

## Faculty Performance Expectations MATHEMATICS

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
<b>SR Instructor 1 (3 year extendable appt.)</b>	1	1	
<b>SR Instructor 2</b>		2 — OR —	
<b>Associate</b>	1	1	1
<b>Tenure</b>	2	2 — OR —	
<b>Professor</b>		3 — OR —	
	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.

Black text indicates common bylaws language for all departments. Blue text indicates specifications for mathematics faculty.

## Teaching Performance Levels

Teaching effectiveness is primarily measured by instruction at SOU. In mathematics, other instructional activities are normally reviewed under scholarship since they typically involve disseminating original instructional or pedagogical material that would fall under scholarship of teaching.

<b>Acceptable</b> [Classroom-centric instructional focus]	<b>Preferred</b> [Broader departmental focus]	<b>Exceptional</b> [Demonstrates leadership or innovation]
<p><b>Student evaluations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate instructor’s teaching effectiveness “very good” or higher (see section 5.260)</li> </ul> <p><b>Classroom Instruction<sup>1</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction, such as                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Professional development activities that impacted instruction</li> <li>○ Work with colleagues that impacted instruction</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of effective practices, such as                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reflection and self-improvement</li> <li>○ Engaging teaching methods</li> <li>○ Providing meaningful classroom experiences</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Curricular Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrates courses into departmental programs, such as                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Effectively prepares students for subsequent courses</li> <li>○ Effectively builds on students prior learning</li> <li>○ Effectively addresses dept’l learning outcomes</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Departmental Needs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooperates with program faculty in meeting departmental loading needs both in departmental scheduling meetings and when scheduling changes are necessary.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student evaluations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate instructor’s teaching effectiveness at or near “outstanding” (see section 5.260)</li> </ul> <p><b>Classroom Instruction<sup>1</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction (see acceptable column)</li> <li>• Beyond evidence of effective practices (see acceptable column), also shares successful and/or innovative practices with colleagues</li> </ul> <p><b>Curricular Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beyond integrating courses into departmental programs (see acceptable column), also is an effective partner in curricular and program design and delivery                             <p>For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Individually or as part of a team, develops new (or significantly updates) department course(s) or program</li> <li>○ Introduces new instructional materials, techniques, or technology to department curriculum</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Mentoring</b></p> <p>Actively involved in some student mentoring activities<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>Departmental Needs</b> (see acceptable column)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record of teaching multiple new preparations and/or a diversity of courses across a term or year.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student evaluations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate the instructor’s teaching effectiveness well into the “outstanding” category (see section 5.260)</li> </ul> <p><b>Classroom Instruction<sup>1</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognized by colleagues as a highly skilled and knowledgeable instructor</li> <li>• Models excellent teaching<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>Curricular Development</b> (see preferred column)</p> <p>For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Led significant change as a course coordinator</li> <li>• Led development or significant change in a departmental or interdisciplinary program</li> <li>• Individually or leading a team to develop significant departmental curriculum (multiple courses or program)</li> <li>• Pilots new pedagogy or delivery method (e.g. online) for the department</li> </ul> <p><b>Mentoring</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant student mentoring activities (either in quantity or quality of work with students)<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Mentors colleagues to develop their instructional abilities (assessment, curricular design, effective delivery, technological tools, online delivery, etc.)</li> </ul> <p><b>Departmental Needs</b> (see preferred column)</p>

<sup>1</sup>Classroom instruction is best evidenced by formal classroom observations and evaluation of course materials, most commonly through the annual and/or collegial evaluation processes. Comments on student evaluations may also be used as secondary evidence.

<sup>2</sup>Mentoring should involve an instructional component, but need not have associated SCH. SCH-bearing activities include reading and conference courses, mentoring honors or capstone projects, and supervising practicum experiences. Non-SCH-bearing activities include preparing students for mathematics exams such as GRE Subject Area Exam or Putnam Exam, training mathematics tutors or graduate assistants, coordinating or presenting special events on areas such as career development or mathematics content area. Professional faculty members do not normally participate in SCH-bearing mentoring activities and should be rated on their involvement in non-SCH-bearing activities.

