

CGT
COPY

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
CRITERIA AND PROCESS
(PECAP)**

Approval by the Faculty of the College
in accordance with the applicable Bylaws
certified by the College Governance Team

Thomas Beatty CGT Chair
NOV 8, 2013 Date

Approved by the President or President's Representative

Ronald R. Jell
18 Feb 2014 Date

CONTENTS

PREAMBLE

- 1 SCOPE**
 - 1.1 PURPOSE**
 - 1.2 STATUS**
 - 1.2.1 Limitations**
 - 1.3 ADOPTION & REVISION**
 - 1.4 APPLICABILITY**
 - 1.5 NOTICES**
 - 1.5.1 Temporary Address**
 - 1.6 DEFAULT FORMAT OF DOCUMENTATION**
 - 1.7 PERFORMANCE RECOGNITION PROGRAMS**

2 PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS BY RANK AND LEVEL

- 2.1 RANKED FACULTY**
 - 2.1.1 Assistant Professor**
 - 2.1.2 Associate Professor**
 - 2.1.3 Professor**
 - 2.1.4 Eminent Scholar/Endowed Chair**
- 2.2 INSTRUCTORS**
 - 2.2.1 Instructor I**
 - 2.2.2 Instructor II**
 - 2.2.3 Instructor III**
- 2.3 ACADEMIC ADVISORS**
 - 2.3.1 Academic Advisor I**
 - 2.3.2 Academic Advisor II**
 - 2.3.3 Academic Advisor III**

3 ANNUAL EVALUATION

- 3.1 RANKED FACULTY**
 - 3.1.1 Criteria and Standards for Teaching**
 - 3.1.2 Criteria and Standards for Scholarship**
 - 3.1.3 Criteria and Standards for Service**
- 3.2 INSTRUCTORS**
 - 3.2.1 Criteria and Standards for Teaching**
 - 3.2.2 Criteria and Standards for Professional Development/Scholarship**
 - 3.2.3 Criteria and Standards for Service**
- 3.3 ACADEMIC ADVISORS**
 - 3.3.1 Criteria and Standards for Advising/Teaching**
 - 3.3.2 Criteria and Standards for Professional Development**
 - 3.3.3 Criteria and Standards for Service**

4 PROMOTION

4.1 Ranked Faculty

4.1.1 Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

4.1.2 Associate Professor to Professor

4.2 Instructors

4.2.1 Instructor I to Instructor II

4.2.2 Instructor II to Instructor III

4.3 Academic Advisors

4.3.1 Academic Advisor I to Academic Advisor II

4.3.2 Academic Advisor II to Academic Advisor III

4.4 ROLE OF THE PEER REVIEW AND SUPPORT COMMITTEE

5 APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Definitions

Appendix 2: Templates for Documentation

Professional Development Plan (PDP)

Annual Professional Development Report

(APDR) Appendix 3: Examples of Teaching Activities

Appendix 4: Examples of Scholarly Products

Appendix 5: Examples of Service Activities

Appendix 6: Examples of Professional Development/Scholarship Activities (Instructors)

Appendix 7: Examples of Advising/Teaching Activities (Advisors)

Appendix 8: Examples of Professional Development Activities (Advisors)

PREAMBLE

The College of Arts and Sciences of Florida Gulf Coast University recognizes that its primary mission is to deliver quality educational services in a professional academic setting. The rights of faculty members include the exercise of academic freedom in research, publication, and instruction related activities; the expectation of working in a diverse, collegial, and collaborative environment free from discrimination; and equitable evaluation according to approved performance standards. In return, faculty members accept responsibilities that include being active and informed contributors to their chosen disciplines and to the FGCU community of students and colleagues; maintaining a commitment to intellectual and professional growth, honoring all facets of academic integrity; and achieving sustained productivity in teaching, service, and scholarship and/or professional development. This document, the PECAP, presents the formal framework by which the Arts and Sciences faculty will be evaluated in fulfilling these multiple responsibilities. Faculty members are expected to manage their own professional career development and to be familiar with appropriate evaluation criteria and processes.

The content of the PECAP has been influenced by factors both within and beyond the direct control of the College of Arts and Sciences. First, it must accommodate the special needs and attributes of the CAS, which houses the greatest diversity of disciplines and the most philosophically comprehensive mission. Additionally, it must be sufficiently balanced, both in its challenge for excellence and in its assurance of fairness, that the faculty of the College, peer reviewers, and supervisory administrators at all levels are bound by the PECAP as the sole means of evaluating the performance of in-unit faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences.

1 SCOPE

1.1 PURPOSE

The PECAP must harmonize with policies and procedures codified at the University level in both the most current approved Faculty Performance and Evaluation Document (FPED) and the most current approved Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This document shall govern all aspects of performance expectations, annual evaluation, and promotion review of in-unit faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences. Evaluation events are structured performance reviews that require a coordinated exchange of documents between faculty members and administrators or other designated evaluators and, in the case of annual review, in-person discussion regarding assignment and performance. Criteria for evaluation and Standards for meeting those Criteria are presented in this document under Section 3 (Annual Evaluation), and will additionally be used as the principal indicators of quality performance in promotion review. Representative professional activities fulfilling those Criteria to the degrees noted are presented in Appendices 3-8.

