Faculty Performance Expectations LIBRARY

Professional faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching and service (see section 5.224 and 5.226). Professorial faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching, scholarship and service (see sections 5.224-5.226).

All faculty members should be making progress toward performing at the preferred level in each of the areas applicable to their appointment. The acceptable level describes the minimum performance expected for continued employment. Note: unacceptable performance is defined as below an acceptable level and may require a plan for correction (see 5.370).

The preferred level describes the average or typical performance level for a faculty member making good progress toward final promotion. The exceptional level would characterize and recognize faculty who demonstrated significant achievements, well beyond the preferred level.

All faculty members must have the educational background required and have completed the required years in rank prior to the effective date of promotion or the required years of service prior to the date of awarding of tenure or a three-year extendable appointment (see section 5.223).

In addition, the faculty member's performance portfolio must be reviewed and demonstrate that there are sufficient contributions in each of the areas appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. Faculty must meet or exceed the acceptable performance level in each area applicable to their appointment. The number of areas required to exceed the acceptable level gradually increases (see table below) until all areas must be at the preferred level for final promotion (Senior Instructor 2 or Full Professor). Note: exceptional performance is not expected, nor required for promotion to any rank, however faculty members may elect to replace preferred performance in two areas with acceptable performance in one area and exceptional performance in the other.

| | Min Acceptable | Min Preferred | Min Exceptional |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| SR Instructor 1 (3 year extendable appt.) | 1 | 1 | |
| SR Instructor 2 | 1 | - OR $-$ | 1 |
| Associate | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Tenure | 1 2 | - OR $-$ | 1 |
| Professor | 1 | $- \frac{3}{0R} - \frac{1}{1}$ | 1 |

Minimum Promotion and Tenure Performance Requirements

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area.

Teaching Performance Levels - LIBRARY (LIS)

| Acceptable | Preferred | Exceptional |
|--|--|--|
| Student evaluations | Student evaluations | Student evaluations |
| • Instructor's teaching effectiveness | Rate instructor's teaching | • Rate the instructor's teaching |
| rated at "very good" or | effectiveness at or near | effectiveness in the "outstanding" |
| higher (see section 5.260) | "outstanding" (see section 5.260) | category (see section 5.260) |
| | | |
| Classroom Instruction | Classroom Instruction | Classroom Instruction |
| • Evidence of a commitment to | • Evidence of a commitment to | • Recognized by colleagues as a highly |
| improve instruction, such as | improve instruction (see | skilled and knowledgeable instructor |
| • Professional development activities | acceptable column) | Models excellent teaching |
| that impacted instruction | | Demonstrates attention and |
| • Work with colleagues that impacted | • Beyond evidence of effective | responsiveness to student needs |
| instruction | practices (see acceptable | |
| • Evidence of effective practices, such | column), also shares successful and/or innovative | Demonstration of an |
| as | | Research Instruction |
| Reflection and self-improvement Engaging teaching methods | practices with colleagues | • (see acceptable and preferred columns) |
| Providing meaningful classroom | Research Instruction | • Creates guides, search aids, or other instructional technologies that are used |
| experiences | • (see acceptable column) | instructional technologies that are used by other institutions. |
| ··· F ······ | • Creates more substantial aids to | by other institutions. |
| Research Instruction: | research such as multimedia | |
| • Provides effective information | tutorials. | Curricular Development (see preferred |
| instruction: | • Develops or applies new | column) |
| \circ at the Reference Desk | technologies that enhance | |
| \circ in one-on-one private sessions | instruction. | Mentoring |
| • via e-mail and chat | | • Significant student mentoring activities |
| • Evidence of effective practices such | Curricular Development | (either in quantity or quality of work |
| as: | • Beyond integrating courses into | with students) |
| Creation of well-designed web- | departmental | |
| based guides | programs (see acceptable column), also is an effective | • Mentors colleagues to develop their |
| • Creation of effective aids to research | partner in curricular and | instructional abilities (assessment, curricular design, effective delivery, etc.) |
| in a variety of media | program design and delivery | cumental design, enective denvery, etc.) |
| Curricular Development | program design and denivery | Departmental Needs |
| • Integrates courses into departmental | Mentoring | (see acceptable and preferred columns) |
| programs, such as | • Actively involved in some | Designs and completes a major project |
| • Effectively prepares students for | student mentoring activities | (e.g., creation of substantive websites |
| subsequent courses | | that further the teaching mission of the |
| • Effectively builds on students prior | Departmental Needs | University, administers a grant, etc.) |
| learning • Effectively addresses dept'l learning | • (see acceptable column) | • Demonstrates outstanding performance |
| · · · · · | • Shows exemplary performance | in appropriate areas of responsibility |
| outcomes | in appropriate areas of | • Leads and/or provides statewide or |
| Departmental Needs | responsibility | multi-state professional development |
| • Cooperates with program faculty in | • Demonstrates effective | activities in area of responsibility. |
| meeting departmental loading needs | leadership of professional development activities in area of | |
| • Performs knowledgeable selection of | responsibility. | |
| print and electronic materials | responsionity. | |
| • Performs competently in appropriate | | |
| area of responsibility (e.g., metadata | | |
| creation, systems, selection, etc.) | | |
| • Engages in professional development | | |
| activities in area of responsibility | | |
| [Department Expectations take the form of | f added bullets (solid circles) under a | ny or all of the headings above as well as |

