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**Faculty Evaluation Policy**

**TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY**

**School of Leadership Studies**

First adopted by the School of Leadership Studies May 14, 2009

Approved by the Faculty of Educational Administration May 18, 2009

The School of Leadership Studies (SLS) at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the purpose and goals of evaluating the performance of tenured and/or tenure-track faculty. SLS further supports the goals and processes identified in memorandum by the Provost dated 2/12/09 (attached) indicating that all SLS tenure-track and tenured faculty positions are to be reviewed for tenure/promotion purposes through the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education until such time that the university agrees that tenure/promotion responsibilities should be permanently transferred to SLS.

The faculty in SLS therefore delineate below an annual evaluation policy based on *Scholarship, Teaching,* and *Service*. The evaluation process calls for SLS tenured and/or tenure-track faculty to annually engage in peer review at the first level; followed by joint review by the Director of the School of Leadership Studies and the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership at the second level; and (in the case of annual reappointment of untenured tenure-track faculty) by the Faculty of Educational Administration at the third level. All subsequent evaluation activities shall continue thereafter to follow College of Education procedures, including mid-tenure review and ultimately tenure and/or promotion recommendations.

**Other Evaluation Circumstances**

The evaluation policy that follows is designed and intended in letter and spirit for application to ‘regular’ full-time tenure-track faculty. However, the School is additionally comprised of other full-time term faculty and professional staff wherein the standard teaching/scholarship/service triad is not applicable. Consequently, persons holding non-tenure track positions will be evaluated by a similarly structured, but separate policy that addresses the diversity of service, scope, and appointment in the School of Leadership Studies.

SLS therefore states its tenured and/or tenure-track evaluation policy as follows:

**GENERAL ELEMENTS**

(1) Faculty in the School of Leadership Studies will engage in peer review on an annual basis according to timelines set forth by the University, School of Leadership Studies, College of Education, and Department of Educational Leadership. As adopted in this School, peer evaluation will encompass the period January through December.

(2) Faculty in the School of Leadership Studies will base all peer review on performance contracts prepared in advance of the evaluation period. A performance contract is defined as an agreement between relevant parties outlining the goals and objectives that the evaluatee intends to accomplish during the evaluation period. Performance contracts will be individualized for each faculty member, showing the percentage of time assigned to the areas of *scholarship, teaching*, and *service* and showing the expected performance outcomes of work in each area. Such contracts shall be collaboratively established between the tenured/tenure-track faculty as a whole and the individual, and the individual and the Director and Department Chair, to comprise 100% of each person's time. However, the final decision on assignment of each individual's time shall be made by the Director after taking into consideration the recommendation of the tenured/tenure-track faculty and any justified circumstances, including but not limited to, unusual financial condition.

(3) Tenured/tenure-track faculty in the School of Leadership Studies will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of *scholarship* as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member on publications and/or other scholarly activities as specified in the individual's performance contract. Those activities include, but are not limited to, published media, textbooks, refereed journal articles, grants, and so forth. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.

(4) Tenured/tenure-track faculty in the School of Leadership Studies will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of *Teaching* as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member, including student evaluations for classes taught and data on advisement responsibilities as specified in the individual's performance contract. Those activities include, but are not limited to, submission of syllabi in which expected course and student learning outcomes are stated along with evidence of how courses/expectations are aligned with the School’s mission and goal statements; evidence that courses taught conform to the School’s Learning Outcomes; evidence of new coursework established and/or curriculum improvement activities; and so forth. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.

(5) Tenured/tenure-track faculty in the School of Leadership Studies will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of *Service* as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member on service to the School of Leadership Studies, service to Kansas State University, and service to local, state, national and international constituencies as specified in the individual's performance contract. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.

**PROCEDURES**

(1) In keeping with University, School of Leadership Studies, College of Education, and Department of Educational Leadership timelines, each tenured/tenure-track faculty member shall submit for peer review executive summaries (with availability of full collections of materials) addressing the areas of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service.

(2) Material collections in the area of Scholarship shall include all such refereed and practitioner publications as the evaluatee shall choose to submit and may include nonprint publications. Grant activity shall fall under the nonprint publications category. Peer reviewed presentations and poster sessions at professional conferences and meetings may also be counted in the area of scholarship. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.

(3) Material collections in the area of Teaching shall include formal assessments of teaching skills such as IDEA or TEVAL, any other solicited student evaluation independently derived by the tenured/tenure-track faculty member, and a record of student advisement responsibilities when applicable. Course syllabi identifying course objectives and learning outcomes which are defensibly connected to the School’s mission and goals shall be included and considered as evidence of teaching performance. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.

