

Emporia State University
Policies and Procedures for Faculty Review

School of Humanities and Social Sciences

History and Revisions:
Adopted April 2026

Table of Contents

Values Statement:	3
Academic Appointments	3
Faculty Recognition Committee	3
Annual Faculty Evaluation	4
Evidence and Criteria for Annual Faculty Review.....	5
Teaching	5
Scholarship/Creativity	6
Service	6
Faculty Recognition Matters	7
Performance-Based Salary Increases and Adjustments.....	7
Retention.....	7
Renewal.....	8
Tenure	9
Promotion	10
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	10
PROFESSOR	11
Sabbatical	12
Post-tenure Review	13
Appendices.....	15
A. Relevant University-wide policies	15
B. Sabbatical Application Forms & Rubrics	15
C. Timelines	15
ACADEMIC YEAR ACTIONS & DECISIONS CALENDAR	15
TIMELINES BY APPOINTMENT TYPE	19
TIMELINES BY REVIEWER TYPE	22
D. Evaluation Rubrics.....	25
FACULTY RECOGNITION DOCUMENT COMMON RUBRICS	26
Teaching Evaluation Rubrics	27
Scholarship/Creativity Evaluation Rubrics	32
Service Evaluation Rubrics	38

Values Statement:

Faculty evaluation must be consistent with the values of Emporia State University therefore, the criteria and processes for retention, tenure, promotion, merit raises, sabbaticals, and post-tenure review recognize that:

- 1) We are a teaching-focused institution.
- 2) We highly value teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service activities that result in student learning and the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students.

Academic Appointments

Guiding Policy **UPM 3.04 Academic Appointments**

The policies and procedures described herein apply to all faculty positions and appointments, both full-time and part-time, regardless of rank, position, or assignments. These include continuous non-tenure track, contracted faculty, tenure track ("probationary"), and tenured faculty. Exceptions include faculty members whose intention to resign or retire has been formally executed. Employment in academic temporary positions are considered at-will and may be terminated at any time, without cause, prior to the end date specified in the notice of appointment.

Faculty Recognition Committee

Under direction of their Dean, the faculty of each School or College will participate in such faculty matters as annual review, sabbatical review, post-tenure review, and promotion/tenure decisions.

- Each college/school shall elect 5-9 members to serve on the Faculty Recognition Committee depending on the size of the school and variation of programs within the school.
 - The Faculty Recognition Committee provides school or college level review.
 - The purpose of review by the FRC is to provide peer feedback and recommendations to the Dean. Not all reviews involve voting.
 - As its review is not discipline specific, the FRC need not represent every program in a unit, but its membership should encompass representation from a breadth of program areas within the school or college.
 - The Faculty Recognition Committee should include representation of all ranks and faculty positions including instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, and multi-year contract faculty.
 - Representation areas will be determined by the faculty of the college/school.
- From the elected FRC committee members, each Dean will assign specific responsibilities according to appointment types and elements of performance. For example, all teaching faculty can assess teaching. Faculty whose appointment types include scholarship/creativity might be assigned to assess performance in the area of scholarship/creativity.

All SHSS full-time faculty members holding ranks (assistant professor, associate professor, associate professor with tenure, professor, and professor with tenure) are eligible to serve on the SHSS FRC.

Membership on the SHSS FRC is an annual appointment (1 academic year), constituting service to the SHSS.

The SHSS FRC must consist of six total members. At least six, and no more than eight members of the SHSS FRC must be elected from SHSS programs (Communication, English and Modern Languages, Intensive English, Philosophy, Geography, Social Sciences Education, Political Science, History, and Applied Sociology/Applied Criminology). Of the six-eight total members, the SHSS FRC must consist of three tenured faculty members at the rank of associate professor and/or professor.

The SHSS Dean's office will coordinate the annual election of SHSS FRC members by first soliciting nominations (generally in August and September) and, second, overseeing the SHSS elections by secret electronic ballot. Within one week after the election, the SHSS Dean must email the elected SHSS FRC members and formally assign them to specific candidates for review. The SHSS Dean's office must conclude elections by mid-September, and the elected members will officially begin their duties on the SHSS FRC on October 1.

The SHSS Dean meets with the entire SHSS elected committee between September 15 and October 1 to negotiate with the elected membership their assigned candidate reviews and assignments. Based on the number of candidates under review, the SHSS Dean will formally assign, in collaboration and discernment with all elected FRC committee members, the official review committee for each candidate. Each official review committee assignment must consist of at least 3 (and no more than 5) members per candidate review.

Once assigned for candidate review engagement, the official review FRC is then tasked with selecting a chairperson to oversee the coordination and engagement of all FRC members in reviewing the assigned candidates' teaching, research/creative activity, and service record in accordance with the SHSS FRD evaluation categories and recommendations.

The SHSS Dean may appoint eligible members to the SHSS FRC if elections do not establish the six FRC committee members as constituted.

Annual Faculty Evaluation

Guiding Policy **UPM 4.03** Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation

Annual review follows criteria and guidelines stipulated by School/College Faculty Recognition Documents. All faculty receive annual review. Annual reviews are conducted at the end of each academic year for all faculty ranks and positions. These reviews inform goal setting, workload assignments, and ongoing faculty development. Along with evidence of responsiveness to feedback and a demonstrated commitment to professional growth, they form the basis for faculty recognition decisions such as retention, promotion, and tenure.

The annual faculty evaluation will include:

- a statement of the overall level of faculty performance
- a statement of performance in each area of faculty responsibility (i.e., teaching, scholarly activity, and/or service) relative to rank, position and assigned responsibilities.

- a provision for faculty development and/or progress on prior goals.

Evidence and Criteria for Annual Faculty Review

Guiding Policy **UPM 4.03** Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation

- All Emporia State University tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to make contributions to teaching, research, and service. The amount and nature of these contributions should reflect the standards of the faculty member's discipline and specific assignment to ESU.
- Teaching faculty members who are not connected with the tenure system may, or may not, have expectations in the areas of research and/or service; if these expectations exist, then these expectations shall be in written form consistent with this policy.
- Expectations for the percentage of faculty's effort and expected activities for the academic year are to be enumerated in the faculty's annual work plan and approved by the unit's Dean and the Provost.

At ESU annual faculty review meets the following objectives:

- To provide a documented record of faculty performance to support personnel decisions such as retention, promotion, tenure, merit raises, sabbatical leave, and chronic low performance provisions.
- To recognize that the education of students is the highest priority of ESU. The education of students occurs in a variety of ways and venues, including the classroom, research experiences, outreach, and community service. Consequently, individual faculty or units may vary their emphasis on instruction, scholarly activity, and service and annual evaluations will reflect individual faculty assignments.
- To recognize the varied responsibilities and expectations of faculty at different ranks, appointments, and assigned responsibilities.
- To involve faculty in the design and evaluation of expectations central to their performance and professional growth.
- To develop strategies to link evaluation and its outcomes to assistance and support for faculty growth and development.
- To recognize unique talents or capabilities that contribute to the success of ESU.

The criteria used for faculty evaluation shall be developed by the faculty of the School or College and be approved by a majority vote followed by consecutive approval of the Dean and the Provost. This "Faculty Recognition Document" (FRD) will explain the specific criteria for faculty review. Moreover, it outlines the procedures and timelines for enacting University policies pertaining to faculty recognition. Changes to the Faculty Recognition Document shall follow the same developmental and approval process.

Teaching

The criteria and evidence used for evaluating faculty efforts in teaching shall be developed by the School or College but must include student ratings of instruction. The anonymous rating by students must occur at least once per semester on an instrument that is norm-referenced, controlled for initial student bias/motivation, and adjusted for other major research-demonstrated biases. At a minimum, the instrument should solicit students' perspectives on (a) the delivery of instruction, (b) the assessment of

learning, (c) the availability of the faculty member to the students, and (d) whether the goals and objectives of the course were met.

Scholarship/Creativity

The criteria used for evaluating faculty efforts in scholarship/creativity, research, or creative activities shall be developed by the School or College but must include a measure of how such efforts contribute to student learning or the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students.