1.2 STATUS

The College recognizes that the master document governing faculty performance evaluation at Florida Gulf Coast University is the most current approved Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), which stipulates that each university department/unit shall develop and maintain procedures to evaluate each employee. Those procedures for the College of Arts and Sciences are detailed in the Performance Evaluation Criteria and Process (PECAP) document. A companion document at the university level, the Faculty Performance Evaluation Document (FPED), outlines commonly held university principles, as well as schedules and documentation requirements for performance reviews in all faculty contract categories. The PECAP elaborates and clarifies the faculty evaluation process with regard to the special needs and attributes of the College in a manner consistent with the FPED and the CBA. These three documents constitute the *entire description* of formal process for faculty performance evaluation.

1.2.1 LIMITATIONS

In the event that any provision of the PECAP is inconsistent with any CBA that may be in force concomitantly, the CBA shall take precedence.

1.3 ADOPTION & REVISION

Revision of any or all of the PECAP in force may be solicited at any time by any faculty member governed by the PECAP through a written petition to the CGT. The CGT may determine at its sole discretion whether a proposed revision constitutes a substantive revision. A proposed revision that is deemed non-substantive may be made to the PECAP by the CGT without a faculty vote provided a majority of CGT members approve the revision. Revisions deemed substantive by the CGT shall be submitted to a faculty vote according to the procedure below. Any substantive revision at the University level to either the FPED or the CBA shall trigger a review of the PECAP by the CGT for consistency.

All substantive revisions to the PECAP shall be submitted to a confirmatory vote by secret ballot among all College faculty who are deemed eligible for this purpose according to the College Bylaws. Voting shall be conducted in a suitable format by the College Governance Team (CGT). In the event that the PECAP (in whole or in part) is not approved by a simple majority faculty vote, it may be revised and re-submitted for approval.

In accordance with the CBA, any substantive revision to the PECAP shall not become effective until one (1) year following adoption of the changes, unless mutually agreed to in writing by the UFF President and the University President or representative (See CBA Articles 10.3.A and 15.2.B.4.).

1.4 APPLICABILITY

The PECAP applies to all faculty members who occupy bargaining unit positions under the CBA. More specifically, it applies to all full-time non-administrative faculty members who hold tenured positions, FMYA contracts, or CMYA contracts, with or without modifications including, but not limited to, visiting or provisional appointments. Specific evaluation events for a particular faculty member shall be determined by contract status, promotion status, probationary status, tenure status, and/or similar factors. The Criteria and Standards that have been explicated in this document shall apply in all evaluation cases.

1.5 NOTICES

Subject to §1.5.I hereof, all formal annual evaluation and/or promotion review documents will be considered delivered:

- (a) To a faculty member on the date such notice is either placed in his/her campus mailbox, or on the date such notice is mailed to his/her address, such address being the most current address in the faculty member's personnel file.
- (b) To an administrator on the date such notice is either placed in his/her campus mailbox, or on the date such notice is mailed to his/her campus address.
- (c) To the PRSC on the date such notice is either placed in the PRSC chair's campus mailbox, or on the date such notice is mailed to his/her campus address.

Responsibility for confirmation of delivery rests with the sending party. All notices shall be treated as confidential correspondence.

1.5.1 TEMPORARY ADDRESS

If applicable, the faculty member must declare in writing a temporary address to his/her supervisor for delivery of formal documents associated with annual evaluation and/or promotion. This temporary address may be modified by further written notice by the faculty member to the supervisor at any time during the term. Responsibility for confirmation of delivery rests with the sending party.

1.6 DEFAULT FORMAT OF DOCUMENTATION

In the event that Appendix 2 hereof does not specify the content and/or format of any document generated under the authority and application of the PECAP, the document may be styled in any manner acceptable for its intended purpose and/or recipient(s).

1.7 PERFORMANCE RECOGNITION PROGRAMS

Periodically, the University may choose to recognize superior faculty performance through one-time pay adjustments or other financial and non-financial awards. Responsibility for such evaluations shall be vested in the faculty committees or administrative bodies that are empowered to make the award(s). The PECAP defers to such committees or administrative bodies with regard to all aspects of these evaluations. However, the evaluative instruments mandated by the PECAP may be used as a basis for such adjustments or awards with the prior consent of the faculty member being considered.

2 PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS BY RANK AND LEVEL

The following performance expectations are to be used both for the purposes of promotion and for the annual evaluation process. They provide a guide for a faculty member of any rank or level to use when selecting specific activities to evidence performance in each of the relevant categories of professional activity. Performance in all three categories will be evaluated for promotion, but since individual and institutional purposes change from year to year, individual annual assignments will vary as reflected in each faculty member's PDP.

2.1. RANKED FACULTY

2.1.1 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Assistant professors are assumed to have limited experience as faculty members, hence expectations for their teaching performance are confined to basic competencies. As assistant professors develop experience, they will engage in reflective self-assessment of teaching styles and methods to ensure consistently effective instructional performance. An assistant professor will embrace one or more of the College Criteria for scholarship and begin to develop a record of scholarly activity. Service expectations for assistant professors will depend on their interests and abilities as well as on their familiarity with the constituencies they may engage. Typically, they will initially meet their service commitment in their program or department, then expand to the College, University, and/or community-at-large.

