

Faculty Performance Expectations EDUCATION

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.

Minimum Promotion and Tenure Performance Requirements

	Min Acceptable	Min Preferred	Min Exceptional
SR Instructor 1 (3 year extendable appt.)	1	1	
SR Instructor 2		2 — OR —	
Associate	1 2	1	1
Tenure	1 2	2 — OR —	
Professor		3 — OR —	1
	1	1	1

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

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<p>Student evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate instructor’s teaching effectiveness “very good” or higher (see section 5.260) <p>Classroom Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Professional development activities that impacted instruction ○ Work with colleagues that impacted instruction • Evidence of effective practices, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reflection and self-improvement ○ Engaging teaching methods ○ Providing meaningful classroom experiences <p>Curricular Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrates courses into departmental programs, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Effectively prepares students for subsequent courses ○ Effectively builds on students prior learning ○ Effectively addresses departmental learning outcomes <p>Departmental Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperates with program faculty in meeting departmental loading needs 	<p>Student evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate instructor’s teaching effectiveness at or near “outstanding” (see section 5.260) <p>Classroom Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction (see acceptable column) • Beyond evidence of effective practices (see acceptable column), also shares successful and/or innovative practices with colleagues <p>Curricular Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond integrating courses into departmental programs (see acceptable column), also is an effective partner in curricular and program design and delivery <p>Mentoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively involved in some student mentoring activities <p>Departmental Needs (see acceptable column)</p>	<p>Student evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate the instructor’s teaching effectiveness well into the “outstanding” category (see section 5.260) <p>Classroom Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized by colleagues as a highly skilled and knowledgeable instructor • Models excellent teaching • Demonstrates attention and responsiveness to student needs <p>Curricular Development (see preferred column)</p> <p>Mentoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant student mentoring activities (either in quantity or quality of work with students) • Mentors colleagues to develop their instructional abilities (assessment, curricular design, effective delivery, etc.) <p>Departmental Needs (see acceptable column)</p>

[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.]

Service Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<p>Departmental Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participant in departmental work including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advising students in dept'l programs; writing letters of recommendation; assisting at preview days, registration and orientation activities; and other advising related activities ○ Effective contributor on fair share of dept'l committees ○ Effectively carrying out fair share of individual dept'l tasks <p>University/Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some activity beyond department or program (e.g. serve on active University committee most years under review). • Active service in professional organization or to local educational partners may substitute for a University committee. 	<p>Departmental Service (see acceptable column)</p> <p>University/Professional Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 to statewide educational partners may substitute for a University committee. • Effective partner in accomplishing assignments <p>Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.) 	<p>Departmental Service (see acceptable column)</p> <p>University/Professional Service (see preferred column)</p> <p>Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)

[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.]

Scholarship Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<p>Quantity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-5 scholarly achievements including at least 1 publication <p>Originality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each achievement may be sole or co-authored <p>Meaningfulness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized as a contributor to one's field as evidenced through achievements such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Authoring grant proposals ○ Paid consulting at the local level ○ Presentations at workshops or conferences ○ Invited contributions to edited publications with local or regional contributors <p>Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 2 achievements must be peer reviewed or invited <p>Dissemination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 2 achievements must be disseminated nationally or internationally 	<p>Quantity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-7 scholarly achievements including at least 3 publications <p>Originality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 achievements (including 1 publication) must be sole or lead-authored <p>Meaningfulness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized as a significant contributor to one's field as evidenced through achievements such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grant awards <\$100,000 ○ Paid consulting at the regional or state level ○ Keynote presentations at regional or state conferences ○ Invited contributions to edited publications with national or international contributors <p>Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 achievements (including 1 publication) must be peer reviewed <p>Dissemination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 achievements (including 1 publication) must be disseminated nationally or internationally 	<p>Quantity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >7 scholarly achievements including at least 5 publications <p>Originality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 5 achievements (including 2 publications) must be sole or lead-authored <p>Meaningfulness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized as a leader in one's field as evidenced through achievements such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grant awards >\$100,000 ○ Paid consulting at the national or international level; ○ Keynote presentations at national or international conferences; ○ Editing publications with national or international contributors <p>Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 5 achievements (including 2 publications) must be peer reviewed <p>Dissemination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 5 achievements (including 2 publications) must be disseminated nationally or internationally

Statement on Originality: The Education department values equally scholarship that is conducted individually or in collaboration with others. Collaborative projects involving students, practicing teachers, or junior faculty serve the important function of mentoring emerging educators into a profession characterized by life-long learning and knowledge production. Collaborative projects involving university faculty from outside the School of Education contribute to the university goal of interdisciplinarity. Collaborative projects with national or international colleagues are important opportunities to make or be recognized for significant contributions to one's chosen knowledge community.

Statement on Meaningfulness: The Education department encourages faculty to develop lines of inquiry which are reflective of their personal goals, interests and commitments as educators. Enhanced meaningfulness can be evidenced through either a deepening or a broadening of one's lines of inquiry as an individual progresses through the professoriate, as well as through a greater integration of one's research into our other areas of professional practice (such as teaching or service). Contributions recognized, cited, or utilized by other scholars or educational

practitioners, or which result in specific instructional, curricular, or programmatic improvements, are other indicators of meaningfulness.

Statement on Review: To demonstrate scholarly activity has been reviewed, achievements must undergo some form of review by appropriate peers. This includes, but is not limited to, the traditional refereed or juried (peer-review) process. The review measure may also be met by other forms of peer review, such as conference program committees, panel chairs, granting agencies, editorial boards, publishers, museums, galleries, or others *where* submissions undergo some form of evaluation (as opposed to routine or automatic acceptance). This review standard may also be met when faculty members are contacted and invited to work on a particular type of activity (such as invited book chapter, invited keynote, consultant, etc.).

Statement on Dissemination: To demonstrate scholarly activity is disseminated, achievements must be shared with professionals outside the University. Dissemination is normally expected to be at least in a multi-state region (such as Northwest or Pacific Coast), if not national, *except* in the area of scholarship of application, where the recipient of the work may not have a multi-state presence. However there may be cases where a local or statewide dissemination has sufficient impact to be considered equivalent to multi-state or national dissemination.

I. Examples of Qualifying Scholarly Achievements

- Artistic Performances
- Encyclopedia entries
- Gallery Exhibits
- Grants (proposals or funded)
- Research Team Proposals/ Reports
- Professional Development Workshops
- Monographs
- Editorials
- Program Assessment/ Evaluation Reports
- Newspaper/Newsletter articles
- Book reviews
- Published curriculum
- Patents
- Presentations
- Published poems, plays, recordings, stories, and similar creative works
- Software Development
- Dissertation- Unpublished
- Publications (see below)

II. Examples of Qualifying Publications

- Books
- Book Chapters
- Journal Articles
- Dissertation- Published