Service

The criteria used for evaluating faculty efforts in service and outreach, shall be developed by the School or College in accordance with the FRD, but must include a measure of how such efforts contribute to student learning or the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students. Faculty service should involve the application of discipline-specific knowledge and skills, align with the university's mission, and contribute to institutional or program priorities.

Annual reviews will evaluate faculty in all three areas weighted appropriately according to the faculty member's rank and the nature of their assigned duties and responsibilities. Concerns about upcoming personnel decisions will be documented in writing with specific recommendations for ongoing faculty development.

Faculty Recognition Matters

Guiding Policy UPM 4.03 Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation

Faculty recognition includes the granting of tenure, salary increases and adjustments, reappointments, contract renewals, promotions, chronic low performance, and sabbatical leaves. While recognition certainly includes leaves of absence without pay, reduced loads and other modifications in assignment, office and laboratory space assignments, teaching assignments, and honors accorded, these types of recognition are not within the scope of this policy. These procedures apply to all unclassified employees who are eligible for the types of recognition described herein.

Decisions and recommendations regarding these personnel decisions shall be based on annual faculty reviews and evidence of achievement.

Performance-Based Salary Increases and Adjustments

Eligibility for salary increases shall be merit-based and recognize the “top performers” who model highly impactful contributions to teaching, scholarship/creativity and/or service relative to their rank and assignment. To be considered for merit pay or performance-based bonuses or increases, faculty must have adhered to policies established in the University Policy Manual as well as priorities established by the Provost, and must be recommended by their Dean.

Retention

The decision to retain a faculty member in a tenure-track, probationary appointment shall be based on the cumulative record of Annual Reviews indicating the faculty member is meeting expectations relative to their rank and assigned duties, is effectively addressing areas for improvement identified by the annual review, and is successfully progressing toward a positive tenure decision.

At minimum, Tenure-Track Faculty who are seeking retention to the second or third year will achieve a rating of PROFICIENT in the following areas:

TEACHING

- Course Design (category 2)
- Teaching Practice (category 3)
- Reflection and Growth (category 4)

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- Student Engagement
OR Teaching Integration (category 1)
- Research Productivity and Impact (category 3)

SERVICE

- Student Support and Collaboration (category 1)
- Institutional Service and Leadership (category 2)
- Professional Service and Engagement (category 3)

At minimum, Tenure-Track faculty who are seeking retention to the fourth year and beyond will demonstrate having achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING

- EXPERT in Teaching categories:
 - Teaching Assessment (category 1)
 - Course Design (category 2)
 - Teaching Practice (category 3)
 - Reflection and Growth (category 4)

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- PROFICIENT in Scholarship/Creativity categories:
 - Student Engagement OR Teaching Integration (category 1)
 - External Engagement and Collaboration (category 2)
 - Research Productivity and Impact (category 3)

SERVICE

- PROFICIENT in Service categories:
 - Student Support and Collaboration (category 1)
 - Institutional Service and Leadership (category 2)
 - Professional Service and Engagement (category 3)
 - Community and Civic Engagement (category 4)

Renewal

The decision to renew a contract shall be based on the cumulative record of Annual Reviews indicating the faculty member is meeting expectations relative to their rank and assigned duties and is effectively addressing areas for improvement identified by prior annual reviews.

At minimum, Instructors and faculty in Part-time/Adjunct appointments who are seeking renewal will demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in the following Teaching categories:

TEACHING

- PROFICIENT in Teaching categories:
 - Course Design (category 2)
 - Teaching Practice (category 3)
 - Reflection and Growth (category 4)

By the end of their contract period, faculty on Non-Tenure-Track appointments who are seeking renewal are expected to demonstrate, at minimum having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in the following areas:

TEACHING

- As appropriate to the expectations of their contract, Contract Faculty will have identified teaching priorities and expectations with their Dean. By the end of their contract period, contract faculty are expected to be PROFICIENT in Teaching categories:
 - Course Design (category 2)
 - Teaching Practice (category 3)
 - Reflection and Growth (category 4)

SERVICE

- If appropriate to the expectations of their contract, Contract Faculty will have identified service expectations with their dean and are expected to be PROFICIENT in the Service category:
 - Student Support and Collaboration (category 1)

Tenure

Guiding Policy **UPM 4.04** Tenure

Tenure shall be awarded to faculty who 1) have a terminal degree or professional certification deemed appropriate by the discipline, 2) have completed the probationary period established at the time of hire or promotion, and 3) have demonstrably achieved improvement and development as evidenced by the cumulative record of Annual Reviews.

Faculty applying for tenure will demonstrate having achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING

- EXPERT in:
 - Teaching Assessment (category 1)
 - Course Design (category 2)
 - Teaching Practice (category 3)
 - Reflection and Growth (category 4)

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- EXPERT in Scholarship/Creativity categories:
 - Student Engagement OR Teaching Integration (category 1)
 - External Engagement and Collaboration (category 2)
- PROFICIENT in Scholarship/Creativity category:
 - Research Productivity and Impact (category 3)

SERVICE

- EXPERT in:
 - Student Support and Collaboration (category 1)
 - Institutional Service and Leadership (category 2)
- PROFICIENT in:

- Professional Service and Engagement (category 3)
- Community and Civic Engagement (category 4)

Promotion

Guiding Policy **UPM 3.04 Academic Appointments**

Promotion in rank is not a matter of routine, seniority, or time in rank. Rather, it is the recognition of the cumulative professional record of a faculty member as well as their potential for continued growth and contribution as evidenced by the cumulative record of Annual Faculty Reviews. Completion of five (5) years in rank will be regarded as the normal time necessary before a faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The rank of Associate Professor is granted to faculty who are emerging leaders in academia. Their work positively impacts students, colleagues, and the institution. As such, for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty promotion to this rank carries the minimum expectations of achieving the required levels of development during the requisite time in the probationary period of their appointment. Five (5) years in rank will be regarded as the normal time necessary before an Assistant Professor becomes eligible for promotion to Associate Professor. At the end of five (5) years, or upon application in the sixth year or thereafter, promotion will be recommended only on the basis of documented meritorious performance. The terminal degree/certification deemed appropriate by the discipline is the minimum expectation for this rank.

Faculty applying for promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate having achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING

- EXPERT in:
 - Teaching Assessment (category 1)
 - Course Design (category 2)
 - Teaching Practice (category 3)
 - Reflection and Growth (category 4)

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- EXPERT in Scholarship/Creative category:
 - Student Engagement OR Teaching Integration (category 1)
- PROFICIENT in Scholarship/Creativity categories:
 - External Engagement and Collaboration (category 2)
 - Research Productivity and Impact (category 3)

SERVICE

- PROFICIENT in Service categories:
 - Student Support and Collaboration (category 1)

- Institutional Service and Leadership (category 2)
- Professional Service and Engagement (category 3)
- Community and Civic Engagement (category 4)

PROFESSOR

The rank of Professor is granted to faculty who embody excellence and leadership across academia. They generously contribute to improving academic culture by exemplifying institutional values. Promotion to Professor implies sustained excellence, institutional leadership, and contributions to others' success, not just personal achievement. As such, for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty promotion to this rank carries the minimum expectations of achieving the required levels of development during the requisite time in the probationary period of their appointment. Five (5) years in rank will be regarded as the normal time necessary before an Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor. At the end of five (5) years, or upon application in the sixth year or thereafter, promotion will be recommended only on the basis of documented meritorious performance. The terminal degree/certification deemed appropriate by the discipline is the minimum expectation for this rank.

Early promotions, or promotion in the absence of an appropriate terminal degree, will be considered only when there is acceptable evidence of truly exceptional contributions in teaching, scholarly and/or creative achievements, University service, or professional service.

