

CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL REPORT
(Adopted February 1985)
(Revised Fall 1998 , Spring 2000, Spring 2008, Spring 2010)

The criteria will be reviewed by the School every four years or as needed.

PROCEDURES

Although this document attempts to make the criteria and guidelines as explicit as possible, we recognize that in applying these guidelines to individual circumstances, a certain degree of subjective judgment is exercised. The following set of procedures is an attempt to ensure fairness and consistency in the application of the criteria and guidelines. This is done through a system of multi-level evaluations (or checks and balances).

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The Director of the School shall annually appoint a Personnel Committee consisting of two tenured and one non-tenured full-time tenure track members of the School. In order for membership on the Committee to attempt to represent the diverse areas within the School and to ensure that all faculty members are familiar with Personnel Committee procedures, membership will rotate alphabetically from separate lists of tenured and non-tenured faculty. The Personnel committee shall conduct annual reviews of all School members for the purpose of the annual report and shall make its recommendations to the Director of the School. It shall also evaluate the Director in those areas (instruction, research, service) not associated with duties of the Director and shall make a recommendation to the Dean regarding the evaluation of the Director's activities as Director.

The Committee shall make recommendation regarding the priorities of merit increases based on the overall annual report. It shall also undertake any other responsibilities or tasks assigned to it by the School or Director.

ANNUAL REPORT.

Step One. Each year at the appropriate time each full time tenure track School member shall fill out a report of his/her activities for the previous year, dividing them in categories of Research, Instruction and Service. The faculty member, following the guidelines, shall then assign rankings to each of the activities and include these in a memo to the committee.

Step Two. The Personnel Committee shall review the faculty member's report of activities and his/her evaluation and make its own evaluation. If either the Committee or the faculty member requests it, there shall be a meeting to discuss the report. The Committee shall report its evaluation, and the faculty member's evaluation, to the Director, noting and explaining any differences. The Committee shall also report its evaluation to the faculty member.

Step three. Based on the faculty member's report and the Committee's evaluation, the Director shall issue the final evaluation and the committee's summary report to the faculty member. In any area of dispute between the Director and the Committee and/or the faculty member, the Director shall note the reasons for his/her evaluation.

All evaluations shall be in writing. Each faculty member shall have access to his/her evaluations, and the right to dispute them in writing.

CRITERIA

For purposes of annual report of faculty at the School level members of the School accept the following criteria and guidelines for their interpretation. The criteria and guidelines assume assignment of all faculty to all three aspects of the School's mission. This mission includes quality instruction, research, and professional service. **All evaluation of faculty must be based on assignment.** It must be noted that annual assignments may vary and therefore annual reports will take reconfigured annual assignments into account. For example, if a faculty member receives an internal award that provides a course release for a specific research project, there will be the expectation that more work on that project will be accomplished during the year of the course release than would have been accomplished under normal circumstances. Further, if a faculty member takes on an increased instruction assignment in order to earn release time in a subsequent semester, this arrangement will be taken into consideration for the effected evaluation periods.

RESEARCH

The overall rationale meant to be reflected both in the criteria and the guidelines is based on an evaluation of the mode of production, review/selection, and distribution/exhibition of a faculty member's work. Work that involves a more complex and arduous production process, a more rigorous and/or competitive process of review and selection, and a more prominent mode of distribution or exhibition will be evaluated more highly, considering the appropriateness of the mode of dissemination for a given work. The criteria and guidelines are an attempt to flesh out this rationale both to assist faculty in developing their own program of work and to assist in the personnel committee's evaluation. These criteria and guidelines are not meant to be exhaustive. Types of work not mentioned in these criteria and guidelines can receive evaluation based on evidence showing that mode and method of production, review/selection, and distribution/exhibition is commensurate to the rating given to it by the faculty member in his/her own self evaluation. Both the personnel committee and the Director will determine whether the evidence supports the rating.