## Service Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<p><b>Departmental Service<sup>1</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active participant in departmental work:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advising students in departmental programs; writing letters of recommendation; assisting at preview days, registration and orientation activities; and other advising related activities</li> <li>○ Effective contributor on his/her fair share of departmental committees</li> <li>○ Effectively carrying out his/her fair share of individual departmental tasks</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>University/Professional Service<sup>2</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some activity beyond department or program (e.g. serve on active University committee most years under review). Active service in professional organization or capacity may substitute for a University committee.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Departmental Service</b> (see acceptable column)</p> <p><b>University/Professional Service<sup>2</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Effective partner in accomplishing assignments</li> </ul> <p><b>Leadership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Departmental Service</b> (see acceptable column)</p> <p><b>University/Professional Service</b> (see preferred column)<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>Leadership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognized as a faculty leader on campus</li> <li>• Served in multiple leadership roles</li> <li>• 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)</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup>Departmental Service is evidenced by (1) annual departmental committee assignments and individual tasks (see annual departmental assignments forms), (2) ad hoc assignments completed, and (3) majors advising assignments. Department Chair is responsible for assigning these items so that each faculty member has an opportunity to complete his/her fair share. Annual and/or collegial evaluations review whether activities are carried out effectively. Professional faculty members are not expected to advise majors, but are assigned to department committees, individual tasks, and ad hoc activities.

<sup>2</sup>While activity in professional organizations is highly valued by the mathematics department, rarely will activity in a professional organization be so demanding that a mathematics faculty member is not expected to do any university service in a given year.

## Scholarship Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
<p><b>Originality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each publication, presentation, and/or grant application included some original content from this faculty member</li> <li>• A combination of at least three publications, presentations and/or grant applications</li> </ul> <p><b>Meaningfulness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must include at least one publication</li> <li>• May include one or more presentations</li> <li>• May include external grant application(s), even if not funded</li> </ul> <p><b>Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All publications, presentations, and/or grant applications passed a modest review process</li> </ul> <p><b>Dissemination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three publications, presentations, and/or grant applications received at least multi-state dissemination</li> </ul>	<p><b>Originality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each publication, presentation, and/or grant application included some original content from this faculty member, some of which included significant original content</li> <li>• A combination of at least four publications, presentations and/or grant applications</li> </ul> <p><b>Meaningfulness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must include at least one national publication or two multi-state publications</li> <li>• May include one or more presentations</li> <li>• May include modest external grant award(s) (e.g. \$10K one-time grant)</li> </ul> <p><b>Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One publication, presentation, and/or grant application passed at least a moderately competitive review process</li> </ul> <p><b>Dissemination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one publication, presentation, and/or grant application was nationally disseminated</li> </ul>	<p><b>Originality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, and/or grant applications exceeded the preferred expectation (see examples below) with significant original content from this faculty member, some as lead author</li> </ul> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A combination of at least five publications, presentations and/or grant applications, including at least two publications</li> <li>○ a single pivotal publication in the field, widely recognized for its impact, which results in invitations to conferences, workshops or other follow-up activities</li> </ul> <p><b>Meaningfulness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognized as a scholar/expert in field (either in a multi-state region or nationally)</li> </ul> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Significant national publication</li> <li>○ Invited speaker at major conference</li> <li>○ Consultant for significant State or national body</li> <li>○ Sizable external grant award(s) (e.g. multi-year grant in excess of \$500K)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See examples listed under originality regarding quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, and/or grant applications</li> </ul> <p><b>Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul> <p><b>Dissemination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least three publications, presentations, and/or grant applications were nationally disseminated</li> </ul>

The following lists are not intended to be comprehensive, but representative to guide mathematics faculty in evaluating potential venues:

- The **determination of multi-state versus national** is based on the breadth of audience reached. In some cases, multiple regional activities may result in a national reach. E.g., presenting the same talk in multiple venues is viewed as *one* presentation, but with greater dissemination (essentially the totality of everywhere it was presented).
- **Examples of multi-state venues** (or the equivalent thereof): presentations at regional conferences such as State of Jefferson Congress (Whiskeytown), Northwest Mathematics Conference (NWMC), regional AMS/MAA or NCTM conferences; publications in well-respected regional journals such as Oregon Mathematics Teacher (TOMT); mathematics education work that has significant impact in Oregon, such as in conjunctions with Oregon Department of Education.
- **Examples of venues with modest review processes:** publications in TOMT; presentations at State of Jefferson Congress, Oregon Academy of Sciences, NWMC, AMS/MAA joint meetings or Mathfest (though some types of presentations are more restrictive and may be rated more competitively)
- **Examples of venues with moderately competitive review processes:** publications in Horizons; presentations at regional NCTM conferences
- **Examples of venues with highly competitive review processes:** publications in NCTM journals, MAA journals (including Focus), and sub-discipline specific mathematics journals; presentations at national NCTM, NCSM, AMTE meetings or those sponsored by Bureau of Education and Research, also keynote presentations at NWMC and regional or national meetings sponsored by major mathematics organizations (NCTM, AMS/MAA, ASA, etc.)