Faculty applying for promotion to Professor will demonstrate having maintained performance levels expected for Associate Professors, and having achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING:

- EXPERT in:
 - Teaching Assessment (category 1)
 - Course Design (category 2)
 - Teaching Practice (category 3)
 - Reflection and Growth (category 4)

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- EXPERT in:
 - Student Engagement OR Teaching Integration (category 1)
 - External Engagement and Collaboration (category 2)
- PROFICIENT in Scholarship/Creativity category:
 - Research Productivity and Impact (category 3)

SERVICE

- EXPERT in:
 - Student Support and Collaboration (category 1)
 - Institutional Service and Leadership (category 2)

- Professional Service and Engagement (category 3)
- Community and Civic Engagement (category 4)

Sabbatical

GUIDANCE:

- Guiding ESU Policy **UPM 4.11 Sabbatical Leave**
- Guiding KBOR Policy:
- KBOR Manual Chapter II Governance, State Universities Section C, Chief Executive Officer, Faculty and Staff: Item 10 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF, **Item 10 Leave**
- Guiding Documents **[See Appendix B of FRD on Canvas: Sabbatical Application Forms & Rubrics]**

ELIGIBILITY:

- Eligibility for paid sabbatical leave includes at least 12 consecutive semesters (fall and spring) of full-time service to the University with the rank of instructor or above (ESU UPM). Furthermore, the most recent Annual Review must indicate the faculty is meeting expectations relative to their appointment and rank.
- Only tenured faculty members or administrators are eligible to request sabbatical leave (ESU UPM).

PRIORITIZATION:

The number of faculty members to whom leave of absence with sabbatical pay is granted in any fiscal year shall not exceed four percent of the number of equivalent full time faculty with rank of assistant professor or higher, or equivalent rank for the institution concerned for the fiscal year for which the leave of absence is granted (KBOR PM C-10.3).

- Sabbatical leave with pay is designed to improve the professional competencies of university faculty (ESU UPM).
- All leave requests are judged on the merits of the application, time limitations, and faculty priorities (ESU UPM).
- At all levels of review, sabbatical applications will be prioritized according to their alignment with the core values of Faculty Recognition:
 - We are a teaching-focused institution.
 - We highly value teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service activities that result in student learning and the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students.
- Priority will be given to proposals that demonstrate Scholarship/Creativity that contributes to the instructional mission of the university and results in student learning and the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students.

PROCESS:

- Applications for sabbatical leave reflect the specific nature of the proposed leave.
- Sabbatical requests must be made in writing prior to the creation of course schedules for the semester(s) of the requested leave.

- In consultation with an appropriate faculty committee as appropriate, the dean of the School or College shall review the application in terms of staff requirements, budget limitations, the merits of the individual and the nature of the proposed efforts during leave.
- The Dean will recommend an order of priority among the applicants and forward requests to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President review the applications and recommendations in terms of university-wide staff requirements, budget limitations, and institutional policy.
- The Provost will notify all parties of the final decision.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

The investment in the professional competencies of university faculty is an investment in the university's capacity to serve its students and community.

- No faculty member shall be granted leave of absence with sabbatical pay who does not agree to return to the service of the university granting the sabbatical leave for a period of at least one year immediately following the expiration of the period of leave. Persons failing to return to the institution granting sabbatical leave shall refund all sabbatical pay. Those who fail to remain for the full year of school service (9 to 12 months depending on annual term of employment) shall refund that portion of their sabbatical pay as represented by the portion of time they fail to serve (KBOR PM C-10.4).
- It is the responsibility of the recipient to inform the Vice President for Academic Affairs of any change in the proposed program or financial support during the period of their sabbatical leave (ESU UPM 4.11)
- When an individual returns from sabbatical leave, they must make a written report to the academic unit's administrative supervisor regarding the nature of the studies, research, or the work undertaken while on leave. The academic unit's administrative supervisor will provide copies to appropriate administrative offices (ESU UPM 4.11).
- Further expectations may include a public presentation or performance for campus and/or community about the sabbatical project.

Post-tenure Review

Guiding Policy UPM 4.03 Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation

Post-tenure review is intended to provide periodic and meaningful reflection upon performance for the applicant, the Dean, and any peers involved in the process. Post-tenure reviews must occur at least once every five (5) years. These reviews confirm that faculty are meeting expectations relative to their rank and assignment. Post-tenure review also helps to provide a broader view of patterns, priorities, goals, and meritorious achievements that may not be readily evident in single annual reviews.

A post-tenure review committee shall conduct the review. The academic unit's Dean shall form the post-tenure review committee, which must consist of at least five individuals, no more than half of whom can be from the academic unit of the faculty member under review.

The Post-Tenure Review shall consider the candidate's annual reviews and annual work plans for the past four years and shall include an evaluation of the faculty member's performance in teaching,

scholarship/creativity, and service as those factors are weighted in the academic unit's Faculty Recognition Document.

Tenured faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory post-tenure review evaluation will be placed on a one-year improvement plan, developed with input from the faculty to the academic unit administrative supervisor or direct supervisor and approved by the Provost. The one-year improvement plan should set goals that address the deficiencies noted in the post-tenure review and which can reasonably be achieved in one academic year. Faculty who do not satisfactorily complete the improvement plan are subject to an additional one-year improvement plan, dismissal, reassignment, or other personnel actions, as determined by the Provost.

Tenured faculty in phased retirement are excluded from post tenure review since they already have contractually agreed to a retirement date.

Appendices

A. Relevant University-wide policies

- Academic Appointments [UPM 3.04](#)
- Policies for Promotion [UPM 3.04](#)
- Merit [UPM 3.11](#)
- Policies & Procedures for Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation [UPM 4.03](#)
- Policies & Procedures for Post-tenure Review [UPM 4.03](#)
- Policies and Procedures for Tenure [UPM 4.04](#)
- Reappointment during the Probationary Period [UPM 4.04](#)
- Sabbatical Leave [UPM 4.11](#)

B. Sabbatical Application Forms & Rubrics

These materials are provided in Appendix B of the Canvas format of the Faculty Recognition Document

Application:

- Cover Page and Approvals
- KBOR Sabbatical Leave Agreement
- Description of Project

Evaluation:

- Peer Review (FRC/peer reviewers)
- Coverage of Duties (Dean)

Follow-Up:

- Final Report

C. Timelines

ACADEMIC YEAR ACTIONS & DECISIONS CALENDAR

All dates are deadlines. Early completion is encouraged. If the deadline falls on a holiday or weekend, the deadline will become the next available workday.

August 15: Faculty Notification Deadline

- Faculty being considered for retention, contract renewal, tenure, post-tenure review, are notified by their Dean
- Faculty eligible for promotion or sabbatical are notified by their Dean

August 30: Faculty Annual Review Deadline

- Excluding first year tenure-track faculty, all other faculty in all appointment types meet with their Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year

September 1: Faculty Requests Due

- All faculty in all appointment types submit requests to their Dean to be considered for retention, tenure, promotion, sabbatical, post-tenure review, and contract renewal

October 1: FRC Election Deadline

- **Faculty democratically determines which peers will form committees for faculty recognition & review matters**

October 1: Sabbatical Applications Deadline

- Faculty applying for sabbatical submit all materials

October 15: Faculty Support Materials Due

- Excluding first-year tenure-track faculty, all other faculty in all appointment types who are being reviewed submit review materials

October 15: Dean Assigns Peer Review Tasks

- Dean notifies FRC/peer reviewers of faculty requests and pending review activities
- For matters including retention, contract renewal, promotion, tenure, merit-based pay increases, sabbatical, chronic low performance, and post-tenure review, the Dean of each School/College will assign specific responsibilities according to appointment types and the elements of performance being assessed

October 31: Peer Sabbatical Recommendations

- Peer review committees submit recommendations to Dean for sabbatical requests

November 1: Second-Year Faculty Peer Review

- Peer review committees provide retention recommendations to Dean for tenure-track faculty in the second year of service.

November 15: Second-Year Retention Dean's Review

- Dean provides retention decision to Provost for tenure track faculty in second year of service.

