

**School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences  
Faculty Annual Evaluation Criteria  
Faculty Approved 04-17-2009  
Faculty Approved Revision 02-18-2011**

**Annual Evaluation Criteria for *Teaching* Activities**

Each faculty will be evaluated using the criteria in the “Course Plan and Organization,” “Execution,” and “Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity” Sections listed below. Activities in other domains, although important, may vary on an annual basis. All domains should be addressed over the course of several years and especially by tenure and promotion consideration points. A faculty member may be evaluated using any of the other teaching domains as deemed appropriate by the faculty or the chair. It is assumed the chair will use this information to form a global rating of teaching, not merely a mathematical composite.

Teaching is a multifaceted activity and evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching activity will focus on a broad array of factors related to teaching. The department has identified five major categories under which various aspects of teaching are subsumed:

- Course Planning, Organization, and Execution
- Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity
- Continuous Improvement Efforts
- Curriculum Revision and Assessment
- Unscheduled Teaching

These teaching activities are expected to be closely aligned with the department’s undergraduate Academic Learning Compact (ALC) and the graduate Academic Learning Plan (ALP) and represent a meaningful component of the program curricula of the department. The quality of a faculty member’s teaching is evaluated based on data provided by the faculty member documenting activities, outcomes, and achievements, as well as data made available from other sources (e.g. students, peers).

It is recognized that leadership in Curriculum Revision and Assessment activities may be limited early in one’s career.

The SPBS Executive Committee recommends that faculty may provide the following evidence to support their annual evaluation ratings for each of the 3 required major categories of teaching, but not limited to:

1. Category: **Course Plan and Organization** – Syllabus, assigned readings, tests and assignments, and comments and data from questions #1, #2, and #18 of the currently used SUSSAI report.
2. Category: **Execution** – Syllabus, PPT slides, screen prints, or other examples of technology use, teaching awards, letters from students (solicited or unsolicited), student complaints (or lack thereof), and comments and data from questions #4, #5, and #16 of the SUSSAI report.
3. Category: **Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity** – Letters from students, self-report of office hours/advising, examples of feedback to students (e.g., rubrics, comments on papers/assignments), and comments and data from questions #6, #7, and #15 of the SUSSAI report.

**Tenure and Promotion Criteria: *Teaching***

	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Course Planning, Organization, and Execution</b>	<p><b>Teaching Philosophy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In teaching portfolio: teaching philosophy is missing, poorly articulated and/or poorly expressed in course activities and planning (in other words, one's view of teaching is not evident in course syllabus, objectives, materials, or activities).</li> </ul>		<p><b>Teaching Philosophy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulated and expressed in course planning and activities.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Teaching Philosophy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-articulated and provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities.</li> <li>Incorporates teaching and learning scholarship in philosophy; revolves around effective pedagogical strategies.</li> <li>Emphasizes impact on learner or transformative learning.</li> <li>Student centered.</li> <li>Promotion of high quality teaching in the department.</li> <li>Passionate.</li> <li>Engages in scholarship of teaching.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Course Plan and Organization:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations or SLO's.</li> <li>Assessment practices of student learning are inadequate to support student learning.</li> <li>Course content is outdated, or weak in rigor</li> <li>Textbooks and other reading materials are irrelevant, outdated, and inappropriate.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Course Plan and Organization:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations and SLO's.</li> <li>Assessment practices support student learning.</li> <li>Course content is current.</li> <li>Readings are appropriate.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Course Plan and Organization:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comprehensive syllabi that include all essential elements, SLO's, policies, procedures, timeline, readings, etc.</li> <li>Well-organized and clearly understood by students.</li> <li>Syllabi easily available via web page/site.</li> <li>Performance expectations are clearly defined and understood.</li> <li>Assessment/evaluation practices optimize learning.</li> <li>Course content is inclusive, comprehensive, intellectually stimulating, current and varied sources.</li> <li>Mastery of content.</li> <li>Leadership in developing learning and student engagement opportunities within the department.</li> </ul>

