PennState
College of Information
Sciences and Technology

f 𝕏 📷 @ISTatPENNSTATE
ist.psu.edu

Managing Information, Powering Intelligence

John "Jack" Carroll: Performance Evaluation Summary
January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017

Evaluation Criteria

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations	Significantly Exceeding Expectations
Teaching		✓			
Research				✓	
Service					✓
Overall				✓	

The Faculty Activity Report is an annual review that provides faculty members with a review and assessment of their accomplishments for each calendar year. If there are areas that need improvement, they will be identified. Likewise, areas for which there is evidence of significant accomplishment will be identified. Any rating at or above the mid-point, Meeting Expectations, should be considered an acceptable outcome. Ratings below the mid-point represent situations where changes are encouraged. It is expected that the vast majority of faculty will receive ratings of Meeting or Exceeding Expectations. The highest rating, Significantly Exceeding Expectations, reflects outstanding contributions that are out of the ordinary. At the same time, there is no required distribution that guides the assignment of these ratings.

To remind you of the process, each member of the three committees is charged with providing an individual review/assessment for each individual being reviewed. Each committee is asked to draft a single narrative providing feedback regarding the area being reviewed. All of this is used as input into the process, and I assume responsibility for considering and integrating this information and producing the final review.

The default allocation of effort teaching faculty is 60% teaching, 20% service, with the final 20% being defined through one-on-one conversations with me. This final 20% may be allocated to teaching, service, research or a combination of these areas. The default allocation of effort full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The overall assessment is produced by combining contributions in each area while considering these weights.

Importantly, if someone has a pattern of receiving a rating of Needs Improvement' or lower in the same area, the rating for that area may be adjusted and that area may be given greater consideration when deciding on the overall rating. For example, if someone would have received a Needs Improvement in an area for two years in a row, that rating may be lowered to Unsatisfactory in recognition of a lack of progress in addressing the corresponding concerns. Further, the overall rating may also be adjusted in recognition of the lack of progress in addressing the corresponding concerns. Moving forward, I will also be adopting the policy that an Unsatisfactory rating in any area will result in an Unsatisfactory overall rating.

Finally, before getting into individual results, I want to provide a brief overview of how results compared to last year. In the past, service ratings were very high, but this year the average for service decreased to be similar to the average for research and teaching. The ratings for research decreased a little while the average for teaching stayed about the same. Overall ratings deceased a little as well. After several years calibrating ratings, it seems that we have reached the point where Significantly Exceeding Expectations really is being used to recognize unusual/exceptional accomplishments, with Exceeding Expectations recognizing those individuals who had a very good year, and Meeting Expectations being used to recognize individuals who were successful in their positions. Meeting Expectations was the most common overall rating, which I believe is appropriate. Exceeding Expectations was the second most common rating, recognizing that we have many people who had a very good year. Significantly Exceeding Expectations was used a little less frequently than last year, and a few individuals received overall ratings of Need Improvement or Unsatisfactory.

Teaching:
The committee considers the overall rating as not meeting expectations in recognition of the poor feedback received for the one course taught. One section of IST110H with sixteen students was taught, with twelve responses. The quality of the course was rated 3.08, and instructor 2.92. On the surface, the course appeared experimental and student-taught. Feedback suggests that centering the class on five books, and class discussion, could be enhanced by supplementing the readings with instructor presentation. As one student wrote, "it would have been nice to have some instruction on the topics from the books." There was also the comment to improve feedback, and return "assignments in a timely manner with real justification of the grade." It is clear that something did not go as planned with this course.

Jack advises four first-year PhD students, and five more senior PhD students, four masters students, and two ABD students working at PayPal. He is currently revising the PhD core course in HCD, which he is scheduled to teach for 28 students in spring 2018. Contributions related to supervision of students are strong, but the overall rating for teaching is low due to issues with traditional classes this year.

Service:
Jack's Service to IST concentrates on chairing the P&T Committee and the HCD faculty search committee. Search committee should be a particularly demanding committee given the number of campus visits. P&T used to be a demanding committee but Fall 2017 was a relatively lighter one given the low number of P&T case (n=1). Unfortunately, Jack did not participate in any of the key college events this year including commencement, recruiting events for undergraduates, or other events where the college needed faculty participation. Beyond Penn State, Jack is on a number of conference and program committees including International Conference on Digital Government Research, ACM Designing Interactive Systems, International Conference on Smart Learning Ecosystems and Regional Development. He has served on NSF panel once in 2017. It would be useful for the committee to have more information about external service. For example, many board memberships are listed but there is no information about what kind of work resulted from these memberships.

Research:
Jack's research explores challenges associated with community information infrastructures and services. His research resulted in many publications this year. Jack is actively pursuing external funding, submitted three NSF proposals as PI (two declined and one pending) and another NSF proposal as co-PI (declined), but did not receive any new grants this year. Given the research output and his actively grant applications, this appears to be a strong year.

Summing Up:

Research and service represent areas of significant contributions this year, with numerous publications, ongoing funding, and meaningful contributions through several significant service responsibilities. Teaching was mixed, with one class that seems to have had some issues along with solid contributions in terms of advising/mentoring students. Thank you for taking on these various service activities – they really are important for keeping the college functioning.

On the date indicated below, the Dean provided with me with the results of my annual evaluation. I was provided with a copy of this completed form. (You may comment on reverse side if desired.)

Faculty Member: _____   _____
                Signature   Date

Dean: _____   4.22.19_____
                Signature   Date