Peer Review Criteria for Annual Report of Research

The primary basis for evaluation for all research is peer review. Peer review refers to various processes of selection and critique appropriate to each candidate's discipline, with more rigorous forms evaluated more highly than less rigorous forms. In terms of traditional scholarship, publication generally reflects greater selectivity and rigor than conference presentation. Both the personnel committee and the Director will determine whether the evidence supports the rating and will consider the principles for tenure or promotion and the faculty member's progress in achieving these goals when assigning the rating.

For interpretation of the performance criteria above, the following criteria are among the most useful in determining the value of the work through evaluation of peers. Since not all sub-fields of communication and related disciplines give researchers equal access to these nine criteria of peer review, work need not always be evaluated on the basis of the number of these principles the work fulfills. However, in arguing that an achievement deserves a particular rating when it is not included on the appropriate list, faculty members are encouraged to enumerate peer review criteria associated with the achievement. Electronic publications are considered no differently than print publications with respect to these peer review criteria.

Peer review criteria include the following:

- A. Acceptance to a highly competitive venue with a high ratio of submission to acceptance.

- B. Acceptance based on a substantially completed project.
- C. Acceptance based on blind review by academic peers.
- D. Acceptance based on review by more than one academic peer.
- E. Acceptance to a regional, national and/or international venue with a rigorous academic reputation.
- F. Acceptance to a smaller, local venue for which the work is specifically appropriate.
- G. Favorable critique, citation, and/or reprint by academic peers following publication or exhibition.
- H. Acceptance as a work of original research/ creative work.
- I. Selection by invitation when it results from the established significance of a work or body of works.

Performance Criteria for Annual Report of Research

The designated rating will be awarded for achievements including, but not limited to, the following:

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.
- i. 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

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.

- 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 equivalent.
- 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.
- m. Application for an external grant.

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.

Guidelines for Interpretation of Research Criteria

Newly hired, untenured faculty are assigned mentors who can further elaborate upon these guidelines, particularly regarding the suitability of specific journals, publishers, and creative outlets. Evidence of such consultation can be used by the candidate to support, but not to mandate the suitability of a specific journal, publisher, or creative outlet.

Research will be related to scholarly areas associated with Communication, Film and Media Studies, and other related disciplines/fields. The term *research* is used in this document to apply to both traditional scholarship and creative works, the acceptability of which is based on each candidate's assignment.

All faculty members must claim and **document** their achievements in their Annual Report materials.

If a faculty member disagrees with the Director of the School's evaluation, he or she may appeal the evaluation.

I. Scholarly Work

- A. Authoring or co-authoring a published book which represents a significant contribution to the candidate's discipline may receive a maximum of two "Exceptional" ratings. One when the completed manuscript is accepted by the publisher and another when the book appears in print. A textbook which meets these requirements will also be counted.
- B. For substantial work on a significant book in progress, a faculty member will receive a maximum of two successive "Good" ratings.

- C. For editing significant book together with writing a substantial introduction/commentary, a faculty member will receive one "Exceptional" rating.
- D. Multiple authorship will count the same as single authorship when the faculty member's contribution is substantial. A book to which a faculty member has contributed only an isolated segment will count as an article in a national publication, not as a book.

II. Creative Work

Typically, creative production in The School of Communication and Multimedia Studies (including but not limited to film, video, interactive media, extended realities, technology projects, and collaborative projects across disciplines) results in the creation of original works representing a variety of genres, lengths, subjects, and approaches.

Creative production may include all collaborative works in which a candidate shares authorship or performs a creative role other than producer or director. Multiple authorship on a production will count the same as single authorship when the faculty member's contribution is substantial. The performance of a creative role other than producer or director will count the same as authorship when the faculty member's contribution is substantial.

Creative work using new technologies and realized in non-traditional formats, may also be considered using these guidelines.

