

Emporia State University
Policies and Procedures for Faculty Review

School of Science and Mathematics

History and Revisions:
Adopted April 2026

Table of Contents

Values Statement:	3
Academic Appointments.....	3
Faculty Recognition Committee	3
Annual Faculty Evaluation	5
Evidence and Criteria for Annual Faculty Review.....	5
Teaching	6
Scholarship/Creativity	6
Service	6
Faculty Recognition Matters	6
Performance-Based Salary Increases and Adjustments.....	7
Retention.....	7
Renewal.....	8
Tenure	9
Promotion	9
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	10
PROFESSOR	10
Sabbatical	11
Post-tenure Review	13
Appendices.....	14
A. Relevant University-wide policies	14
B. Sabbatical Application Forms & Rubrics	14
C. Timelines	14
ACADEMIC YEAR ACTIONS & DECISIONS CALENDAR	14
TIMELINES BY APPOINTMENT TYPE.....	18
TIMELINES BY REVIEWER TYPE.....	21
D. Evaluation Metrics	24
FACULTY RECOGNITION DOCUMENT COMMON METRICS	25
Teaching Evaluation Rubrics	26
Scholarship/Creativity Evaluation Rubrics	36
Service Evaluation Rubrics	40

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.

Committee Description

- The faculty of the School of Science and Mathematics shall elect 9 members to serve on the Faculty Recognition Committee that shall consist of 3 representatives each from Mathematics & Statistics, Laboratory Sciences/Forensic Science, and Field Biology/Science Education,
 - The 3 members from Field Sciences and Science Education should include at least one member from each program with the third member representing either program.
 - The 3 members from Laboratory Sciences and Forensic Science should include at least one member from each program with the third member representing either program.

Purpose and Scope

- The Faculty Recognition Committee provides school-level review.
- The purpose of review by the FRC is to provide peer feedback and recommendations to the Dean. Not all reviews involve voting.
 - The FRC will review all applications for retention, tenure, and promotion and conduct post-tenure reviews. Review of other materials (e.g. annual review materials, sabbatical applications, award nominations, etc.) may be performed by the FRC at the request of the Dean or Assistant/Associate Dean.

Eligibility

1. The Faculty Recognition Committee could include faculty at the rank of associate professor, professor, and multi-year contract faculty with more than 4 years of service. Effort should be made to include representatives of a breadth of ranks when possible.
2. Faculty who are in their first year of employment at ESU or who are part-time employees, regardless of rank or position, are **NOT** eligible to serve on the FRC.
3. Faculty members who will be evaluated for retention, contract renewal, tenure, and/or promotion during the FRC term when they are to be evaluated are not eligible to serve.

Term of Service

1. Members shall serve for **one-year terms**.
2. Terms begin on **September 1** and end on **August 31** of the following year.
3. Members may serve **no more than three consecutive terms**.

Election Procedures

1. Elections for service on the FRC will be conducted at the beginning of the Fall semester before service terms begin in September.
2. The Assistant/Associate Dean will compile a list of eligible faculty and divide them according to their primary program assignment. In cases in which a faculty member is a member of multiple programs, the faculty member should be consulted about which program area they choose to represent.
3. The Assistant/Associate Dean will distribute the list of eligible faculty. Any faculty member who feels that they are not able to serve (e.g. has a conflict of interest, significant overload, major medical issue, planned sabbatical, etc.) should contact the Assistant/Associate Dean to remove themselves from the list.
4. The Assistant/Associate Dean will send out ballots (electronic or hard copy) that indicate the number of open positions from each program. All full-time faculty members in the School of Science and Mathematics will have the opportunity to vote, regardless of rank or position.
 - a. The **candidates receiving the highest number of votes** will be appointed to the committee.
 - b. In the event of a tie for the final open seat, a **runoff election** will be held between the tied candidates.
 - c. If the runoff also results in a tie, the **Dean** shall determine the winner by random draw.
5. If a seated member resigns or becomes ineligible, the position will be filled by the **next-highest vote-holder** from the most recent election. Or next election if it's a planned absence.
 - a. If no eligible alternates are available, a **special election** may be held for the remainder of the term.

Committee Responsibilities

1. At its first meeting each academic year, the committee shall elect a committee chair. The chair will serve as a coordinator and liaison between the committee and the Dean or Assistant/Associate Dean.
2. From the 9 elected FRC committee members, the committee should work collaboratively with the committee chair to assign specific responsibilities according to discipline(s). For example, a faculty member teaching in laboratory science and science education should be reviewed by 3

FRC members, at least one of which is in laboratory science and one in science education. When possible, appointment type and/or rank of the committee member and faculty member being evaluated should be considered.