November 15: Dean Sabbatical Recommendation

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for sabbatical requests

December 1: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty Dean Meeting Deadline

- 1st-Year Tenure Track Faculty meet with Dean to discuss the first semester and establish goals and workload for the second semester.
- First full review of 1st-Year Tenure Track Faculty occurs in the annual review by the Dean at the end of spring semester.

December 1: Provost Sabbatical Recommendation

- Provost provides recommendations to President on sabbatical requests

December 15: Sabbatical Decisions

- President's office notifies applicants for sabbatical leave of the decision on their applications

December 15: Second-Year Faculty Non-Reappointment Notification

- Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 2nd year tenure track faculty who will not be retained.

December 15: Contract Renewal Peer Review

- Peer review committees provide recommendations to Dean for contract renewals

December 20: Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Peer Review

- Peer review committees provide recommendations to Dean for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service

December 20: Tenure & Promotion Peer Review

- Peer review committees submit recommendations to Dean for tenure and promotion decisions

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Retention of Faculty in 1st and 3rd + Year of Service

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of 1st year tenure-track faculty.
- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service.

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Retentions and Renewals of Contract Faculty

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of contract faculty
- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for contract renewal for faculty in final year of non-tenure-track contracts.

February 1: Dean's Recommendations for Tenure Track Faculty

- No later than February 1 of each year, the Dean of the School or College is responsible for informing, in writing, each faculty member of their development, their fitness for their position, and their prospects for attaining tenure.

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Promotion & Tenure

- Dean submits recommendations for tenure and promotion decisions to Provost.

March 1: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty Non-Reappointment Notification Deadline

- Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 1st year tenure track faculty who will not be retained

March 1: Post-Tenure Review Materials Deadline

- Faculty identified for post-tenure review submit materials

March 15: Provost Notifications of Decisions on Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Retentions

- Provost notifies faculty of decisions for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service

March 15: Provost Recommendations on Tenures & Promotions

- Provost recommendations to President for tenure and promotion decisions

April 1: Tenure-Track Faculty Appeal Deadline

- Deadline for tenure-track faculty to appeal negative retention or tenure decisions.

April 1: Post-Tenure Review & Non-Contract Instructor Peer Review Deadline

- Peer review committees provide results of post-tenure review to Dean
- Peer review committees make recommendations to Dean for retention of non-contract instructors

April 15: Dean Post-Tenure Review Recommendations

- Dean provides findings from post-tenure reviews to Provost

April 15: Contract Non-Renewal Deadline

- Provost provides notice of non-renewal of contract faculty or presentation of new contracts

May 1: Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Provost Terminal Appointment Deadline

- Deadline for notice of terminal appointment for all tenure track faculty with three or more years of service

May 15: Provost Post-Tenure Review Notifications

- Provost provides letters regarding post-tenure reviews

June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

- Faculty update materials for Annual Review consisting of efforts and achievements for previous academic year
- Materials consist of any additional evidence necessary for applying performance rubrics and illustrating progress in the areas identified for annual goals.

July 1: Dean Annual Faculty Reviews Deadline

- Dean provides an annual review letter to every faculty member in the School or College addressing their development, their fitness for their position, and (if applicable to the position) their prospects for attaining tenure or promotion. Annual review follows criteria and guidelines stipulated by the School or College Faculty Recognition Document.

TIMELINES BY APPOINTMENT TYPE

For ease of use and reference, actions and decisions are represented here as they affect each of the appointment types. All dates are deadlines. Early completion is encouraged. If the deadline falls on a holiday or weekend, the deadline will become the next available workday.

All Faculty

September 1: Faculty Requests Due

- All faculty in all appointment types submit requests to their Dean to be considered for retention, tenure, promotion, sabbatical, post-tenure review, and contract renewal
- October 1: Faculty democratically determine which peers will form the committee(s) for faculty consideration & recognition matters.
- April 1: Deadline for tenure-track faculty to appeal negative retention or tenure recommendations and/or decisions
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Tenure Track Faculty in First Year of Service Applying for Second Year

- August 15: Tenure-Track faculty being considered for first-year retention are notified by Dean
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for retention.
- November 1: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty submit requests to be considered for retention
- December 1: 1st-Year Tenure Track Faculty meet with Dean to discuss the first semester and establish goals and workload for the second semester
- January 30: Dean provides recommendations for retention of 1st year tenure-track faculty
- **March 1: Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 1st year tenure track faculty who will not be retained**
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Tenure Track Faculty in Second Year of Service Applying for Third Year

- August 15: Faculty being considered for second-year retention are notified by Dean
- August 30: 1st & 2nd-Year Faculty meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for retention.
- **October 15: 2nd year tenure track faculty submit materials for review**
- November 1: Peer review committees provide retention recommendations to Dean for faculty in second year of service
- November 15: Dean provides retention recommendation to Provost for tenure track faculty in second year of service
- **December 15: Deadline for notice of non-reappointment to 2nd year tenure track faculty who will not be retained**
- April 1: Deadline for tenure-track faculty to appeal negative retention or tenure decisions
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Tenure-Track Faculty in 3rd + Year of Service

- August 15: Faculty being considered for retention in the 3rd + year are notified by Dean
- August 30: Faculty in the 3rd + year meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year

- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for retention
- **October 15:** 3rd + year tenure track faculty submit materials for review
- December 20: Peer review committees provide recommendations to Dean for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service
- January 30: Dean provides recommendation to Provost for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service.
- March 15: Provost provides recommendations for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service
- April 1: Deadline for tenure-track faculty to appeal negative retention or tenure decisions.
- **May 1: Deadline for notice of terminal appointment for all tenure track faculty with three or more years of service**
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Tenure-Line Faculty Applying for Tenure & Promotion

- August 15: Faculty being considered for tenure are notified by Dean
- August 15: Faculty eligible for promotion are notified by Dean
- August 30: Faculty being considered for tenure meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for tenure and/or promotion
- **October 15:** tenure-line faculty submits materials for promotion and/or tenure
- December 20: Peer Review committee submits recommendations to Dean for tenure and promotion decisions
- January 30: Dean submits recommendations to Provost for tenure and promotion decisions
- March 15: Provost makes recommendations for tenure and promotion decisions

Tenured Faculty Applying for Sabbatical

- August 15: Faculty eligible to apply for sabbatical are notified by Deans
- August 30: Faculty applying for sabbatical meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for sabbatical
- October 1: Faculty submit applications for sabbatical
- **October 31:** Peer Review committee submits recommendations for sabbatical applications
- **November 15:** Dean provides recommendations for sabbatical requests to Provost
- December 1: Provost submits recommendations to President on sabbatical requests
- **December 15:** Deadline for notifying applicants for sabbatical leave of the decision on their applications

Post-Tenure Review

- August 15: Faculty being considered for post-tenure review are notified by Dean
- August 30: Faculty identified for Post-Tenure Review meet with Dean to establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- March 1: Faculty submit post-tenure review materials
- April 1: Peer Review Committees provide results of post-tenure review
- April 15: Deans provide findings from post-tenure review to Provost
- May 15: Provost provides letter regarding Post-tenure reviews
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Contract Faculty

- August 15: Faculty on Non-Tenure-Track Contracts are notified by Dean of which year of their contract they are in and if this is the final year of the term in their contract
- August 30: Faculty on Non-Tenure-Track Contracts meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Contract Faculty submit requests to be considered for contract renewal
- **October 15:** Non-Tenure-Track Contract Faculty submit materials for review
- December 15: Peer Review Committee provides review of contract faculty or recommendation for contract renewals for faculty in final year of contract
- February 15: Dean provides recommendations for retention of contract faculty or contract renewal for faculty in final year of non-tenure-track contracts
- March 1: Deadline for Non-Tenure-Track Contract Faculty to appeal negative retention or renewal decisions
- March 15: Provost provides notice of non-renewal of faculty in final year of contract or presentation of new contract
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Non-Contract Instructors

- August 15: Non-Tenure-Line, Non-Contract Faculty (Instructors and Adjuncts) are notified of their appointment type and status by Deans
- August 30: Instructors meet with Dean/Supervisor to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for renewal.
- **March 1:** Instructors submit review documents
- April 1: Peer Review Committees make recommendations for retention of non-contract instructors
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Annual Review

- June 1: Faculty update materials for Annual Review consisting of efforts and achievements for previous academic year. Materials consist of any additional evidence necessary for applying performance rubrics and illustrating progress in the areas identified for annual goals.
- July 1: Deans provide an annual review letter to every faculty member addressing their development, their fitness for their position, and (if applicable to the position) their prospects for attaining tenure or promotion. Annual review follows criteria and guidelines stipulated by the School or College Faculty Recognition Document.