- A. Evaluating the quality and significance of creative work.
 - 1. Type of venue

In evaluating the quality and significance of creative work, the type of venue in which it appears is a major factor. Generally, creative work must be presented in a venue that demonstrates one or more of the following characteristics:

 - a. Refereed by an independent jury
 - b. Competitive based on the rate of acceptance (to include acceptance based on selection or invitation)
 - c. Quality national or international reputation
 - d. Associated with a national or international professional association
 - 2. Examples of venues
 - a. Festival
 - b. Museum, gallery, or other curated exhibition
 - c. Site-specific installation
 - d. Commercial distribution: non-broadcast (including streaming services, on-demand, or other online venues)
 - e. Commercial distribution: broadcast
 - f. Internet or other electronic distribution
 - g. Conference
 - h. Other commercial or noncommercial forum

Generally, venues should be selective and have a history of exhibition. In addition, the venue should be appropriate to the work; the appropriate target audience for an individual work needs to be considered when evaluating the work's ultimate path for exhibition.

Exhibition includes the purchase of the work by a venue or distributor; in such cases the possibility for exhibition is implied.

Candidates must explain the significance of each instance of exhibition to assist the evaluation process.

B. Assessing the quantity and timing of creative work

Unlike scholarly publications, a single creative production may be evaluated numerous times in different contexts. Each showing makes the work available to a new audience and represents a unique process of selection and peer review, deserving individual recognition.

A completed work of any length may move through several distinct phases of production before completion. Work on a production in progress may be evaluated by one or more of the following:

1. Pre-production documents, including script or pre-production paperwork.
2. Raw footage or a rough cut of the production.
3. Other documentation of pre-production or production work.

INSTRUCTION

Faculty instruction includes, but is not necessarily limited to the following: performance in teaching regularly scheduled classes, instructional performance in coordinating the internship and teaching assistant programs, performance in serving as a chair or a member on a graduate thesis or dissertation committee, and performance in academic advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students. Faculty instruction also includes activities associated with pedagogical development, such as the creation of new courses, concentrations, sequences, or programs, new instructional methods, approaches, and materials, and development of teaching labs and new technology infrastructures, as well as participation in instructional workshops and seminars. This list is not meant to be exhaustive, as other instruction related activities that do not solely fall within the categories of research or service may be included under instruction.

Peer Review Criteria for Annual Report of Instruction

The annual report of instruction is based on a peer review process conducted primarily by the School's Personnel Committee; however, faculty may also elect to be reviewed by appropriate members of the School (member(s) of the Personnel Committee, School Director, colleagues, etc.) via observation in the classroom or other appropriate instructional setting.

I. **Materials to Include in Instructional Portfolios for Annual Peer Review**

- A. Data from the Student Perception of Teaching Surveys (only summary sheets are required)
Other evidence of instructional performance
1. A list of courses taught
 2. The number of students enrolled in each course
 3. Syllabi for each course taught and other written materials such as handouts, exams, etc.

4. Number, role, & status of thesis/dissertation committee assignments
5. Description of other instructional activities
6. A narrative self-evaluation of instruction that addresses how course readings and assignments are appropriate to the level of the course, how courses were updated since last taught, and any other information relevant to course content. This narrative should be included in the memo to the Personnel Committee.
7. (OPTIONAL) Sample student papers (or other written assignments) with instructor's comments
8. (OPTIONAL) Results of peer observation of instruction (classroom observation occurs only when the faculty member has chosen it; criteria & guidelines for observation must be agreed upon & followed; observation must be scheduled ahead of time).

Note: While classroom observation is optional for annual peer review, all faculty preparing for third year review, tenure, and/or promotion must present at least two relatively recent peer evaluations from tenured faculty based on classroom visitations in their review/application portfolios.

