

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
Criteria for Annual Performance Review
(Approved by department vote on August 24, 2007)

Faculty members are evaluated in the areas of:

- A. Research and publication (including scholarly growth and/or creative work)
- B. Teaching
- C. Service and outreach

The normal expectation is that 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. The overall rating for a faculty member will usually be weighted accordingly. 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.

Each of the three areas of review will be assigned a numerical score of 5.0 to 1.0 according to the procedure, which has been approved within the department and is in accord with COH guidelines. Criteria for assignment to each level are described below.

4.0 - 5.0	Outstanding
3.0 - 3.9	Exceeds expectations
2.0 - 2.9	Meets expectations
1.5 - 1.9	Below expectations
1.0 - 1.4	Unsatisfactory

A. Research and publication

Scholarly research is disseminated through all forms of written publication, and by presentation in meetings of professional societies constituted at the local, regional, national, or international level. Quality in research and publication is an important consideration, as suggested by referee processes or other indicators of reputability. Evidence that may be considered for rating in this category includes (but may not be limited to):

- Publication of scholarly book reviews, articles, monographs, books, or creative works by reputable journals or publishing houses
- Scholarly papers or readings of creative work presented at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings
- Editing of a scholarly journal (if it is not counted as a service

activity, and if it contributes substantively to intellectual development in the field)

- Participation in professional colloquia and panels of a scholarly nature
- Other editing, compiling, translation, bibliography, etc.
- On-line publication, including on-line journals, web sites, software, and other electronic materials
- Research grant proposals submitted or funded
- Reviews of previous work published during the review period, or any other evidence which indicates the merit of a faculty member's work
- Ongoing projects

4.0 - 5.0 Outstanding

5.0 A book or its equivalent published by a reputable press. Awards recognizing scholarly or creative merit will be given additional consideration.

4.6-5.0 Publication of two or more substantial scholarly or creative works.

4.5 Acceptance of a book or its equivalent by a reputable press.

4.0 - 4.5 Publication of one substantial scholarly or creative work and/or acceptance of two or more substantial scholarly or creative works.

4.0 Acceptance of one substantial scholarly or creative work.

3.0 - 3.9 Exceeds expectations

Evidence of serious scholarly or creative work, some of which has resulted in publication, and/or evidence of sustained scholarly or creative work in a domain for which productivity has already been widely recognized.

2.0 - 2.9 Meets expectations

Evidence of serious scholarly or creative work, some of which has been accepted for publication or is likely to be so.

1.5 - 1.9 Below expectations

Evidence of scholarly or creative work not likely to be published.

1.0 - 1.4 Unsatisfactory

No evidence of serious scholarly or creative work.

B. Teaching

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 three-hour courses per semester (four per academic year) plus curriculum development, honors, and student committee activities as appropriate. Evidence that will be considered for rating in this category will include, but not be limited to, student and peer evaluations. Other evidence that may be considered for rating includes (but may not be limited to):

- Teaching awards
- Quality of course syllabi
- Faculty member's statement (optional)
- Peer observation and evaluation of instruction
- Teaching load
- Number and length of preparations
- Development of new courses
- New course preparation
- Class sizes
- Course level/status (required, elective, General Education, graduate seminar, etc.)
- Curriculum revision/reform
- Independent studies
- Special advising and mentoring activities
- Efforts to improve minority student recruitment and retention
- Chairing Honors, MA, MFA, or PhD theses
- Membership on MA, MFA, or PhD committees
- Selection for teaching at research colloquia or seminars or at other prestigious institutes or institutions
- Efforts to improve teaching
- Teaching grants applied for or funded
- Interdisciplinary teaching activities

4.0 - 5.0 Outstanding

4.6 - 5.0 Evidence includes a major teaching award and/or exceptionally high student evaluations.

4.0 - 4.5 Very high student evaluations and/or evidence of other outstanding teaching activity, relative to class size and course level/status.

3.0 - 3.9 Exceeds expectations

Above average student evaluations or average student evaluations and evidence of other above average teaching activity.

2.0 - 2.9 Meets expectations

Average student evaluations and other evidence of expected teaching

activity.

1.5 - 1.9 Below expectations
Below average student evaluations and evidence of weakness in curricular development/ implementation and other teaching activity.

1.0 - 1.4 Unsatisfactory
Continued below average student evaluations and evidence of major weakness in curricular development/implementation and other teaching activity.

C. Service and outreach

Service varies with the role that each individual faculty member has chosen to assume within the department and larger professional community. Further, expected level of service varies with academic rank: e.g., senior full Professors are normally expected to participate in campus-level committees and to have national/international impact, while junior Assistant Professors are normally expected to participate in department and program-level committees but are not encouraged to become involved in too much time-consuming service at this stage in their careers. Therefore, rating is expected to be variable by rank in this domain. Evidence that may be considered in this category includes (but may not be limited to):

- Honors or awards
- University or College committees
- Departmental committees
- Program committees
- Other administrative or faculty governance assignments
- Offices held in professional societies
- Organizing panels or colloquia at professional meetings
- Other responsibilities for professional organizations
- Editorial Boards
- Evaluating book or article manuscripts or externally-funded proposals
- National boards and review panels
- Judging of contests (local, regional, national, international)
- Consulting
- Public lectures, readings, and presentations
- Other community service related to professional expertise
- Advising and mentoring activities, such as writing letters of recommendation, helping with applications to graduate school, etc.
- Interdisciplinary program activities

- Personal statements of service/outreach significance (optional)

4.0 - 5.0	<u>Outstanding</u> Meritorious and/or time-consuming activities at several levels.
3.0 - 3.9	<u>Exceeds expectations</u> Significant and/or time-consuming activities either within the University or without.
2.0 - 2.9	<u>Meets expectations</u> Some service activities either within the University or without.
1.5 - 1.9	<u>Below expectations</u> Insufficient positive response to opportunities for service activities either within the University or without.
1.0 - 1.4	<u>Unsatisfactory</u> No positive response to opportunities for service activities either within the University or without.

The five-year overall rating called for by COH will normally be an average of the evaluations of calendar-year performance with recent teaching given greater weight, and adjusted for years when the faculty member's negotiated assignment diverges from the 40-40-20 norm.