TIMELINES BY REVIEWER TYPE

For ease of use and reference, actions and decisions are represented here as they affect each level of review. All dates are deadlines. Early completion is encouraged. If the deadline falls on a holiday or weekend, the deadline will become the next available workday.

Peer Reviewers

October 1: FRC Election Deadline

- Faculty democratically determines which peers will form committees for faculty recognition & review matters.

October 1: Receive Sabbatical Applications

- Faculty applying for sabbatical submit all materials

October 15: Receive Materials and Peer Review Tasks

- Dean notifies FRC/peer reviewers of faculty requests and pending review activities (retentions, tenures, promotions, sabbaticals, post-tenure reviews, contract renewals, chronic low performance, other.)
- For matters including retention, contract renewal, promotion, tenure, merit-based pay increases, sabbatical, chronic low performance, and post-tenure review, the Dean of each School/College will assign specific responsibilities according to appointment types and the elements of performance being assessed.
- Receive materials from faculty in all appointment types who are being reviewed (except first-year tenure track)

October 31: Sabbatical Recommendations

- Peer review committee submits recommendations for sabbatical requests to Dean

November 1: Second-Year Faculty Reviews

- Peer review committees provide retention recommendations for tenure-track faculty in the second year of service to Dean.

December 15: Contract Renewal Reviews

- Peer review committees provide recommendations for contract renewals

December 20: Tenure & Promotion Reviews

- Peer review committees submit recommendations for tenure and promotion decisions to Dean

March 1: Receive Post-Tenure Review Materials & Non-Contract Instructor Review Materials

- Receive materials from faculty identified for post-tenure reviews
- Receive materials from non-contract instructors

April 1: Post-Tenure Review & Non-Contract Instructor Peer Review Deadline

- Peer review committees provide results of post-tenure review to Dean
- Peer review committees make recommendations to Dean for retention of non-contract instructors

Deans

August 15: Notify Faculty

- All faculty being considered for retention, contract renewal, tenure, post-tenure review
- All faculty eligible for promotion or sabbatical

August 30: Annual Faculty Reviews

- Deadline to have met with all faculty in all appointment types (except first-year tenure track) to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year.

September 1: Receive Faculty Requests

- All faculty in all appointment types submit requests to their Dean to be considered for retention, tenure, promotion, sabbatical, post-tenure review, and contract renewal

October 15: Assign Peer Review Tasks

- Dean notifies FRC/peer reviewers of faculty requests and pending review activities (retentions, tenures, promotions, sabbaticals, post-tenure reviews, contract renewals, chronic low performance, other.)
- For matters including retention, contract renewal, promotion, tenure, merit-based pay increases, sabbatical, chronic low performance, and post-tenure review, the Dean of each School/College will assign specific responsibilities according to appointment types and the elements of performance being assessed.

November 15: Dean provides recommendations to Provost for sabbatical requests

November 15: Second-Year Retention Reviews

- Dean provides retention recommendations to Provost for tenure track faculty in second year of service

December 1: Meet with First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty

- 1st-Year Tenure Track Faculty meet with Dean to discuss the first semester and establish goals and workload for the second semester

December 20: Dean Receives Tenure & Promotion Peer Review

- Peer review committees submit recommendations to Dean for tenure and promotion decisions

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Retention of Faculty in 1st and 3rd + Year of Service

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of 1st year tenure-track faculty.
- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service.

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Retentions and Renewals of Contract Faculty

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of contract faculty
- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for contract renewal for faculty in final year of non-tenure-track contracts.

February 1: Dean's Recommendations for Tenure Track Faculty

- No later than February 1 of each year, the **Dean of the School or College** is responsible for informing, in writing, each faculty member of their development, their fitness for their position, and their prospects for attaining tenure.

April 1: Receive Post-Tenure Review & Non-Contract Instructor Peer Review Deadline

- Receive results of peer review committees post-tenure reviews
- Receive recommendations from peer review committees on non-contract instructors

April 15: Post-Tenure Review Recommendations

- Dean provides recommendations from post-tenure reviews to Provost

July 1 Annual Faculty Reviews

- Dean provides an annual review letter to every faculty member addressing their development, their fitness for their position, and (if applicable to the position) their prospects for attaining tenure or promotion. Annual review follows criteria and guidelines stipulated by the School or College Faculty Recognition Document.

Provost

December 1: Provost Sabbatical Decisions Recommendations

- Provost provides recommendations to Provost on sabbatical requests

December 15: First- & Second-Year Faculty Non-Reappointment Notification

- Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 2nd year tenure track faculty who will not be retained

March 1: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty Non-Reappointment Notification

- Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 1st year tenure track faculty who will not be retained

March 15: Contract Non-Renewal Deadline

- Provost provides notice of non-renewal of contract faculty or presentation of new contracts

March 15: Provost Decisions on Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Retentions

- Provost provides recommendations for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service

March 15: Provost Recommendations on Tenures & Promotions

- Provost provides recommendations to President for tenure and promotion decisions

May 1: Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Terminal Appointment Deadline

- Provost notifies all tenure track faculty with three or more years of service of terminal appointments

May 15: Post-Tenure Review Notifications

- Provost provides letters regarding post-tenure reviews

D. Evaluation Rubrics

FACULTY RECOGNITION DOCUMENT COMMON RUBRICS

These common rubrics were derived from criteria provided by faculty workgroups from each School or College. They are comprised of shared values and criteria provided by each School or College, organized into categories.

Each rubric specifies criteria to assess an individual's contributions as developing, proficient or expert.

These rubrics are intended for use in evaluation and formative feedback for improvement.

The categories of these rubrics are fixed and common to all Schools/Colleges. Within the categories, faculty in each School or College are afforded flexibility to adapt and further develop criteria appropriate for their areas.

General performance benchmarks are outlined in the common faculty recognition document template. Within those benchmarks, faculty may tailor expectations for achievement at different ranks and positions within their School or College.

Teaching Evaluation Rubrics

Teaching excellence takes many forms, shaped by discipline, course level, delivery mode, and evolving student needs. However effective teaching centers on the alignment of course goals and instructional practices, the creation of motivating and welcoming learning climates, and consistent attention to student learning and feedback.

These rubrics are intended as a flexible guide to support thoughtful evaluation, not a checklist of prescriptive standards. Faculty are encouraged to provide context and narrative to help evaluators understand their unique teaching contributions. Each category is considered an essential piece of effective teaching practice.

