

School of Public Administration
Annual Evaluation Criteria
Approved by the D.F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters on 2/26/24

I. ANNUAL EVALUATION POLICY.

The mission of the School of Public Administration is to provide an intellectual, analytical, technical, and practical education to advance the state of knowledge in public administration and to enhance ethical public service within our TJ ()Tj ET EMC BT /P <</MCID 13 >>BDC 12 -0 0 12 7 needs improvement or unsatisfactorily since their last annual evaluation.

The Div TJ se 2-52-01 Ed p rnc ip s (t a D 17 (t) 4 (b) 1 (t) 4 (m) - 2 (m) - 2 (e) 4 (d i) - 2 (a) 4 (t) - 2 (e) 4 (s

- i. faculty and instructors have varying responsibilities as reflected in their annual assignments;
- ii.

v. neither unethical conduct nor malfeasance will be tolerated.

The following table will be used to evaluate each faculty member and instructor each year.

Table 1: Rating/Assignment Table

Annual Evaluation Form School of Public Administration Academic Year NAME			
	Rating (R)	Percentage of Assignment (A)	R*A
Instruction			
Scholarship			
Service			
Total			
	5=Exceptional 4= Outstanding 3= Good 2=Needs Improvement 1=Unsatisfactory	Based on Annual Assignment data for the Evaluation Year	

In addition to the evaluation form, the Director can include a narrative describing how the rating for each of the evaluation components was determined based on the established criteria. The report will be conveyed to the individual faculty member through the Director who may add her/his qualitative assessment of accomplishments and deficiencies.

This policy document can be reviewed and changed accordingly when requested by a simple majority of the voting SPA faculty and instructors. Moreover, if University or College policy changes impact the conditions established herein, this policy document will be reviewed and amended if necessary and approved by a simple majority of the faculty and instructors in the School.

II. RESEARCH

Given that instructors are not rated based on research, this section pertains exclusively to tenure-earning or tenured faculty in the School.

The School is most interested in faculty demonstrating a consistent pattern of scholarship in which, for example, conference papers eventually turn to publications; data gathered is eventually analyzed and presented in academic outlets; and scholarship demonstrates a connected body of knowledge. This pattern is the essence of a scholarly career, and these criteria – as well as the School’s promotion and tenure criteria – are organized around it.

Untenured faculty should focus particularly on standards for research productivity as measured by publication. They should be sure to review the School’s promotion and tenure criteria annually, as they prepare their annual reports, and attend carefully to feedback in the annual

- article in non-peer reviewed journals (rank three).
 - d. Substantive review(s) of a published book that has received an Exceptional evaluation in previous years.
 - e. Presentation of research at national academic or professional conferences.
 - f. Writing and submission of external grants to a federal/state agency that are peer-reviewed.
 - g. Article or book chapter under review
 - h. More than one publication **in a Q1 ranked journal** in the previous evaluation year
 - i. Publication of an article in a ranked journal with graduate or undergraduate student coauthor.
 - j. Securing a competitive internal or minor external grant for research
- iii. *Good*. A ranking of good requires two or more of the requirements from those listed below:
 - a. Publication of an article in a Q3 ranked journal.
 - b. Presentation of research at regional conferences.
 - c. Manuscript submission for review in a ranked journal.
 - d. Completion of data collection for a project.
 - e. Publication of a technical report demonstrating scholarly and/or community involvement.
- iv. *Needs Improvement*. No evidence of continuing research or creative activities or efforts to develop research projects. The designation of “Needs Improvement” serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.
- v. *Unsatisfactory*. To merit the rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the faculty member must demonstrate performance that fails to meet School expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a “Needs Improvement” rating will result in a rating of “Unsatisfactory.”

III. TEACHING

The School recognizes that instruction incorporates a broad range of activities along with teaching. As a result, both qualitative and quantitative data will be used when evaluating a faculty member or instructor’s instructional accomplishments and to assess overall performance in this area of the assignment.

The sections below outline the activities the Director will consider in the evaluation of instruction.

The basic elements of instructional work are in assigned classes, and its quality should be assessed through an evaluation including:

- i. Student perceptions of teaching (SPOT) that are provided by the university.

- ii. Peer review. A faculty member or instructor should be reviewed by a tenured member of the School as assigned by the Director in consultation with the faculty member. The review may be based on syllabi and other appropriate teaching materials, and should include classroom/course observation. The observation must be scheduled ahead of time by the Director in consultation with the faculty member.
- iii. Course syllabi, tests, and other course materials.
- iv. Evidence of the development of new courses, curriculum, or programs, including the revision of courses and the development of new teaching methods.
- v. Teaching and advising awards.
- vi. Advising.
- vi. Participation in professional development activities relating to pedagogy, publishing on teaching, or formal presentations concerning teaching and learning.
- vii. Chairing or serving on dissertation committees.
- viii. Supervising/mentoring students in research papers or projects.
- ix. Contributions to the School's teaching mission taking into consideration items such as:
 - a. required or elective courses
 - b. undergraduate or graduate courses
 - c. class size
 - d. number of course preparations
 - e. serving as faculty advisor for student groups and/or organizing School student events and activities with those groups
 - f. new courses/preparations
 - g. the use of innovative teaching methods and technologies

III. Rating Criteria.

- b. Recognition via University or Extramural Teaching Award.
 - c. Chairing of successful doctoral committee
 - d. External grants received for an instructional program or related activities.
 - e. Development and adoption of a new for-credit course not taught elsewhere or an extensive redesign of existing courses along highly innovative lines.
 - f. Development of new degree programs or development of for-credit courses.
 - g. Mentoring junior faculty in teaching and/or instructional activities resulting in significant identifiable improvement in teaching performance.
 - h. Acquiring Quality Matters certification for an online course
 - i. Supervising/mentoring enrolled undergraduate and/or graduate students who receive awards or have published their research papers or projects;
- ii. *Outstanding*. A ranking of *Outstanding* requires scores between 1.85 and 2.6 on the student perceptions of teaching forms for Item #6 and between 1.85 and 2.6 for the mean of means for items 1-5 for all classes taught by faculty/instructor during the year (contextual factors such as course difficulty and grade inflation can be taken into account) **and** two of the following:

- a. Good internal/external peer reviews

DC pT-1.1o (nd)JTJ ()T04 Tc 0ATj EMCc 0 a6 (f)-119d.1.5 023(te)6 (r)5 (n)2 Tc 0 Tw 0.81 50 >

university and professional activities. The designation of “Needs Improvement” serves