Department of English
Annual Performance Review Criteria
Tenure Track/Continuing Status

The Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) requires all faculty to be formally evaluated on their performance once a year. The Department criteria and process conform to UHAP 3.2: Annual Performance Reviews of Faculty, as well as guidelines set by the College of Social & Behavioral Sciences. As a Department, we aim to provide a straightforward system by which all faculty may account for and be fairly recognized for their accomplishments.

Tenure-track and continuing-status faculty members within the Department of English are evaluated in the areas of:
- Research and publication (including scholarly growth and/or creative work)
- Teaching
- Service and Outreach

The following criteria are intended to guide faculty reports. They will also guide the Annual Performance Review (APR) committee as it endeavors to fairly evaluate and support faculty in our Department.

Guidelines for Committee

The criteria provide a framework for consideration and rating of faculty accomplishments across a range of programs and disciplines within our Department. It is the responsibility of the committee and Head to assign scores with awareness of and accounting for varying expectations within programs and disciplines.

The committee is instructed to bear in mind that faculty whose teaching intersects with conversations about race, ethnicity, and other sensitive topics may see their student evaluations impacted. Faculty who teach large and/or required classes may also not have as high scores as those who are teaching graduate classes or upper division electives.

The committee is strongly encouraged to self-reflect on unconscious biases and make accommodations for different styles of teaching.

It is requested that all committee members review the University's Inclusive View of Scholarship.

Scoring Rubric

Peer reviewers will consider departmental criteria and process in accord with University and College guidelines while reviewing faculty APR materials. They will provide written formative

and summative feedback for faculty in the areas of research, teaching and service. They will indicate if the faculty member "meets or exceeds expectations" or "does not meet expectations" for each workload category, as well as overall. Additional criteria for each area can be found in their respective sections in this document. A brief written summary describing the rationale and results of the peer review are transmitted confidentially to the immediate administrative head and the faculty member through Faculty Portfolio.

REVIEW COMMITTEE OPTIONS	HEAD/DIRECTOR REVIEW OPTIONS	
• Meets or exceeds expectations	4	Truly Exceptional
	3	Meets/Exceeds Expectations
• Does not meet expectations	2	Needs Improvement
	1	Unsatisfactory

Workload Distribution

While continuing-status workloads may vary widely, the typical expectation is that tenure-track faculty members will devote 40% of their time to research/publication/scholarly development/creative work, 40% of their time to teaching, and 20% of their time to service/outreach. Divergence from this 40-40-20 norm will occur when a faculty member is on sabbatical, has significant administrative assignments, or makes other arrangements with the department head. Any negotiated departure from 40-40-20 should be noted and explained in the annual report, and the formula for overall rating will be adjusted accordingly. Continuing-eligible and continuing-status faculty will also be evaluated using these criteria, with their distribution of effort accounted for accordingly. Faculty are asked to identify any unseen or under-valued discrepancies in their work experience during the semester.

Administrative Assignments

Administrative roles are distinct from service. Percentage of effort associated with administration will be included in the work distribution percentages and reviewed separately by Head.

Program Directors and others have an administrative percentage in their workload assignment. The administrative portion will be evaluated by the Head. The administrative portion of the Senior Director of the Writing Program APR is reviewed by the College. The Head's APR will be reviewed by the College.

Rank

Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors are expected to produce research and participate in service at different levels, and the criteria are meant to be flexible enough to accommodate that. It is the responsibility of the committee and Head to assign scores with awareness of rank expectations, along with those of specific programs and disciplines.

Feedback

All junior faculty receive written feedback in addition to numerical scores. All faculty are invited to discuss their APR scores with the Head.

In Person Meeting Requirements

In-person meetings are only required for the following:
   A. Annually for all tenure-eligible faculty, regardless of rating;
   B. Annually for all career-track faculty who are at their initial rank (e.g., Assistant Professor, Lecturer);
   C. When the rating in any category is "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" for tenured or career-track faculty;
   D. As requested by the faculty member.

