss Equity Theory as it is the theoretical foundation for organizational justice, particularly distributive justice. Equity Theory is concerned with individual perceptions regarding what outcomes are fair and equitable considering the individual’s inputs or contributions to their jobs. Individuals compare their perceived exchange between themselves and their employers relative to what they believe to be the nature of others’ inputs and outcome exchanges. Individuals determine whether their own treatment is equitable or inequitable relative to their comparisons with others; if their exchange is perceived as inequitable they will be motivated to do something to change it (Pinder, 1998). Faculty members may receive certain outcomes, such as promotion and tenure, as a result of decisions based on the use of the BARS performance appraisal instruments addressed in the present study. Faculty members may compare themselves to others to determine if the outcomes received based on the BARS instrument are fair or equitable considering their inputs. Thus, the dynamics of decisions regarding equity are similar to the dynamics of perceptions of distributive justice.

I will now review the role that fairness perceptions associated with procedural and distributive justice may play in predicting certain outcomes in the workplace. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) found distributive justice to be an important predictor of personal outcomes including job satisfaction and pay satisfaction. Procedural justice, on the other
hand, was found to be an important predictor of organizational outcomes including a subordinate’s evaluation of his/her supervisor and organizational commitment (McFarlin & Sweeney). In a similar vein, other studies have found positive relationships between performance, measured through performance appraisal, and judgments of procedural fairness (e.g., Keller & Dansereau, 1995; Earley & Lind, 1987). Cawley, Keeping, and Levy (1998) found a strong positive correlation between employee participation in the development of a performance appraisal system and employee acceptance of and satisfaction with the appraisal system. Borman (1991) noted that an individual’s performance is reflected in his or her contributions to organizational objectives. As such, Colquitt et al. (2001) suggested that procedural justice should be the primary predictor of performance. Colquitt et al.’s (2001) meta-analysis found procedural and distributive justice to effectively predict many important organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, evaluation of authority, trust, organizational citizenship behaviors, performance, withdrawal, and negative reactions. Procedural justice and distributive justice together were shown to sufficiently predict several of these outcomes by themselves, and were either the strongest or second strongest predictors of these outcomes.

Procedural justice, which refers to whether or not the organizational procedures used to determine how rewards and punishments are allocated are perceived to be fair or unfair, has received substantial research attention (Pinder, 1998). Leventhal, Karuza and Fry (1980) identified six criteria that a procedure should meet to be perceived as fair. These criteria include: consistent application across people and time, freedom from bias, collection and use of accurate information for making decisions, a mechanism to correct
flawed or inaccurate decisions, conformity to personal or prevailing standards of ethics or morality, and accounting for the opinions of various groups affected by the decision. A concept that is of particular importance to perceptions of procedural justice is “voice” or that individuals will perceive a process as fair if they are able to voice their arguments and opinions during the process. Process control, which expands the concept of voice, is when participants feel they have control over the presentation of their opinions and they have enough time to state their position (Colquitt et al., 2001). Colquitt et al.’s meta-analysis yielded a high correlation between process control and the criteria posed by Leventhal et al. This is particularly important to the current study because the faculty should perceive the BARS development process to be fair and accurate based on Leventhal’s criteria as a result of having a voice in the procedure. In other words, because the faculty members were highly involved in the BARS development process (i.e., they had a voice in the procedure), they should perceive the process used to develop the BARS instrument as fair (i.e., procedural justice).

Sashkin and Williams (1990) identified nine dimensions of fairness, related to procedural justice, that expand on Leventhal et al.’s criteria. These include:

1) Trust – the confidence that employees have in management and how much they believe what management says.
2) Consistency – the regularity or predictability of management actions such that employees are not surprised.
3) Truthfulness – the sincerity of actions by management.
4) Integrity – the values or ethics adhered to by management’s actions.
5) Expectations – the task activities desired of employees and the subsequent consequences are clearly stated by management.

6) Equity – the similar treatment of employees through management action in terms of rewards and punishments for behaviors and results that are alike.

7) Influence – the sense of “ownership” that employees have over their actions and achievements that is provided to them based on their responsibilities.

8) Justice – the perception that an adhered to code of standards is appropriate and administered impartially.

9) Respect – the expression of consideration and regard for employees by management.

Sashkin and Williams found perceptions associated with these fairness variables to be related to how employees rated their supervisors and that these variables influenced bottom-line outcomes including employee sickness. Thus, it is evident that perceptions of procedural justice have broad implications for an organization. Faculty members’ fairness perceptions regarding the process used to develop the BARS appraisal instrument may have important implications regarding the use and subsequent success of the appraisal instrument within the Psychology Department.

Faculty should also perceive outcomes associated with the use of the BARS instrument to be fair (i.e., distributive justice). Leventhal et al.’s (1980) criteria focused on the formal procedures used to make decisions, not on the nature of any outcomes from the decisions. The literature suggests that employees are more satisfied with the outcomes of a performance measurement system and more likely to accept its implementation when they have participated in the development of the system (Landy &
Conte, 2007). Thus, to ensure that distributions of outcomes resulting from a performance appraisal system are perceived as fair, employee participation in all phases of the development process is critical.

**Summary**

It is necessary to evaluate faculty performance for both developmental purposes and for making personnel decisions. When appraising performance for the administrative purposes of promoting faculty, awarding salary increases, or tenure status, it is important to have a psychometrically sound, well developed instrument. BARS are considered to be a functional, valid, and reliable assessment tool because they are developed based on the input of subject matter experts and result from a careful development process that ensures that the most representative and agreed upon anchors are used on the scale. Individuals involved in the development of an appraisal tool (i.e., had a voice in the process) are more likely to perceive the development process as fair and accept the implementation and use of the appraisal instrument for making personnel decisions.

The BARS developed for faculty evaluation in the present study may be used for evaluating faculty members who have achieved tenured status and for those who have not. BARS are considered to be fair measures and are behaviorally unambiguous and, as such, are useful for evaluating faculty across different sub-disciplines within a single department. Additionally, a well constructed tool is easier for department chairs and administrators to use and is more legally defensible.

**The Present Study**

The present study compared Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales developed in 2001 and 2008 for the evaluation of faculty performance in the Psychology Department.
at Western Kentucky University. As described below, in 2001 and 2008 faculty participated in the development of the scales by identifying and defining performance dimensions, generating critical incidents for each dimension, retranslating the incidents into performance dimensions, and rating the critical incidents within each dimension of performance. In the current study, a content analysis was conducted and a qualitative comparison was made between the two BARS formats. As background to the current study, the development of the BARS in 2001 and 2008 will be presented next.

Method for Development of the BARS

Participants. Participants were all full-time Psychology Department faculty members at Western Kentucky University. Two instruments were developed, one in 2001 and another in 2008. The 2001 participants were all full-time members of the Psychology Department at that time including 15 men and 13 women; 12 held the rank of full professor, 10 held the rank of associate professor, 5 held the rank of assistant professor, and two held the rank of instructor. The participants in 2008 included 13 men and 15 women; seven held the rank of full professor, 10 held the rank of associate professor, six held the rank of assistant professor, and five held the rank of instructor. Age data were not obtained from the participants. In Step 2, Retranslation, all faculty members participated in 2001; in 2008, 26 of the 28 participants returned data. In Step 3, Calibrating the Anchors, all faculty members participated in 2001; in 2008, 25 of the 28 participants returned data.

Procedure. The same procedure was used to develop the BARS in 2001 and in 2008. The four steps in the BARS development procedure are described below. In both
2001 and 2008, an Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology Graduate Assistant (GA) performed the tasks of data aggregation and data management.

Step 1: Generating Critical Incidents (Exemplars)

Four committees of four faculty members each were created for the purpose of generating performance exemplars in the areas of teaching effectiveness, research-scholarly activity, service activity, and professional conduct. Each committee had one representative from each departmental area. Each committee was assigned a chairperson to whom faculty could send suggestions for additional exemplars pertaining to the given area of performance. A department meeting was convened to discuss the inclusion or exclusion of performance exemplars and the subsequent reasoning for these decisions. A department meeting also was convened to determine the precise definitions for each of 12 performance dimensions. The performance dimensions and their definitions may be found in Appendix A and Appendix B for 2001 and 2008, respectively. Exemplars were generated across the 12 dimensions of performance.