2.1.2 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Associate professors are experienced faculty members who have established credentials as consistently effective teachers, who have developed records of ongoing scholarly activity and service contributions, and are beginning to take leadership roles in their programs/departments. They will approach teaching with a spirit of innovation and reflection; they will remain current with the core of their disciplines; and they will participate in curriculum development and management. Their performance as scholars will exceed that of assistant professors, particularly

in broadening dissemination of their work. Associate professors should satisfy their service requirement in several areas, one of which should represent active and sustained commitment.

2.1.3 PROFESSOR

Professors are faculty whose careers have shown active and sustained productivity, effectiveness, and leadership in teaching, scholarship, and service. They are experienced faculty members who have demonstrated teaching excellence. They will serve as mentors for junior faculty, assume leadership roles in curriculum design and program assessment, and exhibit broad and current knowledge of their core specialties. Professors should exceed the scholarly activity deemed appropriate for an associate professor, particularly with regard to peer reviewed output, and should function as leaders in their chosen field. Likewise, professors should demonstrate an ongoing commitment to service, with evidence of leadership.

2.1.4 EMINENT SCHOLAR/ENDOWED CHAIR

Evaluation of in-unit Eminent Scholars and faculty in Endowed Chairs will follow the Criteria and Standards defined for their rank in PECAP Section 3: Annual Evaluation, with additional consideration of duties and responsibilities specific to the position as stated in the faculty member's PDP and addressed in the APDR.

2.2 INSTRUCTORS

2.2.1 INSTRUCTOR I

Level I instructors are assumed to have limited experience as faculty members, hence expectations for their teaching performance are confined to basic competencies. They will engage in reflective self-assessment of teaching styles and methods to ensure consistently effective instructional performance. For service, level I instructors are expected to engage principally in teaching- and program-related service and professional development activities.

2.2.2 INSTRUCTOR II

Level II instructors are experienced faculty members who have established credentials as consistently effective teachers. They are expected to approach teaching with a spirit of innovation and reflection. A level II instructor will be expected to embrace one of the College Criteria for professional development, broadly defined, and begin to develop a corresponding record of activity. Service expectations for level II instructors are dependent on their interests and abilities, as well as familiarity with the constituencies they may engage. They will engage their service commitment in their program/department, the College, University, and/or community-at-large.

2.2.3 INSTRUCTOR III

Level III instructors are faculty whose careers have shown active and sustained productivity, effectiveness, and leadership in teaching and service. They are experienced faculty members who have demonstrated teaching excellence. A level III instructor will engage in active and sustained service commitments in their program/department, College, University, and/or community at large. A level III instructor is expected to embrace one or more of the College Criteria for professional development broadly defined, and show a record of significant activity.

2.3 ACADEMIC ADVISORS

2.3.1 ACADEMIC ADVISOR I

Level I advisors are assumed to have limited experience as advisors; hence expectations for their advising/teaching performance are confined to basic competencies. As level I advisors develop experience, they will engage in reflective self-assessment of advising/teaching styles and methods to ensure consistently effective advising/teaching performance. A level I advisor will take on initial service duties to meet the needs of CAS Advising. Level I advisors also will pursue initial professional development opportunities.

2.3.2 ACADEMIC ADVISOR II

Level II advisors are experienced advisors whose performance records display consistency and effectiveness. They will approach advising/teaching with a spirit of innovation and reflection. In addition, a level II advisor will take an active role in service, first to meet the needs of CAS Advising and then to the larger university community as needed. In terms of professional development, a level II advisor routinely will engage in program and policy development, participate in post-baccalaureate coursework, workshops, or conferences, and demonstrate consistency in leading advising presentations or workshops for constituents of the University community.

2.3.3 ACADEMIC ADVISOR III

Level III advisors have established careers that demonstrate active and sustained productivity, effectiveness, and leadership in advising/teaching, professional development, and service. They will serve as advising mentors and assume leadership roles in program and policy development. A level III advisor will have a Masters degree in advising, education, counseling, administration, or related field, or a Masters degree from a discipline supported by the College. A level III advisor will embrace service duties and, as called upon, take on leadership roles in service as appropriate and which fulfill professional interests and talents.

3 ANNUAL EVALUATION

This section describes the Criteria held in common by faculty members in the College and the Standards used to gauge performance in support of these Criteria (The phrase "Criteria and Standards" is used to be consistent with language of the CBA). The use of Criteria and Standards will aid faculty in designing and pursuing a mix of professional activities that fulfills their responsibilities to the University. In turn, these Criteria and Standards will be used as the evaluation framework for the Annual Evaluation process. The activities a faculty member intends to pursue as evidence of performance during a given evaluation year are summarized in the annual Professional Development Plan (PDP), drafted by the faculty member with input from his/her supervisor. At the end of the evaluation year, the faculty member submits to his/her supervisor an Annual Professional Development Report (APDR) explaining which activities were actually accomplished. The fundamental process of evaluation, then, involves comparing attainment of the Criteria and Standards set forth by the College in this document (i.e., the PECAP) to the objectives and goals set forth by the faculty member in his/her PDP and to what was accomplished as reflected in the APDR.

It is understood that the following Criteria and Standards constitute the entire basis for evaluating the professional activities of a faculty member with regard to fulfillment of his/her contractual obligations to the University. Responsibility for preparing the APDR, which includes the selection of specific activities to evidence performance and establishes support of the Criteria by an appropriate degree of fulfillment of the Standards, rests solely with the individual faculty member.