Appeals

If a faculty member disagrees with their score, an appeal may be made to the next administrative level within 30 days (see UHAP 3.2.03). A first step should be bringing the matter and justification for a change to the attention of the Head to determine if the matter can be resolved at the department level.

Research

Research is evaluated on two or three criteria: *Type* and *Quality*, and for publications, *Stage.* **The type and range of research activity expected varies widely according to rank, program, and discipline or field.** Quality indicators and stage of publication activity should be reported if they are assumed to be unknown by the APR committee and Department Head.

Type of research refers to research activity types including, but not limited to:
- Publication of scholarly book reviews, chapters, articles, monographs, books, or creative works by reputable journals or publishing houses
- Publication as editor of a volume or collection of writings by multiple authors
- Publication of research-based textbooks or instructional materials that have been peer- reviewed
- Publication in digital, open-source, or otherwise non-print venues, including blogs, websites, and online journals
- Publication of reprints of creative works in anthologies, or of translations of works
- Receiving grants or awards to do scholarly or creative activity
- Readings or presentations of scholarly papers or creative work at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings or events
- Participation in professional colloquia and scholarly conferences
- Editing of a scholarly journal (if not considered service)
- Reviews of scholarly or creative work (if not considered service)
- Preparing and submitting grant proposals
- Other editing, compiling, translation, or bibliography work, etc.
- Continuing research and writing projects that are in progress and in pre-publication stages

Stage of publication refers to whether a piece is in progress, submitted, under review, under revision, accepted, in press, and published. Stage criteria are applied only to work leading to publications or to grant submission.
- *In progress/Under revision* designates a piece that has not been submitted, or that has been submitted but has been returned and is under revision. In progress work may take years.
- *Submitted/Under review* designates a piece that have been submitted but is still under review, requiring only minimal work by the author.
- *Accepted* designates a piece that has been accepted for final publication and may or may not require additional revision and editing work. A piece is only counted as accepted once.

- *In press* designates writings that are in their final form and are in production, requiring only minimal work by the author.
- *Published* designates writings that are published in the APR year. Except for reprints in new venues or translations, a piece is normally only counted as published once.

Quality refers to the scholarly, scientific, pedagogical, and/or original nature of the work as suggested by referee processes or other indicators of reputability and can range from serious to substantial to truly exceptional. For publications, quality may be indicated by whether the work was invited and by whom, peer reviewed, or blind peer reviewed, and how the work itself was reviewed or received by its readership, for example, if the work received award or other exceptional recognition.

Meets Expectations in Research (3.0-4.0)

4.0 Truly exceptional research activity is of a type or types above expectations of rank, program, and discipline, and is of exceptional quality. Examples of such activity may include (but are not limited to):
- Publication of a book or its equivalent by a reputable press
- Receiving substantial awards or grants to do scholarly or creative activity
- Acceptance of a book or its equivalent by a reputable press
- Publication of two or more substantial scholarly or creative works

3.0 Research activity that exceeds expectations is of a type or types generally above expectations of rank, program, and discipline, and is mostly of substantial quality. Examples of such activity may include (but are not limited to):
- Publication of one or more substantial scholarly or creative works
- Acceptance of one substantial scholarly or creative work

3.0 Research activity that meets expectations is of a type or types that meets expectations of rank, program, and discipline. Scores in this range are given when there is clear evidence of serious scholarly or creative work, some of which may have been presented or read at meetings and events and may be in progress/under revision or submitted/under review.

Does Not Meet Expectations in Research (1.0-2.0)

2.0 Research activity that needs improvement but approaches meeting expectations is of a type or types that does not meet expectations of rank, program, or discipline and/or may not be of a serious quality that meets expectations. Scores in this range are given when there may be unclear evidence that scholarly or creative work is likely to be accepted and published.

1.0 Research activity that is unsatisfactory is of a type or types that does not meet expectations of rank, program, or discipline and is not of a quality that meets expectations. Scores in this range are given when there may only be minimal or no evidence that scholarly or creative work is likely to be published, or there is no evidence of serious scholarly or creative work at all.