Step 2: Retranslation

To ensure exemplars were clear examples for a given dimension, a retranslation process was used. The GA created a file for the retranslation task by generating a list of random numbers using a random number generator on the internet. The GA copied the list of numbers into an Excel file containing the exemplars and then sorted the file by the random numbers, thus randomizing the order of the performance exemplars. Faculty members were e-mailed the Excel file containing the randomized list of behavioral exemplars. Faculty members were instructed to use this file to assign exemplars back into one of the 12 performance dimensions. The directions for the retranslation task may
be found in Appendix C (note these are the directions for the 2008 task, which were slightly modified from the 2001 task). Faculty members were instructed to e-mail the retranslated files back to the GA. The GA compiled the faculty responses into a new Excel file. The frequency with which each exemplar was sorted into a dimension was computed. The majority response, or plurality if there was no majority, was used to determine the dimension to which an exemplar belonged. Few items were dropped as too ambiguous because they failed to be assigned to a single dimension.

Step 3: Calibrating the Anchors

Step 3 involved calibrating each exemplar that survived retranslation. The GA created another Excel file that contained a separate worksheet for each dimension of performance. The worksheet for a given dimension contained the dimension name and definition and listed each exemplar for that dimension in random order. The file contained a column to the right of each exemplar into which the faculty members could assign the rating they believed the behavior exemplified. This file was provided to faculty members and they were asked to rate each exemplar within each of the 12 dimensions of performance. Faculty members were instructed to assign a rating of 1, 2, 3 or 4 to each exemplar indicating that the exemplar is an example of poor, satisfactory, good, or excellent behavior, respectively. The directions for Step 3 (for the 2008 task, slightly modified from the 2001 task) may be found in Appendix D.

Step 4: Scale Development

Modes, means, and standard deviations for each exemplar were calculated based on the ratings provided by the faculty members. Mean ratings with relatively low standard deviations indicated high agreement across faculty member ratings; mean
ratings with high standard deviations indicated low agreement among raters. Exemplars with low standard deviations are preferred for inclusion on the final scale. The modal rating for each exemplar was used to determine the scale value an exemplar would represent on the final BARS.

A scale was developed for each of the 12 dimensions of performance. Exemplars that survived retranslation and exhibited high agreement among raters via low standard deviations were used on the final scale. The modal rating for each exemplar determined the level of performance for the dimension exemplar. The exemplars were used to anchor the final dimension scales reflecting various levels of performance. It should be noted that the anchors only serve as examples of performance at a given level and are not intended to be exhaustive or a checklist. The BARS developed for the 12 dimensions of performance for the Psychology Department faculty may be found in Appendix A for 2008 and in Appendix B for 2001.
Method

A content analysis was conducted and a qualitative comparison was made between the BARS developed for the WKU Psychology Department in 2001 and 2008. The dimensions contained in each appraisal format were the primary focus of the comparison. Dimensions were compared in terms of both the dimension definition and how they were clustered in the format.
Results

The comparison of the 2001 and 2008 Psychology Department BARS indicated that the two instruments are similar. The differences between the two instruments are in the actual dimensions contained in the instruments and the specific exemplars contained within each dimension.

The original (2001 format) 12 dimensions of performance were contained within the following four broad categories:

1) Teaching Effectiveness, which included Planning, Delivery, and Assessment of Student Performance;
2) Research/Creative Activity, which included Publications, Presentations, Research Activity, and Funding Activities;
3) University/Public Service, which included Organizational Duties and Applied Professional Activities; and
4) Professional Identity, which included Knowledge of the Field and Professional Involvement.

The 2001 performance dimensions and definitions may be found in Appendix B.

In comparison to the old format, faculty members altered the categories and dimensions of performance during the process of developing the new BARS to consist of the following:

1) Teaching Effectiveness, which includes Planning, Delivery, and Assessment of Student Performance;
2) Research/Creative Activity, which includes Publications, Presentations, and Research Activity;
3) Service Activity, which includes University Service, Public Service, and Professional Service/Professional Development; 
4) University Priorities, which includes Student Engagement and Funding Activities; and 
5) Professional Conduct.

The new format contains five broad categories with 12 redefined performance dimensions. Furthermore, the faculty identified a number of new behavioral exemplars under each performance dimension. The new dimension definitions and performance exemplars may be found in Appendix A.
Discussion

The process of developing a BARS instrument is very time consuming. The Psychology Department faculty invested a great deal of time in defining the dimensions of performance and developing behavioral anchors for those performance dimensions. However, because the extensive participation of SMEs in generating representative exemplars, it is believed that BARS enable evaluators to rate individuals in a consistent manner across different situations or sub-disciplines (Jacobs, Kafry, & Zedeck, 1980). Landy and Trumbo (1980) stated that it may be easier to develop high quality BARS than, for example, a high quality graphic rating scale. BARS have the significant advantages of involving workers and supervisors in their development and having high face validity for the raters and ratees. The new BARS instrument should have high face validity for all faculty members, old and new, because of their involvement in the development process. Additionally, the department head should be able to make valid and fair evaluations of faculty performance across the four sub-disciplines within the Psychology Department (i.e., Industrial/Organizational, Clinical, School, and Experimental).

BARS have additional advantageous features in comparison to other appraisal formats. Research has indicated that BARS are generally less susceptible to leniency error and halo error, and produce less method variance than other rating formats such as mixed standard scales, graphic rating scales, trait scales, and summated rating methods (Kingstrom & Bass, 1981; Campbell et al., 1973). Rarick and Baxter (1986) emphasized that BARS provide clearer standards of what constitutes good job performance, offer more accurate measurement because of employee involvement in the development
process, provide better feedback on performance because they are based on specific behaviors, and are more consistent than other methods of evaluation. Thus, the faculty involved in the development of the instruments addressed in the present study should have a clearer understanding of their performance expectations across the 12 dimensions of performance. Measurement of their performance should be more accurate as a result of their direct role in defining and identifying the behaviors on which they will be evaluated. Accordingly, this should enable the department head to make more accurate evaluations of the department faculty and provide them with appropriate feedback in terms of the strengths and weaknesses in their performance.

Participation in the BARS development process has been demonstrated to result in more acceptance and commitment to the scale. Ivancevich (1980) investigated the consequences of BARS feedback on individual behavior and found that employees exhibited more positive attitudes and performed better when evaluated with BARS in comparison to employees evaluated with a trait scale. Silverman and Wexley (1984) found that employees who participated in the development of the BARS considered it to be a more useful tool and exhibited more positive reactions about the overall process when compared to a group that was not involved in developing their performance appraisal instrument, and were subsequently more motivated to improve their performance. Harrell and Wright (1990) found that the BARS developed in their study were readily accepted for use as a performance evaluation instrument and for use as a feedback device. In a similar vein, but from an organizational justice perspective, Cawley, Keeping, and Levy (1998) found that when employees had a voice in the performance appraisal process, they were more satisfied, perceived the process as more
fair, and were more motivated to improve their performance. Thus, as a result of their participation in the BARS development process, the Psychology Department faculty should exhibit a more positive attitude toward the instrument and be more committed to its implementation. In particular, newer faculty should find the new instrument to be more useful than the instrument previously used to evaluate their performance. Additionally, the Psychology Department could benefit from improved faculty performance as a result of this process.

*The Old versus the New Format*

The new performance appraisal format integrated the input from the Psychology Department faculty to redefine the 12 performance dimensions. The original 12 dimensions of performance were contained within the following four broad categories:

1) Teaching Effectiveness, which included Planning, Delivery, and Assessment of Student Performance;

2) Research/Creative Activity, which included Publications, Presentations, Research Activity, and Funding Activities;

3) University/Public Service, which included Organizational Duties and Applied Professional Activities; and

4) Professional Identity, which included Knowledge of the Field and Professional Involvement.

The old performance dimensions and definitions may be found in Appendix B. A large portion of faculty members involved in developing the old instrument are no longer working in the Psychology Department. Since the development and implementation of the old format, a number of new faculty members have joined the Psychology
Department. Furthermore, university priorities have changed somewhat during this time period. Thus, it was appropriate to develop a new instrument to effectually redefine the standards of performance across the dimensions identified as important by a substantially newer group of faculty members.