The three categories of professional activity in which ranked faculty shall be evaluated are *teaching, scholarship, and service*; the three categories of professional activity in which instructors shall be evaluated are *teaching, service, and professional development/scholarship*; and the three categories of professional activity in which academic advisors shall be evaluated are *advising/teaching, professional development, and service*. This section sets forth the Criteria established for each of these categories and the Standards by which performance with regard to these Criteria may be assessed.

The PECAP adopts the consistent terminology of the FPED with regard to rating the outcome of assessment with respect to Criteria and Standards. The terms "*satisfactory*" and "*unsatisfactory*" are reserved for *overall* performance with respect to teaching, advising, scholarship, professional development, and service (as applicable) collectively in an evaluation year or other assessment time frame. The terms "*exceeds*," "*meets*," and "*does not meet*" are reserved for assessments with respect to teaching, advising, scholarship, professional development, and service (as applicable) individually in an evaluation year, and it is understood that what is being exceeded, met, or not, as the case may be, are the *objectives* stated by the faculty member in the PDP with regard to evaluation Criteria and Standards.

3.1 RANKED FACULTY

3.1.1 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR TEACHING (RANKED FACULTY)

CRITERIA

Teaching is the most important of the three categories of professional activity and is broadly defined to include activities that impart knowledge both inside and outside the traditional classroom setting. These activities include, but are not limited to, teaching on-campus and distance learning courses, mentoring students within the faculty member's area of expertise, supervising scholarly work by students, and developing technological systems that supplement the classroom experience.

The following Criteria are held in common by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and are complementary to the model proposed by Boyer (1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*). Demonstrated support of these Criteria may be used by a faculty member to evidence performance in teaching:

Required

- (a) Discipline competence and discovery: Engaging in the pursuit of knowledge with students by drawing on a command of disciplinary content and of pedagogical methods with measurable performance. This includes continual engagement with evolving disciplinary knowledge and presenting that knowledge in varied teaching settings.
- (b) Reflection: Utilizing thoughtful examination of instructional methods, objectives, and/or student learning outcomes with the goal of learning from and improving on one's own teaching.

Optional

- (c) Interdisciplinarity and integration: Interpreting, integrating, and drawing conclusions across disciplines that intersect with the faculty member's area of expertise so as to enhance student learning.
- (d) Innovation and application: Engaging in appropriate experimentation, or implementing innovative strategies in order to improve student learning and interest in the subject matter. Engaging with the scholarship of teaching and learning as a means to develop and/or implement innovative techniques and pedagogies.
- (e) Stewardship: Reinforcing and advancing the broader goals of the College and the University.

STANDARDS

The following Standards apply to the Criteria of teaching identified in §3.1.1. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a narrative with supporting evidence, addressing the appropriate Standards below, that describes how his/her teaching supports the Criteria articulated. A partial list is provided in Appendix 3 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence teaching in the various disciplines represented within the College.

(a) Teaching competence

(i) Clear goals

Course objectives

- Issues addressed are of importance to the subject matter
- Goals are realistic and achievable
- Clear indication of course expectations

(ii) Adequate preparation

- Demonstrated understanding of course topics
- Prepared for class
- Ability to access appropriate resources to carry out objectives

(iii) Appropriate methods

- Understanding and application of teaching to different types of students (majors, minors, general education, lower-level, upper-level, undergraduate, graduate)
- Use of fair and effective methods for evaluating student work
- Amount of material covered (balance between breadth and depth, as appropriate)
- Material presented in a logical manner

(iv) Significant results

- Evidence of stimulating student interest
- Improving recognized competencies
- Learning valuable skills
- Evidence of competencies gained

(v) Effective presentation

- Evidence of clarity of course materials

(vi) Reflective critique

- Thoughtful reflection on successes and areas of improvement
- Ability to connect separate tasks or projects from a course as integral pieces of a larger and longer-term intellectual endeavor
- Identification of existing teaching strengths and areas for development, creation of strategies for improvement and continual effectiveness, incorporation of feedback from peers and students, and appropriate revision of course syllabi and teaching methods.
- Application of self-assessment to improve instructional effectiveness.

(b) Teaching effectiveness as measured by:

- (i) Standardized University evaluation forms and other course-based student assessment of instruction
 - (ii) Peer evaluation of classroom instruction or teaching approach
- (c) Teaching development and application:
- (i) Development of new courses
 - (ii) Substantive revisions of courses taught repeatedly
 - (iii) Implementation of innovations in student learning (e.g., inquiry-based learning, service learning, alternative delivery methods) as appropriate to the subject matter
 - (iv) Integration of appropriate technology
 - (v) Team teaching
 - (vi) Application of knowledge acquired through participation in seminars, workshops, or conferences on teaching as well as through participation in teaching cells, teaching squares, peer coaching, mentoring, or teaching breakfasts.
- (d) Teaching stewardship: Advancing the missions of the College and University by contributions to, for example, general education, interdisciplinary studies, culturally diverse perspective, service learning, ecological perspective, and civic engagement.
- (e) Teaching environment: Different teaching environments present different challenges to a faculty member. The teaching environment should be considered as an influential factor in the evaluation of teaching performance, as it provides a context in which teaching and learning take place.
- (i) Class size
 - (ii) Course classification (e.g., general education, upper division, graduate; required or elective; lab or lecture; in class, virtual, hybrid)
 - (iii) Attrition rate across sections of the same course
 - (iv) Effects of team teaching
 - (v) New course preparation
 - (vi) Presence of teaching assistant(s)
 - (vii) Web supported classes

3.1.2 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP (RANKED FACULTY)

CRITERIA

Although scholarship may directly or indirectly support teaching, its primary purpose is to expand what is known, what has been created, or what has been performed. The intensity of scholarship may ebb and flow depending on the cycle of competing professional demands and on the availability of relevant resources; nonetheless, a continuous career-long commitment to scholarship is an essential component of the academy.