Teaching

Excellence in teaching is evaluated on these criteria: *Quality*, *Range*, and *Innovation*.

Quality refers to demonstrated excellence in the classroom and mentorship, as indicated by outcomes, student evaluations, and awards. *Range* refers to the breadth of courses taught, with consideration of challenges faced in large and/or required classes, as well as impact in mentorship (e.g., committee work, independent studies, informal mentorship). *Innovation* measures production of new curriculum, methods of teaching, and student engagement. These criteria may overlap in some instances.

Effective and creative teaching is the primary function of the University and an indispensable function of faculty members in the Department of English. For faculty members whose teaching constitutes 40% of their total work assignment, the normal expectation is two 3-credit hour courses per semester (four per academic year) as well as sustained advising and mentorship. Student course surveys are only one component in a wide range of activities and evidence indicating excellence in teaching. Additional material that may be considered includes exceptionally strong student feedback, potentially evidenced across a variety of feedback modes from student testimony, letters of gratitude, and mentee achievement. Mentorship, advising, and student support are highly valued by the department, and it's understood that these activities may expand beyond the parameters of institutional committee and course assignments, and that the labor of mentorship inordinately falls upon women and faculty of color; we seek to recognize this in our APR process.

The department uses this multimodal assessment of teaching to avoid an excessive reliance on Student Course Surveys. Research shows that student evaluations can be biased by faculty members' gender, ethnicity, national origin, disability, and sexual orientation and identity as well as by a range of extraneous factors such as the modality or type of course. Faculty are asked to call attention to their teaching, mentorship, and student-centered labor in their Statement of Accomplishments.

Evidence to be considered in the rating of Teaching includes but is not limited to:

Quality:
- Quality of course syllabi and materials
- Curriculum revision and/or other efforts to improve teaching
- Peer observation of instruction
- Teaching awards

- Selection for teaching at research colloquia or seminars or at other prestigious institutes or institutions
- Teaching grants applied for or funded

Range:

- Student success (publications, awards, job placements, etc.)
- Chairing Honors, MA, MFA, or PhD theses
- Membership on MA, MFA, or PhD committees
- Advising and mentoring activities
- Efforts to improve BIPOC, disabled, and LGBTQ+ student recruitment and retention (with attention to curriculum, class design, and mentorship)
- Class size(s) (acknowledging labor of high-enrollment classes)
- Course level/type (e.g., required, elective, Gen Ed, graduate seminar)
- Independent studies

Innovation:

- Development of new courses
- Retooling of existing courses (when needed)
- Development of online course materials
- Use of new technologies
- Interdisciplinary teaching activities

Meets Expectations in Teaching (3.0-4.0)

4.0 Exceptional teaching is defined as well above normal expectations of rank and program and is of truly exceptional quality, range, and/or innovation. Such accomplishment may be recognized by a major teaching award, evidence of outstanding teaching in terms of exceptional feedback from students, evidence of mentorship of breadth and depth, and student success. Other factors that may be considered include class size and demonstration of innovation in the development or retooling of courses, approaches, or pedagogies.

3.0 Teaching that exceeds expectations rises above normal expectations of rank and program and demonstrates excellence in quality, range, and/or innovation. It may be evidenced by strong student feedback, evidence of above-average mentorship, and strong teaching activity relative to class size and level/type.

3.0 Teaching that meets expectations will be average in quality, range, and/or innovation. It may be evidenced by average student feedback and mentorship responsibilities, as well as teaching

activity that is adequate but does not exceed expectations for the faculty member's rank and program.

Does Not Meet Expectations in Teaching (1.0-2.0)

2.0 Teaching that needs improvement will be evidenced by below-average student surveys, feedback, and/or depth of mentorship. It may also show indications of weakness in curricular development/implementation and/or other teaching activity.

1.0 Teaching that is unsatisfactory will be evidenced by repeated below-average student feedback and evidence of major weakness in curricular development/implementation and/or other teaching activity.