In comparison to the old format, faculty members altered the categories and dimensions of performance during the process of developing the new BARS to consist of the following:

1) Teaching Effectiveness, which includes Planning, Delivery, and Assessment of Student Performance;
2) Research/Creative Activity, which includes Publications, Presentations, and Research Activity;
3) Service Activity, which includes University Service, Public Service, and Professional Service/Professional Development;
4) University Priorities, which includes Student Engagement and Funding Activities; and
5) Professional Conduct.

The new format contains five broad categories with 12 redefined performance dimensions. Furthermore, the faculty identified a number of new behavioral exemplars under each performance dimension. The new dimension definitions and performance exemplars may be found in Appendix A. The new instrument offers several benefits over the existing appraisal format.

Both faculty with long tenure and newer faculty had a role in the development process for the new evaluation format. They were given control to the extent that they
created the dimension definitions and the behavioral performance exemplars. Additionally, faculty members were responsible for assigning the exemplars to the 12 performance dimensions (i.e., retranslation phase) and rating those exemplars within the dimensions (i.e., anchor calibration phase). Thus, faculty, particularly the newer faculty not involved in the process of developing the existing format, should be more satisfied with the new instrument. The Psychology Department faculty should perceive both the development process and the resulting instrument to be fair. Additionally, the department faculty should consider the instrument to be more valid in terms of the content contained in the instrument due to their direct involvement in providing the content.

Generally, 12 dimensions of performance coupled with a large number of exemplars allow for greater flexibility when a single appraisal format is used to assess the performance of faculty working across different sub-disciplines of psychology. The new format breaks service activity down further, adding Professional Service and Professional Development as a new dimension of performance. Initially, the old format recognized only University and Public Service. The new service category captures more behaviors and activities than the old, thus making the new instrument more accurate in terms of content. Additionally, Funding activity was separated into its own category rather than being contained in the Research Activity category. An additional performance dimension, Student Engagement, was added to reflect university priorities. The addition or expansion of performance dimensions allows for a more precise evaluation of faculty performance. Essentially, the new dimensions provide additional direction to department faculty in terms of their efforts and performance.
Limitations

Although developing these instruments in the organization in which they were to be used helps to ensure the validity of the instrument, there are some associated limitations. When working in an organization, an industrial/organizational psychologist is subject to organizational timelines and the mixed priorities of the employees involved in the instrument development process. For example, working with Psychology Department faculty was a more complex process than originally anticipated. The faculty members came from different sub-disciplines within the field of psychology and, as such, had different priorities and agendas. In 2001, deadlines had to be extended to ensure the data collection period enabled all faculty members to complete retranslation and the rating of critical incidents. In 2008, some individuals expressed disagreement with various phases of the process, some faculty members failed to participate in the data collection, and some faculty may have struggled with trust issues. Thus, there were political considerations that presented challenges for the effective development of a valid performance evaluation system. It is likely that the same or similar issues would be present in the development of performance evaluation instruments in any public or private sector organization.

The BARS developed in 2001 and 2008 were based on prior research establishing effective methods for developing performance appraisal instruments. The development of the BARS by the WKU Psychology Department was an application of the science of performance evaluation but did not advance the science of performance evaluation. As such, the results of this study are specific to the instruments developed for the WKU Psychology Department and cannot be generalized.
Implications/Future Research Directions

The Psychology Department faculty members now have a new appraisal instrument for which they participated in the development process. As a result of their direct involvement in the development process, the faculty members should be more satisfied with the new instrument and perceive it to be more fair than the old instrument when used to evaluate their performance. According to the literature on procedural justice, because faculty members had voice in the process, they should perceive the process and the subsequently developed instrument to be more fair (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Future research could be conducted to directly assess faculty perceptions of the Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale and the process used to develop the scale. The faculty who participated in the development of the scale could report perceptions of the BARS scale and anticipated outcomes from the performance appraisal process. Such a questionnaire developed to address fairness of the instrument, perceived content validity, fairness of the development process, and satisfaction with the instrument is contained in Appendix E.

Employees involved in a BARS development process have been found to exhibit more positive reactions to the final instrument than individuals not involved in the development process for an appraisal instrument (Silverman & Wexley, 1984). Leventhal et al. (1980) identified six criteria for a process to be perceived as fair, including the importance of the participation of individuals affected by a decision. Although the BARS instrument used previously in the department under study was developed by a similar process, many of the current faculty were not employed at the time of its development and, consequently, were not involved in the development
process. Thus, it could be expected that a BARS instrument developed by the current Psychology Department faculty members would be perceived as more fair than the previous appraisal instrument.

BARS instruments have been shown to have high face validity for the raters and ratees (Landy & Trumbo, 1980), to provide clearer standards of what constitutes good job performance and offer more accurate measurement (Rarick & Baxter, 1986), and have demonstrated content validity by accurately reflecting work that is performed on the job (Harrell & Wright, 1990). Thus, it could be expected that a performance evaluation instrument would be perceived as more content valid than the previous appraisal instrument.

The six steps of the BARS development process (Guion, 1998; Landy & Trumbo, 1980; Schwab, Heneman & DeCotiis, 1975; Smith & Kendall, 1963) conform to the six criteria presented by Leventhal et al. (1980) that ensure procedural justice. Thus, it could be expected that the Psychology Department faculty members would perceive the process used to develop the BARS instrument as fair.

Employees have demonstrated satisfaction with performance evaluation using a BARS appraisal instrument for which they participated in the development (Silverman & Wexley, 1984), and employees have demonstrated satisfaction with a performance measurement system for which they participated in the development (Cawley, Keeping, & Levy, 1998). Thus, it could be expected that the Psychology Department faculty members would be more satisfied with the new BARS appraisal instrument than with the previous BARS appraisal instrument.

Conclusion
In conclusion, two Behavioral Anchored Rating Scales were developed for a psychology department. Future research could verify the assumptions drawn from the literature regarding the result of employee participation in the performance appraisal development process. However, this research would be specific to faculty performance evaluation in a higher education institution. Nonetheless, the Psychology Department at Western Kentucky University should benefit from this process by clarifying the performance expectations of the faculty and enhancing faculty perceptions of usefulness and fairness of the instrument used to evaluate their performance.
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## Appendix A

