**Annual Faculty Evaluation** **HHP PPS No. 04.02.10**

**Effective Date: November 4, 2022**

**Next Review Date: November 4, 2027**

**Sr. Reviewer: Department Chair**

**01. DEFINITIONS**

For the purpose of this document, the following definitions apply:

01.02 The Department **Personnel Committee** (PC) is made up of tenured faculty who are paid at a rate of fifty percent or more from faculty salary dollars budgeted to the Department (AA/PPS 04.02.20).

01.02 The **Department’s recommendation** includes the recommendations of both the PC and the Chair.

* 1. A **College recommendation** includes the recommendation of the Dean.

01.04 **Annual Evaluations** are used to provide:

a. Each faculty member with information about his/her strengths and growth areas that may be used for continuous professional development,

b. The Department Chair and the PC with information that can be used in in awarding merit raises, and/or in making decisions regarding the retention of faculty (AA/PPS 04.02.10).

01.05 **Merit** is defined as additional salary adjustments in recognition of performance that is clearly exceptional during the preceding merit evaluation period. Merit salary adjustments are made every two years when funds are available. Merit salary adjustments are based on a faculty member’s annual evaluations for the period defined by the President.

**02. PURPOSE AND CORRESPONSING POLICIES**

02.01 The Department of Health and Human Performance (HHP) Policy and Procedure Statement sets forth criteria and guidelines for annual evaluation in the Department of HHP. These criteria are based on the following sources:

a. AA/PPS 04.01.50 Faculty Merit and Retention Salary Adjustments

b. AA/PPS 04.01.20 Faculty Responsibilities, Definitions, and Titles

c. AA/PPS 04.02.10 Faculty Background Checks and Self-Reporting Requirements

d. AA/PPS 04.02.20 Tenure and Promotion Review

e. Faculty Handbook, Texas State University

f. HHP PPS 04.02.20

02.02 The primary method for awarding salary raises at Texas State is based upon the annual evaluation for merit salary adjustments (AA/PPS 04.01.50). In addition, reappointment decisions for faculty both non-tenure line and tenure-track are informed by annual evaluations.

**03. CANDIDATES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION**

03.01 All faculty employed as percentage-contract faculty are evaluated annually and required to complete an annual evaluation.

03.03 All faculty employed as percentage-contract faculty are eligible for merit raises awarded through this process.

03.04 Because all per course faculty are hired for one semester at a time, they do not complete an annual evaluation. Instead, they are evaluated at the end of each semester (Refer to paragraph 14).

03.05 Graduate Teaching Assistants do not complete an annual evaluation, as they are evaluated at the end of each semester.

**04. annual ACTIVitY report**

04.01 The Annual Activity Report is based on the previous calendar year’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.

04.02 Faculty will complete the Annual Activity Report by uploading at least two files into the faculty qualifications system: A narrative concisely summarizing achievements in all three areas of faculty evaluation in HHP Annual Activity Report Form (Appendix A) and an updated Texas State Vita (AA/PPS 04.02.20).

04.03 The HHP Annual Activity Report Form provides faculty the opportunity to report their contributions in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service during the past year, self-evaluate, and establish goals for next year.

04.04 The Annual Activity Report should document achievements that only apply to the time period (previous calendar year) of the annual evaluation.

04.05 Faculty should concisely summarize evidence and provide additional documentation that supports quality of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service in their Annual Activity Report.

**05. REVIEW PROCESS**

05.01Annually, in early January, the Chair will notify all faculty of the required electronic and hard copy materials to be submitted by February 1.

05.02 The PC and the Chair will make independent and separate recommendations on each faculty member for merit and performance salary adjustments.

05.03 After the Annual Activity Reports are due, the PC will have two weeks to review each faculty member’s annual activity report, to evaluate teaching, scholarship/creativity activity, and service, and to make evaluative comments that provide a rationale for scoring and suggestions for professional growth and development.

05.04 Faculty will be given an opportunity to review preliminary recommendations made by both the Chair and the PC prior to the recommendations being forwarded to the Dean. Specifically, before making final merit recommendations, the Chair shall be required to indicate to each faculty member whether the Chair intends to recommend that specific faculty member for merit and the approximate level of merit determined for that specific faculty member. After receiving the PC and Chair's preliminary recommendations, faculty who believe their accomplishments have been overlooked or undervalued may, within five working days, request a meeting with the Chair. At this meeting, the Chair shall explain the reasons for preliminary recommendations, and the faculty member may ask the Chair to reconsider the preliminary decision on the basis of accomplishments or achievements that may have been initially overlooked or undervalued. The Chair may also request additional PC members to evaluate the faculty member’s annual accomplishments. After reconsidering the accomplishments of all faculty who have requested a review of their activities, the Chair will make final merit recommendations to the Dean. Not meeting expectations in an annual evaluation generally involves receiving evaluations of “Does Not Meet Expectations” in one or more categories, that are not compensated for by performance ratings in other categories.

05.05 If a faculty member on a tenure-track or extended-term contract fails to meet departmental expectations, the PC and Chair will provide the faculty member with specific written suggestions for improvement in order to become eligible for a merit raise. Reappointment evaluations for tenure and promotion and for clinical faculty promotion are separate evaluations from annual evaluations.

05.06 If a faculty member is tenured and fails to meet departmental expectations, the Chair will inform the faculty member in writing and invite the faculty member to meet and discuss the evaluation. This notice should be given within three working days from completion of the annual evaluation. If the faculty member would like to meet with the Chair, the faculty member has six working days (after the receipt of the Chair’s written notification). If the faculty member chooses not to meet with the Chair, the faculty member should notify the Chair in writing within the six-day period. The faculty member’s failure to respond does not prevent the process from moving forward.

a. After discussing the evaluation with the faculty member, if the Chair still finds that the faculty member may have failed to meet departmental expectations, the Chair will notify the PC of this finding and call a special hearing of the PC. This hearing should take place no earlier than three and no later than six working days after the Chair’s meeting with the faculty member.

b. The Chair will present the evaluation and supporting documentation to the PC. The affected faculty member can be present, address the PC, and provide additional evidence related to his or her performance.