Service

Service is evaluated with consideration of three criteria: **Time**, **Range**, and **Quality**. *Time* refers to the number of hours spent doing service. *Range* refers to the breadth of service to various constituents: program, department, college, university, community, and discipline or profession. *Quality* refers to the role taken in doing, and positive impact in terms of outcomes, of work done in service assignments and activities.

The criteria for assessing service contributions are based on four assumptions:

1. As faculty, we all have an obligation to contribute to the shared governance of our department, college, and/or university, even if we are making significant service contributions to our discipline and our external communities.
2. Faculty in senior ranks have the additional responsibility of helping to provide leadership with service obligations to avoid hindering our colleagues' progress toward promotion, continuing status, and tenure.
3. In assessing service, we need to consider that research shows that women and minority faculty tend to face higher service demands. It is the committee's responsibility to be aware of this trend and be attentive to it in scoring.
4. The Department will endeavor to distribute work equitably among faculty, balancing the need to represent constituencies with the need to share responsibilities.

Time expectations can be determined by considering the proportion of time allotted to service in one's workload assignment (e.g., a 20% service assignment is equivalent to 128 hours a semester, or 8 hours a week for sixteen weeks). Faculty are expected to report their service in a manner that allows for objective and transparent evaluation. Faculty on academic year contracts should include service over the summer months in their reported service.

Range of service refers to the diversity and breadth of service activities to program, department, college, university, community, and discipline/profession. To meet expectations, all faculty at all ranks are expected to participate in some level of service to their program and the department by, for instance, attending program and department meetings and serving on program and department committees. The department is committed to equitably sharing service responsibilities and fostering a culture of inclusion for all service opportunities to the extent possible. Service at the college and university level is expected of senior faculty. Service to community and profession may be local, regional, national, or global, and expectations vary depending on one's discipline, rank, and assignment percentage.

Quality of service refers to role taken and impact of the service. Working as part of a team on shared goals is valued in the department, university, and profession. Fulfilling a certain role unexpected of one's rank, or peer recognition of the impact of one's service, normally serves as evidence of exceeding expectations or being truly exceptional. As with the range and time of service, the expectations for role and impact of a faculty member's service will differ by rank, program, and discipline. For example, serving in leadership roles exceeds expectations or is truly exceptional for junior faculty, while for senior faculty it normally meets or exceeds expectations.

Service may include, but is not limited to, activities such as the following:

1. Service on program, department, college, or university committees, including temporary assignments like search committees and task forces, as well as service to interdisciplinary programs and units outside English
2. Service and consulting to government and community organizations and the private sector in professional capacity as U Arizona employee
3. Service to discipline/profession includes activities including, but not limited to:
    a. service to professional organizations, including holding assigned or elected positions
    b. service to national boards and review panels
    c. service on editorial boards of journals, book series, and other professional publications
    d. editing professional journals or book series (unless counted as research)
    e. organizing and managing professional conferences
    f. organizing panels or colloquia at professional meetings
    g. judging local, regional, national, or international contests or award applications
    h. reviewing article submissions for journals or conference presentation proposals for professional organizations
    i. evaluating book manuscripts for publishers or externally funded proposals for grant agencies

Meets Expectations in Service (3.0-4.0)

4.0 Truly exceptional service is usually *above* expected time expenditure, of an exceptional range and/or quality, in terms of role and outcome impact, for the individual's rank, program, and discipline.

3.0 Service that exceeds expectations is usually *at or above* expected time expenditure, of a range and quality that exceeds expectations, in terms of role and outcome impact, for the individual's rank, program, and discipline.

3.0 Service that meets expectations is usually *at* expected time expenditure, of a range and quality that meets expectations, in terms of role and outcome impact, for the individual's rank, program, and discipline.

Does Not Meet Expectations in Service (1.0-2.0)

2.0 Service that needs improvement is usually *below* expected time expenditure, of a range and quality that needs improvement, in terms of role and outcome impact, for the individual's rank, program, and discipline.

1.0 Service that is unsatisfactory is usually *below* expected time expenditure, of a range and quality   that is unsatisfactory, in terms of role and outcome impact, for the individual's rank, program, and discipline.