New (2008) Faculty Performance Appraisal Format

### Teaching Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4. EXCELLENT** | teaches 5 or more different courses (i.e., multiple preps)  
plays a major role in the initiation and development of a new course |
| **3. GOOD** | has specific learning objectives for each section/unit/chapter and plans course content on said learning objectives  
clearly defines anticipated outcomes for students and selects course activities that reflect the desired outcomes  
seeks out formative feedback about teaching (peer review, video analysis, student feedback, etc) and subsequently uses acquired knowledge to improve course(s)  
considers a variety of texts and ancillary materials during text adoption process and upon request can document rationale for adopted texts and materials  
teaches a course for the first time  
teaches 3 to 4 different courses (i.e., multiple preps)  
maintains updated resources on a course webpage or on Blackboard  
regularly modifies course content to reflect new developments in field  
attends workshops, seminars, etc on teaching and subsequently uses acquired knowledge to improve course(s) |
| **2. SATISFACTORY** | structures course in a manner that is appropriate for the population for the course (e.g., freshmen, non-traditional, and graduate students, etc.)  
has for each course a syllabus that provides a comprehensive overview of course content, timetable, and requirements and other information that helps the student succeed in the course  
has for each course a syllabus with current information and focused, clear expectations  
has a syllabus prepared and posted on TOPNET prior to start of each class |
| **1. POOR** | rarely seeks out formative feedback about teaching  
does not submit textbook requests in a timely manner  
rarely re-evaluates course delivery methods  
does not meet University expectation that all course syllabi will be posted to TopNet  
rarely modifies course content to reflect new developments in the field |
**2. TEACHING DELIVERY:** Defined in terms of the degree of effectiveness with which one facilitates understanding of course content and other learning endeavors (e.g., independent study, practicum experiences, etc.). (Relevant SITE items: 2 & 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. EXCELLENT</strong></td>
<td>Receives the Department, College, or University Teaching Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. GOOD</strong></td>
<td>Goes beyond material covered in text  &lt;br&gt; Integrates a new technology which facilitates learning  &lt;br&gt; Uses real-world examples in conveying course material  &lt;br&gt; Provides outside-class support to students (e.g., tutoring, review sessions)  &lt;br&gt; Provides supervision of independent study, practicum, and internship experiences which enhances learning, prevents problems and/or effectively handles problems that may arise  &lt;br&gt; Uses active learning techniques  &lt;br&gt; Invites and encourages student feedback  &lt;br&gt; Stimulates effective student participation (e.g., by inviting students to identify practical applications or examples of theoretical concepts, or therapy)  &lt;br&gt; Requires student participation in class beyond class discussion such as participating in class demonstrations or giving presentations  &lt;br&gt; Includes, updates and maintains learning activities other than lectures  &lt;br&gt; Uses effective methods (e.g., technology, lecture, case studies, demonstrations, activities, debate, videos) to facilitate learning of course objectives  &lt;br&gt; Uses multiple formats to deliver course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. SATISFACTORY</strong></td>
<td>Conveys information at students’ level  &lt;br&gt; Uses only one format or method to deliver content in class  &lt;br&gt; Occasionally effectively/appropriately uses technology in instruction  &lt;br&gt; Regularly uses current technology in instruction in an appropriate and effective manner  &lt;br&gt; Understands and accurately conveys major concepts in his/her field  &lt;br&gt; Lecture coincides with text material  &lt;br&gt; Actively constructs class environment where students feel safe and comfortable to voice questions, comments, and ideas, and has a system of doing so  &lt;br&gt; Manages disruptive behavior in a professional manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. POOR</strong></td>
<td>Rarely uses active learning techniques  &lt;br&gt; Does not understand or inaccurately conveys major concepts in his/her field  &lt;br&gt; Cancels classes without justification  &lt;br&gt; Students express concerns about being able to openly voice relevant questions, comments, and ideas.  &lt;br&gt; Primarily reads from lecture notes, PowerPoint slides, or textbook in class  &lt;br&gt; Regularly discusses irrelevant subject matter  &lt;br&gt; Often begins class late  &lt;br&gt; Overly dependent on graduate students to teach (i.e., more than 2 class periods)  &lt;br&gt; Invites minimal student input and participation  &lt;br&gt; Frequently uses videos in lieu of other instructional activities  &lt;br&gt; Has frequent student complaints concerning disorganized coverage of material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. TEACHING ASSESSMENT STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Defined in terms of the extent to which one is effective in systematically and comprehensively assessing the progress and achievement of students in course content areas and providing timely and meaningful feedback to students. (Relevant SITE items: 4 & D1).

#### 3. GOOD
- Routinely evaluates tests/assessments for item quality such as content validity, item difficulty, etc.
- Requires individual meetings with students who are performing poorly in class.
- Creates and uses rubrics for all written assessments (i.e., essay tests, papers, etc.).
- Sets high but reasonable standards for student performance for the ability level of the students.
- Provides opportunities for students to receive comprehensive feedback via formal assessment of learning (small group discussion, question-answer sessions, quizzing, etc.).
- Uses multiple methods of assessment appropriate to course content and purpose.

#### 2. SATISFACTORY
- Develops/assigns tests, papers, projects, and related course/practicum activities that appropriately represent actual course content.
- Provides adequate supervision of independent study, practicum, and internship experiences.
- Goes over problematic and key exam items with students after exams have been graded.
- Administers tests/assessments frequently enough to provide students with adequate and timely feedback about their progress in the course or practicum.
- Constructs exam items based on specific learning objectives for each section/unit/chapter (i.e., content validity).
- Uses only one method of assessment.
- Adheres to identified guidelines for creating good classroom assessment in attempt to maximize reliability and validity of classroom measures.
- At least part of the course assessment requires more than memorization as appropriate to course content and level.
- Course assessment is primarily based on memorization.

#### 1. POOR
- Continues to use exams with compromised security.
- Does not follow university final exam policy.
- Course assessment content does not reflect course content.
- Measures student performance in a manner that deviates from methods stated on the syllabus.
- Provides minimal independent study or practicum experience feedback.
- Fails to provide periodic feedback to students.
- Fails to provide timely feedback to students on assignments.
- Rarely evaluates tests/assessments for item quality such as content validity, item difficulty, etc.
- Provides minimal or inadequate supervision of independent study, practicum, or internship experiences.

[Note: Student ratings and comments should be used as follows. A rating of good or excellent for teaching effectiveness should be associated with a consistent pattern of high student ratings on relevant items and positive student comments. Consideration should be made for factors such as the appeal of the course content, level of the course, grade inflation (or lack thereof), high standards, and demanding (but relevant) projects. Student ratings should be interpreted in a manner consistent with University guidelines.]
## Research/Creative Activity

### 4. PUBLICATIONS

Publications must derive from research activity (basic or applied). Such publications could be:
1. empirical reports of psychological research,
2. theoretical contributions designed to explain/describe empirical findings,
3. literature reviews,
4. empirical reports of studies designed to investigate teaching methods used in Psychology,
5. empirical reports based on traditional methodologies used in applied areas of Psychology (e.g., case study, single subject design, research to practice applications), and
6. other appropriate scholarly contributions.

All publications must indicate WKU as the author's current institutional affiliation, and must have undergone peer review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. EXCELLENT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 refereed article every 1-2 years in a top-tier journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 refereed articles per year in a mid-tier journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6 refereed articles per year in a low-tier journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>author of a book by a respected publisher (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc) once every 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 chapter in an edited book by a respected publisher per year (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. GOOD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 refereed article every 3-4 years in a top-tier journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 refereed article every 2 years in a mid-tier journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 refereed article every 1-2 years in a low-tier journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 chapter in edited book by a respected publisher every 2 years (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>author of a book by a respected publisher (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc) once every 6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has invited article in a practitioner publication (e.g., journal, trade magazine, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. SATISFACTORY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 refereed article every 3 years in a low-tier or mid-tier journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 chapter in edited book by a respected publisher every 3-4 years (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writes technical report for granting agency documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of a funded grant program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has article in a practitioner publication (e.g., journal, trade magazine, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. POOR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 refereed article in a low-tier or mid-tier journal every 4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. PRESENTATIONS: Presentations of Scholarly Activity. Presentations at academic conferences may be invited by conference or symposia organizers; if the presentations are not invited, then peer-review is required. Conference presentations may be either oral or poster presentations. Presentations must have content similar to that described for publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. EXCELLENT</td>
<td>is coauthor of 3-4 presentations per year at national or international meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GOOD</td>
<td>is coauthor of 1-2 presentations per year at national or international meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>is coauthor of 1 presentation every 2 years at national or international meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POOR</td>
<td>does not author or coauthor presentations at regional, national, or international meetings at least once every 3 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. RESEARCH ACTIVITY: Defined in terms the amount and nature of investigative research conducted or supervised at WKU. Faculty are expected to engage in research activity on an ongoing basis in their respective areas of expertise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. EXCELLENT</td>
<td>receives the Department, College, or University Research/Creative Activity Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directs 3-5 master’s theses per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directs 4-5 master’s theses per year that are unrelated to personal research program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is actively involved in data collection in research programs on a continual basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GOOD</td>
<td>collaborates with colleagues in research program development within and outside the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>submits 1-2 manuscript per year (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conducts program evaluation (i.e., develops instrumentation; collects, analyzes, and interprets data to address hypotheses concerning program effectiveness) for a funded grant program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directs 2-3 master’s theses per year that are unrelated to personal research program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directs 2 master's theses per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is actively involved in data collection in a research program once per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>is actively involved in data collection in a research program once every 2-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directs 1 master's thesis every 1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directs 1 master’s thesis every 1-3 years that is unrelated to personal research program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>submits 1 manuscript every 2-3 years (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POOR</td>
<td>does not submit at least 1 manuscript every 3 years (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is rarely involved in data collection in a research program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directs 1 master's thesis every 4-5 years or fewer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Service Activity

7. **UNIVERSITY SERVICE**: Defined in terms of the extent of one’s involvement and responsibility in departmental, college, and university activities that support and maintain the effective functioning of the department, college, and university. Includes the applied practice of one’s professional skills within the university.

