

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REPORT OF RESEARCH, INSTRUCTION, AND SERVICE

Performance Criteria for Annual Report of Research

I. Rating: 5 – *Exceptional*

- a. Acceptance of a completed book manuscript by a publisher.
- b. Publication of a peer-reviewed book. [1]
- c. Publication of a textbook or other instructional material.
- d. Acceptance and/or exhibition of a production by selection at an appropriate venue.
- e. Distribution of a production by selection from an appropriate distribution company. [2]
- f. Acceptance and/or exhibition of a production by invitation at an appropriate venue.
- g. Purchase of a production by an appropriate venue or distributor.
- h. Award of a competitive external research fellowship or research grant.
- i. Editing of a book accepted by contract for publication.
- j. Editing of a journal, journal issue or volume, or series of books.
- k. Two or more published articles in a peer-reviewed international, national or regional journal, edited volume, or competitively refereed conference proceedings, or, one published article and one other substantial (outstanding) accomplishment.

II. Rating: 4 – *Outstanding*

- a. Acceptance of a completed article in a peer-reviewed international, national or regional journal, edited volume, or competitively refereed conference proceedings.
- b. Acceptance of a substantial review essay in an international, national, or regional journal.
- c. Acceptance of a book proposal and an offer of a contract by a publisher.
- d. Acceptance of a proposal for a textbook or other instructional material by a publisher.
- e. Presentation of a paper at an international, national, or regional meeting.
- f. Presentation of a production at a national or international conference.
- g. Appearance on a panel at a national or international conference.
- h. Publication of a book requiring disciplinary expertise / specialization, by a commercial publisher.
- i. Award of a competitive internal research fellowship or research grant

III. Rating: 3 – *Good*

- a. Original submission of an article to a national or regional journal.
- b. Acceptance of an article in a state journal.
- c. Substantial work on a book, production, exhibition or other major work in progress.
- d. Acceptance of a book review in an international, national, or regional journal.
- e. Acceptance of an encyclopedia synopsis, essay, or an ERIC précis.
- f. Acceptance and/or exhibition of a production at a non-competitive venue.
- g. Presentation of a paper at a regional or state meeting.
- h. Presentation of a production at a regional or state conference.
- i. Acceptance and/or exhibition of a collaborative production in which the candidate's creative contribution is limited.
- j. A draft of an article (or summary of research in the advanced stage) presented to the School or the College.
- k. A production presented to the School or College.

- l. Achieving institutional approval of research protocols and substantial data collection for a project dealing with human subjects.

IV. Rating: 2 – *Needs Improvement*

- a. Failure to meet expectations in one or more aspects of research/creative activity.
- b. Indication that future progress in the category of research/creative activity is expected.
- c. A rating of ‘Needs Improvement’ triggers the development of an improvement plan to clarify standards and set a timetable for remediation.

V. Rating: 1 – *Unsatisfactory*

- a. Failure to demonstrate any significant achievement in research or creative activity.
- b. A performance improvement plan will be developed to clarify standards and set a timetable for remediation.
- c. Failure to meet performance improvement plan benchmarks and may result in sanctions.

Notes:

- [1] An ‘exceptional’ rating would be granted for two years: One for the acceptance by a publisher, and one for the actual publication.
- [2] An ‘exceptional’ rating would be granted for two years: One for the acceptance by a distributor, and one for the second year of distribution.

Performance Criteria for Annual Report of Instruction

I. Rating: 5 – *Exceptional*

- a. Evidence of consistently outstanding instruction in at least two (2) of the three (3) main categories listed under II, Instructional Portfolios: Peer Review Process: A. Evidence of Quality Instructional Performance, B. Evidence of Quality Instructional Development (including but not limited to creating a new course, supervising DIS/DIR, advising, serving on an undergraduate or graduate thesis committee, etc.), and C. Evidence of Quality Advisement. “Exceptional” in a category means that faculty must achieve excellence in two (2) of the numbered sub-areas in that category.
- b. Two measures of excellent on Student Perception of Teaching Survey.
 - i. Average mean of 1.0 to 2.5 on Item 6 on summary sheet, Overall Rating of Instructor.
 - ii. Narrative self-evaluation that justifies the equivalent of the 1.0 to 2.5 mean based on analysis of student perception of teaching. When this self-evaluation rests on a numerical argument (e.g. averaging all the items on the Student Perception of Teaching for a class, or considering SPOT scores in relation to average grades awarded in a class), these numbers should also appear in the instructional tables.