(4) Material collections in the area of Service shall include all such documentation regarding School, University, local, state, regional, national, and international service as the evaluatee shall choose to submit and may include consulting activities bringing recognition to the School and/or the University. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.

(5) Material collections shall be reviewed by SLS tenured/tenure-track peers, assessing documentation submitted against the individual's performance contract criteria, with written confidential evaluations of the same to be submitted to the Director. Peer evaluations must reflect differential weightings attributable to percentage assignment of time per individual.

(6) The Director shall take the confidential peer evaluations and condense them into a summative evaluation letter addressed to each faculty member, with said letter faithfully preserving the intent of peer review. The Director shall consult with the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership about each such letter prior to actual delivery—such consultation shall be for the purpose of assessing progress toward tenure and/or promotion. At appropriate times, the Department Chair shall carry forward reappointment, mid-tenure, and tenure and/or promotion recommendations to the Faculty of Educational Administration and to the Dean of Education.

(7) Individual faculty members’ evaluation letters shall remain confidential between the Director, the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, and the evaluatee, except where the same are required to be submitted to administrators in the University or when otherwise compelled by force of law.

(8) This policy shall be effective as of the date first written above and shall be reviewed by the tenured/tenure-track SLS faculty as a whole not more than five years from the date of first adoption and reviewed on the same basis thereafter.

(9) All other applicable University, School, College, and Department policy shall be observed.

**EVALUATEE RESPONSIBILITIES**

(1) Each tenured/tenure-track faculty member shall be given the opportunity to meet with peer faculty as a whole and the Director annually for the purpose of constructing a performance contract. The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership should be regularly consulted and available to assist with aligning performance contracts with tenure/promotion expectations.

(2) Upon receipt of annual written evaluations, each evaluatee shall sign an acknowledgment indicating that an opportunity was provided to discuss and review with the Director and peer faculty the evaluation and any relative merit ranking. The evaluatee must respond in writing, if desired, within seven working days regarding any disagreement with the evaluation.

**EVALUATOR RESPONSIBILITIES**

(1) In keeping with the evaluation calendar published by the School of Leadership Studies the Director, with appropriate involvement by the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, will prepare a written evaluation (usually in February) for each faculty member according to the procedures described above. The evaluation shall identify the basis for any numeric quantification of performance, and the evaluation shall summarize achievements on which assessment and/or quantification is based.

(2) The Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, shall identify in the summative evaluation letter the relative merit ranking upon which salary increases will be recommended so that each successively higher performance ranking will result in a recommendation for a higher salary increase. The only exception shall be in the event of market/equity adjustments, which must be justified and documented separately and determined jointly through discussion between the Director and the Provost or Provost designees.

(3) The Director, in making a summative evaluation, shall take into account the percentage of time identified in each performance contract and weight the total evaluation by those same percentages so that a person's evaluation shall be weighted by area of responsibility in direct relationship to the percentage of time assigned to each function. Likewise, the ranking shall take into consideration the professorial rank of the individual (see the School’s published *Minimum Performance Standards* which explicate the different expectations according to the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor).

(4) The Director shall provide an opportunity for each evaluatee to discuss his/her evaluation in person, shall secure signatures indicating occurrence of the same, and shall allow for disagreement within the same seven days required by the University.

(5) The Director shall forward to the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership copies of the following items: (a) the evaluation policy as adopted by the tenured/tenure-track faculty; (b) a written evaluation of each tenured/tenure-track faculty member identical to the copy given to the evaluatee; (c) a recommendation on salary adjustment consistent with other provisions in this policy; and (d) any responses by the evaluatee to the evaluation.

**MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

**MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

**School of Leadership Studies**

**Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty, School of Leadership Studies**

First adopted by the School of Leadership Studies May 14, 2009

Approved by the Faculty of Educational Administration May 18, 2009

**DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES**

**EXCEEDS STANDARDS (ES)**

This rating is available only when a faculty member demonstrates exceptional overall performance. To qualify for this rating, the School will judge the evidence and demonstrate formal support by nominating the individual for this rating. Exceptional is defined as:

*Scholarship*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority.

*Service*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having secured significant external funding or national recognition for service.

*Teaching*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been recognized for excellence in teaching through awards from Kansas State University, the School of Leadership Studies, or nationally recognized organizations.

**MEETS STANDARDS (MS)**

This rating is available only when a faculty member meets and exceeds minimal standards for his or her respective academic rank. Standards will be developed annually through a peer review process for determining performance contracts and evaluating performance for merit. For purposes of definition, the rating of MS is synonymous with the provisions of the annual individual performance contract.

**FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS, BUT MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS (MMS)**

This rating is used to notify a faculty member that he or she has not met the terms of the annual individual performance contract, but that minimum standards have been met. The upper and lower limits of the rating of MMS are defined as follows. The upper limit (MMS) shall be invoked when the individual has not met the terms of his/her annual performance contract. The lower limit (FMS, see below) shall be crossed when the individual has not met one or more of the standards on the minimum standards matrix. (See attached matrix).

**FAILS TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS (FMS)**

This rating is used to notify a faculty member that he or she has failed to satisfy one or more of the criterion on the matrix. (See attached matrix).

**PROCEDURES FOR FMS**

1. If a faculty member receives a ranking of **FMS** in one evaluation year, the person will be notified in writing by the Director and will be required to meet with the Director to establish a written plan of action to bring performance up to stated standards. Monthly meetings will be held with the Director to monitor progress on the plan.
2. If the plan is not completed and if the faculty member receives an overall ranking of **FMS** in a second consecutive evaluation year, the person will be notified in writing and will meet with the Director, the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, the Dean of the College of Education, and the Provost or Provost’s designee to outline specific remedial action.
3. Failure to meet the plan constructed at that time will result in consideration of "dismissal for cause" at the discretion of the Director, the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, the Dean of the College of Education, and the Provost or the Provost’s designee.
4. Any faculty member whose evaluation indicates failure to meet minimum levels of performance in a critical area of responsibility will participate in the above procedures.

**MATRIX OF CRITERIA SATISFYING THE DESIGNATION OF**

**MEETS STANDARDS (MS)**

**TEACHING**

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

* Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
* Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
* Utilizes TEVAL, IDEA, or other School-approved standardized measurement of instructional effectiveness for appropriate courses.

**TEACHING**

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

* Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
* Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
* Utilizes TEVAL, IDEA, or other School-approved standardized measurement of instructional effectiveness for appropriate courses.
* Achieves graduate faculty status when appropriate to the candidate’s teaching assignment.
* Serves as an effective member on doctoral committees when applicable.
* Serves as an effective advisor for masters students when applicable.

**TEACHING**

**FULL PROFESSOR**

* Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
* Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
* Utilizes TEVAL, IDEA, or other School-approved standardized measurement of instructional effectiveness for appropriate courses.
* Achieves graduate faculty status when appropriate to the candidate’s teaching assignment.
* Serves as an effective advisor for doctoral students when applicable.
* Serves as an effective advisor for masters students when applicable.
* Provides effective supervision of internships when applicable.

**SCHOLARSHIP**

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

* Shows evidence of submitting research for publication.
* Shows evidence of presenting at state, regional, national, or international conferences.
* Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the leadership field.

**SCHOLARSHIP**

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

* Demonstrates ability to produce a research agenda.
* Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the leadership field.
* Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (*e.g.,* refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

**SCHOLARSHIP**

**FULL PROFESSOR**

* Produces a coherent research agenda with demonstrated impact.
* Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the leadership field.
* Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (*e.g.,* refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

**SERVICE**

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

* Attends local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.
* Participates in the development of curriculum.
* Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on School of Leadership Studies and/or University committees.

**SERVICE**

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

* Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
* Participates in the development of curriculum.
* Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on School of Leadership Studies and/or university committees.

**SERVICE**

**FULL PROFESSOR**

* Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
* Participates in the development of curriculum.
* Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on School of Leadership Studies and/or university committees.
* Positively and proactively mentors junior colleagues.

**STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

**STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

**AND**

**TENURE AND PROMOTION**

**School of Leadership Studies**

**Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty of School of Leadership Studies**

First adopted by the School of Leadership Studies May 14, 2009

Approved by the Faculty of Educational Administration May 18, 2009

**STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES**

The tenured/tenure-track Faculty of the School of Leadership Studies at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the acts of measuring, evaluating, and rewarding performance of all faculty. The faculty values a wide range of contributions to the School’s assigned mission of teaching, scholarship, and service and asserts that annual evaluation, the award of tenure, and the award of promotion in rank are performance events that should be linearly connected to the greater institution’s advancement. The faculty therefore concludes that quality and versatility in performance, together with meaningful contribution to the School’s mission, are the appropriate metrics for decisions about evaluation of both tenured and tenure-track faculty and about the actual award of tenure and/or promotion.