<i>Teaching</i>	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Course Planning, Organization, and Execution</b>	<p><b>Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedagogical strategies are ineffective.</li> <li>• Disorganization and/or routinely poor preparation.</li> <li>• Standards are inappropriate.</li> <li>• Classroom is disorganized, hostile, or not well-managed.</li> <li>• Does not engage students through varied effective and creative pedagogical strategies.</li> <li>• Consistent and substantive problems with courses, as revealed by students.</li> <li>• Poor course management: confusing instruction and guidance.</li> <li>• Frequent complaints.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Majority of pedagogical strategies are effective and appropriate.</li> <li>• Organized and prepared.</li> <li>• Routinely provide helpful feedback.</li> <li>• Standards are appropriate.</li> <li>• Classroom is organized and well-managed.</li> <li>• Engages students using selective pedagogical strategies.</li> <li>• Adequate impact on student learning, as revealed by students.</li> <li>• Good course management: provide clear guidance.</li> <li>• Few complaints.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedagogical strategies optimize learning.</li> <li>• Always well-organized and prepared.</li> <li>• Standards are appropriate.</li> <li>• Classroom is always organized and well-managed.</li> <li>• Engages students broadly through varied and creative pedagogical strategies.</li> <li>• Exceptional impact on student learning, transformative experiences, as revealed by students.</li> <li>• Outstanding course management; consistently provides clear guidance.</li> <li>• Professional maturity in handling teaching situations.</li> <li>• Capitalizes upon instructional technology.</li> <li>• Receives teaching awards.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Student Support and Advising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student support practices are ineffective.</li> <li>• Advising: Consistently poor advising.</li> <li>• Not responsive.</li> <li>• Not proactive in advising students.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Student Support and Advising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Majority of student support practices are effective.</li> <li>• Advising: Consistently done well and few concerns with advising.</li> <li>• Consistently responsive to student.</li> <li>• Provides adequate information.</li> <li>• Primary focus on course planning.</li> <li>• Offers materials that may contain obsolete information.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Student Support and Advising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student support practices are exceptional, above and beyond; and facilitate optimal student development.</li> <li>• Provides “multimodal advising opportunities to provide appropriate assistance for course planning, effective mentoring, and proper career guidance.”</li> <li>• Emphasizes student responsibility.</li> <li>• Provides “comprehensive advising materials that are targeted to help students at different phases of their education.”</li> <li>• Engages in discussions with students outside the classroom.</li> </ul>