c. The PC will discuss the evidence provided by the Chair and the faculty member. The faculty member will not be present during this discussion, and the Chair will preside in a non-voting capacity. The PC will choose a recorder who is responsible for minutes of the deliberations.

d. The PC may decide to gather additional information before making a judgment on the faculty member's performance. Such additional information, if required by the PC, should be provided and the PC should reconvene and make its decision within ten working days after the first PC meeting regarding the issue.

e. When it has gathered relevant information, the PC will vote by secret ballot as to whether the faculty member has performed to departmental standards. The affected faculty member will not be present for the vote. A finding of nonperformance requires the vote of a majority (fifty-one percent or greater) of the members of the PC present at the meeting excluding the Chair and affected faculty member. The Chair must concur in a finding of nonperformance.

f. If the faculty member is judged to have performed below expectations, the Chair and faculty member, in consultation with the PC, will design a Professional Development Plan to help the faculty member meet departmental expectations in the future. The PC recorder will utilize AA/PPS 04.02.10, Form No. 1, which includes a record of the vote and a list of the faculty voting for documentation. The PC will forward the form to the Chair upon completion. The Chair will forward the tracking form, the record of the vote, list of voters, the Chair's recommendation, and a copy of the Professional Development Plan to the Dean of the COE within ten working days of the vote.

g. The Professional Development Plan will follow timelines and procedures prescribed in AA/PPS 04.02.10.

05.07 The Dean also makes an independent and separate recommendation on each annual evaluation.

**06. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION**

06.01 Faculty performance in the Department of HHP is evaluated on documentation of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Collegial contributions to the University community by the candidates are also important. Collegial faculty members are expected to contribute to the positive functioning of their respective program, department and the university.

06.02 Faculty are assigned different workloads based on several factors, including their year of employment, their scholarly productivity, and their administrative responsibilities (for more information, refer to HHP PPS 04.01.40). Because faculty are assigned different workloads, the workload should be considered when evaluating teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. For each area (teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service), faculty will be evaluated on multiple criteria as described in the HPP Evaluation Rubrics (Appendix B-D). Faculty’s score for each area will be the average of criteria ratings using the following scale:

1 point = Does Not Meet Expectations

2 points = Meets Expectations

3 points = Exceeds Expectations

4 points = Exemplary

**07. TEACHING**

07.01 Teaching, for the purpose of annual evaluation, includes planning, implementing and assessing instruction, facilitation and support of student learning, and cooperation in departmental programs and procedures (e.g., consideration of accreditation requirements and standards, maintenance of certification requirements). Updating course content to include current topical or field-specific content and practices, as well as maintaining best practices in pedagogy and assessment are also part of teaching. Annual evaluation of teaching quality and effectiveness focuses on courses taught during the previous calendar year. Supervision of individualized student learning experiences, including internship, practicum, field experience, independent study, culminating project and thesis are included in faculty workload. Overload and summer courses may be included in faculty annual reports; however, because these courses are taught on a separate contract, inclusion is not required.

07.02 Documentation of Teaching Performance. Evidence of teaching performance can be established through careful consideration of formative and summative teaching documentation. Teaching effectiveness will be established through multiple summative student evaluations. Teaching quality will be established through evidence presented in the Annual Activity Report Form.

07.03 Evidence of teaching performance will be obtained by the evaluation of multiple criteria: teaching goals, student evaluations, course currency, professional development, individualized student learning mentoring, curriculum development, and teaching recognition (Appendix B). All faculty must report teaching goals, all student evaluation of teaching course section means, currency/methodology, and individualized student learning activities.

a. Teaching goals refers to a written reflection of teaching goals, goal attainment, methodology, and goals for continued improvement. Teaching goals should address the instructor’s: 1) teaching goals and how the goals are consistent with the aims of his/her academic program, the HHP Department, College of Education and the University; 2) a discussion of goal attainment; 3) description of changes that will be made to future course methodology to meet teaching goals; and 4) goals for continued development to meet teaching goals (see Appendix B for more information).

b. Student evaluation scores refer to aggregate data from HHP student evaluations for all fall and spring courses, annually. Faculty will report all section means for all courses taught during the past year. Student response rate will also be reported and considered when interpreting scores.

c. Current/methodology refers to currency of course content and teaching practices utilized in faculty courses.

d. Professional Development / Innovation refers to pedagogical development of faculty and implementation of innovative teaching practices. Professional development consists of activities aimed at improvement in teaching performance. Innovative teaching practices are demonstrated through evidence of implementation of practice learning during professional development activities.

e. Individualized students learning refers to faculty mentoring of students conducting individualized learning projects including, but not limited to, theses, culminating projects, independent studies, and internships.

f. Curriculum development refers to creation of new courses, development of new program curricula or other curriculum development activities.

g. External evaluation refers to evaluation of teaching performance by professionals from the office of instructional technology design, fellow HHP teaching faculty, or other qualified professionals.

h. Teaching Funding refers to monetary attainment for support of facilitation of teaching methodology or activities, which may include internal or external contracts or grants.

i. Recognition / Awards refers to acknowledgment of excellence in teaching performance by internal or external professional organizations.

j. Evidence of faculty teaching performance will be uploaded into the faculty qualifications system. Additional evidence of teaching performance may be entered into the faculty qualifications system. The Chair may also require examples of additional evidence of quality to be submitted in hard copy form. These may include but are not limited to:

i. Class artifacts including a minimum of two but not to exceed four. Examples of class artifacts include course materials such as power point presentations, class assignments, classroom activities and discussion prompts.

ii. Evidence of efforts to enhance teaching excellence. An example may include the participation in Office of Professional Development sponsored events focused on teaching enhancement.

iii. College, university, or professional teaching awards.

iv. Completed doctoral dissertations, master’s theses, independent studies, and supervised research projects.

v. The development and/or revision of programs, courses, seminars, and assessments.

vi. Accolades from students or colleagues including written comments from student end-of-semester evaluations.

vii. Acquisition of instructional grant(s) (e.g., instructional technology grants and academic computing committee grants).

vii. Peer evaluation: Peer evaluator(s) can include, but are not limited to, professionals from the office of instructional technology, a division coordinator or fellow HHP teaching faculty member from the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

07.04 Criteria for Teaching Evaluation. Faculty’s annual teaching performance will be evaluated using the *Teaching Performance Rubric* (Appendix B).