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.

Tenure-Track Faculty who are currently in their second year, seeking retention to the third year, have typically achieved minimum ratings as follows:

TEACHING

- A score of 2 (DEVELOPING) in each category

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- A score of 2 (DEVELOPING) in Scholarship/Creativity Category 1.

SERVICE

- A score of 2 (DEVELOPING) in Service Category 1.

Tenure-Track faculty who are currently in their third year, seeking retention to the fourth year, have typically achieved minimum ratings as follows:

TEACHING

- A rating of at least 2 (DEVELOPING) in each category and a score of 3 or more in two or more categories.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- A score of 3 (PROFICIENT) in Scholarship/Creativity Category 1.

SERVICE

- A score of 3 (PROFICIENT) in Service Category 1.

Tenure-Track faculty who are currently in their fourth year, seeking retention to the fifth year, and beyond have typically achieved minimum ratings as follows:

TEACHING

- A rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in each category.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- A rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in Scholarship Category 1.
- A rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in either Scholarship/Creativity Categories 2 or 3 as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals.

SERVICE

- A rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in Service Category 1.
- A rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in at least one of Service Categories 2-4 as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals.

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.

Faculty on Non-Tenure-Track appointments who are seeking renewal have typically achieved minimum ratings as follows:

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 should typically achieve a minimum rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in all categories. .

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- If appropriate to the expectations of their contract, Contract Faculty will have identified scholarship/creativity expectations with their Dean. By the end of their contract period, contract faculty should typically achieve a rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in any of the criteria on the Scholarship/Creativity Metrics.

SERVICE

- If appropriate to the expectations of their contract, Contract Faculty will have identified service expectations with their Dean. By the end of their contract period, contract faculty should typically achieve a rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in any of the criteria on the Service Metrics that have been identified as applicable to their position.

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. Tenure decisions will be based on holistic, cumulative performance in the years leading up to the tenure decision, including previous annual reviews, trends, and indication of self-reflection and improvement. **Tenure is not based solely on any single year's performance.**

Faculty applying for tenure have typically achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING

- A minimum rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in each category.
- A record of self-reflection and commitment to professional growth.

SCHOLARSHIP

- A minimum rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) in Scholarship Category 1.
- A rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) or greater in either Scholarship/Creativity Category 2 or Category 3 as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals.
- A record of self-reflection and commitment to professional growth.

SERVICE

- A rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) or greater in Service Category 1.
- A rating of 3 (PROFICIENT) or greater in at least one of Service Categories 2-4 as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals.
- A record of self-reflection and commitment to professional growth.

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.

Promotion decisions will be based on the holistic, cumulative performance in the years leading up to the promotion decision, including previous annual reviews, trends, and indication of self-reflection and improvement. ***Promotion is not based solely on any single year's performance.***

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.

All faculty are expected to be successful in Teaching. Some individuals may also be successful in scholarship/creativity and service, but some individuals may focus on scholarship/creativity or service. It is up to the faculty to explain to the committee the breadth of their effort.

Faculty applying for promotion to Associate Professor have typically achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING

- A minimum score of 3 (PROFICIENT) in each category and a score of 4 in one or more categories.
- A record of self-reflection and commitment to professional growth.

SCHOLARSHIP and SERVICE

- A rating of 4 in Category 1 in either Scholarship/Creativity **OR** Service.
- A record of self-reflection and commitment to professional growth.

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.

All faculty are expected to be successful in Teaching. Some individuals may also be successful in scholarship/creativity and service, but some individuals may focus on scholarship/creativity or service. It is up to the faculty to explain to the committee the breadth of their effort.

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 have typically achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING

- A minimum score of 3 (PROFICIENT) in each category and a score of 4 in two or more categories.
- A record of self-reflection and commitment to professional growth.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY and SERVICE

- A rating of 4 in Category 1 **AND** in one other category in **either** Scholarship/Creativity **OR** Service.

OR

- A rating of 4 in Category 1 in **BOTH** Scholarship/Creativity and Service.

AND

- A record of self-reflection and commitment to professional growth.

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 Metrics

FACULTY RECOGNITION DOCUMENT COMMON METRICS

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.

These metrics are intended to serve as flexible guides, not a checklist of prescriptive standards, to support thoughtful evaluation of the accomplishments and trends of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service. The descriptions and examples provided for scoring the criteria within each category are not intended to be an exhaustive list, and there may be other positive contributions not listed that could contribute to the evaluation of the faculty member. It is not necessary to meet every individual criterion within a category to receive that score. When evaluating a faculty member's performance in a category, the evaluator should reflect on the overall meaning of the category (see its "Key Question"), and the elaborating criteria, descriptions, or examples should help guide, but never override, the evaluator(s) sound professional judgment of what constitutes good and effective teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service.