<i>Teaching</i>	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Continuous Improvement Efforts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has not administered/evaluated student course evaluations as required.</li> <li>• Has not expressed any interest in improving or advancing teaching activities and has not developed a plan or taken any action to achieve this.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has regularly administered and evaluated student course evaluations for improvement.</li> <li>• Has developed a basic plan and/or taken limited action to improve or advance teaching activities, with modest or limited improvements or outcomes. Such efforts may include one of the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ requested/evaluated an in-class (peer) evaluation of his/her teaching,</li> <li>▪ participated in university workshops that promote pedagogical practices,</li> <li>▪ acted as a discussant or as a presenter at a regional, national, or international meeting to promote pedagogical practices, or</li> <li>▪ participated actively in department, college, or university curriculum decisions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has administered and evaluated student course evaluations for improvement per University policy.</li> <li>• Has implemented a clear and effective plan for improving or advancing teaching activities, with exceptional improvements and outcomes. Such efforts include more than one of the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ requested/evaluated an in-class (peer) evaluation of his/her teaching,</li> <li>▪ participated in university workshops that promote pedagogical practices,</li> <li>▪ acted as a discussant or as a presenter at a regional, national, or international meeting to promote pedagogical practices, or</li> <li>▪ participated actively in department, college, or university curriculum decisions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity</b>	<p><b>Respect for Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more serious incidents or a consistent pattern of disrespect or disregard for students as evidenced by:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Being late or missing class,</li> <li>▪ hostile demeanor toward student(s),</li> <li>▪ inappropriate role boundaries or relationship with students</li> <li>▪ or inequitable treatment of students.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p><b>Respect for Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent pattern of basic respect for students with no serious incidents and only infrequent, isolated occurrence of a minor incident of disrespect or disregard for students.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Respect for Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary role model of highest respect for students as evidenced by:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consistent punctuality, respectful, supportive demeanor toward students, active engagement with students in a mentoring role,</li> <li>▪ clearly defined and implemented role boundaries in the mentoring role with students,</li> <li>▪ and highest standards for equitable treatment of students.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<i>Teaching</i>	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity</b>	<p><b>Accessibility to Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more serious incidents or a consistent pattern of inaccessibility to students as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ failure to keep required office hours,</li> <li>▪ failure to respond in timely fashion to student letters, e-mails, phone calls,</li> <li>▪ or failure to keep appointments with students.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p><b>Accessibility to Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent pattern of required accessibility to students with no serious incidents and only infrequent, isolated occurrence of a minor incident of inaccessibility to students.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Accessibility to Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary role model of high standards for accessibility to students as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consistent availability during posted office hours as well as other times,</li> <li>▪ consistent pattern of quick response to student communication, and</li> <li>▪ priority given to student appointments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Provision of Evaluative Feedback on Student Work:</b> One or more serious incidents or a consistent pattern of inadequate or inappropriate feedback to students as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ failure to communicate grades in timely fashion,</li> <li>▪ failure to provide constructive feedback on student work,</li> <li>▪ or failure to provide guidance and expectations for student work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p><b>Provision of Evaluative Feedback on Student Work:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent pattern of adequate and appropriate feedback to students with no serious incidents and only infrequent, isolated occurrence of inappropriate feedback to students.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Provision of Evaluative Feedback on Student Work:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary role model of high standards for providing thorough, constructive feedback to students as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ consistent communication of grades with no delays, provision of exceptionally clear and constructive feedback on student work, and</li> <li>▪ provision of exceptionally clear guidance and expectations for student work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Unscheduled Teaching</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in no or minimal unscheduled teaching such as directed studies, internship and thesis committees.</li> <li>• Quality of mentoring process or student product is poor.</li> <li>• Fails to successfully guide students to degree completion.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in some unscheduled teaching activities.</li> <li>• Chairs at least one thesis (or thesis equivalent) or internship committee, but less than average/norm.</li> <li>• Most student products are in acceptable range of quality.</li> <li>• Successfully guides most students to degree completion.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successfully mentors numerous students in unscheduled teaching activities.</li> <li>• Extended record of chairing more than the average number of thesis, (or thesis equivalent) and internship committees.</li> <li>• Consistently produces high quality internship portfolios and theses (or thesis equivalent) from students.</li> <li>• Consistently guides numerous students through thesis and internship process to degree completion.</li> </ul>

<i>Teaching</i>	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Curriculum Revision and Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs syllabi without SLOs.</li> <li>• Constructs syllabi with SLOs that are inappropriate for course or not assessed.</li> <li>• Does not participate in departmental discussions about curriculum revision and Assessment or data-based decision-making.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs syllabi with appropriate SLOs and assessments.</li> <li>• Participates in curriculum revision or departmental program assessment.</li> <li>• Participates in discussions about data-based decision-making at the departmental level.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implements course SLOs and assessments in integrated and creative ways; prepares syllabi with SLOs integrated with course assignments, assessments, and program SLOs.</li> <li>• Takes a leadership role and/or participates significantly in an aspect of curriculum revision or departmental assessment planning/implementation.</li> <li>• Takes a leadership role and/or participates significantly in data-based decision-making at the departmental level.</li> <li>• Contributes to the scholarship of curriculum or assessment.</li> </ul>

## Annual Evaluation Criteria for Scholarly Activities

The following activities are among the typical and relevant activities that are valued as scholarly work in the discipline of Psychology: write and publish a book; write and publish a chapter of a book; publish refereed journal articles and technical reports; present professional papers at conferences; write and/or obtain grants and/or contracts; develop, design and present new workshops; develop research instruments (e.g., paper and pencil tests, hardware, software, etc.); develop or continue an exemplary research program; give invited colloquia; submit an article or conference paper, book, workshop design, grant proposal; present at an organized professional or invitational scholarly panel, workshop, etc. These scholarly activities would be expected to yield tangible products or outcomes that have a measurable impact on the discipline of Psychology. The quality of the tangible product or outcome of the scholarly activity would be evaluated based on its relative impact in the discipline, as indicated by such things as citation rates; circulation; quality of the journal or publisher; funding source and amount; prominence, visibility, or recognition of the work; public recognition and awards; level of exposure (local, regional, national, international); and other relevant indicators of the impact.

### Poor

Demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship as reflected by the indicators below.

#### Indicators:

- Scholarly agenda has not been identified
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly projects
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly production

### Fair

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below.