**08. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY CRITERIA**

08.01 Scholarly/creative activity is among the primary functions of the university. A faculty member’s contribution will vary from one academic or professional field to another, but the general test to be applied is that the faculty member is engaged consistently and effectively in scholarly/creative activity of quality and distinction. Evidence of high quality and distinction can be established through careful consideration of productivity and quality. Collaboration with colleagues is viewed as a means of enhancing scholarly/creative activity. The quality of the results and the relative contributions of the participants must be weighed, and documentation of the role and contribution of the individual should be annotated in the faculty qualifications system.

08.02 The HHP Department recognizes that faculty scholarly/creative activity enhances teaching and vice versa; therefore, an inclusive view of scholarly/creative activity is held that recognizes the importance of *discipline-based* (theoretical), *application-oriented* (action), and *pedagogical* (instructional) research and scholarship, among others. Even though faculty members may publish in many venues, peer-reviewed works will receive greater emphasis when decisions are made related to appointment, tenure, promotion and merit. Venues should be sought that will result in the greatest recognition by colleagues; therefore, as an example, more emphasis will be given to national/international works than to others.

08.03 Documentation of Criteria for Scholarly/Creative Activity. Evidence of scholarly/creative activity performance will be obtained by the evaluation of multiple criteria, including scholarly publications and presentations, funding, awards, and other criteria (Appendix C). Scholarly products and activity will be reported in the Annual Activity Report Form.

a. Scholarly/Creative products include, but are not limited to:

i. Research-based articles published in high quality peer-reviewed publications;

ii. Research-based articles in press or published online before print (counts for only 1 year; must have DOI assigned);

iii. Refereed books published (counts for 2 years);

iv. Refereed edited books published;

v. Editor of edited books (chapters written by range of authors) published;

vi. Refereed book chapters published; and

vii. Refereed monographs published;

viii. Refereed, full-manuscript articles published in proceedings of professional presentations at national/state/regional meetings.

ix. Successful external grants and contracts that support research. Activity will be credited for all years reassigned time or direct costs are expended;

b. Other publications or scholarly/creative activities that may also be taken into consideration, although assigned less weight, as evidence of progress towards publication include, but are not limited to:

i. Manuscripts in review;

ii. Acquisition or management of internal grant;

iii. Unsuccessful submission of external grant proposals;

iv. Development of tests and/or assessment instruments;

v. Development of software and/or multimedia products;

vi. Development of internet products;

vii. Technical reports published;

viii. Peer-reviews abstracts of professional presentations published; and

ix. Book reviews published.

c. Scholarly/Creative presentations refer to peer-reviewed or referred presentations conducted in a professional venue, typically peer-reviewed, juried, or invited presentations at state, national, or international levels.

d. Funding refers to monetary awards acquired for advancement of faculty’s scholarly/creative agenda. Internal and external contract and grants are considered, although external funding is typically assigned more weight.

e. Scholarly/Creative Awards refers to acknowledgment of excellence in scholarship by internal offices or external professional organizations.

f. Evidence of scholarly products and activities will be uploaded into the faculty qualifications system.

08.04 Quality. The quantity of published material is, alone, not enough evidence of scholarly/creative activity. The quality of each endeavor must be carefully documented and is often more important than quantity. Quality refers to the implications to the field, significance, and importance of the work to a degree indicated by the venue. When determining quality, such factors as acceptance rate, index distribution, readership, importance to the field, authorship/contribution, and rigor of the research project should be considered. Documentation of the quality of venues and a description of faculty’s contribution to each publication is expected. In short, all peer-reviewed works are not considered equal.

08.05 Criteria for Scholarly/Creative Activity Evaluation. Faculty’s annual scholarly and creative performance score will be evaluated using the *Scholarly/Creative Activity Performance Rubrics for Tenure-Line, Clinical, and Lecturer* faculty, respectively (Appendix C).

a. Modification of these criteria will be considered for new tenure-track

faculty who have been on staff less than one year at the time of culmination of the first annual evaluation cycle since their hire.

b. Research criteria for clinical faculty shall be based on the terms of their contract.

**09. SERVICE**

09.01 In addition to demonstrated excellence in teaching and scholarly/creative activity, faculty should have a commitment to the University, their professions through participation in service activities. Such participation may take several different forms, including: service to the Institution (service on committees charged by the Faculty Senate or by an administrator at the Dean level or higher); service to the College (service on a committee charged by the Dean of the COE); service to the Department (service on a committee charged by the Chair of the Department); and service to the profession or to higher education in general (leadership/service appointments made by officials representing professional organizations, public schools, cities, states, or the nation).

09.02 Faculty members are expected to participate in the conduct of their department, college, and university; in appropriate professional organizations in their field; and in professional service to schools, colleges, universities, and other agencies in the community. Evidence of superior service may be established through careful consideration in the areas of productivity and quality. While service activity is expected of each faculty member, service shall not substitute for expectations in teaching or in scholarly/creative activity.

09.03 Service expectations will vary among ranks (See paragraph 10.01 for more information).

a. Lecturers are expected to be actively involved in service.

b. Tenure-track faculty are expected to perform targeted service.

c. Tenured faculty are expected to assume leadership roles and perform extensive service activities.

09.04 Documentation of Effective Service. Evidence of service will be obtained by the evaluation of multiple criteria: institutional service, service to professional organizations, community service, editorial service, service funding, and service recognition (Appendix D). All faculty must report institutional service, professional service, and editorial contributions; reporting of additional criteria is at the discretion of individual faculty. Documentation will be presented within the Annual Activity Report Form.

a. Institutional service refers to service to the departmental, college, or university that contributes to department, college, or university function and goals.

b. Professional service refers to contribution to advancement of faculty’s field of study beyond the university at the state, national, or internal level.

c. Community service refers to service to the community related to the faculty’s field of study.

d. Editorial service refers to editorial contributions, including, but not limited to, serving as a reviewer for scholarly publications, external academic organizations, funding agencies, professional organizations, or as editor of a scholarly publication.

e. Service Recognition refers to acknowledgment of excellence in service by internal offices or external professional or community organizations.

f. Administrative Reassignment refers to institutional responsibilities in an administrative role, including servicing as a program coordinator, departmental chair, or serving in other institutional offices within the University with reassigned time.

g. Evidence of service activities and accomplishments will be uploaded into the faculty qualifications system and may include letters of recognition from the chair of a committee, examples of projects undertaken by a committee, products from service, or documentation of internal or external recognition for institutional, professional, or community service. Documentation of service may also be required by the Chair.