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 environments, and consistent attention to student learning and feedback.

These rubrics are intended to serve as flexible guides, not a checklist of prescriptive standards, to support thoughtful evaluation of the accomplishments and trends of the faculty member's teaching.. The descriptions and examples provided for scoring the criteria within each category are not intended to be an exhaustive list, and there may be other positive contributions not listed that could contribute to the evaluation of the faculty member. It is not necessary to meet every individual criterion within a category to receive that score. When evaluating a faculty member's performance in a category, the evaluator should reflect on the overall meaning of the category (see its "Key Question"), and the elaborating criteria, descriptions, or examples should help guide, but never override, the evaluator(s) sound professional judgment of what constitutes good and effective teaching within the context of the course(s) being taught. Faculty are encouraged to provide brief context and narrative to help evaluators understand their unique teaching contributions. Each category is considered an important piece of effective teaching practice.

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

Faculty are expected to follow all university policies, procedures, and practices including:

- a. using the required learning management system,
- b. entering progress reports and midterm and final grades on time,
- c. required teaching evaluations are administered in an appropriate and professional manner (e.g., not having students complete teaching evaluations in faculty member's presence, etc.),
- d. holding office hours,
- e. following textbook adoption practices,
- f. and any other policies and procedures relevant to teaching

Score Scale:

Score 1 (Unsatisfactory) - Faculty member fails to demonstrate proficiency as described in (3) despite consistent feedback from students, peers, and/or supervisors and opportunities for improvement.

Score 2 (Developing) – Faculty member is not currently demonstrating proficiency for all criteria described in (3) but there is evidence of improvement and progress toward proficiency based on feedback from students, peers, and/or supervisors.

Score 3 (Proficient) - indicates that a faculty member is typically meeting the criteria described as proficient as appropriate to their course(s).

Score 4 (Exceeds proficiency standards) -Faculty member demonstrates proficiency in all criteria as described in (3) AND exceeds them in one or more ways.

Teaching Category 1: Student Learning Assessment

This category encourages evaluators to consider how faculty use learning assessment to guide instruction and support student growth. Methods will vary across disciplines and course levels.

Key question: *Does this faculty member use course-level assessment to understand, support, and enhance student learning?*

Additional examples of Score 4 – Exceeds Proficiency Standards:

1. Course level assessments are designed to provide information on higher-level thinking such as understanding, critical thinking, and application of knowledge, and inform program curricula or course changes rather than assigning grades
2. Designs assessments that are adopted by others
3. Organizes, analyzes, and reports course-level assessment data to inform course-design or curriculum decisions

Criteria	2 - Developing	3 - Proficient	4 - Exceeds Proficiency Standards
Alignment of Assessments with Outcomes	Assessments administered are vague, confusing, or not reflective of course content or learning outcomes	Assessments are relevant to course material and learning outcomes	Assessments administered are clear and thorough and reflective of course content and learning outcomes
Assessment Methods	Assessment fails to assess student understanding (e.g., exams rely solely on rote memorization and recall when not appropriate for the course)	Assessments are designed to determine levels of learning (e.g. remembering, understanding, applying, etc.) key concepts as appropriate to the course	Employs a wide range of formative and summative assessments, (e.g. employs real-time assessments that provide continuous feedback to students)
Feedback Timeliness and Quality	Feedback from assessments is delayed (2-4 weeks) or nonspecific, making it difficult for students to improve	Feedback is provided in a timely manner and is generally useful for student improvement	Assessment feedback is timely and feedback helps students understand their progress and supports learning, such as regularly providing detailed written or verbal comments on assignments and tests

Frequency	Assessments are administered too infrequently to facilitate student improvement	Assessments are administered at intervals appropriate for the course to facilitate learning and improvement	Assessments are administered frequently and consistently so that students have the opportunity to continuously improve throughout the semester
------------------	---	---	--

Teaching Category 2: Course Design

Course design reflects a faculty member's intentional planning, creativity, and responsiveness to the needs of their learners. Strong course design aligns content, structure, and outcomes in ways that engage students and supports academic programs.