Overall, the evaluator should ask: *Based on the evidence provided by the faculty member how does this faculty member create meaningful learning experiences, foster student success, and reflect a commitment to continuous improvement in teaching?*

Teaching Category 1: Student Learning Assessment

At ESU, effective teaching assessment across all ranks varies and is demonstrated through evidence provided by the faculty member and the evaluation process. This category encourages evaluators to consider how faculty use learning assessments to guide instruction and support student growth through course assignments. Methods will vary across disciplines and course levels. The candidate's assessment materials should present evidence that the assessment aligns with learning outcomes, demonstrates variation in assessment methods, and maintains consistency in assessment feedback and quality.	Evidence for Teaching -- Student Learning Assessment: course materials, peer evaluations, redacted reviewed student work, emails from students and colleagues related to assessment, assessment training materials from workshops, self-reflection essays directly related to student assessment, assessment plans, and course mapping documents.
---	--

Developing	Proficient	Expert
The candidate's dossier shows a record of development: • A comprehensive syllabus (consistent in form and content with ESU policy) • Course learning outcomes that align with Program Learning Outcomes • Evidence that personal and professional growth from course content and skills is supported by best practices or academic research	The candidate's dossier shows a record of engaged and consistent assessment: • Evidence of assessment practices implemented on Canvas • Evidence of consistent self-reflection on the importance and implementation of student assessment of learning, such as journaling or reflection essays, a record of course-mapping related to assessment, and/or annual course assessment plans. • Evidence of course-specific assessment that aligns course content, assignments, and skills to professional and career development	The candidate's dossier shows a record of engagement, consistency, and excellence in assessment: • Evidence of campus-wide participation in course or program student learning assessment practices, such as regularly attending assessment-focused professional development workshops or seminars. • Evidence of collaborating with discipline-specific student learning outcome assessment practices recommended by the candidate's chosen national or international academic discipline organization or association of course-specific assessment that aligns course content, assignments, and skills to professional and career development

Teaching Category 2: Course Design

At ESU, effective course design across all ranks varies and is demonstrated through evidence provided by the faculty member and the evaluation process. Course design reflects a faculty member's planning, creativity, and responsiveness to learners' needs. Strong course design aligns content, structure, and outcomes to engage students and support academic programs. The candidate's course design materials should present evidence illustrating how course design aligns with learning outcomes, that the course content is relevant and applicable, and that the course structure, organization, and materials are clear.	Evidence for Teaching – Course Design: course materials, peer evaluations, redacted reviewed student work, emails from students and colleagues related to assessment, assessment training materials from workshops, self-reflection essays directly related to student assessment, assessment plans, and course mapping documents.
---	---

Developing	Proficient	Expert
The candidate's dossier shows a record of developing/including: • A comprehensive syllabus (consistent in form and content with ESU policy) • Course learning outcomes that align with Program Learning Outcomes • Evidence of Canvas application with course materials that include explanations of student learning (scaffolding) • Evidence that personal and professional growth from course content and skills is supported by best practices or academic research	The candidate's dossier shows a record of engaged and consistent course design proficiency: • A comprehensive syllabus (consistent in form and content with ESU policy) that includes detailed assignment descriptions, grading rubrics, or grading philosophy, assignment point breakdown aligned with assignment and cumulative course grades earned. • Redacted Student Evaluations of Teaching, including quantitative and qualitative, with content related to course design • Peer teaching evaluations with content related to course design and teaching practice effectiveness • Evidence of designing an Independent Study (or Internship Opportunity) contract • Evidence of course-specific design, topics, and assignments that align with professional and career development	The candidate's dossier shows a record of engagement, consistency, and expertise in course design: • Evidence of campus-wide participation in course design innovation workshops or seminars • Evidence of consistent self-reflection on the importance and implementation of course design as related to career and professional applications • Evidence that the course structure is highly organized, flexible, student-focused, and promotes exploration and self-directed learning • Recipient of a teaching award OR Evidence of specific course design practices considered forward-thinking and innovative, applied, and practical

Teaching Category 3: Teaching Practices

At ESU, effective teaching practice at all ranks varies and is demonstrated by evidence provided by the faculty member and through the evaluation process. Teaching practices encompass the day-to-day choices faculty make to connect with students, present content, and build an engaging learning environment. The candidate's materials should present evidence that teaching practices are engaging, inclusive, and positive, including student-focused group work, problem-solving, and reflection, and that the faculty member is consistently available and proactive in working with students during and outside of class.	Evidence for Teaching – Teaching Practice: course materials, peer evaluations, redacted and reviewed student work, emails from students and colleagues related to assessment, assessment training materials from workshops, self-reflection essays directly related to student assessment, assessment plans, and course mapping documents.
---	--

Developing	Proficient	Expert
The candidate's dossier shows a record of developing each of the items below: • A comprehensive syllabus (consistent in form and content with ESU policy) • Evidence of Canvas application with course materials that present material clearly and professionally • Evidence of incorporating a variety of content presentation styles, methods, or media that maintain interest in course content	The candidate's dossier shows a pattern of proficient engagement in teaching practice: • Evidence of interactive activities, discussions, and active learning • Evidence of a classroom climate that facilitates collaboration, applied group work, student reflection, and instructor availability • Redacted Student Evaluations of Teaching, including quantitative and qualitative data related to clarity of course content and student engagement with course content • Peer teaching evaluations with content related to clarity of course material, responding to student questions/concerns, and overall course climate	The candidate's dossier shows student engagement and expertise: • Evidence of a variety of interactive engagement strategies that foster high levels of student learning, collaboration, and reflection • Evidence that the instructor is regularly and appropriately available, and that includes regular and appropriate “check-ins” related to student learning • Evidence that the instructor invites guests, coordinates outings, facilitates networks, and encourages engagement and application of course-related concepts with experts, research, best practices, and/or career or professional development • Recipient of a teaching award OR Evidence that students are actively engaging with the course material in ways that foster a community of belonging and respect

Teaching Category 4: Reflection and Growth

At ESU, effective teaching at all ranks includes reflection and growth and is demonstrated through evidence provided by the faculty member and the evaluation process. Excellent teaching evolves through thoughtful reflection on student and peer feedback. This category values faculty who learns from experience, seek out new strategies, and contribute to broader efforts to improve teaching and learning. Evaluators should look for patterns of intentional growth, not perfection. The candidate's materials should present evidence that the faculty member consistently reflects on teaching assessment, design, and practice by collecting regular feedback from students and colleagues, and that they make significant contributions to institutional or program teaching initiatives.	Evidence for Teaching: Student Learning Assessment: course materials, peer evaluations, redacted reviewed student work, emails from students and colleagues related to assessment, assessment training materials from workshops, self-reflection essays directly related to student assessment, assessment plans, and course mapping documents.
--	---

Developing	Proficient	Expert
The candidate's dossier shows a record of developing/including: - Peer teaching observations include reflection by the faculty member about the peer teaching evaluation - Evidence that the faculty member is developing methods and means that invite anonymous student feedback about course design, class assignments, delivery of course content, and application of course content to professional practice - Evidence that the faculty member has attended and participated in institutional initiatives related to teaching and learning	The candidate's dossier shows a pattern of thoughtful improvement to assessment of student learning, course design, and teaching practice based on student or colleague feedback and engagement/participation in institutional teaching initiatives: - Redacted Student Evaluations of Teaching, including quantitative and qualitative data from the 2 courses. - Peer teaching evaluations related to teaching practice from 4 separate courses by 2 different peers. - Evidence that the faculty champions teaching growth and improvement.	The candidate's dossier shows a robust pattern of reflection, growth, improvement, and leadership. - Evidence of leading a college, campus-wide, state, or national teaching practice initiative focused on improving teaching course design, practice, or assessment of student learning. - Recipient of a teaching award. - Evidence that the faculty member is a campus or disciplinary leader who champions teaching reflection and growth.

Scholarship/Creativity Evaluation Rubrics

Scholarly and Creative activity is broad and has some generalizability across all ESU Schools and Colleges, while others have a very discipline-specific focus.

These rubrics provide a structure for understanding the scope, quality, and impact of a faculty member's work. These rubrics provide the prioritization for scholarship & creative endeavors to align with institutional values.

It is expected that these rubrics will be applied with flexibility and professional judgment. Reviewers should look for outcomes, not volume, with the keen understanding that faculty rarely demonstrate expert status in all three categories. The context and circumstances of each faculty must be considered.