09.05 Quality. Service involves working creatively with others so that professional knowledge has an impact on the primary and secondary schools, colleges, professional organizations, community agencies, and other institutions. The impact of service on the group served is of critical importance in evaluating quality of service. Added value should be given for committees with significant impact and/or significant time commitments and demonstrated leadership in service.

09.06 Criteria for Service Evaluation. Faculty’s annual service performance score will be evaluated using the *Service Performance Rubric* (Appendix D).

Modification of these criteria will be considered for new tenure-track faculty members who have been on staff less than a year at the time of culmination of the first annual evaluation cycle since their hire.

**10. FACULTY WITH REASSIGNED TIME**

10.01 Faculty on 100% reassigned time for research and grant supervisors will be evaluated as meeting expectations based on fulfillment of the terms of the release contract. Evaluation will be made in consultation with the office in charge of or charged with overseeing the contract. Judgment on the criteria for research, *Exceeds Expectations* and *Exemplary*, will be made on a case-by-case basis in accordance with interpretation of the contract. Judgment on the criteria for service will be based on criteria stated in paragraph 09.05.

10.02 Faculty on administrative reassigned time will be evaluated pro-rata on [proportion of] outstanding workload (as determined by department policy or contract) dedicated to research. Based on stated proration, equal merit will be awarded as is awarded to another tenured/tenure-track faculty.

**11. SELF-EVALUATION**

11.01 HHP faculty will submit a self-evaluation within the HHP Faculty Annual Report Form. Specifically, they should identify whether (and explain why) they believe they met evaluation standards for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.

**12. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ANNUAL REVIEW AND TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW**

12.01 While these two processes are not necessarily related, successful candidates for consideration of tenure and promotion typically have exceeded expectations during annual reviews.

**13. ELIGIBILITY FOR MERIT**

13.01 A merit raise shall be defined as an additional salary to be awarded to faculty whose performance meets or exceeds departmental expectations during the preceding merit evaluation period.

13.02 Each faculty member is evaluated by at least 2 members of the PC. The assigned PC members will: a) score teaching, service, and scholarship based on the criteria stated in paragraphs presented in the evaluation rubrics, based evaluation area weights, and sum scores from each area; and b) draft evaluative comments that provide a rationale for scoring and suggestions for professional growth and development. The scores in each category will be used to create a frequency distribution.

13.03 The Chair will then carefully review the summary scores and comments provided by the PC as well as the documents provided by each faculty member for annual evaluation. The Chair will provide his/her own scores and evaluative comments.

13.04 The scores provided by the PC and the Chair will be averaged across the three categories and used in the calculation of merit.

13.05 A faculty member will be considered for merit based upon the evaluation period of the previous three years for the areas of teaching, creative/scholarship, and service. For tenure-track and tenured faculty, the scores for these three areas for each of the previous three years will be averaged and compared to the departmental mean.

13.06 Merit will usually be awarded using the following formula: Percent salary increase = [% of eligible salaries allocated for merit raises x (faculty member’s score/departmental mean)] x 100.

**14. EVALUATION OF PER COURSE FACULTY**

14.01 The Department of HHP currently employs many per-course faculty, in large part, to broaden the range and increase the number of course offerings. Also, per-course faculty often bring expertise to the classroom not possessed by full-time faculty. HHP realizes the importance of per-course faculty and will continue to employ the highest quality per-course faculty. To ensure that the teaching performances of the per-course faculty conform to the Department’s standards of teaching quality, per-course faculty will be evaluated by the Department Chair, and students. At the end of the semester, students of per-course faculty will complete course evaluations on the faculty member’s teaching. These evaluations will be reviewed by both the Department Chair and shared with the appropriate Program Coordinator. The Chair will draft a formal report. The report is based on a review of the course syllabus, feedback from the Program Coordinator, and review of both the qualitative and quantitative portions of the student evaluations. The per course faculty member will acknowledge the evaluation, indicating that he/she has read the report, and may, if desired, add his/her own written comments. The evaluation will be entered into the per-course faculty member’s permanent file and should be considered when determining whether the per-course faculty should be re-hired.

**Certification Statement**

This HHP PPS has been approved by the reviewers listed below and represents the

HHP Department policy and procedure from the date of the document until superseded.

Voting Faculty Representative: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Approve: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chair of the HHP Department

**Appendix A**

**Annual Activity Report Form**

Based on title/position and workload, faculty will report annual teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities. Use this form to report annual activity, to conduct a self-evaluation, and to provide a rationale for self-evaluation scores.

**Reporting**

Within the table provided below, faculty will report annual activities and accomplishments from the previous year. Faculty will provide a statement describing their annual accomplishments for teaching, service, and scholarly activity as described within the reporting table below. Additionally, faculty will conduct a self-evaluation for each area of evaluation (teaching, research, service), and will provide a rationale for self-scores in each area of evaluation by referencing criteria benchmarks identified in the associated rubric. Faculty will complete the reporting form for Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service noting specific accomplishments in each area during the previous year (except for scholarly products which look at a 3-year average). When necessary, or at the request of the chair, faculty will provide evidence (e.g., documentation of professional development activities, professional organization engagement, publications/presentations) documenting stated activities and accomplishments. The table below provides a further description of the reporting process.