9. (OPTIONAL) Supporting letters from students and peers who have had the opportunity to observe instruction directly or indirectly
 10. Nomination or receipt of College, University, or professional teaching awards
 11. Awards, publications, exhibitions, conference presentations, or other recognition of student projects substantially completed in a faculty member's classes or under faculty supervision
- B. Evidence of instructional development
1. A list of new courses developed
 2. A description of new concentrations/sequences/programs developed
 3. A description of significant course revisions
 4. A description of new instructional approaches and/or technologies implemented
 5. A description of attendance and/or participation in instructional workshops/seminars.
- C. Description of academic advising
1. Description of office hours devoted to students
 2. Description of other advising related duties and/or accomplishments
 - a. Development of new advising materials
 - b. Nomination or receipt of College, University, or professional advising awards
 - c. Additional advising responsibilities at the School, College, or University level

II. Instructional Portfolios: Peer Review Process

The peer review process focuses on the examination of the instructional portfolios in relation to the following items (and with an understanding that course assignment is subject to School needs):

- A. Evidence of quality instructional performance.

1. Considerations in regard to data from Student Perception of Teaching Surveys.
 - a. Number of courses taught; faculty teaching full loads will be given more consideration than those with other assignments.
 - b. Number of course preparations required; faculty preparing more courses will be given more consideration than those teaching multiple sections of the same course.
 - c. Range of courses taught (that is, introductory courses to graduate seminars; required or elective courses; theory, performance, or analytics courses); recognition will be given to the fact that different kinds of courses present different instructional challenges.
 - d. Grading load of courses taught; faculty teaching courses with heavier grading requirements (writing intensive courses, presentation intensive courses [i.e. viewing student productions, listening to speeches, etc.]) will be given more consideration than those teaching lecture/objective exam courses. The assignment of graduate teaching assistants will also be considered.
 - e. Number of students enrolled in courses taught; faculty teaching more students will generally be given more consideration than faculty teaching fewer students. Consideration will be given to the assignment of graduate teaching assistants as well as to pedagogically driven caps on course size.
2. Considerations in regard to instructional materials/pedagogical presentations.
 - a. Quality of class syllabi.
 - (1) Quality syllabi are clear and comprehensive; objectives, assignments, and policies are clearly described.
 - (2) Bibliographic materials (texts and readings) are appropriate to the level of course (depth vs. breadth, primary vs. secondary) and are current and/or historical (depending on the nature of the course).
 - b. Quality of other written course materials; quality materials exhibit clarity, comprehensiveness, and appropriateness.
 - c. Quality of grading standards.
 - (1) Clarity of requirements and level of challenge appropriate to the course.
 - (2) Items such as instructions for assignments, criteria sheets for grading, explanations of grading standards for the course, samples of student work with instructor's comments, etc.
 - d. Optional peer observations when faculty members choose to include them; quality instruction is demonstrated when faculty meet or exceed the agreed upon evaluative criteria used during peer observation.
3. Considerations in regard to membership on and/or direction of graduate thesis or dissertation committees.
 - a. Quality is demonstrated primarily by the timely and successful completion of theses and dissertations.
 - b. Faculty may choose to document the amount and character of work on these committees as well as the quality of the finished product.
4. Considerations in regard to other instructional activities.

