

Teaching

Historically teaching ratings have been primarily based on course documents and student evaluation of teaching. The Executive Committee and Chair recognize the problematic nature of teaching evaluations based on the specific course being taught, the size and modality of the classes being taught, and other factors that influence student ratings such as the physical embodiment of the instructor. For those reasons, we encourage instructors to provide evidence of successful teaching that captures engagement in and commitment to undergraduate and/or graduate programs in a variety of ways.

The yearly record may vary from year to year in terms of its contents but in each year the record should exhibit the specified level of achievement, or it should exhibit a total volume of achievement over the period that equates to this standard with less productive years offset by more productive years.

Exceeds Expectations (1)

Meets Expectations (2)

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)

Unsatisfactory (4)

showing evidence of activities that encourage critical thinking, inquiry-based learning, written and oral communication, community engagement, or other high impact practices

Innovation and Teaching Enhancement

engagement in instructional innovation through such activities as the incorporation of new research findings into course content, the creation of new courses and new preparations for existing courses, and/or interest in and exploration of advanced instructional technologies
engagement in teaching enhancement activities of colleagues or peers in and outside of the department

Curriculum and Program Development

participation in curriculum development, for example, establishing study abroad experiences, service-learning opportunities, writing intensive experiences, community

as the incorporation of new research findings into course content, the creation of new courses and new preparations for existing courses, and/or interest in and exploration of advanced instructional technologies
engagement in teaching enhancement activities of colleagues or peers in and outside of the department

Curriculum and Program Development

participation in curriculum development, for example, establishing study abroad experiences, service-learning opportunities, writing intensive experiences, community engagement opportunities, and so forth
development of new courses in traditional, hybrid, or online formats
participation in collaborative course development and team-teaching
participation in program level revisions and assessment

Mentoring

advising and mentorship of undergraduate and graduate

engagement opportunities, and

Contributing to Departmental Teaching Needs

teaching required courses
teaching General Education courses
teaching large courses (capped at 90+ students)
other contributions not otherwise listed in these categories (please elaborate in teaching narrative)

Alternatively, the committee may assign a rating of Exceeds Expectations on the basis of consistently exceptional performance in a single category - such as:

the receipt of multiple teaching, mentoring, or advising awards during the evaluation period;
leadership roles in department, college, university-wide curriculum development during the evaluation period;
service on undergraduate honors, MA thesis, or PhD dissertation committees in the evaluation period that is unusually large in comparison with other department members and is not otherwise recognized;
other accomplishments deemed

--

--

--

extraordinary by a majority of committee members. Evidence of such exemplary accomplishments must be included in the faculty member's post-tenure report for consideration.

Research

The Executive Committee and Chair encourage faculty to provide evidence of all research activity and productivity during the evaluation period including scholarly publications that appear in and/or are copyrighted during the period, conference papers submitted and presented during the period, and grant proposals submitted, and grants awarded during the period.

The EC and Chair give consideration to manuscripts in progress as well as other research activities described below. While the Executive Committee reviews all publications and manuscripts in the file, only the most notable may be mentioned in the written evaluation. Faculty must submit a current curriculum vitae and each scholarly product they wish to be counted in the review.

The following kinds of productivity are considered:

Published Work with Significant Contributions

Peer-reviewed book published by a respected press for which the faculty member is the sole author, corresponding author, or co-author with substantive contribution

Research Participation

Funded external grant as senior personnel or social researcher

<p>technical reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ activity not otherwise listed but approved by review of the Executive Committee and Chair of the Department.			
---	--	--	--

NOTE: A book or edited volume is counted for three consecutive years in our annual review criteria and will be given equivalent weight in the five-year PTR. A book published prior to the beginning of the five-year period will count if it was counted during an annual review within the five-year period.

Service

Service ratings are based on membership on department, college, or university level committees, membership or leadership of regional, national, or international organizations, or service to the discipline as evidenced as participation on journal editorial boards, journal peer review, external grant review panels, or other activities that promote research and scholarship. Community service is included as well.

The yearly record may vary from year to year in terms of its contents but in each year the record should exhibit the specified level of achievement, or it should exhibit a total volume of achievement over the period that equates to this standard with less productive years offset by more productive years.

Exceeds Expectations (1)

Exceeds Expectations (1.0) in Service means the Executive Committee finds evidence that on a yearly basis in each of the five years the service record includes **active membership on at least two department, college, or university level committees and evidence of service to the discipline or community and in the preponderance of years, evidence of at least one of the following:**

Leadership of at least one department, college, or university level committee

Meets Expectations (2)

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)

Unsatisfactory (4)

OVERALL PTR RATING

To reiterate, the final score for the five-year record is the score in each area weighted by the proportion of total assignment in that area over the five-year span. This calculation will produce fractional quantities such as 1.45 or 1.55. Conversion to the four-point scale is done by rounding scores with fractions of less than .5 down and those with fractions of .5 or more up. In the two examples, 1.45 becomes 1.0 or EE while 1.55 becomes 2.0 or ME.

In other words, the Weighted Average PTR Score = (Teaching score X average percentage assignment in teaching) + (Research score X average assignment in research) + (Service score X average percentage in service)

NOTE: For faculty members who have service appointments that include directorship of centers and institutes, the percentage of assignment associated with the directorship will be removed from the total and the assignments in other categories will be adjusted to total 100 percent for the purpose of calculating their overall weighted average.

Exceeds Expectations (1)

Meets Expectations (2)

Does Not Meet Expectations (3)