

**ANL EXLNTD
MCH**

**GUIDELINES
(HC)**

Annual evaluations will be conducted by the faculty member's chair and reviewed by the Dean and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs¹. The annual evaluation is conducted on a calendar basis and includes an overall evaluation of Exceptional, Outstanding, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory achievement. The overall rating will be translated into a numerical rating from an Exceptional rating of 5 to an Unsatisfactory rating of 1.²

Determining the Overall Rating

Tenureline Faculty: Faculty are rated in each area of the triad of instruction/scholarly/creative production, and service as Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory per criteria given below. An overall evaluation score using the rating scale is generally determined as follows, although variations may be made in individual cases based on exceptional performance.³

Exceptional: Excellent in all 3 areas.

Outstanding: Excellent in 2 areas and Good.

Good: Good in 3 areas or 2 Good and 1 Excellent, or 2 Good and 1 Needs Improvement, or 2 Excellent and 1 below Good (needs improvement or unsatisfactory), or 1 Excellent and 2 Needs Improvement, or 1 Excellent, 1 Good, and 1 below Good (needs improvement or unsatisfactory)

Needs Improvement: Needs Improvement in 3 areas, 2 Needs Improvement and 1 Good, 2 Good and 1 Unsatisfactory, or 1 Excellent and 2 Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory: Unsatisfactory in 2 areas with no rating of Excellent, 1 Unsatisfactory and 2 Needs Improvement

Instructors: Since instructors are not assigned research, they will be evaluated solely based on teaching and service. Their overall rating will be generally determined as follows:

Exceptional: Excellent in both areas.

Outstanding: Excellent in one area and Good in one area.

Good: No rating below Good; or 1 Needs Improvement and 1 Excellent.

Needs Improvement: Needs Improvement in 2 areas, or 1 Needs Improvement and 1 Good.

¹ As explained in the P&T Guidelines, there is not a direct relationship between annual evaluation outcomes and promotion and tenure decisions. The annual evaluations of faculty are determined by chairs and reviewed by the deans, while P&T recommendations are largely generated by tenured faculty in a separate process.

² In translating ratings to potential pay increases, note that a faculty member may earn merit pay with an overall rating of "3" (good) and a 3% sustained performance evaluation (SPE) raise requires an average rating of "4"

Unsatisfactory: Unsatisfactory in teaching regardless of the other score.

A faculty member earning a rating in categories below C will establish a plan for improvement with his/her Chair, which may include peer mentoring, reassignment of duties, or other interventions as agreed upon by the faculty member and his/her Chair.

AIEMh

Materials used to evaluate instruction will include student evaluation data (SPOT scores), and evidence of teaching enhancement activities. Such activities are defined as those intended to benefit the HC by improving teaching effectiveness, student experience, and the curriculum, and also by disseminating on

(between 3 and 4)

Unsatisfactory Failure to achieve at least a needs improvement rating.

Teaching Enhancement activities

Examples of teaching enhancement activities that contribute to the HO include: Team teaching a course, teaching a writing intensive (WAC) course; teaching Directed Independent Study (DIS) that is not the same version of a course being simultaneously taught; being primary reader of at least two honors theses for which one is not receiving a course reduction; serving as second reader of multiple honors theses; lecturing as part of the Honors College forum; receiving a teaching grant; successful curricular development (new course proposed, approved and taught; leading role in proposing a concentration that is approved and added to the curriculum); publication of a peer-reviewed article regarding teaching methods; making presentation or having an organizing role in a conference on pedagogy; taking students to conferences/exhibitions to present their scholarly or artistic work

Articles

Faculty members may report research during years when an item is accepted for publication or during years when published but not both. For instance, if an Article is included in an annual report as forthcoming (i.e., accepted but not yet in print), the same Article should not be included in a future report⁴.

While an emphasis in annual evaluation is on finished work, faculty may also receive some credit for work that is in the production process (e.g., an Article sent for review; artistic work in progress). Documentation of such productivity must be provided by the faculty member.

Excellent A rating of excellent will be achieved by accomplishing one or more of the following during the period of evaluation:

1. Acceptance or publication of an Article in a peer-reviewed national or international journal, or a chapter in a peer-reviewed book.
2. Acceptance or exhibition/performance of peer-reviewed creative work in nationally or internationally recognized shows. A local or regional exhibit will also count if it is in a museum.
3. Acceptance or publication of a book by a University press or commercial publisher on the basis of an externally peer-reviewed manuscript (a book may be counted in two consecutive years).
4. Revision of a book by a University press or commercial publisher
5. Receiving a significant grant or grants as a result of an external review process.
6. Acceptance or publication of a peer-reviewed textbook, or revised version of a textbook by a University or commercial publisher.
7. Editing a peer-reviewed book accepted by contract for publication.

⁴ As stated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, an Article is different from a "comment," a "note," or a "review." A series of notes, for example, may be considered as equivalent to a single Article.

8. Receiving a fellowship or residency
9. Jurying or curating an exhibition or performance.
10. Acceptance of creative writing or other creative product in peer reviewed national or international journals, books or magazines.
11. Presentation of 2 papers/posters at peer reviewed national or international conferences.
12. Organizing a professional conference, symposium, or exhibition.

Trail.96-Tm/16)73-10(4)g)6-20(3)02-Tj(1)05) (0)1205(s)10(4)010(e)11(es)102(16-7)Tj[(0a)14-30(du

orp6(er)t 06 i6o((6(octai .z3 Tw [gO)-8(r0aT)4(n4.73(n)-4(ces)-5 Td TJ 0 Tc 0 Tw 1.71 0

Examples of service include: chairing or serving on a standing or ad hoc College committee
(ad hoc committees include

The chair is an advocate for the success of faculty to whom he or she is assigned. After submitting the annual evaluation form for review, faculty members have the opportunity to meet with the chair to discuss its contents, ask and answer questions, and receive feedback. Faculty should bring to the meeting a copy of the completed annual evaluation form, an updated CV, and relevant documentation of items listed on the evaluation form (e.g., letters indicating receipt of an award or honor, messages indicating the inclusion of artwork in an exhibition, or the acceptance of books, articles, and chapters for publication, etc.).

Faculty

A faculty member may request in writing a meeting with an administrator at the next higher level to discuss concerns regarding the evaluation that were not resolved in discussions with the chair. In addition, each candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor may choose to be assigned a Faculty Mentor, who is an academic/professional advisor with no supervisory responsibilities. The Faculty Mentor must be a tenured member of the HC faculty. The candidate in consultation with the Associate Dean(s) would select the Faculty Mentor. At the request of the faculty member, the advisor may attend meetings between the faculty member and his or her supervisor regarding issues of assignment.