**Reporting and Scoring for Teaching**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria**  **Report on teaching criteria within this table. All faculty must report teaching goals, student evaluation scores, currency/methodology, and individualized student learning.** | **Accomplishments / Description / Documentation**  **Report annual teaching activity and accomplishments in this column, including a description of your accomplishments and engagement, and provide documentation, when appropriate. Documentation should be uploaded in your annual report within electronic reporting system. To report your activities, please replace the existing blue text with your statement.** |
| **Teaching goals** | Present your teaching goals for the past year and explain their alignment with program, departmental, college, and/or university goals. Describe efforts to meet teaching goals and discuss level of goal attainment and discuss any adjustments you will make in future courses to meet your teaching goals. Finally, describe goals for continued development to meet teaching goals. |
| **Student evaluation scores** | Report all section SET means with response rate for each section. A summary and examples of students’ comments may also be included. |
| **Currency / methodology** | Describe course currency by explaining alignment with goals, standard, and competencies within your field, as well as currently accepted best practices in your field. Syllabi, other course materials, and professional documents within your field, may be submitted as documentation. |
| **Individualized student learning** | Describe your role in any theses, culminating project or other individualized student learning committees or activities in which you engaged during the previous year. Include the number of committees on which you served, your role on each, and your level of involvement and time commitment. Role/involvement description may include project development, methodology, editing, or other guidance provided to students. |
| **Professional development / Innovation** | Report the number and quality of professional development activities in which you engaged in the past year. Describe each activity, including a description of content/focus, time commitment, and quality/depth. Also, make a statement on how you have implemented innovations from professional development activities into your courses. Additionally, provide a rationale for each self-score by referencing criteria identified in the teaching rubric. |
| **Curriculum development** | Report your role in any curriculum development activities during the past year. Describe your role in course development, program curriculum development, or accreditation activities. Documentation may include new course syllabi or university/professional organization letters/form demonstration curriculum or accreditation process/progress. |
| **Teaching funding** | Report any funding submissions or awards from the past year, or evidence of preparation of funding submission. Internal and external submissions and awards should be included, as well documentation of collaboration with the Office of Sponsored research in seeking funding. Documentation may consist of letters of submission, award, or rejection. Finally, describe your contribution to each submission. |
| **Teaching recognition** | Report any award received in the past year and provide a statement describing why you received the award(s). Describe the organization granting the award. Documentation may include award letters. |

**Faculty Self-Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Self-evaluation score** | **Self-evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate your self-evaluation teaching score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for your self-evaluation score. Your statement should include a summary of your annual teaching accomplishments and how they align with the teaching criteria benchmarks identified in the teaching rubric. |

**Personnel Committee Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation score** | **Evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate PC teaching score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for the PC evaluation score. The PC statement should include a summary of faculty’s annual teaching accomplishments and how they align with the teaching criteria benchmarks identified in the teaching rubric. |

**Chair Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation score** | **Evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate Chair teaching score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for the Chair evaluation score. The Chair statement should include a summary of faculty’s annual teaching accomplishments and how they align with the teaching criteria benchmarks identified in the teaching rubric. |

**Reporting and Scoring for Scholarly/Creative Activity**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria**  **Report on required and selected scholarly/creative criteria within this table. All tenure-line faculty must report publications and presentations.** | **Accomplishments / Description / Documentation**  **Report annual scholarly/creative activity and accomplishments in this column. For each criterion reported, include a description of your accomplishments and engagement, and provide documentation, when appropriate. Documentation should be uploaded in your annual report within electronic reporting system. To report your activities, please remove the existing descriptions in blue text.** |
| **Scholarly Products** | Describe your scholarly productivity during the past year (peer-reviewed articles, books, book-chapters, full-length abstracts, and external funding). Tenure line faulty will report your 3-year scholarly product average (total number of scholarly products over the past 3 years divided by 3), clinical faculty will report the number of scholarly products over the past 5 years, and lecturer faculty will report any engagement in scholarly activity during the past year. In addition to scholarly product quantity, provide a statement discussing product quality by referring to quality indicators identified in the scholarly activity rubric as well as your role in each product. Finally, describe your contributions to each product. Documentation is provided by uploading electronic copies of each publication into Digital Measures. |
| **Scholarly Activities** | All faculty should also describe current scholarly activities including manuscripts in review, acquisition/management of internal grants, and unsuccessful submission of external grant proposals. |
| **Presentations** | Describe your scholarly presentation accomplishments during the past year, including peer-reviewed presentations, invited presentations, and other scholarly presentations. In addition to presentation quantity, provide a statement discussing product quality by referring quality indicators identified in the scholarly activity rubric. Finally, describe your contributions to each presentation. Documentation may be provided by uploading acceptance letters, letters of invitation, or documentation from conference proceedings. |
| **Professional Development** | Report the number and quality of professional development activities in which you engaged in the past year. Describe each activity, including a description of content/focus, time commitment, and quality/depth. Also, make a statement on how you have implemented innovations from professional development activities into your research. |
| **Scholarly / Creative Recognition** | Report any award received in the past year. Provide a statement describing why you received the award(s). Describe the organization granting the award. Documentation may include award letters. |

**Faculty Self-Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Self-evaluation score** | **Self-evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate your self-evaluation scholarly activity score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for your self-evaluation score. Your statement should include a summary of your annual scholarly accomplishments and how they align with the scholarly activity criteria benchmarks identified in the scholarly activity rubric. |

**Personnel Committee Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation score** | **Evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate PC scholarly activity score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for the PC evaluation score. The PC statement should include a summary of faculty’s annual scholarly accomplishments and how they align with the scholarly activity criteria benchmarks identified in the scholarly activity rubric. |

**Chair Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation score** | **Evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate Chair scholarly activity score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for the Chair evaluation score. The Chair statement should include a summary of faculty’s scholarly accomplishments and how they align with the scholarly activity criteria benchmarks identified in the scholarly activity rubric. |