- a. Coordinating the internship or graduate teaching assistant program; quality of instruction related activities in these programs may be demonstrated by any written materials similar to those listed under “Instructional Materials” (2. above).
 - b. Any other instructional activities described in the Instructional Portfolio.
- B. Evidence of quality instructional development.
 - 1. Considerations in regard to new courses developed (with an understanding that this is subject to School needs and constraints).
 - a. Number of new courses developed; faculty developing new courses will be given more consideration than those who do not.
 - b. Quality of new courses developed; quality is demonstrated by the appropriateness of the course in the curriculum and the quality of the instructional materials developed.
 - 2. New concentrations/sequences/programs developed (with an understanding that this is subject to School, College, and University needs and constraints); quality is demonstrated by the appropriateness of the program in the curriculum and the quality of the curricular materials developed.
 - 3. Development of significant course revisions; quality of course revisions is determined by the extent and appropriateness of revisions demonstrated in instructional materials.
 - 4. Development/implementation of new instructional approaches and/or technologies; quality of these innovations is determined by the extent and appropriateness of the approaches and/or technologies documented by examples, explanatory narratives, etc.
 - 5. Attendance and participation in instructional workshops/seminars; quality is determined by the character and reputation of the workshop/seminar and the extent of faculty participation.
 - 6. Awarding of a competitive instructional grant or fellowship.
 - 7. Membership on special School, College, or University committees dealing with issues related to instruction (when not counted for service).
- C. Evidence of quality advisement.
 - 1. Considerations in regard to availability of faculty to students; quality is demonstrated by sufficiency of office hours, flexibility in making time to meet with students, general accessibility to students and willing to assist students in understanding the requirements of course work.
 - 2. Considerations in regard to effective understanding of curriculum requirements and procedures; quality is demonstrated by effectively advising students about the requirements of the communication major, its various sequences, and the communication minor.
 - 3. Consideration in regard to development of new advising materials; faculty who develop clear, effective advising materials will be given special consideration.
 - 4. Consideration in regard to additional advising responsibilities; faculty who effectively take on additional advising responsibilities at the School, College, or University level will be given special consideration.

Performance Criteria for Annual Report of Instruction

The designated rating will be awarded for achievements including, but not limited to, the following:

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.

SERVICE

Service consists of those activities not clearly defined under instruction and research which nevertheless contribute to the furtherance of the University's role and functioning as an academic institution. Service can consist of activities on behalf of or contributing to the School, College, or University; to the professional field, and/or to the community. In addition, under the category of service, assigned administrative activities, including School Director, Program Director or Coordinator, Assistant Dean or any other administrative position which accounts for 50 percent or less of an individual's annual assignment shall be included as administrative service.

Because administrative service assignments vary greatly, they shall be evaluated individually on the basis of information supplied to the Personnel Committee.

Criteria for Annual Report of Service

The designated ratings and the levels of achievement for service activities listed under each rating represent only the minimum required. In themselves they do not guarantee the respective rating. Criteria used in the assigning of a rating are (1) the amount of time spent on the specific service, (2) the kind of role played by the faculty member, with leadership positions evaluated more highly, and (3) the outcome or result of the 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.

Note: It is important to note that individuals who want to make a case for distinction in areas of non-administrative service need to be gathering written evidence from those in a position to evaluate their work. Alternate routes to promotion put more of a burden on the faculty member since it is necessary to provide hard evidence to document the case for distinction.

EVALUATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE SCHOOL

(Adopted Spring 1998, Unrevised Spring 2000, Revised Spring 2008)

Guidelines for Evaluation of Director of the School

Along with other faculty, the Director of the School shall be evaluated. In the areas of research, instruction and non-administrative service, the Director shall submit a self-evaluation to the Personnel Committee, which shall then make a recommendation to the Dean in these areas.

The Director's activities as Director shall be evaluated as administrative service. Such an evaluation shall be based on the Director's self-evaluation and a confidential and anonymous evaluation survey completed by all full-time faculty members and conducted by the Personnel Committee. In addition, the Committee may seek additional information from students and adjuncts. Based on this information, the Committee shall make a recommendation to the Dean, with the understanding that the Dean shall make his/her own evaluation of the Director's performance based on criteria that may be different from the School's.

Criteria for the Annual Report on the Director of the School

In making recommendations to the Dean for the evaluation of the Director, the Personnel Committee will use the following criteria:

- Consulting with faculty before making important decisions
- Maintaining a professional environment
- Upholding academic standards

- Promoting a scholarly environment
- Implementing and maintaining School policies
- Effectively representing the School and its faculty to the Dean and other University administrators
- Making personnel and evaluation decisions in a professional, unbiased manner
- Conducting administrative matters in a timely and efficient manner