The tenured/tenure-track faculty declares that there can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when completed, will result in performance levels sufficiently meritorious to meet or exceed standards for annual evaluation and/or tenure/promotion purposes. Rather, the faculty declares that the true litmus test is a careful and informed judgment by knowledgeable faculty en banc regarding a candidate’s overall performance in the total context of ‘quality’, ‘versatility’, and ‘mission’. More specifically, faculty holding expertise in the candidate’s broad field (i.e., School peers, subject to additional review by the Faculty of Educational Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership and the wider College of Education) must judge whether a candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service advances the School’s reputation and whether the candidate’s contributions advance the School’s overall mission. In sum, a candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when his/her peers and the supporting Department/College affirm that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the institution.

**STATEMENT OF STANDARDS**

The tenured/tenure-track Faculty in the School of Leadership Studies has established a set of standards for evaluation and tenure/promotion which are conditioned upon performance by academic rank—i.e, each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment. More specifically, promotion to *Assistant Professor* reflects an acceptable level of achievement for time in rank and evidence of continuing potential for quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion to *Associate Professor* *with tenure* rests on evidence of substantial professional contributions given time in rank that reflect quality in teaching, scholarship or other creative endeavor, and directed service. Promotion to *Professor* is based on attainment of superior quality in the assigned responsibilities of the candidate, recognition of excellence by relevant external constituencies, and clear indication of continuing sustained contributions over an entire career. These same watershed expectations apply to annual evaluation as well, so that the faculty has enacted a performance model by academic rank, with all faculty held accountable for continual quality, versatility, and contribution to overall mission.

**PERFORMANCE MATRIX**

The tenured/tenure-track Faculty of the School of Leadership Studies strongly supports new and expanded models of teaching, scholarship, and service. Accordingly, the faculty has constructed a performance matrix that values a wide range of contributions to organizational goals. In sum, tenured/tenure-track faculty may expect institutional rewards for outstanding performance on the dimensions illustrated next in matrix form:

**SLS PROMOTION AND TENURE RUBRIC**

A candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when his/her peers and the supporting Department/College affirm that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the institution. All candidates are expected to integrate the components of technology, diversity, and field-based partnerships, as well as to provide evidence of satisfactory student performance.

**For tenure track or for promotion only to Assistant Professor**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching and Advising** | **Unsatisfactory**  | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Advisement  | Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students | Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) | Develops regular office hours and engages in continuous student communication (face to face and/or electronically) |
| Syllabi | Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting the School’s guidelines | Creates course syllabi aligned to the School’s mission statements and accreditation guidelines | Creates comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and the School’s mission statements and accreditation guidelines |
| Evaluation | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings  | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings |
| Self-Reflection | Demonstrates no evidence of self-reflection activities | Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities | Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities  |
| Teaching Agenda | Demonstrates no teaching agenda, or an agenda which is poorly conceived | Creates a written teaching agenda | Creates an innovative, comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi |
| **Research and/or Scholarly Activity** | **Unsatisfactory**  | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Publications and/or Grants | Demonstrates no activity related to publications or grants | Seeks mentoring for writing and publishing articles, books, and/or grants, and generates a publication and/or grant record appropriate to time in rank | Publishes articles, books, or receives local, state or national grants aligned with research agenda and School’s mission |
| Research Agenda | Does not provide evidence of a written research agenda | Creates written research agenda, appropriate to time in rank, that focuses on attaining graduate faculty membership and certification to direct dissertations (as appropriate) | Creates written research agenda that focuses on enhancing and/or expanding previous works |
| Currency | Has no new publications or grants since last promotion or review | Provides evidence of new scholarly efforts, appropriate to time in rank, since last promotion or review | Provides evidence of significant and current scholarly efforts since last promotion or review |
| **Service** | **Unsatisfactory**  | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Service Agenda | Possesses no written service agenda | Creates and implements a written service agenda appropriate to time in rank | Carries out a strong service agenda at School, University, local, state, and/or national levels related to the mission of the School |
| School of Leadership Studies/University Contributions | Does not engage in School, University committee work or curriculum development | Engages in School, University committee work, and curriculum development | Engages in activities at several levels of the organization (School or University), and contributes to positive social-emotional culture in the department |
| University, State, Regional, National or InternationalProfessional OrganizationsParticipation | Demonstrates little or no activity in University, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations | Demonstrates record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending state, regional, and national/international professional meetings | Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at University, state, regional, and/or national/international levels |