Overall, the evaluator should ask: *How has this faculty member used their advanced knowledge and skills to engage students, peers, and/or the community?*

Scholarship/Creativity Category 1: Student Engagement and Teaching Integration

At ESU, effective research, scholarship, and creativity at the rank are most impactful when they connect to student learning. This category recognizes faculty who mentor students in research, scholarship, or creative work, or who bring scholarly insight directly into their teaching. The candidate's materials should present evidence related to involving students in their research, scholarship, and creative work, and how this mentoring enriches their teaching and research/scholarship/creativity pursuits. Very important: The candidate may choose to provide evidence related to Student Engagement, Teaching Integration, or BOTH. The candidate should clearly label and explain how the evidence relates to Student Engagement, Teaching Integration, or both.			Evidence/Examples: mentoring student research, scholarly, or creative activity undergraduate or graduate thesis, project, independent study, community-focused, service-learning, applied learning activity that resulted in the student presenting and/or authoring as a (co-)panelist (co-)author at a competitively selected or invited professional or academic conference and/or publication, paper, posterboard, report, or review. Integrating new research, theory, or pedagogy into an existing course or student learning experience. Judging student-research or creative activity-focused projects at local, regional, national, or international academic or professional contests or award competitions.
Developing	Proficient	Expert	
The candidate's dossier shows a consistent record of including/developing: - an independent study or internship (for student credit) designed for mentoring student engagement with scholarship, research, or creative activity. - course assignments, projects, or initiatives that integrate scholarship, research, or creative activity concepts related, but not exclusive to, the construction of research questions or hypothesis-testing, literature reviews, data collection, archival or textual critical analysis, statistical/empirical analysis, discipline-specific source citation practices, and (broad-level) data analysis. - sponsorship of student participation in ESU's Student Research and Creative Activity Day.	The candidate's dossier shows a record of engaged and consistent participation, including: - fostering student participation in applied or community-focused scholarly, research, or creative activity at state or regional academic or professional conferences - hosting colleagues for class (or as public speakers or exhibitors) with scholarly, research, or creative expertise and experience to interact and engage with students - serving as a campus advocate and leader for student scholarship, research, or creative activity - incorporating an Open Educational Resource for implementation in an introductory ESU course	The candidate's dossier shows a robust pattern of engagement, consistency, and excellence, including: - authoring an Open Educational Resource for implementation in an introductory ESU Course - serving as a campus advocate and leader for student scholarship, research, or creative activity. - advising undergraduate and/or graduate students' scholarly, research, or creative activity projects that result in a public presentation by the student.	

Scholarship/Creativity Category 2: External Engagement and Collaboration

At ESU, scholarship, research, and creative activity gain depth and relevance through collaboration, funding, and/or connections to community or societal needs. This category encourages candidates and evaluators to recognize diverse forms of impact and value to ESU through grant writing and submission, interdisciplinary partnerships, and contributions to community or societal needs. Impact should be viewed through the lens of the candidate's specific discipline. The candidate's materials should illustrate expansion of their scholarship, research, or creative activity through, but not exclusively through collegial collaboration, grant writing and submission (secured or not), presentation, publication, and public engagement.			Evidence/Examples: Preparing, coordinating, collaborating, and/or submitting grant proposals for a scholarly, literary, or research project. Submitting a formal scholarly, literary, or research-in-progress report to a granting agency, accreditation institution, or regulatory institution. Presenting as an individual participant or panelist a public (invited or competitively selected) scholarly, literary, or research project or response at a professional or academic gathering. Presenting as an individual participant or panelist, a public (invited or competitively selected) disciplinary content to a group, agency, or organization outside the candidate's home discipline. Submitting scholarly, literary, or research-focused projects for consideration for local, regional, national, and/or international academic or professional awards. Earning a local, regional, national, and/or award by a professional, academic, non-profit, or agency for excellence in research and creative activity. Securing ESU Foundation and/or private funding for conducting, presenting, and/or publishing a research or creative activity project. Serving as an invited scholar, artist, writer, or performer. Serving as a reviewer or as a member of an editorial review board for an academic publication or conference. Sharing one's research, scholarly, literary, or creative activity expertise with reputable and non-political mass-mediated audiences, local, regional, and/or national media outlets.		
Developing		Proficient		Expert	
The candidate's dossier shows a consistent record of: - secures ESU funding for presenting scholarship, research, or creative activity at a state, regional, or national academic or professional conference. - attends grant-writing and submission workshops sponsored by ESU's Office of Grants and Research. - presents scholarship, research, or creative activity presentations at ESU or at Emporia service or community organizations - serves as an expert scholarly, research, or creative activity judge at ESU's Student Research and Creative Activity Day or other		The candidate's dossier shows a record of engaged and consistent external engagement and collaboration: - prepares with ESU and/or other colleagues, applications and submissions for external funding. - serves as an external reviewer of scholarship, research, or creative activity for an academic or professional conference, organization, or publication. - collaborates and submits (peer-reviewed or invited) scholarship, research, or creative activity, in academic/professional presentations, and publications with both ESU and colleagues at other universities or organizations.		The candidate's dossier shows a robust pattern of engagement, consistency, and excellence: - secures external grant funding for scholarship, research, teaching, or creative activity from state, federal, or private agencies. - receives state, regional, national, or international recognition for scholarship, research, or creative activity that contributes to public policy, addresses social needs, or improves quality of life. - serves as an invited speaker, presenter, reviewer, or editor because of contributions to scholarship, research, or creative activity - receives a local, regional, national, or international award for scholarship, research, or creative activity OR completes a sabbatical for	

student-focused scholarly, research, or creative activity public event	• fosters scholarship, research, and creative activity that demonstrates relevance to institutional, community, or social needs.	scholarly, research, or creative activity that results in the publication of a journal article, book, or monograph.
--	--	---

Scholarship/Creativity Category 3: Research Productivity and Impact

At ESU, faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity foster a symbiotic reflection that benefits ESU’s mission of academic excellence. This category focuses on quality, visibility, and significance of scholarly or creative output, not simply quantity. Evaluators should consider the faculty member’s annual record in the context of the varied time required to complete specific projects. The candidate’s materials should illustrate the quality and impact of scholarly and/or creative work and how it contributes to their discipline.			Evidence/Examples: Preparing, coordinating, collaborating, and/or submitting grant proposals for a scholarly, literary, or research project. Submitting a formal scholarly, literary, or research-in-progress report to a granting agency, accreditation institution, or regulatory institution. Presenting as an individual participant or panelist a public (invited or competitively selected) scholarly, literary, or research project or response at a professional or academic gathering. Presenting as an individual participant or panelist, a public (invited or competitively selected) disciplinary content to a group, agency, or organization outside the candidate’s home discipline. Submitting scholarly, literary, or research-focused projects for consideration for local, regional, national, and/or international academic or professional awards. Earning a local, regional, national, and/or award by a professional, academic, non-profit, or agency for excellence in research and creative activity. Securing ESU Foundation and/or private funding for conducting, presenting, and/or publishing a research or creative activity project. Serving as an invited scholar, artist, writer, or performer. Serving as a reviewer or as a member of an editorial review board for an academic publication or conference. Sharing one’s research, scholarly, literary, or creative activity expertise with reputable and non-political mass-mediated audiences, local, regional, and/or national media outlets.		
Developing		Proficient		Expert	
The candidate's dossier shows a consistent record of: • A scholarly, research, or creative activity agenda relevant to the faculty member’s discipline, rank, and letter of appointment. • A peer-reviewed or invited scholarship research, or creative activity paper, panel, or posterboard presentation at a state, regional, national, or international academic conference • Submission (not work in progress) of scholarly, research, teaching, or creative activity to a peer-reviewed state, regional, national, or international journal		The candidate’s dossier shows a pattern of engagement and consistent research productivity (any combination of items is acceptable): • A peer-reviewed or invited scholarship, research, or creative activity paper, panel, or posterboard presentation at a state, regional, national, or international academic conference. • Author of a peer-reviewed conference proceeding (evidence of the published peer-reviewed proceedings must be included in the dossier		The candidate’s dossier shows a robust pattern of excellence: • secures external grant funding for scholarship, research, teaching, or creative activity from state, federal, or private agencies. • receives state, regional, national, or international recognition for scholarship, research, or creative activity that contributes to public policy, addresses social needs, or improves quality of life. • serves as an invited speaker, presenter, reviewer, or editor because of contributions to scholarship, research, or creative activity.	