The following Criteria are held in common by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and are derived largely from the broad view of scholarship proposed by Boyer (1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*). Demonstrated support of one or more of these Criteria may be used by a faculty member to evidence performance in scholarship:

- (a) Discovery: Contributions to the advancement of the discipline through scholarship generally recognized as appropriate to the field.
- (b) Integration: Scholarship that cultivates intellectual breadth through connections with disciplines that have a demonstrated relevance to the faculty member's home discipline, and through multidisciplinary collaborations.
- (c) Application: Scholarship that is directly used to address or solve consequential problems, or which informs clinical or professional practice via community-engaged scholarship.
- (d) Teaching: Scholarship that examines the teaching and learning process.
- (e) Stewardship: Alignment of scholarly objectives with the mission and broader goals of the College or University.

STANDARDS

Standards gauge how effectively the above Criteria are met. Just as not all Criteria may apply to a faculty member during a specific performance evaluation, not all Standards may apply to each Criterion. In addition, Standards may overlap one another in the sense that they gauge two or more aspects of the same activity. The nature of scholarship and the relative weight placed on individual scholarly products varies by discipline. It is therefore incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a narrative with supporting evidence, addressing the appropriate Standards below, that describes how his/her scholarly activity supports the Criteria for scholarship

articulated in §3.1.2. A partial list is provided in Appendix 4 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence scholarship in the various disciplines represented within the College.

Scholarship is measured as a function not only of the level of productivity involved, but also, and more importantly, of the quality of the work produced. Therefore, overall quality is a principal Standard applied to any single scholarly product.

The Standards that address the Criteria of §3.1.2 are:

(a) Scholarly process (adapted from Glassick et al. 1997, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*)

(i) Clear goals

- Statement of purpose
- Realistic and achievable objectives
- Identification of important questions

(ii) Adequate preparation

- Sophisticated understanding of existing work in the field
- Mastery of necessary skills
- Ability to secure essential resources

(iii) Appropriate methods

- Effective selection and application of methods appropriate to the project's goals
- Ability to modify procedures in response to changing circumstances

(iv) Significant results

- Achievement of goals
- Substantive contribution to the field
- Project opens areas for further exploration

(v) Effective presentation

- Suitable style and organization used to present the work
- Appropriate forums used to communicate the work to its intended audiences
- Work presented with clarity and integrity

(vi) Reflective critique

- Reflective/creative examination of the project
- Reflective critique is of significant breadth
- Evidence of applying reflective critique to improve subsequent work

(b) Stage of completion. For example, published works are assigned higher relative value than those in press, those in press are assigned higher relative value than those in review, etc.

(c) Scope and results of critical review of scholarship according to disciplinary norms.

For example, scholarly works that have undergone rigorous, external peer review are assigned higher relative value than works that have undergone less rigorous or internal review only.

- (d) Degree to which scholarship is disseminated within the profession. For example, scholarship that is broadly disseminated to a national or international professional audience is assigned higher relative value than scholarship that is disseminated only locally.
- (e) Level of productivity in adding substantively to the body of knowledge or work that characterizes a discipline, interdisciplinary study, or pedagogy.
- (f) Level of scholarly productivity in contributing to the mission of the College or University (i.e., stewardship), including the acquisition of tangible resources that enhance the University's scholarly infrastructure, teaching and learning, or opportunities for service.
- (g) Degree to which scholarship represents original research. For example, original research is assigned higher relative value than reviews of research.
- (h) Degree to which the results of scholarship are used (e.g., decision making, policy development, resource management, planning, resource allocation, technical efficiency, etc.) in addressing social and environmental issues and in solving related problems, and in pursuing the ideals and aspirations of community-engaged scholarship.
- (i) Degree to which the work of the individual faculty member contributed to the total scholarly product (i.e., works with multiple contributors or collaborators).

3.1.3 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR SERVICE (RANKED FACULTY)

Service includes service to the University or any of its parts, service to the faculty member's discipline or profession, service rendered in interdisciplinary efforts, service related to teaching, and community service that derives from the faculty member's association with the University, discipline, or profession. Activities qualifying as service shall be verifiable with respect to a faculty member's individual participation and responsibilities. For the purpose of evaluation, the role of Program Leader is considered a service activity in the College. In all other cases, activities for which there is remuneration beyond faculty salary (other than nominal honoraria or reimbursement of expenses, shall not qualify as faculty service.