#### 4. EXCELLENT
- receives Department, College, or University award for advising
- member of 4-6 master’s thesis committees per year
- creates or revitalizes a professional university organization
- assumes administrative responsibilities in the department in a meritorious manner (e.g., promotes significant program development, completes reports that bring recognition to the department, etc.)
- actively supports and provides leadership for valued university initiatives (e.g., chairs committee, workgroup, taskforce; chairs subcommittee, etc.)
- participates in multiple university, college, or departmental (regular or ad hoc) committees on a daily to weekly basis
- provides leadership for the committees of the university, college, or department
- conducts program evaluation (i.e., develops instrumentation; collects, analyzes, and interprets data to address hypotheses concerning program effectiveness) for the university.
- serves as the advisor to 20 or more students (percentage of transfer students should be considered)

#### 3. GOOD
- mentors new faculty
- member of 2-3 master’s thesis committees per year
- frequently represents faculty or departmental interests in university affairs
- participates in a university, college, or departmental committee on a monthly basis
- participates as a committee member on committees at more than one level (department, college, university)
- participates in at least two of the following types of committees: university, college, or departmental
- actively supports valued university initiatives (e.g., committee membership, promotes activities, etc.)
- provides leadership for university initiatives that promote public engagement
- serves as the advisor to 15-20 students
- administers/coordinates academic program within the department (e.g., writes reports, coordinates graduate program, etc.)
- writes technical report for university documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of a university policy or program.
- conducts program review for academic programs outside the department
- serves as a faculty advisor to a university student club/organization
- brings in speaker/s with expertise in content area
- regularly presents workshops within university based on area of professional expertise

#### 2. SATISFACTORY
- occasionally represents faculty or department interest in university affairs
- participates in at least one university, college, or departmental committee
- participates in university, college, or departmental committees on a once-a-semester basis
- participates in committee work at the departmental level
- maintains equitable load of student advisement; serves as the advisor to 10-15 students
- member of 1 master’s thesis committee every 1-3 years
- occasionally presents workshops within university based on area of professional expertise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. POOR</strong></td>
<td>rarely participates in department meetings&lt;br&gt;serves as the advisor to fewer than 10 students&lt;br&gt;rarely represents faculty or departmental interests in university affairs&lt;br&gt;does not participate in university, college, or departmental committees&lt;br&gt;member of 1 master's thesis committee every 4-5 years or less&lt;br&gt;occasionally/rarely participates in department meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. SATISFACTORY</strong></td>
<td>occasionally presents workshops for campus or University based on area of professional expertise&lt;br&gt;serves as the advisor to fewer than 10 students&lt;br&gt;occasionally represents faculty or departmental interests in university affairs&lt;br&gt;occasionally participates in university, college, or departmental committees&lt;br&gt;member of 1 master's thesis committee every 4-5 years or less&lt;br&gt;occasionally participates in department meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. GOOD</strong></td>
<td>presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university 1 to 3 times per year&lt;br&gt;serves on the board of a non-university organization&lt;br&gt;serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 1 to 3 times per year&lt;br&gt;routinely involved in community at large in ways that support community needs&lt;br&gt;regularly provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government&lt;br&gt;seeks out or creates ways to be involved in the community at large in ways that support community needs&lt;br&gt;presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university 1 to 3 times per year&lt;br&gt;is interviewed by media on topics related to professional expertise 1 to 3 times per year&lt;br&gt;writes technical report for public or private organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. EXCELLENT</strong></td>
<td>presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university 4 or more times per year&lt;br&gt;creates or revitalizes a community organization&lt;br&gt;serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 4-7 times per year&lt;br&gt;presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university every 3 years on average&lt;br&gt;occasionally provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government&lt;br&gt;seeks out or creates ways to be involved in the community at large in ways that support community needs&lt;br&gt;presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university 4 or more times per year&lt;br&gt;is interviewed by media on topics related to professional expertise 3 or more times per year&lt;br&gt;writes technical report for public or private organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8. PUBLIC SERVICE:** Defined in terms of the extent of one's involvement in activities that support the needs of the public and that draw on professional expertise. Includes the applied practice of one's professional skills outside of the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. POOR</strong></td>
<td>rarely presents workshops for community based on area of professional expertise&lt;br&gt;rarely serves or does not serve as a consultant to a non-university constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. SATISFACTORY</strong></td>
<td>occasionally presents workshops for campus and/or community based on area of professional expertise&lt;br&gt;presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university every 3 years on average&lt;br&gt;occasionally provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. GOOD</strong></td>
<td>presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university 1 to 3 times per year&lt;br&gt;serves on the board of a non-university organization&lt;br&gt;serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 1 to 3 times per year&lt;br&gt;routinely involved in community at large in ways that support community needs&lt;br&gt;regularly provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government&lt;br&gt;seeks out or creates ways to be involved in the community at large in ways that support community needs&lt;br&gt;presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university 1 to 3 times per year&lt;br&gt;is interviewed by media on topics related to professional expertise 1 to 3 times per year&lt;br&gt;writes technical report for public or private organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. EXCELLENT</strong></td>
<td>presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university 4 or more times per year&lt;br&gt;creates or revitalizes a community organization&lt;br&gt;serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 4-7 times per year&lt;br&gt;presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university every 3 years on average&lt;br&gt;occasionally provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government&lt;br&gt;seeks out or creates ways to be involved in the community at large in ways that support community needs&lt;br&gt;presents a workshop, colloquium, or seminar outside the university 4 or more times per year&lt;br&gt;is interviewed by media on topics related to professional expertise 3 or more times per year&lt;br&gt;writes technical report for public or private organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Defined in terms of the extent of one’s involvement in activities that support the needs of the profession and that draw on professional expertise. Includes keeping abreast of new developments and activities undertaken to develop and maintain professional credentials.

4. EXCELLENT

serves as editor, or on the editorial board, for a professional journal
regularly serves in professional organizations as an officer, committee chair, or committee member
regularly reviews grant proposals for a granting agency

3. GOOD

regularly attends professional conferences and is involved in professional societies
regularly attends professional development workshops in his/her field
participates in a professional development seminar or workshop to improve research skills
completes Continuing Education requirements to maintain professional credentials (e.g., license, certification; if applicable)
regularly provides professional development workshops, colloquia, or programs
regularly presents workshops for campus and/or community based on area of professional expertise
reads and is conversant about major professional periodicals in his/her field
regularly reviews submissions for professional journals, books, book chapters, or conferences
occasionally serves in professional organizations as an officer, committee chair, or committee member
regularly engages in the applied practice of the profession (e.g., provides direct services, including assessments and interventions)
regularly supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one’s profession
maintains a professional or organizational website (other than one’s own homepage)

2. SATISFACTORY

provides accurate information regarding additional sources of information in his/her field
functions as a competent resource both inside and outside the department
sufficiently conversant with most major content areas in his/her field, so as to serve as a resource to other departmental faculty members
provides accurate and contemporary information within the scope of his/her competency
understands and accurately conveys major concepts in his/her field
occasionally attends professional conferences and has limited involvement in professional societies
occasionally attends professional development workshops
occasionally reviews grant proposals or submissions for professional journals, book chapters, or professional conferences
rarely reviews submissions for professional conferences
occasionally or rarely engages in the applied practice of the profession (e.g., provides direct services, including assessments and interventions)
conducts technical and professional evaluation of website
complies with state licensing law requirements and/or maintains professional license (if practicing or appropriate)
ocasionally supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one’s profession
occasionally provides professional development workshops, colloquia, or programs
rarely serves in professional organizations as an officer, committee chair, or committee member
1. POOR