II. Rating: 4 – *Outstanding*

- a. Evidence of consistently above satisfactory instruction in at least two (2) of the three (3) main categories listed under II. Instructional Portfolios: Peer Review Process, A. Evidence of Quality Instructional Performance, B. Evidence of Quality Instructional Development (including but not limited to creating a new course, supervising DIS/DIR, advising, serving on an undergraduate or graduate thesis committee, etc.), and C. Evidence of Quality Advisement. “Outstanding” means that faculty must achieve above satisfactory in two (2) of the numbered sub-areas in that category.
- b. Two measures of above satisfactory on Student Perception of Teaching Survey.
 - i. Average mean of 2.5 to 3.5 on Item 6 on summary sheet, Overall Rating of Instructor.
 - ii. Narrative self-evaluation that justifies the equivalent of the 2.5 to 3.5 mean based on analysis of student perception of teaching. When this self-evaluation rests on a numerical argument (e.g. averaging all the items on the Student Perception of Teaching for a class, or considering SPOT scores in relation to average grades awarded in class), these numbers should also appear in the instructional tables.

III. Rating: 3 – *Good*

- a. Evidence of consistently satisfactory instruction in at least two (2) of the three (3) main categories listed under II. Instructional Portfolios: Peer Review Process, A. Evidence of Quality Instructional Performance, B. Evidence of Quality Instructional Development (including but not limited to creating a new course, supervising DIS/DIR, advising, serving on an undergraduate or graduate thesis committee, etc.), and C. Evidence of Quality Advisement. “Good” in a category means that faculty must be satisfactory in two (2) of the numbered sub-areas in that category.
- b. Two measures of satisfactory on Student Perception of Teaching Survey.
 - i. Average mean of 3.5 of 4.0 on Item 6 on summary sheet, Overall Rating of Instructor.
 - ii. Narrative self-evaluation that justifies the equivalent of the 3.5 to 4.0 mean based on

analysis of student perception of teaching. When this self-evaluation rests on a numerical argument (e.g. averaging all the items on the Student Perception of Teaching for a class, or considering SPOT scores in relation to average grades awarded in a class), these numbers should also appear in the instructional tables.

IV. Rating: 2 – *Needs Improvement*

- a. Failure to meet expectations in one or more aspects of instruction.
- b. Indication that future progress in the category of instruction is expected.
- c. A rating of 'Needs Improvement' triggers the development of an improvement plan to clarify standards and set a timetable for remediation.

V. Rating: 1 – *Unsatisfactory*

- a. Failure to demonstrate any significant achievement in instruction.
- b. A performance improvement plan will be developed to clarify standards and set a timetable for remediation.
- c. Failure to meet performance improvement plan benchmarks may result in sanctions.

Performance Criteria for Annual Report of Service

I. Rating: 5 – *Exceptional*

An “Exceptional” rating will be awarded to any faculty member who, in addition to serving the School satisfactorily, has served the academic or civic community in at least one of the following ways:

- a. Membership on a major College or University committee or governance body.
- b. Significant service to a professional association, editorial board, or other professional or scholarly entity.
- c. Significant service to the School.
- d. Significant service to the community.
- e. Cumulative equivalent to any of the above.

II. Rating: 4 – *Outstanding*

An “Outstanding” rating will be given to any faculty member who, in addition to serving the School satisfactorily, has served the academic or civic community in at least one of the following ways:

- a. Membership on a minor College or University committee.
- b. Service to the public schools.
- c. Service to the School, University, community, professional association, or other professional or scholarly entity.
- d. Cumulative equivalent of any of the above.

III. Rating: 3 – *Good*

A “Good” rating will be given to any faculty member who serves the School in the following ways:

- a. Attending to routine School and curricular responsibilities.
- b. Indicating availability to serve on College or University committees.

IV. Rating: 2 – *Needs Improvement*

- a. Limited contribution to routine operation of the School.
- b. Failure to meet expectations in one or more aspects of service.
- c. Indication that future progress in the category of service is expected.
- d. A rating of ‘Needs Improvement’ triggers the development of an improvement plan to clarify standards and set a timetable for remediation.

V. Rating: 1 – *Unsatisfactory*

- a. Failure to demonstrate any contribution to routine operation of the School.
- b. Failure to demonstrate any significant achievement in service.
- c. A performance improvement plan will be developed to clarify standards and set a timetable for remediation.
- d. Failure to meet performance improvement plan benchmarks may result in sanctions.