	• Author of a peer-reviewed journal article published in a state, regional, national, or international journal. • Author of a book chapter (either peer-reviewed or invited) • Editor of a book or monograph • Author of a book (with a publisher who requires a proposal and review process) • Author of an Open Educational Resource for implementation in an introductory ESU course. • Obtains external funding for scholarship, research, or creative activities (including funding for fellowships).	• Receives a local, regional, national, or international award for scholarship, research, or creative activity OR completes a sabbatical for scholarly, research, or creative activity that results in the publication of a journal article, book, or monograph.
--	---	--

Service Evaluation Rubrics

These rubrics are intended to recognize contribution and leadership in activities that strengthen the institution, supports student success, or connect the university to the broader community.

Evaluators should consider the depth of commitment, overall impact, and alignment of service efforts with institutional goals.

Evaluators should look for outcomes, not volume. Faculty will rarely demonstrate strength in all four categories, and the context and circumstances of each faculty member's service contributions must be considered.

Overall, the evaluator should ask: *In what ways has this faculty member used their advanced knowledge and skills to contribute to the operations of the University, their discipline, or the community?*

Service Category 1: Student Support and Collaboration

At ESU, service to students goes beyond the classroom and includes mentorship, recruitment, and the active building of a supportive learning community. This category values faculty who invest in student growth and who help connect students to ESU and to one another. The candidate’s materials should demonstrate support for student success outside the classroom and foster a collaborative academic environment.		Evidence/Examples: Participating in student recruiting efforts (e.g., meeting with prospective students, preparing school recruitment materials, attending academic fairs on or off campus). Participating in student retention and success efforts (e.g., supporting student endeavors and campus events, new student orientation programming, and award ceremonies). Advising or sponsoring student organizations and events, as well as organizing and/or carrying out responsibilities connected to student organizations, without course release or salary support. Supervising student internships, independent studies, research, or practical learning initiatives directly with students. Coordinating scholarship committees and evaluating scholarship applications. Performing special responsibilities assigned or assumed within the program, school, or university (including but not limited to the preparation of reports, assessments, etc.) Coordinating and/or conducting student travel for educational purposes. Coordinating and/or conducting student learning enhancement activities (guest lectures, guest speakers, class projects, student presentations of research or learning).	
Developing		Proficient	
The candidate’s dossier shows a consistent record of: • participates in prospective student recruiting efforts, including attending visits to ESU and the SHSS • participates in an ESU or SHSS student organization or honor society • attends SHSS student-centered social and academic events outside of the classroom		The candidate’s dossier shows a pattern of engagement and consistent student support contributions: • advises students on academic and career initiatives related to the student’s degree program • participates in ESU and SHSS prospective student recruitment efforts • designs independent studies, internships, emersion experiences, field trips, and other initiatives that connect students outside the classroom.	
		Expert	
		The candidate’s dossier shows a robust pattern of engagement, consistency, and excellence: • Develops and/or leads a structured and successful mentoring program or initiative that serves student learning OR develops and/or leads strategic recruiting or retention efforts in support of ESU or an SHSS program	

Service Category 2: Institutional Service & Leadership

ESU thrives when faculty participate actively and take initiative in shared governance, strategic planning, and community building. This category emphasizes the scope and impact of a faculty member's service to ESU, including leadership, committee work, and program development. The candidate's materials should demonstrate support for ESU operations, culture, and growth through institutional service and leadership.			Evidence/Examples: Serving on or chairing a university committee (e.g., Council for Teacher Education, Academic Appeals Committee, Graduate Committee, General Education, Institutional Review Board, among others). Organizing and facilitating events for the university community (e.g., Constitution Day, organizing speakers, Global Citizen Kids' Day, etc.) Serving as a judge or critic for an on-campus event such as the 3-Minute Thesis Day or Research & Creativity Day. Participating in university-serving fundraising, recruiting, and retention efforts (e.g., in collaboration with any other academic or student-serving ESU unit). Participating in university-service, professional, or academic advising initiatives. Honors, awards, or special recognition of university service. Serving on executive-level search committees (e.g., for school dean, Provost, Vice-Provost, President, and Vice-President). Serving on teaching and research-focused student learning projects within a school or college outside SHSS. Mentoring (in addition to teaching) ESU Honors students, Jumpstart students, international students, graduate students, or study abroad students. Serving as an academic expert, ambassador, or public intellectual on behalf of ESU or the SHSS. Serving as an unpaid consultant for another ESU academic or student support unit. Directing workshops on behalf of another ESU academic or student support unit		
Developing		Proficient		Expert	
The candidate's dossier shows a consistent record of: - participates in an SHSS program with academic, teaching, or social initiatives - participates in an SHSS or ESU initiative that fosters collegiality, collaboration, and community.		The candidate's dossier shows a pattern of engagement and consistent institutional service and leadership contributions: - contributes to ESU and/or SHSS with participation in program, curriculum, and/or learning assessment review - contributes to faculty shared governance and decision-making with the ESU Faculty Senate.		The candidate's dossier shows a robust pattern of engagement, consistency, and excellence: Leads institutional initiatives by chairing an ESU search, curriculum, or Faculty Senate committee	

Service Category 3: Professional Service & Engagement

ESU faculty serve their disciplines by participating in professional organizations, reviewing scholarly work, and helping shape academic standards. This category values engagement that advances a field or supports and positively impacts ESU and/or other colleagues in formal or informal, meaningful ways. The candidate's materials should show contributions to their academic or professional community beyond ESU.			Evidence/Examples: Serving as a consultant for an agency, business, or organization outside ESU. Directing workshops for an agency, business, or organization outside ESU. Serving as a guest lecturer/critic/performer/technician/speaker at off-campus events. Hosting and/or directing conventions or meetings of professional or academic organizations or serving on a conference organizing committee. Contributing to professional or academic organizations as a volunteer, committee member, chair, or governing board member. Serving on an editorial advisory board, and/or grant review board. Editing a professional or academic journal.
Developing	Proficient	Expert	
The candidate's dossier shows a consistent record of: - maintains active membership in a professional and/or academic organization related to, or like, the candidate's academic discipline - serves as a peer-reviewer for scholarship or related initiatives for a professional organization and/or academic organization's conference, conference proceedings, newsletter, or publication	The candidate's dossier shows a pattern of engagement and consistent professional service and engagement contributions: - serves in a leadership role (committee chair/member, editorial board member, invited journal reviewer, or other peer review role) that contributes to a professional and/or academic organization's mission - presents, moderates, or facilitates initiatives that support a professional and/or academic organization's conference events or journal-related activities	The candidate's dossier shows a robust pattern of engagement, consistency, and excellence: Leads, organizes, edits, or contributes significantly to a professional and/or academic organization as a conference planner, journal editor, or assistant, OR receives an award for service to a professional and/or academic organization.	

Service Category 4: Community & Civic Engagement

As a public, regional-comprehensive university, ESU benefits from faculty who apply their expertise to serve the broader community. This category recognizes those faculty who participate in outreach, serve on advisory boards, or contribute to civic efforts in ways aligned with their discipline and/or ESU's mission. Contributions may be service-based, educational, or consultative. The candidate's materials should illustrate contributions that benefit the public good and build community relationships.		Evidence/Examples: Performing community service, locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally. Serving as a public intellectual, expert, or ambassador, in support of community, regional, local, national, and international democratic, social welfare, educational, or agricultural initiatives. Serving as a volunteer, board member, or advocate in support of community, regional, local, national, and international democratic, cultural, social welfare, educational, or agricultural initiatives.
Developing	Proficient	Expert
The candidate's dossier shows a consistent record of: participates or volunteers in community service or civic engagement activities	The candidate's dossier shows a pattern of engagement and consistent community and civic engagement contributions: serves in a leadership role (chair, advisory board member, consultant, educator, newsletter editor, coordinator, public information officer) related to public service and or civic engagement	The candidate's dossier shows a robust pattern of engagement, consistency, and excellence in community and civic engagement receives formal or informal recognition for excellent contributions to community service and/or civic engagement.