CRITERIA

The following Criteria are held in common by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and are complementary to the model proposed by Boyer (1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*). Demonstrated support of one or more of these Criteria may be used by a faculty member to evidence performance in service:

- (a) Service to the profession (discovery): Contributions that support the work of professional associations and organizations affiliated with the faculty member's discipline.
- (b) Interdisciplinary service (integration): Contributions that support the work of professional associations and organizations that have interdisciplinary missions or goals.
- (c) Outreach (application): Contributions that support organizations, programs, and activities beyond the University that nonetheless connect with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.
- (d) Learning enrichment (teaching): Contributions that advance the teaching and learning enterprise beyond its role in the conventional instructional mission.
- (e) Stewardship: Contributions at all levels to the governance of the University and its parts; to the development, improvement and enhancement of University or College programs; and to the mentorship of junior faculty.

STANDARDS

Standards gauge how effectively the above Criteria are met. Just as not all Criteria may apply to one faculty member during a specific annual evaluation, not all Standards may apply to each Criterion. In addition, Standards may overlap one another in the sense that they gauge two or more aspects of the same activity. The following Standards apply to the Criteria of service identified in §3.1.3. Because the nature of service and of the relative weight placed on individual service activities varies by discipline, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a narrative with supporting evidence of how his/her service activities support the Criteria articulated. A partial list is provided in Appendix 5 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence service in the various disciplines represented within the College.

Service is gauged not only as a function of the level of responsibility involved but also of the scope of the contributions made. The following Standards may be used to gauge attainment of one or more of the above Criteria in service:

- (a) Level of responsibility. For example, leadership is assigned higher relative value than routine participation.
 - (i) Association that is either affiliated with the faculty member's discipline or pursues an interdisciplinary mission or interdisciplinary goals.

- (ii) Organization, program, or other activity beyond the University that nonetheless connects with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.
 - (iii) Committee, task force, team, or other formal group involved in the governance of the University or any of its parts.
- (b) Scope of contributions made. For example, substantive contributions to the work of a committee, association, or organization are assigned higher relative value than perfunctory service.
- (i) Association that is either affiliated with the faculty member's discipline or pursues an interdisciplinary mission or interdisciplinary goals.
 - (ii) Organization, program, or other activity beyond the University that nonetheless connects with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.
 - (iii) Committee, task force, team, or other formal group involved in the governance of the University or any of its parts.
 - (iv) Activity that enhances the teaching and learning enterprise beyond its normal role (e.g., additional hours contributed to enhance the classroom experience, additional hours contributed to course-specific service learning activities, etc.).
- (c) Degree of commitment. For example, ongoing, regular service rendered is assigned higher relative value than sporadic or short-term service. Nonetheless, it is important to consider that some relatively short-term service commitments are much more time and labor intensive than commitments of longer calendar duration.
- (i) Association that is either affiliated with the faculty member's discipline or pursues an interdisciplinary mission or interdisciplinary goals.
 - (ii) Organization, program, or other activity beyond the University that nonetheless connects with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.
 - (iii) Committee, task force, team, or other formal group involved in the governance of the University or any of its parts.
 - (iv) Activity that enhances the teaching and learning enterprise beyond its normal role (e.g., additional hours contributed to enhance the classroom experience,

additional hours contributed to course-specific service learning activities, etc.).

- (v) Mentoring (i.e., support and encouragement) of junior faculty in their pursuit of contributions to teaching, scholarship, service, advising, or other activities related to professional development.
- (d) Mission or scope of the committee or organization to which service is rendered. For example, service to a committee charged with greater responsibility (e.g., one that addresses systemic or consequential issues or problems within the University) is assigned higher relative value than service on a committee with a less substantive charge (e.g., departmental search committee, though still recognized as important to the missions of the University and the College); and service to an organization or professional association that is national in scope is assigned higher relative value than service to one that is local.
 - (i) Association that is either affiliated with the faculty member's discipline or pursues an interdisciplinary mission or interdisciplinary goals.
 - (ii) Organization, program, or other activity beyond the University that nonetheless connects with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.
 - (iii) Committee, task force, team, or other formal group involved in the governance of the University or any of its parts.

3.2 INSTRUCTORS

3.2.1 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR TEACHING (INSTRUCTORS)

CRITERIA

Teaching is the most important of the three categories of professional activity and is broadly defined to include activities that impart knowledge both inside and outside the traditional classroom setting. These activities include teaching on-campus and distance learning courses, mentoring students within the faculty member's area of expertise, supervising scholarly work by students, and developing technological systems that supplement the classroom experience.

The following Criteria are held in common by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and are complementary to the model proposed by Boyer (1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*). Demonstrated support of these Criteria may be used by a faculty member to evidence performance in teaching:

Required

- (a) Discipline competence and discovery: Engaging in the pursuit of knowledge with students by drawing on a command of disciplinary content and of pedagogical methods with measurable performance. This includes continual engagement with evolving disciplinary knowledge and presenting that knowledge in varied teaching settings.
- (b) Reflection: Utilizing thoughtful examination of instructional methods, objectives, and/or student learning outcomes with the goal of learning from and improving on one's own teaching.

Optional

- (c) Interdisciplinarity and integration: Interpreting, integrating, and drawing conclusions across disciplines that intersect with the faculty member's area of expertise so as to enhance student learning.
- (d) Innovation and application: Engaging in appropriate experimentation or implementing innovative strategies in order to improve student learning and interest in the subject matter. Engaging with the scholarship of teaching and learning as a means to develop and/or implement innovative techniques and pedagogies.
- (e) Stewardship: Reinforcing and advancing the broader goals of the College and University.

