

# DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES, LINGUISTICS AND COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

## CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Adopted by faculty on April 24, 2009

Amended on November 6, 2009

Amended on November 12, 2010

Amended on December 3, 2010

Amended on October 19, 2015

Amendments approved by faculty vote on 3/13/2017

Document sent to Dean's Office for review on 3/13/2017

All tenure-line faculty are expected to excel in all assigned areas, and in a typical year, faculty will have assignments in all three areas: Teaching, Research, and Service. Although each element in these categories will be rated on its own merits and quality, consideration will be based generally on the following evaluation guidelines in each category.

All evaluations are predicated on annual assignments. Tenure-line faculty should note that the Department values published research, and they should also regularly consult the Department's Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

Faculty ratings are determined by the Chair in consultation with the department's annually elected Promotion and Tenure Committee, one of whom shall be the department's representative to the College's Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Each Spring semester, each faculty member will submit a written Annual Faculty Report detailing his or her activities during the preceding year in the three categories of Teaching, Research and Service. Faculty are rated in each of the three categories according to the following scale: Exceptional/Excellent; Outstanding/Above Satisfactory; Good/Satisfactory; Needs Improvement/Below Satisfactory; Unsatisfactory. Any area in which a faculty member had no formal assignment will be noted as Not Assigned. On the basis of these ratings, an overall annual evaluation rating shall be determined as described in section D below.

### **A. TEACHING**

Teaching includes such matters as achieving course objectives and remaining current in knowledge of the field, new courses initiated, numbers of courses and preparations, assistance to students outside class through advising and mentoring, caliber and frequency of thesis and dissertation direction, supervision of teaching staff including close mentoring of graduate teaching assistants, as well as student and peer evaluations of

teaching. Documentation of teaching performance may include, but is not restricted to, the following materials:

1. Course syllabi, including course objectives, and course web sites.
2. Titles of theses and dissertations for which instructor has served as director or reader, including student names and state of progress.
3. Evidence of curriculum/program development including the substantial revision of currently offered courses and the documented development of new courses and teaching materials.
4. Report from invited peer-review.
5. List of teaching and/or advising awards, with copies of letters and announcements.
6. List of GTAs and interns supervised, by course and semester.
7. Student evaluation data, by course and semester.
8. Participation in pedagogy workshops, with dates and descriptions, or presentations concerning teaching methods.
9. Titles of courses offered as Directed Independent Study, with names of students and semester taught.
10. List of students advised, by semester.
11. List of interdisciplinary courses, by semester.
12. List of freshman honors seminars, SLS and WAC courses taught, by semester.
13. Self-critique of videotaped classes, with copies of DVD.
14. List of grants obtained in support of curricular and pedagogical development, by amount, term, and name of funding agency.
15. List of guest lectures in colleagues' courses, by course, title, and date, with a copy of the invitation.

Ratings will reflect the faculty member's ability to communicate subject matter and stimulate student interest; achieve the objectives of the course; remain current in knowledge of the field; demonstrate commitment to good teaching and concern for improving teaching methods and developing new approaches in existing courses; assist students, including availability outside class. Statistical student evaluations will, following the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, use replies to Question 6 on the SPOT form. In the case of exceptional circumstances (such as large classes, disruptive students, hurricanes, etc.), the faculty member may submit additional supporting data in narrative or statistical form to assist the committee in interpreting the numbers.

**Exceptional:** The rating of Exceptional reflects the highest level of performance in most of the areas (#1-15 above). In addition, ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on Question 6 as stipulated in the university's Promotion and Tenure guidelines) will be 1.00 to 1.99 or better.

**Outstanding:** The rating of Outstanding reflects a high level of performance in most of the areas cited. In addition, ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on Question 6 as stipulated in the university's Promotion and Tenure guidelines) will be 2.00-2.99 or better.

**Good:** The rating of Good reflects an acceptable level of performance in most of the areas cited. In addition, ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on Question 6 as stipulated in the university's Promotion and Tenure guidelines) will be 3.00-3.75 or better.

**Needs Improvement:** The rating of Needs Improvement reflects less than adequate performance in most of the areas cited. In addition, ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on Question 6 as stipulated in the university's Promotion and Tenure guidelines) will be 3.76-4.50 or worse (higher).

**Unsatisfactory:** The rating of Unsatisfactory reflects performance that egregiously fails to meet expectations in most of the areas cited. In addition, ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on Question 6 as stipulated in the university's Promotion and Tenure guidelines) will be 4.51 to 5.0.

