

## 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 10, 2015

Amended on September 21, 2017; presented to faculty for adoption

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 contract period 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. List of Honors in the Major theses, curriculum compacts, and other honors enrichments directed or undertaken, including student names and state of progress, by semester.
14. List of Academic Service-Learning (AS-L)-enriched courses taught and/or specific AS-L and other community/classroom initiatives undertaken, by semester.
15. Self-critique of videotaped classes, with copies of DVD.
16. List of grants obtained in support of curricular and pedagogical development, by amount, term, and name of funding agency.

**Exceptional:**

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

Any co-authored work 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:

10. edited conference proceedings
11. scholarly translations of books
12. substantially expanded or revised editions of previously published books, including self-translations
13. authored and co-authored software and other media publications
14. book review articles or essays
15. national and international grants and fellowships
16. state and local grants and fellowships
17. papers presented at top-ranked national and international conferences or professional meetings
18. 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:

19. creative literary work
20. translations of shorter texts (e.g. articles, stories, poetry)



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

**16. directing an interdisciplinary program (a)10 me**

**cring collng or university(c)4 (c**

**16. itng orscings gi f-82  
ing(s)4 ( f)2 f)-82 (i)**

|                           |                                      |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <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