Key question: *How thoughtfully and effectively is this faculty member designing courses to foster meaningful, student-centered learning?*

Additional examples of Score 4 – Exceeds Proficiency Standards:

1. Course structure is highly organized, flexible, and student-focused, promoting an engaging learning experience that encourages student interest.
2. Course materials are developed by the faculty member (e.g., hands-on exercises, new open educational resources, etc.) or creation of a new course or substantial course revisions, informed by student and peer feedback, and substantiated by evidence collected after implementation demonstrating enhanced student learning outcomes

Criteria	2 - Developing	3 - Proficient	4 – Exceeds Proficiency Standards
Learning Outcomes	Learning outcomes are unclear, poorly defined, or misaligned with course content. They lack specificity and provide little guidance for assessment, learning, or instructional planning	Learning outcomes are clearly stated and are relevant to the course content and course outcomes	Learning outcomes are based on data and feedback to improve student learning and engagement and focus on student growth and achievement within the academic program
Curriculum Design and Content	Course content is outdated, inaccurate or otherwise misleading, or inappropriate for the intended audience	Course content is current, relevant, and appropriately challenging for the intended audience	Course content reflects real-world applications, incorporates interdisciplinary perspectives, or incorporates emerging trends. Supplemental course materials (e.g., peer-reviewed literature, creative projects, activities, videos, etc.) deepen and enrich student understanding
Course Structure and Organization	Course structure lacks coherence: learning activities and materials are poorly designed	Course structure is logical, with clear organization and sequencing of learner activities	Course structure and organization promote student engagement, encouraging exploration and self-directed learning

Teaching Category 3: Teaching Practices

Teaching practices encompass the day-to-day choices faculty make to connect with students, present content, and build an engaging learning environment.

Key question: *How does this faculty member create an engaging and supportive classroom experience that promotes student learning?*

Additional examples of Score 4 – Exceeds Proficiency Standards:

1. Exceptional and effective innovation in teaching is demonstrated by employing new or creative methods to encourage student interaction (e.g., holding voluntary recitation sessions or small-group discussions that explore material in greater depth outside of class times, etc.).
2. A significant amount of time is spent with students (e.g., significant time meeting one-on-one, time helping students not enrolled in their classes, etc.).
3. Success in teaching a wide range of courses is demonstrated, such as general education, major-specific, graduate, and interdisciplinary courses, within their discipline within a single evaluation period.

Criteria	2 - Developing	3 - Proficient	4 – Exceeds Proficiency Standards
Engagement Strategies	Classroom environment is minimally conducive to learning. Student engagement is minimal because the faculty member does not consistently attempt to engage students in active learning	Classroom environment is conducive to learning Student engagement is encouraged	Classroom environment is dynamic and actively engages student learning (e.g., interactive activities, discussions, etc.) Student engagement with faculty member, peers, and course content is actively encouraged
Classroom Climate and Atmosphere	Teacher/student interactions are sometimes discouraging, unwelcomed, or disrespectful	Professional, supportive relationships with students are fostered	Interactions with students promote inclusivity, collaboration and trust
Student-Centered Learning	Faculty member is not mindful of students' time. Class intermittently begins or ends on time but not consistently. Classes are cancelled on short notice or without appropriate notification in non-emergency circumstances	Faculty member respects students' time (e.g. using class time efficiently and effectively, etc.)	Classroom activity offers opportunities for inquiry, self-reflection, and practice.

Faculty member Availability	Faculty member is not consistently available to students outside of normal class hours (may not be consistently present during publicized office hours) Students complain that the Faculty member does not communicate with them outside of class (e.g. unreasonable delays in answering emails, returning phone calls, etc.	Faculty member is available to students during reasonable times outside of normal class hours (e.g. available during publicized office hours, answers emails and returns phone calls in a timely manner, etc.)	Faculty member availability is adjusted to meet student needs (e.g., scheduling appointments outside regular publicized office hours, meeting virtually vs in-person upon request, etc.)
---	---	---	---

Teaching Category 4: Reflection and Growth

Great teaching evolves through thoughtful reflection on feedback from students and peers. This category values faculty who learn 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.

Key questions: *How does this faculty member use feedback and self-reflection to improve their teaching effectiveness? How does this faculty member engage with the broader teaching community and contribute to instructional improvement?*

Additional examples of Score 4 – Exceeds Proficiency Standards:

1. Demonstrates exceptional peer mentoring (e.g., leads peer mentoring groups or facilitates one-on-one peer mentoring opportunities, etc.).
2. Demonstrates exceptional effort in professional development (e.g., leads professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences devoted to pedagogy or course subject-related material, etc.).
3. Assumes a leadership role in informing curricular decisions.