**Reporting and Scoring for Service**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria**  **Report on required and selected service criteria within this table. All faculty must report service to the institution and profession, and any editorial contributions.** | **Accomplishments / Description / Documentation**  **Report annual service activity and accomplishments in this column. For each criterion reported, include a description of your accomplishments and engagement, and provide documentation, when appropriate. Documentation should be uploaded in your annual report within electronic reporting system. To report your activities, please remove the existing descriptions in blue text.** |
| **Institutional** | Report all engagement in institutional service. Describe your role in each activity including level of involvement/leadership, specific contributions, and estimated time requirement. Documentation may consist of committee products, letters from committee chairs, or other artifacts. |
| **Professional organizations** | Report all engagement in professional service. Describe your role in each activity including level of involvement/leadership, specific contributions, and estimated time requirement. Documentation may consist professional accomplishments, products from committee service, letters from professional organization, or other artifacts. |
| **Community** | Report all engagement in community service as it relates to your professional discipline. Describe your role in each activity including level of involvement/leadership, specific contributions, and estimated time requirement. Additionally, explain how community service activities are related to your profession. Documentation may consist of products from committee service, letters from community members or organization, or other artifacts. |
| **Editorial / Review** | Report all engagement in editorial service as it relates to your professional discipline. Describe your role in each activity including level of involvement/leadership, specific contributions to editorial work, and estimated time requirement. Documentation may consist of letters of appreciation from editors or professional organizations, unsolicited communications from editors, editorial service roster/list, or other artifacts. |
| **Service Funding** | Report any funding submissions or awards from the past year, or evidence of preparation of funding submission. Internal and external submissions and awards should be included, as well documentation of collaboration with the Office of Sponsored research in seeking funding. Documentation may consist of letters of submission, award, or rejection. Finally, describe your contribution to each submission. |
| **Service Recognition** | Report any award received in the past year. Provide a statement describing why you received the award(s). Describe the organization granting the award. Documentation may include award letters. |

**Faculty Self-Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Self-evaluation score** | **Self-evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate your self-evaluation service score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for your self-evaluation score. Your statement should include a summary of your annual service accomplishments and how they align with the service criteria benchmarks identified in the service rubric. |

**Personnel Committee Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation score** | **Evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate PC service score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for the PC evaluation score. The PC statement should include a summary of faculty’s annual service accomplishments and how they align with the service criteria benchmarks identified in the service rubric. |

**Chair Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation score** | **Evaluation rationale** |
| Indicate Chair service score here:  1 = does not meet expectations  2 = meets expectations  3 = exceeds expectations  4 = exemplary | Provide a rationale for the Chair evaluation score. The Chair statement should include a summary of service accomplishments and how they align with the service criteria benchmarks identified in the service rubric. |

**Annual Faculty Evaluation Score**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of Evaluation** | **PC** | **Chair** | **PC/Chair Avg.** |
| **Teaching** |  |  |  |
| **Service** |  |  |  |
| **Scholarly/Creative Activity** |  |  |  |
| **Annual Score** | | |  |

**Appendix B**

**Teaching Performance Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary (4)** | **Exceeds Expectations (3)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Does Not Meet Expectations (1)** |
| Faculty clearly defined teaching goals and discussed how each goal aligns with academic program, department, college or university goals.  Faculty utilized effective teaching practices/methods for all classes. Course content is current and teaching methods are supported by evidence or best practices of the field. Significant participation in teaching-related professional development.  Faculty demonstrated effective interpersonal communication with students, as indicated by student evaluation comments, letters or other communications.  Most SET section means for courses taught in the previous academic year were 3.5 or higher. Student response rate is considered in evaluation of SET scores. Faculty rating may be adjusted for low response rate or extreme scores.  Faculty demonstrated leadership in facilitation of individualized student learning by mentoring students in multiple individualized learning projects, typically by serving as chair / director on numerous projects. Time requirement is consistent and significant and quality of student mentoring is exemplary.  Faculty demonstrated leadership in curriculum development to meet departmental, college, or university teaching goals. Curriculum development may consist of leading development of new program curricula, accreditation activities, or other program development activities.  Faculty acquired external funding to support teaching agenda.  Faculty received recognition for teaching effectiveness at the university, state, national, or international level, such as the University Presidential Award for Excellence in Teaching, and awards from professional organizations. | Faculty clearly defined teaching goals and discussed how each goal aligns with academic program, department, college or university goals.  Faculty utilized effective teaching practices/methods for most classes. Course content is current and teaching methods are supported by evidence or best practices of the field.  Significant participation in teaching-related professional development.  Faculty demonstrated effective interpersonal communication with students, as indicated by student evaluation comments, letters or other communications.  Most SET section means for courses taught in the previous academic year were 3.0 to 3.49. Student response rate is considered in evaluation of SET scores. Faculty rating may be adjusted for low response rate or extreme scores.  Faculty demonstrated facilitation of individualized student learning by mentoring students in multiple individualized learning projects. Time requirement is significant, and quality of student mentoring is evident.  Faculty demonstrated engagement in curriculum development to meet departmental, college, or university teaching goals. Curriculum development may consist of creation or a new course, development of new program curricula, or engagement in accreditation activities.  Faculty actively sought external funding to support teaching agenda.  Faculty received recognition for teaching effectiveness within the college or department, such as the Presidential Distinction Award within the College of Education. | Faculty clearly defined teaching goals and discussed how each goal aligns with academic program, department, college or university goals.  Faculty utilized effective teaching practices/methods for most classes. Frequency and quality of course content currency and best practice teaching methods may vary. Minimal participation in teaching-related professional development.  Faculty demonstrated effective interpersonal communication with students, as indicated by student evaluation comments, letters or other communications.  Most SET section means for courses taught in the previous academic year were 2.75 to 2.99. Student response rate is considered in evaluation of SET scores. Faculty rating may be adjusted for low response rate or extreme scores. | Faculty teaching goals are not well defined and/or teaching goal alignment with academic program, department, college or university goals is unclear.  Faculty generally did not utilize effective teaching practices/methods for most classes, course content was not current, and/or teaching methods were not generally supported by evidence of best practices of the field. No participation in teaching-related professional development.  Most SET section means for courses taught in the previous academic year were 2.74 or lower. Student response rate is considered in evaluation of SET scores. Faculty rating may be adjusted for low response rate or extreme scores. |
| The teaching performance rubric is used for holistic evaluation (i.e., not as a checklist) of faculty’s teaching engagement during the past year. Faculty’s annual teaching rating is determined by identifying the rating of best fit based on the evaluation of overall teaching performance (i.e., faculty will generally meet many criteria described for a rating, but do not have to meet all criteria) during the past year. Other teaching contributions, as presented by the faculty member, that are not specifically identified within the rubric, will also be considered as part of annual teaching evaluation. Additional factors, such as student response rate for SETs and progress towards threshold expectations for tenure and promotion seeking faculty, are considered during annual review. Expectations may be adjusted for workload and administrative assignments. Progress towards promotion and/or tenure may vary and are evaluated in a separate process based on faculty role, rank, and years in rank. Faculty workload and administrative assignments are considered, and expectations adjusted accordingly. Progress towards promotion and/or tenure may vary and are evaluated in a separate process based on faculty role, rank, and years in rank. Other factors, including student response rate for SETs and progress towards threshold expectations for tenure and promotion seeking faculty are considered. | | | |