## B. RESEARCH

Given the multi-disciplinary nature of the department, types of research will vary. Research is assessed according to the quality of each publication, and will be weighed against the time assigned for research in the faculty member's annual assignment.

**Exceptional:** A rating of Exceptional will be demonstrated by production of REFEREED works, as follows: at least one (1) from CATEGORY 1; or one (1) from CATEGORY 2 and one (1) from CATEGORY 3.

**OUTSTANDING:** A rating of Outstanding will be demonstrated by production of at least one (1) item from CATEGORY 2; or two (2) items from CATEGORY 3.

**GOOD:** A rating of Good will be demonstrated by production of at least one (1) item from CATEGORY 3; or two (2) items from CATEGORY 4.

**NEEDS IMPROVEMENT:** A rating of Needs Improvement will be demonstrated by the production of one (1) item from CATEGORY 4.

**UNSATISFACTORY:** Lack of production of any of the above items during the review period.

**CATEGORY 1** (credit received for 2 years for Items 1-4, and 1 year for Item 5)

1. single-authored scholarly books and monographs
2. co-authored scholarly books and monographs
3. book-length critical editions
4. textbooks
5. articles in highly selective journals

**CATEGORY 2**

1. chapters in scholarly books
2. edited books of original scholarly essays
3. articles in other scholarly journals
4. articles in proceedings
5. scholarly translations of books or other major works

**CATEGORY 3**

1. edited volumes of conference proceedings
2. substantially expanded or revised editions of previously published books, including self-translations
3. authored and co-authored software and other media publications
4. book reviews, notes, encyclopedia entries, and interviews in top-ranked scholarly journals
5. national and international grants and fellowships
6. state and local grants and fellowships

7. papers presented at top-ranked national and international conferences or professional meetings
8. invited lectures given at other academic institutions

#### CATEGORY 4

1. creative literary work
2. translations of shorter texts (e.g., articles, stories, poetry, etc.)
3. papers presented at regional, statewide, and local conferences or professional meetings
4. presentation at a community event
5. non-refereed single-authored and co-authored scholarly books and monographs
6. non-refereed chapters in scholarly books
7. non-refereed edited books of reprinted scholarly essays
8. non-refereed edited conference proceedings
9. non-refereed scholarly translations of books
10. non-refereed articles in other scholarly journals, including online journals
11. non-refereed authored and co-authored software and other media publications
12. non-refereed book review articles or essays
13. documentation of recent effort on work in progress

To facilitate the evaluation of co-authored work, any co-authored piece should be accompanied by a statement from the other author(s) specifying the percentage of each contributor's effort.

A book (defined as items 1, 2, and 3 above) will count in BOTH the year it is accepted for publication and in the year that it is published. If a book is accepted and published in the same year, it counts as Excellent for two years. All other publications may count in EITHER the year they are accepted OR the year they are published – they will NOT be counted twice.

**Outstanding:** A rating of Outstanding will be demonstrated by production of at least one of the following items:

1. edited conference proceedings
2. scholarly translations of books
3. substantially expanded or revised editions of previously published books, including self-translations
4. authored and co-authored software and other media publications
5. book review articles or essays
6. national and international grants and fellowships
7. state and local grants and fellowships
8. papers presented at top-ranked national and international conferences or professional meetings
9. invited lectures given at other academic institutions

Production of several items from the above list may qualify for a higher rating.

**Good:** A rating of Good will be demonstrated by production of at least one of the following:

1. creative literary work
2. translations of shorter texts (e.g. articles, stories, poetry, etc.)
3. papers presented at regional, statewide and local conferences or professional meetings
4. book reviews, notes, encyclopedia entries and interviews in top-ranked scholarly journals
5. non-refereed single-authored and co-authored scholarly books and monographs
6. non-refereed chapters in scholarly books
7. non-refereed edited books of reprinted scholarly essays
8. non-refereed edited conference proceedings
9. non-refereed scholarly translations of books
10. non-refereed articles in other scholarly journals, including online journals
11. non-refereed authored and co-authored software and other media publications
12. non-refereed book review articles or essays
13. documentation of recent effort on work in progress

Production of several items from the above list may qualify for a higher rating.