STANDARDS

The following Standards apply to the Criteria of teaching identified in §3.2.1. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a narrative with supporting evidence, addressing the appropriate Standards below, that describes how his/her teaching supports the Criteria articulated. A partial list is provided in Appendix 3 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence teaching in the various disciplines represented within the College.

(a) Teaching competence

(i) Clear goals

- Course objectives
- Issues addressed are of importance to the subject matter
- Goals are realistic and achievable
- Clear indication of course expectations

(ii) Adequate preparation

- Demonstrated understanding of course topics
- Prepared for class
- Ability to access appropriate resources to carry out objectives

(iii) Appropriate methods

- Understanding and application of teaching as it relates to different types of students (majors, minors, general education, lower-level, upper-level, undergraduate, graduate)
 - Use of fair and effective methods for evaluating student work
 - Amount of material covered (balance between breadth and depth, as appropriate)
 - Material presented in a logical manner
- (iv) Significant results
- Evidence of stimulating student interest
 - Improving recognized competencies
 - Learning valuable skills
 - Evidence of competencies gained
- (v) Effective presentation
- Evidence of clarity of course materials
- (vi) Reflective critique
- Thoughtful reflection on successes and areas of improvement
 - Ability to connect separate tasks or projects from a course as integral pieces of a larger and longer-term intellectual endeavor
 - Identification of existing teaching strengths and areas for development, creation of strategies for improvement and continual effectiveness, incorporation of feedback from peers and students, and appropriate revision of course syllabi and teaching methods.
 - Application of self-assessment to improve instructional effectiveness
- (b) Teaching effectiveness as measured by:
- (i) Standardized University evaluation forms and other course-based student assessments of instruction
- (ii) Peer evaluation of classroom instruction or teaching approach
- (c) Teaching development and application:
- (i) Development of new courses
- (ii) Substantive revisions in repeated course taught
- (iii) Implementation of innovations in student learning (e.g., inquiry-based learning, service learning, alternative delivery methods) as appropriate to the subject matter
- (iv) Integration of appropriate technology

- (v) Team teaching
- (vi) Application of knowledge acquired through participation in seminars, workshops, or conferences on teaching as well as through participation in teaching cells, teaching squares, peer coaching, mentoring, or teaching breakfasts.
- (d) Teaching stewardship: Advancing the missions of the College and University by contributions to, for example, general education, interdisciplinary studies, culturally diverse perspective, service learning, ecological perspective, and civic engagement.
- (e) Teaching environment: Different teaching environments present different challenges to a faculty member. Although not a Standard per se, teaching environment should be considered as an influential factor in the evaluation of teaching performance, as it provides a context in which teaching and learning take place.
 - (i) Class size
 - (ii) Course classification (e.g., general education, upper division, graduate; required or elective; lab or lecture; in class, virtual, hybrid)
 - (iii) Attrition rate across sections of the same course
 - (iv) Effects of team teaching
 - (v) New course preparation
 - (vi) Presence of teaching assistant(s)
 - (vii) Web supported classes

3.2.2 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT/ SCHOLARSHIP (INSTRUCTORS)

Professional development relates to skills and knowledge attainment that pertain to career advancement, preparation, education, teaching, or contributions to one's field or to

interdisciplinary study. In the evaluation of professional development/scholarship, instructor level and specific items in an instructor's formal assignment may impact the time available to adequately pursue such activities and must be taken into consideration. These include class size, teaching load, program-related work, and College or University responsibilities. Moreover,

performance may be influenced by the availability of budgetary and other resources to pursue professional development/scholarship opportunities.

CRITERIA

The following Criteria of professional development/scholarship are held in common by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and are derived largely from the broad view of scholarship proposed by Boyer (1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*). Demonstrated support of one or more of these Criteria may be used by a faculty member to evidence performance in professional development/scholarship:

- (a) Teaching focus: Participation in or contribution to the examination of the teaching and learning process through professional activities that improve teaching skills and promote best teaching practices.
- (b) Stewardship: Alignment of professional objectives with the mission and broader goals of the College or University.
- (c) Discipline benefit: Advancement of the discipline through participation in or contribution to professional development or scholarly activities generally recognized as appropriate to the field, including those activities that represent community-engaged scholarship.
- (d) Interdisciplinary focus: Participation in or contribution to activities that promote interchanges across disciplinary boundaries.

STANDARDS

Standards gauge how effectively the above Criteria are met. Just as not all Criteria may apply to a faculty member during a specific annual evaluation, not all Standards may apply to each Criterion. In addition, Standards may overlap one another in the sense that they gauge two or more aspects of the same activity. The nature of professional development/scholarship and the relative weight placed on individual contributions vary by discipline. It is therefore incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a narrative with supporting evidence, addressing one or more of the Standards below, that describes how his/her professional development/scholarship supports the Criteria articulated in §3.2.2. A partial list of professional development activities and scholarly products is provided in Appendix 6 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence professional development/scholarship for instructors in the various disciplines represented within the College.