Criteria	2 - Developing	3 - Proficient	4 – Exceeds Proficiency Standards
Self-Reflection on Teaching	Little or inadequate reflection on teaching effectiveness; few adjustments made based on prior experience, student learning assessment, student, or peer feedback	Reflects on teaching practices and adjusts them based on feedback from students and peers on an as-needed basis	Consistently reflects on teaching practices, actively seeks feedback, and makes iterative adjustments to improve teaching effectiveness
Integration of Student Feedback	Inadequate or minimal integration of student feedback in adjustments to course design or delivery	Reflects on student feedback and uses information from it to make some adjustments to their course delivery	Student feedback is intentionally collected, thoughtfully considered, and actively used to improve course design, delivery, and teaching methods
Professional Development and Collaboration	Little integration of professional development activities (reading current literature, attending conferences or workshops, etc.) such that it negatively impacts their teaching (inaccurate or outdated methods or content, etc.)	Engages in professional development activities (e.g., reading current literature, including aspects of their research in their teaching, utilizing available on-campus resources, participating in discussions of teaching with their peers, attending conferences or workshops, etc.) and occasionally uses information derived from professional development in their course content or teaching	Regularly engages in professional development activities (e.g., reading current literature, including aspects of their research in their teaching, utilizing available on-campus resources, participating in discussions of teaching with their peers, attending conferences or workshops, etc.) and consistently uses information to significantly enhance course content or teaching
Institutional Contributions	Minimal institutional contributions beyond their own courses.	Contributes to program or institutional discussions about teaching, learning, and curriculum	Contributes thoughtfully to program or institutional discussions regularly. Makes significant contributions related to teaching beyond their own classroom (e.g., supports fellow faculty by guest lecturing, sharing teaching materials, mentoring peers, or participating in student-centric [teaching-focused] outreach activities, etc.)

Scholarship/Creativity Evaluation Rubrics

These categories provide a structure for understanding the scope, quality, and impact of a faculty member's work and provide the prioritization for scholarship & creative endeavors to align with institutional values. Examples provided under criteria are not intended to be an exhaustive list, nor are examples ranked in order of value. **Some activities may fit into more than one category. It is the faculty member's responsibility to choose how such activities are credited and provide appropriate justification.**

It is expected that these metrics will be applied with flexibility and professional judgment. Reviewers should look for outcomes, not volume. Faculty are not expected to demonstrate proficiency in all 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, research and creative activities are most impactful when they connect to student learning.

This category recognizes faculty who mentor students in research or creative work, **or** who bring scholarly insight directly into their teaching.

Key question: *How does this faculty member involve students in their scholarly or creative work or enrich teaching through their scholarly pursuits?*

The mere presence of particular activities or products should not by itself determine the rating. Evaluators should assess the quality and educational impact of the faculty member's efforts in light of position/rank and opportunities.

Score 1 (Unsatisfactory) - There is little or no evidence that the faculty member meaningfully involves students in scholarly or creative work or uses scholarship to enrich teaching and student learning. Any connections are minimal, incidental, or poorly developed despite consistent feedback from students, peers, and/or supervisors and opportunities for improvement.

Score 2 (Developing) – The faculty member shows effort to involve students in scholarly work or to connect scholarship to teaching. Efforts may be promising but are not yet sufficient to demonstrate proficiency.

Score 3 (Proficient) - The faculty member involves students in scholarly work and/or clearly integrates their scholarly pursuits in ways that enhance student learning as appropriate to the discipline.

For example:

1. Incorporates students into faculty member's research (e.g., faculty-led active research projects that may or may not culminate in a publication).
2. Incorporates faculty member's own scholarly activity into a course to enhance teaching, student learning, course content or course materials (publicly available or not).
3. Attends professional conferences with students or uses experiences from conferences attended to enhance their teaching and student learning
4. Mentors a graduate student's research project or scholarly activity in a supportive role (e.g., serves on a graduate research, thesis, or dissertation committee, supervises student seminar, etc.).
5. Mentors an undergraduate student-led research project or scholarly activity.
6. Gives a scholarly presentation directed primarily to an audience of ESU students.

Score 4 (Exceeds proficiency standards) - The faculty member demonstrates consistent and intentional engagement of students in scholarly work and/or strong integration of scholarship into teaching. Their work demonstrates effective mentoring or curricular influence beyond the basic level of proficiency.

For example:

1. Faculty member is a co-author on a student presentation resulting from their collaborative research that is professionally relevant to the student (e.g., departmental seminar, student or faculty conference presentation/poster, etc.).
2. Faculty member serves as the primary investigator/supervisor for student-led research or scholarly activities.
3. Mentors a student research project that is multifaceted (requiring collaboration or coordination with multiple disciplines or institutions or similar) and that results in publication or presentation at professional conferences.