| rarely reads professional periodicals in his/her field |
| rarely supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one’s profession. |
| is unfamiliar with major recent theoretical and empirical developments in his/her specialty area |
| rarely attends professional conferences and is not involved in professional societies |
| rarely attends workshops, seminars, etc. on teaching |
| rarely attends professional development workshops |
| rarely reviews submissions for professional journals, books, or book chapters |
| does not obtain or maintain appropriate professional credentials (e.g., license or certification) |
| does not understand or inaccurately conveys major concepts in his/her field |
| rarely provides professional development workshops, colloquia, or programs |
**University Priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. STUDENT ENGAGEMENT: Defined in terms of meaningful activities that inspire students to become active contributors to their own learning, and to take responsibility for their own education and personal and professional growth. May include activities conducted within the context of a course either during or outside of class time, activities related to research, and/or activities related to University, public, or professional service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. EXCELLENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sponsors (not coauthor) 5-8 student presentations per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports student engagement in research funding activities by mentoring students to obtain funding for their research projects every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervises 3 or more independent studies per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly includes students as coauthors on published articles and/or book chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes students in university, college, or departmental projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>routinely or actively supports or promotes activities to engage students in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develops class projects or activities that promote student civic engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervises 2 independent studies per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly involves students in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports student engagement in research funding activities by mentoring students to obtain funding for their research projects every other year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sponsors (not coauthor) 3-4 student presentations per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally includes students as coauthors on published articles and/or book chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>routinely provides support for student involvement in activities of the profession (Faculty sponsor to professional group; encourages students to become &quot;engaged&quot; with professional activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actively supports students in promoting the profession (provides leadership for creating student engagement in the profession)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develops class projects or activities that promote student engagement in psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involves graduate students in activities of the program (recruitment activities, student groups, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SATISFACTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports student engagement in research funding activities by mentoring students to obtain funding for their research projects every three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally involves students in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervises 1 independent study every 1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sponsors (not coauthor) 1-2 student presentations per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides periodic support for activities to engage students in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>routinely encourages students to attend campus and community events related to course material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides opportunities for students to connect material to larger social systems and issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports student involvement in activities of the profession (promotes membership in professional organizations, participation in conferences, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourages individual meetings with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not support or promote student involvement in activities in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not supervise an independent study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rarely includes students as coauthors on published articles and/or book chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rarely involves students in research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11. FUNDING ACTIVITIES: Defined in terms of the extent of one's involvement in seeking and obtaining funding to support faculty research, scholarly activities, or other projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. EXCELLENT</td>
<td>administers/coordinates (PI, co-PI) externally funded project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prepares and submits proposal for external funding every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>receives internal funding every year (faculty research grant, summer fellowship, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>receives external funding every 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GOOD</td>
<td>receives external funding every 5-6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>receives internal funding every 2-4 years (faculty research grant, summer fellowship, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prepares and submits proposal for external funding every 2-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obtains donations or “in-kind” contributions to support research program (donations of equipment, consumable materials) every 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>receives internal funding at least every 5 years (faculty research grant, summer fellowship, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rarely applies for internal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prepares and submits proposal for external funding at least every 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obtains donations or ‘in-kind’ contributions to support research every three years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT: Defined in terms of adherence to the APA Code of Ethics and university policies; demonstration of good citizenship in relations with students, peers, and staff, and when representing the university; demonstrating collegiality; valuing diversity; and meeting professional responsibilities and obligations.

3. GOOD
- is respected by colleagues (e.g., serves as a source of professional expertise)
- is always on time in fulfilling obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth functioning of the department
- regularly is proactively helpful to colleagues

2. SATISFACTORY
- maintains and adheres to office hours
- is usually on time in fulfilling obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth functioning of the department
- is conscientious in meeting obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth functioning of the department
- displays sensitivity to ethical issues and university policies in the conduct of university and personal activities
- is knowledgeable about and adheres to APA Code of Ethics
- consistently treats students and colleagues fairly, irrespective of ethnicity, religion, gender, culture, age or disabilities
- demonstrates respect for colleagues, staff, and students
- adheres to ethical research procedures

1. POOR
- does not maintain and adhere to office hours
- makes derogatory remarks about or engages in discriminatory behavior toward people of differing ethnicities, religions, genders, cultures, ages or disabilities
- is overly and frequently critical in non-constructive ways of other faculty members
- disregards ethical principles and/or university policies
- rarely is proactively helpful to colleagues
- reacts in an emotionally inappropriate manner to unruly, disruptive students
- habitually unavailable to students
- is often careless about fulfilling obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth function of the department
- seldom treats students and colleagues fairly, irrespective of ethnicity, religion, gender, culture, age or disabilities
Appendix B

Old (2001) Faculty Performance Appraisal Format

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

To Associate: 2 of 3 Good, none Poor; To Full: 3 of 3 Good.

1. Teaching: Planning
Defined in terms of the degree of preparation, planning and organization of course materials and evidence of the integration of appropriate technology in the classroom.

Good
- has for each course a syllabus that provides a comprehensive overview of course content, timetable, and requirements and other information that helps the student succeed in the course
- plays a major role in the initiation and development of a new course
- clearly defines anticipated outcomes for students and selects course activities that reflect the desired outcomes
- regularly modifies course content to reflect new developments in field
- plays a major role in the initiation or development of a new technology

Average
- has for each course a syllabus with current information and focused, clear expectations
- structures course in a manner that is appropriate for the population for the course (e.g., freshmen, non-traditional, and graduate students, etc.)
- regularly reviews lecture notes immediately before class
- periodically revises course content and form to reflect results of systematic evaluation

Poor
- rarely reviews lecture notes immediately before class
- rarely modifies course content to reflect new developments in the field

2. Teaching: Delivery
Defined in terms of the degree of effectiveness with which one presents and conveys content material; measured in part by student critiques.

Good
- uses effective methods (e.g., technology, lecture, case studies, demonstrations, activities, debate, videos) to facilitate learning of course objectives
- stimulates effective student participation (e.g., by inviting students to identify practical applications or examples of theoretical concepts, or therapy)
- provides supervision of practicum and internship experiences which enhances learning, prevents problems and/or effectively handles problems that may arise
- regularly uses technology (e.g., overheads or presentation software) in instruction in an appropriate and effective manner
- invites and encourages student input
Average
- provides adequate supervision of practicum and internship experiences
- teaches a web-based course
- teaches a distance learning course
- occasionally effectively/appropriately uses technology in instruction
- uses only a lecture format to deliver content in class input

Poor
- rarely uses technology in instruction
- invites minimal student input and participation
- rarely re-evaluates course delivery methods
- primarily reads from lecture notes in class
- provides minimal practicum experience feedback
- has frequent student complaints concerning disorganized coverage of material
- primarily shows videos and gives quizzes in class
- provides minimal or inadequate supervision of practicum or internship experiences

3. Teaching: Assessment of Student Performance
Defined in terms of the extent to which one systematically and comprehensively assesses the progress and achievement of students in course content areas and provides timely feedback to students.

Good
- uses involves multiple methods of assessment appropriate to course content and purpose
- sets high but reasonable standards for student performance for the ability level of the students
- develops/assigns tests, papers, projects, and related course/practicum activities that appropriately represent actual course content
- routinely evaluates tests/assessments for item quality such as content validity, item difficulty, etc.
- attempts innovative but reasonable assessment strategies

Average
- administers tests/assessments frequently enough to provide students with adequate and timely feedback about their progress in the course or practicum
- at least part of the course assessment requires more than memorization as appropriate to course content and level
- administers a scheduled mid-term and final test

Poor
- course assessment is primarily based on memorization
- measures student performance in a manner that deviates from methods stated on the syllabus
- continues to use exams with compromised security
- fails to provide periodic feedback to students
- course assessment content does not reflect course content and purpose
RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

To Associate or Full: 2 of 4 Good, Publications at least Average;

4. Publications
Defined in terms of the number and nature of published works that are substantive, require peer review, and/or are in recognized outlets for information in the discipline. Manuscripts that are in press or have been accepted for publication constitute valid publications. All publications must indicate WKU as the author’s current institutional affiliation.

Excellent
- publishes a major work in discipline (e.g., book, monograph, major theoretical paper, or article in journal with >80% rejection rate)
- averages 1 (or more) publication(s) per year

Good
- edits a book in his/her discipline
- averages 1 publication every 2 years

Average
- averages 1 publication every 3 years

Poor
- averages 1 publication every 4 years or less

5. Presentations
Defined in terms of the number and nature of presented works that are substantive, require peer review, and/or are in recognized outlets for information in the discipline. Includes presentations at state, regional, national, or international meetings.