**Needs Improvement:** Lack of production of any of the above items during the review period.

**Unsatisfactory:** Lack of production of any of the above items during the review period and the preceding two years.

### **C. SERVICE**

Because the Department of Languages, Linguistics and Comparative Literature offers multiple degree programs (at the BA and MA levels), in addition to participating in numerous certificate programs as well as the Ph.D. Program in Comparative Studies, faculty service assignments vary widely. Most faculty participate in more than one program in the department, and often participate in interdisciplinary college and university programs. The proportion of service in one's assignment has to be an important consideration in making the evaluation. (For example, Assistant Professors are typically given a limited service assignment.) It is the faculty member's responsibility to inform the Chair of any change in the service assignment. Each faculty member should indicate the actual time commitment involved in each service category, in the service table on the annual evaluation form. Be sure to indicate your role in the activity (e.g., Chair, Member) and the approximate time required by it (e.g., "3 hours a week"). Also indicate which activities, if any, were supported by a reduced teaching assignment.

**Exceptional:** A rating of Exceptional will indicate outstanding performance in the assigned service from among such service activities as those listed below. Faculty member goes well beyond the minimum expectations of the assignment, provides extraordinary leadership, or takes on and completes with success an extraordinary project.

**Outstanding:** A rating of Outstanding indicates very good performance in the assigned service from among such service activities as those listed below. Faculty member makes a clear contribution through his or her service above the minimum expectations of the assignment.

**Good:** A rating of Good reflects an adequate performance in the assigned service from among such service activities as those listed below. Faculty member meets but does not exceed expectations of the assignment.

**Needs Improvement:** A rating of Needs Improvement reflects weak performance in the assigned service from among such service activities as those listed below. Faculty member does not meet the expectations of the assignment.

**Unsatisfactory:** A rating of Unsatisfactory reflects the failure to perform the assigned service activities during the review period.

Examples of service activities include (but are not limited to):

**a. DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE**

1. heading a departmental program
2. chairing or serving on a search committee
3. developing or conducting study abroad programs (planning, supervising, and teaching)
4. coordinating the administration of Master's oral and written examinations
5. membership on department standing or *ad hoc* committee
6. directing Student Club or Honor Society
7. building the university library collection in one's discipline

**b. COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE**

1. directing an interdisciplinary certificate program
2. chairing college or university committee
3. membership on college or university committees, College Faculty Assembly, or University Senate
4. planning and organizing a special event
5. fundraising

**c. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

1. editing or serving as officer of a professional journal
2. serving as officer of a professional organization
3. organizing national and international seminars and colloquia
4. organizing regional and local seminars and colloquia
5. serving as manuscript reviewer for a publisher or scholarly journal
6. organizing and chairing a session at a professional meeting
7. chairing session at a professional meeting

8. serving as an outside reviewer for promotion and tenure candidates at other universities

#### D. OVERALL ANNUAL EVALUATION RATING:

The overall annual evaluation rating is cumulative. It is based on the evaluation in each of three categories of Teaching, Research, and Service. The following numeric value shall be assigned to each level of performance in each of the three categories:

<b>Exceptional:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Outstanding:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Good:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Needs Improvement:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Unsatisfactory:</b>	<b>1</b>

To ensure that the overall rating reflects the individual faculty member's annual assignment, an overall annual evaluation rating shall be determined by multiplying the percentage assigned to the faculty member in each of the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service by the numeric value of the rating (1-5 above) achieved in that area. The three scores shall be added together and the overall annual evaluation rating shall be determined according to the following standards:

<b>Exceptional:</b>	An overall rating of 4.20-5.0.
<b>Outstanding:</b>	An overall rating between 3.4-4.19.
<b>Good:</b>	An overall rating between 2.60-3.39.
<b>Needs Improvement:</b>	An overall rating of 1.80-2.59
<b>Unsatisfactory:</b>	An overall rating of 1.79 or below.

For example, if the annual assignment entails 65% Teaching, 20% Research and 15% Service, and the faculty member earns a rating of Outstanding in Teaching (4), Exceptional in Research (5) and Exceptional in Service (5), the overall annual evaluation rating is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Teaching} = 65\% \times 4 = 2.60$$

$$\text{Research} = 20\% \times 5 = 1.00$$

$$\text{Service} = 15\% \times 5 = 0.75$$

$$\text{Overall Annual Evaluation Rating} = 4.35 = \text{Exceptional}$$

Appendix A: Annual Faculty Report Guidelines

Appendix B: Annual Faculty Report Template