4. Faculty member or student mentee gives an invited presentation on student's research at a professional conference.
5. Faculty member publishes the results of research that provided multiple students with research experiences and/or the opportunity to coauthor a publication.

Scholarship/Creativity Category 2: External Engagement and Collaboration

Scholarly & Creative work gains depth and relevance through collaboration, funding, or connection to community needs.

This category encourages evaluators to recognize diverse forms of impact and value to ESU through grant writing, interdisciplinary partnerships, and contributions to community or societal needs.

Impact should be viewed through the lens of the faculty member's specific discipline and personal goals.

Key question: *How does this faculty member expand their scholarship/creativity through collaboration, funding, and public engagement?*

Score 1 (Unsatisfactory) - There is little or no evidence that the faculty member expands their scholarship through collaboration, pursuit of funding, or engagement beyond the university despite consistent feedback from peers and/or supervisors and opportunities for improvement.

Score 2 (Developing) – The faculty member shows emerging efforts to expand scholarship and research through collaboration, funding activity, or public engagement. Efforts may be promising but are not yet sufficient to demonstrate proficiency.

Score 3 (Proficient) - The faculty member expands their scholarship through collaboration, pursuit of funding, and/or public engagement beyond the institution. Their efforts are intentional and appropriate to position/rank.

For example:

1. Receives internal grant funding resulting from a submitted proposal or contract funding.
2. Submits a proposal for external funding.
3. Participates in a professional development activity related to their area of expertise or research.
4. Engages in research that demonstrates relevance to community or institutional needs.
5. Performs consulting services related to their area of expertise.

Score 4 (Exceeds proficiency standards) - The faculty member demonstrates consistent and intentional success in expanding their scholarship through collaboration, funding activity, and/or public engagement. Their efforts show notable scope, depth, and/or effectiveness.

For example:

1. Files a patent application or is granted a patent.
2. Receives external competitive research funding from a state or federal agency, or other entity that requires similar proposals with review.
3. Faculty member receives recognition by a professional organization (e.g., research fellow, publication/research award, etc.).
4. Leads, facilitates, or contributes to research with state, regional, national, or international collaborators.

5. Writes grant proposals and is awarded grants for community groups related to their discipline.

Scholarship/Creativity Category 3: Research Productivity and Impact

This category focuses on the quality, visibility, and significance of scholarly or creative output, not simply quantity. Evaluators should consider the faculty member's annual record in context of the varied time required to complete specific projects.

Key question: *What is the quality and impact of this faculty member's scholarly or creative work, and how does it contribute to their discipline?*

Score 1 (Unsatisfactory) - There is little or no evidence of scholarly work of identifiable quality, significance, or discipline contribution despite consistent feedback from peers and/or supervisors and opportunities for improvement.

Score 2 (Developing) – The faculty member shows emerging scholarly work with some evidence of progress, but the quality, coherence, rigor, originality, or disciplinary impact is still limited. The work may be promising, but it does not yet demonstrate proficiency.

Score 3 (Proficient) - The faculty member produces quality scholarly work that is appropriate to their discipline, role, and stage of career. The work demonstrates rigor, originality, or creative strength and makes a meaningful contribution to the discipline through dissemination, application, or recognition appropriate to the field.

For example:

1. Prepares a manuscript for publication in a regional, national, or international journal.
2. Gives a seminar presentation over their research (individual or collaborative) (e.g., departmental seminar, invited seminar, faculty conference presentation/poster, etc.).
3. Faculty member has acceptance of a proposed or solved mathematical problem in a scholarly journal.
4. Demonstrates progress toward developing new equipment or techniques for research purposes.

Score 4 (Exceeds proficiency standards) - The faculty member demonstrates sustained production of high-quality scholarly work that shows notable rigor, originality, or significance and contributes substantively to the discipline. The work has clear impact, visibility, or influence.

For example:

1. Has acceptance/publication of research in a peer-reviewed journal, conference proceeding, or scholarly book. Has acceptance/publication of multiple high-quality, impactful publications in peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, or scholarly books within the evaluation period.
2. Authors a book chapter that is published.
3. Builds new effective equipment or develops new techniques suitable for research purposes.
4. Authors a new textbook or professional resource.

Service Evaluation Rubrics

The categories and examples provided 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.

Reviewers should look for outcomes, not volume. Faculty are not expected to demonstrate proficiency in all four categories. Some activities may span multiple categories; the context and circumstances of each faculty member must be considered.

Faculty are expected to make meaningful contributions to program needs, such as participating in recruitment and retention activities, outreach, program assessment, curriculum change and development, serving on search committees, etc. A faculty member serving on any committee is assumed to be an active participant (e.g., not chronically absent and participating in a collegial and timely manner).