Excellent
- gives 4 or more presentations per year at national or international meetings

Good
- gives 1-3 presentations per year at national or international meetings
- gives 4 or more presentations per year at regional meetings

Average
- gives 1-3 presentations per year at regional meetings
- gives 2-3 presentation per year at state meetings
- gives 1 presentation every other year (or less frequently) at a(n) national or international meeting

Poor
- gives 1 presentation every year (or less frequently) at a state meeting
- gives 1 presentation every other year (or less frequently) at a regional meeting

6. Research Activity
Defined in terms of the amount and nature of investigative research conducted or supervised. The goal is to establish and maintain an ongoing program of research at WKU.
Excellent
- directs an average of 4 or more theses per year
- actively involved in data collection in substantive research programs on a continual basis
- serves as a member on an average of 6 or more theses committees per year
- annually submits 2 substantive manuscripts (e.g., peer review journal, book chapter) for publication
Good
- annually submits 1 substantive manuscript (e.g., peer review journal, book chapter) for publication
- directs an average of 3 theses per year
- supervises an average of 3 or more independent study students (e.g., 390, 490, honors, 590) per year
- serves as a member on an average of 3 theses committees per year
- actively involved in data collection every year
Average
- directs an average of 1-2 theses per year
- every two years submits 1 substantive manuscript (e.g., peer review journal, book chapter) for publication
- supervises an average of 1-2 independent study students (e.g., 390, 490, honors, 590) per year
- actively involved in data collection every other year
- serves as a member on an average of 1-2 theses committees per year
Poor
- actively involved in data collection as part of a substantive research program every third year
- supervises an average of fewer than one independent study student (e.g., 390, 490, honors, 590) per year
- actively involved in data collection every third year
- has not served as a member of a thesis committee
- has not submitted a substantive manuscript (e.g., peer review journal, book chapter) for publication

7. Funding Activities
Defined in terms of the extent of one’s involvement in actively seeking grant funding to support university services and projects
Excellent
- administers a grant (including supervision of professional staff, administration of budget, etc.)
- receives an external grant totaling more than $75,000 (per year) or more
- administers/coordinates funded project
Good
- receives an external grant totaling $10,000 - $50,000 (per year)
- every 2-4 years obtains internal funding (e.g., faculty research grant, summer fellowship)
- plays a major role (e.g., PI, CoPI, or Collaborator) in the preparation and submission of an external grant proposal

**Average**
- plays a supportive role in the preparation and submission of grant proposals for external funding (e.g., as a consultant who wrote a portion of a proposal)
- receives an external grant totaling $2,000 - $7,500 (per year)
- every 5 years obtains internal funding (e.g., faculty research grant, summer fellowship)
- applies for internal funding
- explores possible sources of internal funding
- explores possible sources of external funding

**UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE**

To Associate: 1 of 2 Good, none Poor; To Full: 2 of 2 Good.

8. Organizational Duties
Defined in terms of the extent of one's involvement and responsibility in departmental, college, and university activities that are designed to support and maintain the effective functioning of the department, college, and university.

**Excellent**
- participates in university, college, or departmental committees on a daily to weekly basis
- serves as the advisor to 20 or more students
- assumes administrative responsibilities in the department (e.g., writes reports, coordinates grad program, etc.)

**Good**
- frequently represents faculty or departmental interests in university affairs
- administers/coordinates academic program within the department
- is conscientious in meeting obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth functioning of the department
- serves as the advisor to 15-20 students
- regularly participates in student consultation (includes providing guidance, mentoring, writing letters of recommendation, etc.)
- mentors new faculty

**Average**
- regularly participates in department meetings
- participates in university, college, or departmental committees on a monthly basis
- maintains equitable load of student advisement; serves as the advisor to 10-15 students
- is usually on time in fulfilling obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth functioning of the department
- participates in university, college, or departmental committees on a once-a-semester basis
- occasionally represents faculty or department interest in university affairs

**Poor**
- occasionally/rarely participates in student consultation (includes providing guidance, mentoring, writing letters of recommendation, etc.)
- occasionally/rarely participates in department meetings
- rarely represents faculty or departmental interests in university affairs
- serves as the advisor to fewer than 10 students
- is often careless about fulfilling obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth function of the department
- does not participate in university, college, or departmental committees

**9. Applied Professional Activities**
Defined in terms of the extent of one’s involvement in activities that support the needs of the public and that draw on professional expertise consistent with the faculty member’s departmental role. Includes the applied practice of one’s professional skills within and outside of the university. Includes activities undertaken to develop and maintain professional credentials.

**Excellent**
- presents a workshop outside the university 4 or more times per year
  - serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 7 or more times per year
- chairs the board of a non-university organization

**Good**
- presents a colloquium or seminar outside the university every year on average
- regularly provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government
- regularly supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one’s profession
- regularly provides professional development workshops, colloquia, or programs
- regularly engages in the applied practice of the profession (e.g., provides direct services, including assessments and interventions)
- conducts program review for academic programs outside the department
- serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 4 to 6 times per year
- regularly presents workshops for campus and/or community based on area of professional expertise
- presents a workshop outside the university 1 to 3 times per year
- completes Continuing Education requirements to maintain professional credentials (e.g., license, certification) (if applicable)
- complies with state licensing law requirements (if practicing)
- is interviewed by media on topics related to professional expertise 3 or more times per year
- presents a colloquium or seminar outside the university every other year on average
- serves as a judge for a science fair once per year
- serves on the board of a non-university organization

**Average**
- occasionally presents workshops for campus and/or community based on area of professional expertise
- serves as a judge for a science fair every other year
- serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 1 to 3 times per year
- occasionally provides professional development workshops, colloquia, or programs
- occasionally provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government
- occasionally engages in the applied practice of the profession (e.g., provides direct services, including assessments and interventions)
- occasionally supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one’s profession
- presents a colloquium or seminar outside the university every 3 years on average

**Poor**
- is not interviewed by media
- rarely presents workshops for campus and/or community based on area of professional expertise
- does not serve as a consultant to a non-university constituent
- rarely provides professional development workshops, colloquia, or programs
- rarely provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government
- rarely supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one’s profession.
- rarely engages in the applied practice of the profession (e.g., provides direct services, including assessments and interventions)
- does not obtain or maintain appropriate professional credentials (e.g., license or certification)

**PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY**

To Associate: Knowledge of Field & Professional Conduct Good; Professional Involvement at least Average; To Full: 3 of 3 Good.

**10. Knowledge of Field**
Defined in terms of the depth and breadth of knowledge of one’s field, with special emphasis on keeping abreast of new developments.

**Good**
- functions as a competent resource both inside and outside the department
- regularly attends professional development workshops in his/her field
- sufficiently conversant with most major content areas in his/her field, so as to serve as a resource to other departmental faculty members
- reads and is conversant about major professional periodicals in his/her field
- provides accurate information regarding additional sources of information in his/her field
- provides accurate and contemporary information within the scope of his/her competency
- understands and accurately conveys major concepts in his/her field

**Average**
- occasionally attends professional development workshops

**Poor**
- rarely attends professional development workshops
- rarely reads professional periodicals in his/her field
- is unfamiliar with major recent theoretical and empirical developments in his/her specialty area
- does not understand or inaccurately conveys major concepts in his/her field
- rarely attends professional conferences and is not involved in professional societies

11. Professional Involvement
Defined in terms of one’s role and activity in the profession and professional societies

**Excellent**
- serves as editor for a professional journal
- regularly serves in professional organizations as an officer, committee chair, or committee member
- regularly reviews grant proposals for a granting agency
- regularly reviews submissions for professional journals or books

**Good**
- regularly reviews submissions for professional conferences
- serves on the editorial board for a professional journal
- regularly attends professional conferences and is involved in professional societies
- maintains a professional website (other than one’s own homepage)
- maintains professional license (if appropriate)
- occasionally serves in professional organizations as an officer, committee chair, or committee member

**Average**
- occasionally reviews submissions for professional journals or book chapters
- occasionally reviews grant proposals for a granting agency
- occasionally reviews submissions for professional conferences
- conducts technical and professional evaluation of website
- occasionally attends professional conferences and is involved in professional societies

**Poor**
- rarely serves in professional organizations as an officer, committee chair, or committee member
- rarely reviews submissions for professional journals or books
- rarely reviews submissions for professional conferences
12. Professional Conduct
Defined in terms of adhering to APA Code of Ethics and university policies; demonstrating consideration and good citizenship in relations with students and peers and when representing the university; demonstrating collegiality; and valuing diversity.