**Appendix C**

**Scholarly/Creative Activity Performance Rubric: Tenure-Line Faculty**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary (4)** | **Exceeds Expectations (3)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Does Not Meet Expectations (1)** |
| Faculty clearly demonstrates a sustained scholarly research program and research goals are being exceeded as indicated by numerous high-quality national or international scholarly products (publications, external funding), typically resulting in a 3-year annual scholarly product average of 2.5 for tenured faculty and 3.5 for tenure-track faculty.  Quality indicators of scholarship are also considered. Quality indicators such as complexity of scholarly products, author contribution, importance to the field, and serial acceptance rate, collectively, demonstrate significant value to the faculty’s field.  Significant participation in research-related professional development.  Faculty presents scholarly findings at professional meetings that are judged to be of high quality during the past year.  Faculty led the proposal, acquisition, or management of substantial, competitive external funding to support their scholarly program during the past year.  Faculty received recognition for scholarly publications at the university, state, national, or international level, such as the University Presidential Award for Excellence in Scholarly Activity, and awards from professional organizations during the past year. | Faculty demonstrates a sustained scholarly program and research goals are clearly being met as indicated by multiple high-quality national or international scholarly products (publications, external funding), typically resulting in a 3-year annual scholarly product average of 1.5 for tenured faculty and 2.5 for tenure-track faculty.  Quality indicators of scholarship are also considered. Quality indicators such as complexity of scholarly products, author contribution, importance to the field, and acceptance, collectively, clearly demonstrate value to the faculty’s field.  Significant participation in research-related professional development.  Faculty presents scholarly findings at professional meetings that are judged to be of high quality during the past year.  Faculty sought external funding or acquired internal funding to support their scholarly program during the past year  Faculty received recognition for scholarly publications within the college or department, such as the Presidential Distinction Award within the College of Education during the past year. | Faculty demonstrates a sustained scholarly program as indicated by national scholarly products (publication, external funding), typically resulting in a 3-year annual scholarly product average (publications, funding) of 1 for tenured faculty and 2 for tenure-track faculty, although achievement of research goals may vary.  Quality indicators of scholarship are also considered. Quality indicators such as complexity of scholarly products, author contribution, importance to the field, and acceptance rate may vary, but collectively, scholarly production is judged to be of value in the faculty’s field.  Faculty may present scholarly findings at professional meetings and presentations are judged to be of acceptable quality.  Scholarly production allows faculty to maintain graduate faculty membership, when necessary.  Minimal participation research-related professional development. | Faculty demonstrates little evidence of on-going scholarly program exists. Scholarship goals are generally not met and faculty’s 3-year annual scholarly product (publications, external funding) average is typically less than 1 for tenured faculty or less than 2 for tenure-track faculty.  Quality indicators of scholarship are also considered. Quality indicators such as complexity of scholarly products, author contribution, importance to the field, and acceptance rate may vary, but collectively, scholarship product accomplishments are judged to be of minimal value to faculty’s field, or the role of the faculty was limited.  Presentation of scholarly findings at professional meetings is minimal, or presentations are judged to be of limited quality.  Scholarly productivity does not allow faculty to maintain graduate faculty membership, when necessary.  No participation in research-related professional development. |
| The scholarly activity performance rubric is used for holistic evaluation (i.e., not as a checklist) of faculty’s scholarly activity engagement during the past year. Tenure-Line faculty’s annual scholarly activity rating is determined by identifying the rating of best fit based on the evaluation of overall scholarly activity performance (i.e., faculty will generally meet many criteria described for a rating, but do not have to meet all criteria) during the past year. Other scholarly contributions, as presented by the faculty member, that are not specifically identified within the rubric, will also be considered as part of annual scholarly activity evaluation. Additional factors, such as progress towards threshold expectations for tenure and promotion seeking faculty, are considered during annual review. Expectations may be adjusted for workload and administrative assignments. Progress towards promotion and/or tenure may vary and are evaluated in a separate process based on faculty role, rank, and years in rank. | | | |

**Scholarly/Creative Activity Performance Rubric: Clinical Faculty**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary (4)** | **Exceeds Expectations (3)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Does Not Meet Expectations (1)** |
| Faculty maintain discipline currency and contribution through engage in scholarly activity. Clinical faculty engage in research presentations and led workshops at state and national conferences. Faculty demonstrated leadership in presentations and workshops.  Additionally, clinical faculty maintained eligibility for graduate faculty status, typically by maintaining a scholarly product rate of at least 1 publication every 3 years. Faculty demonstrated leadership in scholarly activity through manuscript contribution.  Quality indicators of scholarship are also considered. Quality indicators such as complexity of scholarly products, author contribution, importance to the field, and acceptance rate may vary, but collectively, scholarly production is judged to be of value in the faculty’s field.  Faculty sought funding to support scholarly activity as an individual or member of a team (investigator order not considered).  Faculty received recognition for scholarly activity at the university, state, national, or international level (e.g. University awards, awards from professional organizations). | Faculty maintain discipline currency and contribution through engage in scholarly activity. Clinical faculty engage in research presentations and led workshops at state and national conferences. Faculty demonstrated leadership in presentations and workshops.  Additionally, clinical faculty maintained eligibility for associate graduate faculty status, typically by maintaining a scholarly product rate of at least 1 publication every 5 years. Faculty demonstrated leadership in scholarly activity through manuscript contribution.  Quality indicators of scholarship are also considered. Quality indicators such as complexity of scholarly products, author contribution, importance to the field, and acceptance rate may vary, but collectively, scholarly production is judged to be of value in the faculty’s field. | Faculty maintained discipline currency and contribution through engagement in scholarly activity. Faculty engaged in research presentations and led workshops at state and national conferences.  Additionally, clinical faculty maintained eligibility for associate graduate faculty status, typically by maintaining a scholarly product rate of at least 1 publication every 5 years.  Quality indicators of scholarship are also considered. Quality indicators such as complexity of scholarly products, author contribution, importance to the field, and acceptance rate may vary, but collectively, scholarly production is judged to be of value in the faculty’s field. | Faculty did not meet minimum expectations for presentations and/or workshops and do not engage in scholarly activity adequate to maintain associate graduate faculty status. |
| The scholarly activity performance rubric is used for holistic evaluation (i.e., not as a checklist) of faculty’s scholarly activity engagement during the past year. Clinical faculty’s annual scholarly activity rating is determined by identifying the rating of best fit based on the evaluation of overall scholarly activity performance (i.e., faculty will generally meet many criteria described for a rating, but do not have to meet all criteria) during the past year. Other scholarly contributions, as presented by the faculty member, that are not specifically identified within the rubric, will also be considered as part of annual scholarly activity evaluation. Additional factors, such as progress towards threshold expectations for promotion seeking faculty, are considered during annual review. Expectations may be adjusted for workload and administrative assignments. Progress towards promotion may vary and are evaluated in a separate process based on faculty role, rank, and years in rank. | | | |