#### Indicators:

- General focus of interest identified, but lacking effective organization and management to be fully productive.
- Evidence of completion of beginning stages of scholarly process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline), but lacking final completion.
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration, but not yet in effect.
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly work questionable at times
- Efforts have yielded limited progress toward tangible products of limited impact

## Scholarly Activities, continued

### **Good**

Demonstrates tangible progress in scholarship as shown by the indicators below; meets SPBS expectations, but may not be sufficient for tenure.

#### Indicators:

- Organized program of research that demonstrates potential for patterns of productivity as indicated by presentations, internal grant submissions, conference submissions, and other such products in preparation
- Specific scholarly agenda identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination venues (effective organization and management for productivity)
- Establishment of scholarly collaboration to help with specific scholarly agenda

### **Excellent**

Demonstrates quality execution of scholarship with tangible products or outcomes that have a measurable impact on the discipline of Psychology as shown by the indicators below.

#### Indicators:

- Peer-reviewed manuscript submissions or publications, published or submitted book chapters, funded internal grants, external grant submissions
- Refined scholarly agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
- Publications or presentations co-authored with students

### **Distinguished**

Demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence.

#### Indicators:

- Scholarly productivity that clearly exceeds the standards of excellence
- Successful proposal for external funding
- Awards received for scholarly projects

## Annual Evaluation Criteria for Service Activities

The SPBS expectations are that:

1. All faculty will act as good departmental and university citizens by participating in cooperative efforts to foster the well-being of the organization.
2. All faculty will engage in professional service to promote the department, college, university, community, or profession.

Service is broadly defined including, but not limited to, the following.

- Service on university, college, and school/department governance
- Public lectures or local professional presentations
- Service as school director, department chair or program director
- Unremunerated consultancies
- Community activities related to one's discipline
- Advising student organizations
- Service to academic organizations
- Service to professional organizations
- Service on editorial review boards
- Service to the university in the form of travel to and from remote campus locations
- Reviewing papers and symposiums for conferences or grant proposals
- Service on personnel search committees and other ad hoc assignments

Faculty will vary in their execution of a service plan. For example, service may emphasize activity on the campus at the expense of the other options. In such a case, greater depth of service would be expected. Although there is no requirement about the balance of service activities that faculty should select, there is an expectation that the faculty member will function effectively as a department citizen, assisting in completing the work of the department's programs.

At the outset of employment, service activities are likely to be the relatively lowest priority of the three categories; however, service is essential to accomplish the various objectives of the regional comprehensive university. Service expectations should be somewhat lighter for new faculty who are establishing themselves as teachers and scholars, but new faculty should still be encouraged to render high quality service in their selected activities.

As faculty progress in their service commitments, the general trend is to move from less involved participation (e.g., "sitting" on a committee and being reactive to emerging plans) through more intense investment (e.g., exercising leadership and solving service problems proactively).

Community service that is related to a faculty member's disciplinary background is more valuable than service that is not related to the faculty member's disciplinary background.

Service, continued

### **Poor**

Demonstrates *serious* problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is *well below* the SPBS expectations.

Indicators:

- Service activity nonexistent, extremely limited, or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- Fails to participate effectively in SPBS service obligations

### **Fair**

Demonstrates only *minor* tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is *below* SPBS expectations.

Indicators:

- Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored, but limited involvement
- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g. “sits” on committees as compared to active participation, lack of fulfilling obligations, tardiness or absence from meetings)
- Multiple service obligations are poorly managed

### **Good**

Demonstrates *adequate* tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service *meets* SPBS expectation for rank.

Indicators:

- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
- Usually effective in service as citizen of SPBS
- Multiple service obligations are adequately managed

Service, continued

**Excellent**

Demonstrates *high* degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions are *above* expectations of the SPBS.

Indicators:

- Scope and effort level are above SPBS standards
- Colleagues view contributions to SPBS as effective
- Service agenda is well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Multiple service obligations are managed effectively
- Recognition inside or outside of the university for service contributions

**Distinguished**

Demonstrates *very high* degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions *clearly exceed* the expectations of the SPBS.

Indicators:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds professional or university elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Extraordinary skill in accomplishing service tasks
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audience) or award achieved for quality of service contributions