



CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

Date: December 1997
Revision December 1998
Revision April 2005
Revised July 2014 (to comply with UHAP revisions)

1. GENERAL

- 1.1 Written evaluation criteria will be developed by the faculty of each department and program within the College of Humanities, together with the department or program head. These criteria shall express the performance expectations for faculty members. The stated expectations will differentiate between satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance and must align with the mission and goals of the department or program and the college.
1.2 Criteria for annual performance must consider teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly growth, creative activity, service and outreach. Evaluation criteria may provide for recognition of long-term faculty activities and outcomes. Concentration of effort in one of the three major areas of faculty responsibilities (teaching, research, and service) is permissible and may even be encouraged. Guidelines and evaluation procedures within departments will be flexible enough to meet the particular objectives of the department without undermining the uniformity of the whole system.
1.3 When teaching effectiveness is evaluated, a systematic assessment of both student and peer opinion will constitute one component of the evaluation. An annual review that fails to include student evaluations is an incomplete review.

2. PERFORMANCE SCALE

2.1 Each department and program will adopt a five-point scale for the performance ratings of faculty in each area (teaching, research, service) for which they are responsible. The following chart will provide the framework for evaluation on a scale from 1.0 to 5.0.

Table with 2 columns: Performance Rating and Score Range. Rows include Outstanding (4.0 to 5.0), Exceeds expectations (3.0 to 3.9), Meets expectations (2.0 to 2.9), Below expectations (1.5 to 1.9), and Unsatisfactory (1.0 to 1.4).

2.2 A score of 2.0 and above will be considered satisfactory performance. A score below 2.0 will be considered unsatisfactory performance and will require the tenured faculty member to implement either a faculty development plan or a performance improvement plan. These plans are described in the post-tenure review procedures of the College of Humanities.

3. OVERALL EVALUATION

- 3.1 In addition to a numerical score in each area of responsibility, faculty will also receive an overall score.
- 3.2 The expectation is that the workload for most faculty members will be as follows: 40 percent devoted to teaching, 40 percent to research/creative activity, and 20 percent to service.
- 3.3 The overall rating for a faculty member with a 40-40-20 workload division will be based on a weighting of 4.0 for teaching, 4.0 for research and 2.0 for service.
- 3.4 In some cases faculty members will have responsibilities that differ from the 40-40-20 norm: for example, when they are on sabbatical or leave, have significant administrative assignments, or make other arrangements with the department or program head. When faculty have such arrangements, the formula for arriving at an overall score will be adjusted accordingly.
- 3.5 Any negotiated variation from the 40/40/20 allocation should be noted and explained in the annual review of each faculty member.
- 3.6 The information specified in Items 3.4 and 3.5 will be made available to the college committee when conducting the dean's-level audit.

4. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

- 4.1 Because of the diversity of disciplines and methodologies within the College of Humanities, each department or program will have the responsibility for determining what specific performance merits a particular number on the five-point scale.
- 4.2 Each department or program must observe the following principle in the evaluation of teaching: Every annual review of teaching will consist of peer and student input, including student evaluations of faculty classroom performance in all classes, and other expressions of teaching performance (UHAP 3.2.01).
- 4.3 Each department or program will determine precisely how student evaluations are to be interpreted. Attention should be paid to patterns *over a period of five years*. [4/2005 Revision]
- 4.4 Evaluations of teaching will take into account the burdens of faculty who teach large classes (e.g., Tier One or Tier Two courses, or other courses that enroll large numbers of students).
- 4.5 Evaluations will take into account the direction of dissertations, the teaching of honors sections, the development of experimental courses and other kinds of innovative teaching.
- 4.6 Individual departments and programs should encourage the highest levels of performance and at the same time, provide fair, consistent and reasonable standards for the assessment of performance.
- 4.7 The criteria developed by each department or program must be approved by the dean of the college.
- 4.8 In the event that a department or program fails to create criteria and measures for the annual review, the dean will select the criteria and measures of another College of Humanities department or program and direct the department head/program director and appropriate committee to apply those criteria.