**Scholarly/Creative Activity Performance Rubric: Lecturer Faculty**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary (4)** | **Exceeds Expectations (3)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Does Not Meet Expectations (1)** |
| Faculty demonstrated a sustained effort to remain current in their academic discipline through appropriate professional development, including attendance of university, local, state, or national workshops and conferences.  Faculty presented practitioner- or evidence-based findings at professional meetings that are judged to be of high quality during the past year.  Faculty engaged in scholarly activity that led to peer-reviewed publication as an individual or member of a team (authorship is not considered).  Faculty sought funding to support scholarly activity as an individual or member of a team (investigator order not considered).    Faculty received recognition for scholarly activity at the university, state, national, or international level (e.g. University awards, awards from professional organizations). | Faculty demonstrated a sustained effort to remain current in their academic discipline through appropriate professional development, including attendance of university, local, state, or national workshops and conferences.  Faculty presented practitioner- or evidence-based findings at professional meetings that are judged to be of high quality during the past year. | Faculty demonstrated a sustained effort to remain current in their academic discipline through appropriate professional development, including attendance of university, local, state, or national workshops and conferences. | Faculty engagement in professional development to maintain discipline currency was not adequate to meet minimal expectations. |
| The scholarly activity performance rubric is used for holistic evaluation (i.e., not as a checklist) of faculty’s scholarly activity engagement during the past year. Lecturer faculty’s annual scholarly activity rating is determined by identifying the rating of best fit based on the evaluation of overall scholarly activity performance (i.e., faculty will generally meet many criteria described for a rating, but do not have to meet all criteria) during the past year. Other scholarly contributions, as presented by the faculty member, that are not specifically identified within the rubric, will also be considered as part of annual scholarly activity evaluation. Additional factors, such as progress towards threshold expectations for promotion seeking faculty, are considered during annual review. Expectations may be adjusted for workload and administrative assignments. Progress towards promotion may vary and are evaluated in a separate process based on faculty role, rank, and years in rank. | | | |

**Appendix D**

**Service Performance Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary (4)** | **Exceeds Expectations (3)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Does Not Meet Expectations (1)** |
| Faculty engaged in exceptional institutional service and demonstrated consistent, high-quality leadership that significantly impacted faculty, students, staff, and/or the, goals, mission, or strategic plan of the academic unit, department, college, or university. Service was varied and/or deeply dedicated to selective task  Involvement in the academic unit, department, college, or university supported collegial achievement of academic goals.  Service to the profession is varied and/or deeply dedicated to selective tasks within the profession. Evidence suggests that faculty contributed substantially to editorial or professional organization service  Faculty may have made additional significant service contributions through significant leadership, including leadership within the community, related to the profession, editing or review work.  Faculty acquired external funding to support service activities.  Faculty received recognition for service at the university, state, national, or international level, such as the University Presidential Award for Excellence in Service, and awards from professional organizations. | Faculty engaged in institutional service and demonstrated leadership that impacted faculty, students, staff, and/or the, goals, mission, or strategic plan of the academic unit, department, college, or university.  Involvement in the academic unit, department, college, or university supported collegial achievement of academic goals.  Service to the profession may vary in depth but involves some leadership within the profession. Evidence suggests that faculty contributed substantially to editorial or professional organization service.  Faculty may have made positive contributions through other forms leadership, including leadership within the community, related to the profession, editing or review work.  Faculty actively sought external funding to support service activities.  Faculty received recognition for service within the college or department, such as the Presidential Distinction Award within the College of Education. | Faculty engaged in institutional service that impacted faculty, students, staff, and/or the, goals, mission, or strategic plan of the academic unit, department, college, or university.  Involvement in the academic unit, department, college, or university supported collegial achievement of academic goals.  Service to the profession may vary in depth, but evidence suggests that faculty made some positive impact through editorial contributions or professional organization service.  Faculty may have made positive contributions through other forms of service, including community service, related to the profession, editing or review work. | Faculty engaged in minimal institutional service and had little impact on faculty, students, staff, and/or the, goal, mission, or strategic plan of the academic unit, department, college, or university.  Involvement in the academic unit, department, college, or university did not support collegial achievement of academic goals.  Service to the profession or community was minimal and evidence suggests that faculty made little impact through editorial contributions, professional organization service, or community service/engagement. |
| The service performance rubric is used for holistic evaluation (i.e., not as a checklist) of faculty’s service engagement during the past year. Faculty’s annual service rating is determined by identifying the rating of best fit based on the evaluation of overall service performance (i.e., faculty will generally meet many criteria described for a rating, but do not have to meet all criteria) during the past year. Other service contributions, as presented by the faculty member, that are not specifically identified within the rubric, will also be considered as part of annual service evaluation. Additional factors, such as progress towards threshold expectations for tenure and promotion seeking faculty, are considered during annual review. Expectations may be adjusted for workload and administrative assignments. Progress towards promotion and/or tenure may vary and are evaluated in a separate process based on faculty role, rank, and years in rank. | | | |