The examples provided under a particular score are intended as a flexible guide to support thoughtful evaluation and are not intended to be an exhaustive list of possible service activity. Any activity by a faculty member not counted as teaching or scholarship/creativity constitutes service if it requires a time commitment and contributes to support our students, our institution, the faculty member's profession, or the community. **Some activities may fit into more than one category. It is the faculty member's responsibility to choose how such activities are credited and provide appropriate justification.**

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

Service to students goes beyond the classroom; it includes mentorship, recruitment, and building a supportive learning community.

This category values faculty who invest in student growth and who help connect students to the university and to one another.

Key question: *How does this faculty member support student success outside the classroom and foster a collaborative academic environment?*

Score 1 (Unsatisfactory) - There is little or no evidence that the faculty member meaningfully contributes to student success outside the classroom or a collaborative academic environment. Efforts, if present, are minimal, inconsistent, or limited in value despite consistent feedback from peers and/or supervisors and opportunities for improvement.

Score 2 (Developing) – The faculty member shows emerging efforts to contribute to student success or the academic environment, but the evidence is limited in consistency, intentionality, or impact. Efforts may be promising but do not yet demonstrate proficiency.

Score 3 (Proficient) – The faculty member contributes to student success outside the classroom and/or to a collaborative academic environment in ways that are appropriate to their position and rank. Their efforts are consistent, intentional, and beneficial to students, colleagues, programs, or the institution.

For example:

1. Supports student engagement efforts (e.g., attends or encourages attendance at seminars, club activities, student events, etc.).
2. Mentors or advises students in support of their career or professional needs or goals.
3. Participates in recruitment events or activities (e.g., Black & Gold, meeting with prospective students, etc.).

Score 4 (Exceeds proficiency standards) - The faculty member demonstrates sustained and effective service efforts that provide notably strong support for student retention. Their efforts show depth, initiative, or impact beyond routine expectations.

For example:

1. Serves as an instructor or facilitator in Program or School recruitment/outreach events (e.g., Exploring Your Future Day, Math Day, Future Healthcare Professionals Day, etc.).
2. Recruits students off-campus (e.g., talking to K-12 classes, participating in recruitment fairs, etc.).
3. Leads tours of School facilities for prospective students (e.g., cadaver lab tours, museum tours, crime scene tours, etc.). Serves as a faculty sponsor for a student organization or otherwise provides substantial mentorship or support for students.
4. Makes contributions that lead to measurable improvements for student recruitment, retention, or engagement (e.g., initiates new activities, coordinates multidisciplinary efforts for student engagement, etc.).

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 internal service, including leadership, committee work, and program development.

Key question: *How does this faculty member contribute to the university's operations, culture, and progress through institutional service and leadership?*

Score 1 (Unsatisfactory) - There is little or no evidence that the faculty member meaningfully contributes through institutional service or leadership to university operations, culture, or progress. Efforts, if present, are minimal, inconsistent, or of limited value despite consistent feedback from peers and/or supervisors and opportunities for improvement.

Score 2 (Developing) – The faculty member shows emerging efforts to contribute through institutional service or leadership, but the evidence is limited in consistency, reliability, or impact. Efforts may be promising but do not yet demonstrate proficiency.

Score 3 (Proficient) – The faculty member contributes through institutional service and/or leadership in ways that are appropriate to their rank/position. Their efforts are consistent, constructive, and beneficial to program, school, or university operations, governance, or culture.

For example:

1. Contributes to institutional service through committee participation.
2. Constructively participates in governance meetings and decision-making processes.
3. Contributes to curriculum development, accreditation support, or assessment activity.

Score 4 (Exceeds proficiency standards) - The faculty member demonstrates sustained and effective institutional service and/or leadership that makes a strong contribution to university operations, governance, culture, or progress. Their efforts show depth, initiative, or impact beyond routine expectations.

For example:

1. Constructively participates on a committee requiring a great deal of time (e.g., a serving on a committee with frequent meetings such as faculty senate or requiring frequent action, supervising student employees, etc.).
2. Consistently volunteers for service tasks, especially those that are less desirable but crucial for the program's needs.
3. Demonstrates evidence of making a significant contribution to the output of multiple committees.
4. Is appointed or elected to ad hoc committees or serves on a university task force.
5. Regularly takes advantage of opportunities to provide feedback or insight on potential initiatives.
6. Serves in a leadership role on a university committee (e.g., officer in faculty senate, committee chair, etc.).
7. Demonstrates versatility and a broad commitment to serving the program's and institution's needs, thereby enhancing both the program's and institution's connections and reputation.
8. Works with the university leadership to create a new taskforce or committee that bolsters or broadens the service and resources the university offers.