**For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching and Advising** | **Unsatisfactory**  | **Meets expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Advisement (office hours) | Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students | Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) | Develops regular office hours and engages in consistent, continuous communications with advisees and is appropriately available for non-advisee appointments |
| Syllabi | Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting department/ college guidelines | Updates course syllabi aligned to School mission statements and accreditation guidelines | Implements a comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and School mission statements and accreditation guidelines |
| Evaluation | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings |
| Self-reflection | Demonstrates little evidence of self-reflection activities | Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities | Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities |
| Teaching Agenda | Demonstrates only a poorly conceived teaching agenda | Pursues teaching agenda with attention to currency and creativity | Engages in teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Research and/or Scholarly Activity** | **Unsatisfactory**  | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Publications and/or Grants | Demonstrates limited publications and/or grants | Publishes articles or books, or receives state or national grants  | Publishes multiple articles or books and/or receives state or national grants over a sustained period of time |
| Research Agenda and Methodology | Does not pursue a written research agenda; provides no evidence of research methodology knowledge | Publishes articles or books and/or receives state or national grants; provides evidence of research methodology expertise; co-directs or directs doctoral dissertations (as appropriate) | Publishes respected scholarly materials and successfully guides students through the dissertation process (as appropriate) |
| Currency | Has generated no new research or publications since the last promotion or review | Provides evidence of publications, appropriate to time in rank, since last promotion or review | Provides evidence of significant multiple publications since last promotion or review |
| **Service** | **Unsatisfactory**  | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Service Agenda | Demonstrates only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda | Attends to a service agenda appropriate to time in rank | Updates and pursues a comprehensive written service agenda |
| University, State, Regional, National or International Participation | Demonstrates little or no activity in University, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations | Provides a record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending state, regional, and national/international professional meetings | Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at University, state, regional, and/or national/international levels |
| School/University Contributions | Does not engage in leadership roles in School committee work and/or curriculum development | Engages in and assumes leadership roles in School and/or University committee work and/or curriculum development | Assumes visible leadership roles and builds relationships and contributes to positive culture in the School |

**For promotion to Professor**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching and Advising** | **Unsatisfactory**  | **Meets expectations** | **Exceeds expectations** |
| Advisement (office hours) | Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate consistently with students | Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) and is regularly available to students and other faculty | Maintains office hours, advises a full case load of students, and is available to students and faculty |
| Syllabi | Uses syllabi that lack periodic updating of goals, objectives, grading, etc. | Updates course syllabi based on evaluations and self-reflections that are aligned to School mission statements and accreditation guidelines  | Engages in innovative teaching practices reflecting attention to diversity issues, use of technology, field-based partnerships  |
| Evaluation | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings | Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings |
| Self-reflection | Demonstrates inadequate evidence of self-reflection activities | Demonstrates evidence of self-reflection activities on a regular basis | Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities |
| Teaching Agenda | Demonstrates weak or no implementation of a teaching agenda | Demonstrates strong implementation of a teaching agenda, with attention to currency and creativity | Demonstrates strong implementation of innovative teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity |
| **Research and/or Scholarly Activity** | **Unsatisfactory**  | **Meets Expectationss** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Publications and/or Grants | Demonstrates only limited or erratic success with refereed publications and/or grants since last promotion | Regularly publishes multiple articles and/or books, and/or receives state or national grants since last promotion | Publishes articles and/or books, and/or receives state or national grants over a sustained period of time |
| Research Agenda and Research Methodology | Does not update and adjust written research agenda according to changes in field of expertise; exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid, rigorous research methodologies  | Updates and adjusts written agendaaccording to changes in field of expertise; recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to college (expertise)  | Documents implementation of a research agenda that contributes to current needs in the field and/or engages futuristic or cutting-edge lines of research; regularly and successfully guides students through the completed dissertation process (as appropriate) |
| Currency | Has generated little research or publication since the last promotion | Provides evidence of a systematic record of publications since last promotion | Provides evidence of a record of significant and sustained publications since last promotion |
| **Service** |  |  |  |
| Service Agenda | Exhibits only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda beyond date of last promotion | Regularly updates written service agenda since date of last promotion  | Regularly updates and pursues a written comprehensive service agenda that results in a state and/or national reputation |
| University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations | Exhibits limited or no participation in professional organizations at state, regional, or national levels since last promotion | Maintains a record of attending/presenting at state, regional, and national professional meetings on a regular basis | Appropriately assumes leadership roles in state, regional, and/or national professional organizations which lead to national recognition |
| School/University Contributions | Engages in only limited leadership roles in School committee work and/or curriculum development | Engages in and assumes appropriate leadership roles in School and/or University committee work, and/or curriculum development | Demonstrates role model behavior in School and/or University committee work, and/or curriculum development |