[Department Expectations take the form of added bullets (solid circles) under any or all of the headings above as well as added bullets (open circles) under any or all of the existing bullets above.]

| Acceptable | Preferred | Exceptional |
|--|---|---|
| A combination of at least three publications, presentations and/or grant applications is required. Each print or online Originality Originality Each print or online publication, presentation, and/or grant application includes some original content from this faculty member, some of which included | | Originality The quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, and/or grant applications were well above average with significant original content, some as lead author Examples: |
| publication, presentation, and/or grant application includes some original content from this faculty member | significant original content A combination of at least four print or online publications, presentations, and/or grant applications. | A combination of at least five publications, presentations and/or grant applications, including at least two publications A single pivotal publication in the field, widely recognized for its impact, which |
| Meaningfulness Must include at least one publication May include one or more presentations May include external grant application(s), even if not funded Review All publications, presentations, and/or grant applications passed a review process | Meaningfulness Must include at least one national publication or two regional publications May include one or more presentations May include modest external grant award(s) (e.g. \$10K one-time grant) Review One publication, presentation, and/or grant application passed at least a moderately competitive review process | results in invitations to conferences, workshops or other follow-up activities Meaningfulness • Recognized as a scholar/expert in field (either in a multi-state region or nationally) Examples: • Significant national publication • Invited speaker at major conference • Consultant for significant state or national body • Sizable external grant award(s) (e.g. multi-year grant above \$500K) • See examples under originality |
| Dissemination Three publications, presentations, and/or grant applications received at least multi-state dissemination | Dissemination At least one publication, presentation, and/or grant application was nationally disseminated | regarding quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, and grant applications. Review Most publications, presentations, and/or grant applications passed at least a moderately competitive review process, including at least one formally refereed article that underwent a highly competitive review process Dissemination At least three publications, presentations, and/or grant applications were nationally disseminated |

• Three published book reviews are considered to be the equivalent of one published article.

- Presentations can also include conducting a workshop for other professionals at a state or national meeting.
- Online Northwest, Computers in Libraries, Choice Reviews, and Library Journal are examples of entities with moderately competitive review processes.

[Department Expectations take the form of added bullets (solid circles) under any or all of the headings above as well as added bullets (open circles) under any or all of the existing bullets above.]

| Acceptable | Preferred | Exceptional |
|---|--|---|
| Departmental Service Active participant in departmental work: | Departmental Service (see acceptable column) University/Professional Service University service on active committees (at least one committee every year under review, more if committee(s) is not very active). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee. Effective partner in accomplishing assignments Leadership Some documentable accomplishment in a leadership role at the departmental, institutional or professional level during period under review (department chair, program coordinator, faculty program director, chair active committee, lead taskforce, significant individual task, etc.) | Departmental Service (see acceptable column) University/Professional Service (see preferred column) Leadership Recognized as a faculty leader on campus Served in multiple leadership roles Significant accomplishments at the institutional level as a faculty leader (either multiple committees or taskforces, as a program director, as a department chair, or other significant leadership responsibilities resulting in multiple documentable achievements that furthered the institutional mission) |

Originally submitted and approved, 2013

Reformatted October 24, 2016