Service Category 3: Professional Service & Engagement

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 peers in meaningful ways. Impact can be formal or informal, local or national.

Key question: *How does this faculty member contribute to their academic or professional community beyond campus?*

Score 1 (Unsatisfactory) - There is little or no evidence that the faculty member meaningfully contributes through service or outreach to their academic or professional community beyond campus. Efforts, if present, are minimal, inconsistent, or of limited value despite consistent feedback from peers and/or supervisors and opportunities for improvement.

Score 2 (Developing) – The faculty member shows emerging efforts to contribute through professional service or outreach beyond campus, but the evidence is limited in consistency, reliability, or impact. Efforts may be promising but do not yet demonstrate proficiency.

Score 3 (Proficient) – The faculty member meaningfully contributes through service or outreach to their academic or professional community beyond campus in ways that are appropriate to their role and discipline. Their efforts are consistent, constructive, and beneficial to professional organizations, partnerships, standards, or shared field-based goals.

For example:

1. Actively engages with regional, national, or international professional organizations or journals (e.g., maintains active membership in professional organizations, attends conferences, serves as a peer reviewer, serves on organization or editorial boards, etc.).
2. Seeks opportunities for new partnerships or memberships.

Score 4 (Exceeds proficiency standards) : The faculty member demonstrates sustained and effective professional service or outreach that makes a strong contribution to the profession, field, or broader academic community. Their efforts show depth, initiative, or impact beyond routine expectations.

For example:

1. Engages in active service within a professional organization (e.g., serves as a committee chair, makes significant contributions to the output of a committee, helps organize a conference symposium, etc.).
2. Serves in an editorial role or reviews manuscripts and/or proposals.
3. Serves on a professional entity that sets standards or similar impact within the profession.
4. Develops relationships with schools, agencies, industry, nonprofits, professional associations, or community organizations; creating partnerships that support outreach, service, or professional development;
5. Earned a leadership role in professional organizations and effectively executes the responsibilities of that position (e.g., serving as an officer or editor, writing grant proposals on behalf of an organization, organizing an annual meeting, serving on advisory boards, etc.).

6. Brings new organizational partnerships that facilitate School or University initiatives and goals. (e.g., facilitates new partnerships between the ESU Foundation and other private Foundations, etc.).

Service Category 4: Community & Civic Engagement

As a public institution, ESU benefits from faculty who apply their expertise to serve the broader community.

This category recognizes those who participate in outreach, serve on advisory boards, or contribute to civic efforts in ways aligned with their discipline. Contributions may be service-based, educational, or consultative.

Key question: *How does this faculty member use their academic knowledge and skills to benefit the public good and build community relationships?*

Key question: *How does this faculty member use their academic knowledge and skills to benefit the public good and build community relationships?*

Score 1 (Unsatisfactory) - There is little or no evidence that the faculty member meaningfully contributes through service or outreach to the public good or to community relationships by applying their academic knowledge and skills. Efforts, if present, are minimal, inconsistent, or of limited value despite consistent feedback from peers and/or supervisors and opportunities for improvement.

Score 2 (Developing) – The faculty member shows emerging efforts to contribute through service or outreach to the public good or to community relationships, but the evidence is limited in consistency, intentionality, or impact. Efforts may be promising but do not yet demonstrate proficiency.

Score 3 (Proficient) – The faculty member contributes through service or outreach by applying academic knowledge and skills in ways that benefit the public good and/or build productive community relationships. Their efforts are consistent, constructive, and beneficial to community partners, public audiences, or shared university-community goals.

For example:

1. Participates in community outreach, community advisory boards, or unpaid professional consulting with community members or organizations.
2. Participates in community education or public awareness efforts (e.g., public lectures, workshops, demonstrations, etc.).

Score 4 (Exceeds proficiency standards) - The faculty member demonstrates sustained and effective service or outreach that makes a strong contribution to the public good and/or to community relationships. Their efforts show depth, initiative, or impact beyond routine expectations.

For example:

1. Serves as an instructor or facilitator in community outreach activities (e.g., PAROC or planetarium events, etc.).
2. Regularly organizes and/or leads community outreach events or successfully brings opportunities or events to the school or university that require community participation.
- 3.
4. Holds leadership positions and/or plays active roles on community advisory boards, shaping community initiatives.

5. Demonstrates a record of applying academic or area expertise and skills in ways that help civic and community organizations to advance their goals.
 - Acquires support (monetary or otherwise) and holds a leadership role in building a community-based coalition that addresses needs of the university and community.