Good
- consistently treats students and colleagues fairly, irrespective of ethnicity, religion, gender, culture, age or disabilities
- is respected by colleagues (e.g., serves as a source of professional expertise)
- demonstrates respect for colleagues
- displays sensitivity to ethical issues and university policies in the conduct of university and personal activities
- is knowledgeable about and adheres to APA Code of Ethics
- regularly is proactively helpful to colleagues

Poor
- rarely is proactively helpful to colleagues
- seldom treats students and colleagues fairly, irrespective of ethnicity, religion, gender, culture, age or disabilities
- is overly and frequently critical in non-constructive ways of other faculty members
- disregards ethical principles and/or university policies
- makes derogatory remarks about or engages in discriminatory behavior toward people of differing ethnicities, religions, genders, cultures, ages or disabilities
Appendix C
Retranslation Phase Instructions

WKU PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT APPRAISAL FORMAT DEVELOPMENT
STEP 2: ASSIGNING BEHAVIORS (Exemplars) TO DIMENSIONS

In the first step of developing the appraisal instrument, Psychology Department faculty members generated over 350 examples of faculty behavior. Step 2 (i.e., this step) will ensure that the examples of behavior used on the appraisal instrument are clear examples of a given performance dimension.

You will be given a copy of an Excel file with the behaviors/exemplars listed in random order. The objective of this step is to classify each behavior into one of the 12 dimensions of faculty performance. We will use the consensus of these classifications to ensure that each behavior is a clear example of a given dimension.

To complete this task, please:

1. Carefully read the definitions for each of the 12 performance dimensions. (It is a good idea to print the definitions and keep them in front of you while you complete the dimension assignments).
2. For each behavior/exemplar, decide the dimension in which the behavior belongs.
3. Enter the “number” for that dimension in the field to the right of the behavior (i.e., Column D).
4. If you believe a behavior could be classified in more than one dimension, please choose the ONE dimension for which that behavior is most representative.
5. If you are not familiar with a behavior, do NOT assign that behavior. Simply leave the field blank.
6. After you have finished assigning the behaviors to dimensions, save your Excel file and send it to Travis Yanul at: travis.yanul13@wku.edu

Note: You will probably notice that the list of behaviors includes behaviors that would be considered poor performance. Regardless of the level of performance, please assign a dimension to each behavior that you are familiar with.

Thank you for your time in completing this important step of the process!
PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT 12 DIMENSIONS OF PERFORMANCE

Use the dimension list below as a “quick list.” Be sure you fully understand each dimension by reading the definitions on the following pages.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
1. Teaching: Planning
2. Teaching: Delivery
3. Teaching: Assessment of Student Performance

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY
4. Publications
5. Presentations
6. Research Activity

SERVICE ACTIVITY
7. University Service
8. Public Service
9. Professional Service/Professional Development

UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES
10. Student Engagement
11. Funding Activities

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT
12. Professional Conduct
Appendix D

Anchor Calibration Phase Instructions

**WKU PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT APPRAISAL FORMAT DEVELOPMENT**

**Directions for Rating Exemplars Within Dimensions**

The step we just completed classified each exemplar into one of the 12 dimensions of faculty performance. Using consensus across the department ensured that each exemplar is a clear example of a given dimension.

The objective of the current step is to rate each exemplar within each of the 12 dimensions of faculty performance (see attached Excel file). We will use the mean of these ratings to determine what level of performance is represented by a given exemplar.

**For each Dimension:**

1. Carefully read the definition of the dimension (see below or at the top of each Excel sheet).

2. Scan each activity listed under that dimension to get an overall idea of the exemplars you will be rating.

3. Determine the level of performance reflected by each exemplar on the “Performance Rating Scale” below. **For each exemplar, enter the rating (1 to 4) for that exemplar in the field to the right of the exemplar.**

Take for example the exemplar in Dimension 2: Teaching Delivery “Regularly uses current technology in instruction in an appropriate and effective manner.” If this behavior is representative of what is expected for a faculty member teaching in the Psychology Department, then enter a “2” in the field to the right of the activity; if the behavior exceeds expectations enter a “3” in the field; if the behavior fails to meet expectations, enter a “1” in the field.

4. **After you have finished assigning ratings to the exemplars, save your Excel file and send it to Travis Yanul at: travis.yanul13@wku.edu**

Thank you for your time in completing this important step of the process!
Performance Rating Scale

4 – Excellent  This rating reflects a level of performance that consistently meets and almost always exceeds expectations. (This rating should be assigned on a limited basis.)

3 - Good  This rating reflects a level of performance that consistently meets and frequently exceeds performance expectations. The faculty member has gone beyond what is typically expected.

2 – Satisfactory  This rating reflects good performance and what is expected from faculty member who meets and occasionally exceeds performance expectations.

1 - Poor  This rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations.
Appendix E

Questionnaire to Assess Faculty Perceptions of BARS

Faculty Performance Appraisal Format Development Questionnaire

The following questionnaire is designed to measure perceptions of fairness and satisfaction with the process used to develop the performance appraisal format that will be used to evaluate Psychology Department faculty performance. Please complete the questionnaire according to the instructions at the beginning of each section. Thank you for your participation in this research.

***Completion of this questionnaire implies your informed consent.***

Please indicate your rank by placing a check by one of the following:
Instructor ___
Assistant ___
Associate ___
Full ___

1. Were you promoted using the old instrument for evaluation? Yes ___ No ___
2. Did you participate in the development of the old performance appraisal format in 2001? Yes ___ No ___
3. Were you a faculty member when the old performance appraisal instrument was developed in 2001? Yes ___ No ___

Please respond to the statements on the following three pages by circling the appropriate number in the corresponding box using this five-point Likert scale:
1 = (SD) Strongly Disagree
2 = (D) Disagree
3 = (N) Neutral
4 = (A) Agree
5 = (SA) Strongly Agree
Please respond to the following items regarding the **OLD PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORMAT** (i.e., the one used by the Psychology Department from 2001 to 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The old instrument captured what I did on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The old format captured what I did in the area of <em>teaching</em>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The old format captured what I did in the area of <em>research</em>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The old format captured what I did in the area of <em>service</em> <em>(university, community, professional)</em>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The old format captured what I did in the area of <em>professional service and development</em>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I made a significant contribution to the development of the old instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The old instrument was a fair way to evaluate all faculty members of the psychology department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall, I was satisfied with the old performance appraisal instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The old appraisal format more accurately assessed what I do in my job compared to the new instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was able to express my views and feelings during the process of developing the old appraisal instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I had influence over the outcome arrived at during the development of the old appraisal instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The process of developing the old appraisal instrument was free of bias.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The old appraisal instrument was based on accurate information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The outcomes that resulted from the old appraisal instrument reflected the effort I put into my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The outcomes that resulted from the old appraisal instrument were appropriate for the work I had completed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The outcomes that resulted from the old appraisal instrument reflected my contributions to the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The outcomes that resulted from the old appraisal instrument were justified given my performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Recognizing that the behavioral anchors are just examples of effective and ineffective job performance, please indicate what percentage of your job performance was captured by the old instrument.

The old instrument captured what percentage of the work that you did? _____%

19. If the old instrument did not accurately capture the work that you did, in what area(s) was the old instrument deficient?
Please respond to the following items regarding the **NEW PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORMAT**. Think in terms of the new appraisal instrument that has been developed over the past few months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The new instrument captures what I do on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The new format captures what I do in the area of teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The new format captures what I do in the area of research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The new format captures what I do in the area of service (university, community, professional).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The new format captures what I do in the area of professional service and development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I made a significant contribution to development of the new instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The new instrument is a fair way to evaluate all faculty members of the psychology department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall, I am satisfied with the new performance appraisal instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The new appraisal format will more accurately assess what I do in my job compared to the old instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was able to express my views and feelings during the process of developing the new appraisal instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I had influence over the outcome arrived at during the development of the new appraisal instrument.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The process of developing the new appraisal instrument was free of bias.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The new appraisal instrument is based on accurate information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Any outcomes resulting from the new appraisal instrument will be reflective of the effort I put into my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Any outcomes resulting from the new appraisal instrument will be appropriate for the work I complete.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Any outcomes resulting from the new appraisal instrument will be reflective of my contributions to the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Any outcomes resulting from the new appraisal instrument will be justified given my performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My evaluations will be higher with the new appraisal format.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My evaluations will be lower with the new appraisal format.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Recognizing that the behavioral anchors are just examples of effective and ineffective job performance, please indicate what percentage of your job performance will be captured by the new instrument.

   The new instrument captures what percentage of the work that you do? ____ %

21. If the new instrument does not accurately capture the work that you do, in what area(s) is the new instrument deficient?