The Standards that address the Criteria of §3.2.2 are:

- (a) Degree of involvement in professional development activities (e.g., workshops, conferences, training sessions) that focus on teaching praxis. For example, tangible contributions to such efforts are assigned a higher relative value than attendance or modest participation.
- (b) Degree of involvement in scholarly activities that advance pedagogy, the faculty member's discipline, or interdisciplinary study. For example, a scholarly product in one or more of these areas is assigned a higher relative value than attendance or participation in a professional conference. (See section 2.1.2 for more detailed Standards that can be applied to the evaluation of a single scholarly product).
- (c) Degree of involvement in professional development activities that focus specifically on professional growth as it relates to the faculty member's discipline or profession (e.g., workshops or training sessions on time management, grant writing, portfolio development, etc.).
- (d) Degree of contribution to the mission of the College or University (i.e., stewardship), including the development or acquisition of resources that enhance University infrastructure, teaching and learning, or opportunities for service.
- (e) Professional development through continuous learning, as demonstrated by the completion of coursework or professional certification that enhances teaching, contributions to the faculty member's discipline, or contributions to interdisciplinary efforts (defined as having demonstrated relevance to a faculty member's home discipline).

3.2.3 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR SERVICE (INSTRUCTORS)

Service includes service to the University or any of its parts, service to the faculty member's discipline or profession, service rendered in interdisciplinary efforts, service related to teaching, and community service that derives from the faculty member's association with the University, discipline, or profession. Activities qualifying as service shall be verifiable with respect to a faculty member's individual participation and responsibilities. Activities for which there is remuneration beyond faculty salary (other than nominal honoraria or reimbursement of expenses) shall not qualify as faculty service.

CRITERIA

The following Criteria are held in common by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and are complementary to the model proposed by Boyer (1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*). Demonstrated support of one of more of these Criteria may be used by a faculty member to evidence performance in service:

- (a) Learning enrichment (teaching): Contributions that advance the teaching and learning enterprise beyond its role in the conventional instructional mission.
- (b) Stewardship: Contributions at all levels to the governance of the University and its parts; to the development, improvement and enhancement of University or College programs; and to the mentorship of junior faculty.
- (c) Service to the profession (discovery): Contributions that support the work of professional associations and organizations affiliated with the faculty member's discipline.
- (d) Interdisciplinary service (integration): Contributions that support the work of professional associations and organizations that have interdisciplinary missions or goals.
- (e) Outreach (application): Contributions that support organizations, programs, and activities beyond the University that nonetheless connect with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.

STANDARDS

Standards gauge how effectively the above Criteria are met. Just as not all Criteria may apply to a faculty member during a specific annual evaluation, not all Standards may be applicable to each Criterion. In addition, Standards may overlap one another in the sense that they gauge two or more aspects of the same activity. The following Standards apply to the Criteria of service identified in §3.2.3. Because the nature of service and the relative weight placed on individual service activities varies by discipline, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a narrative with supporting evidence of how his/her service activities support the Criteria articulated. A partial list of service activities is provided in Appendix 5 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence service in the various disciplines represented within the College.

Service is gauged not only as a function of the level of responsibility involved but also of the scope of the contributions made. The following Standards may be used to gauge attainment of one or more of the above Criteria in service:

- (a) Degree of responsibility. For example, leadership is assigned higher relative value than routine participation.
 - (i) Association that is either affiliated with the faculty member's discipline or pursues an interdisciplinary mission or interdisciplinary goals.
 - (ii) Organization, program, or other activity beyond the University that nonetheless connects with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.

- (iii) Committee, task force, team, or other formal group involved in the governance of the University or any of its parts.
- (b) Scope of contributions made. For example, substantive contributions to the work of a committee, association, or organization are assigned higher relative value than perfunctory service.
- (i) Association that is either affiliated with the faculty member's discipline or pursues an interdisciplinary mission or interdisciplinary goals.
 - (ii) Organization, program, or other activity beyond the University that nonetheless connects with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.
 - (iii) Committee, task force, team, or other formal group involved in the governance of the University or any of its parts.
 - (iv) Activity that enhances the teaching and learning enterprise beyond its normal role (e.g., additional hours contributed to enhance the classroom experience, additional hours contributed to course-specific service learning activities, etc.).
- (c) Degree of commitment. For example, ongoing, regular service rendered is assigned higher relative value than sporadic or short-term service. Nonetheless, it is important to consider that some relatively short-term service commitments are much more time and labor intensive than commitments of longer calendar duration.
- (i) Association that is either affiliated with the faculty member's discipline or pursues an interdisciplinary mission or interdisciplinary goals.
 - (ii) Organization, program, or other activity beyond the University that nonetheless connects with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.
 - (iii) Committee, task force, team, or other formal group involved in the governance of the University or any of its parts.
 - (iv) Activity that enhances the teaching and learning enterprise beyond its normal role (e.g., additional hours contributed to enhance the classroom experience, additional hours contributed to course-specific service learning activities, etc.).
 - (v) Mentoring (i.e., support and encouragement) of junior faculty in their pursuit of contributions to teaching, scholarship, service, advising, or other activities related to professional development.

- (d) Mission or scope of the committee or organization to which service is rendered. For example, service to a committee charged with greater responsibility (e.g., one that addresses systemic or consequential issues or problems within the University) is assigned higher relative value than service on a committee with a less substantive charge (e.g., departmental search committee, though still recognized as important to the missions of the University and the College).
- (i) Association that is either affiliated with the faculty member's discipline or pursues an interdisciplinary mission or interdisciplinary goals.
- (ii) Organization, program, or other activity beyond the University that nonetheless connects with the mission of the University/College or with the faculty member's discipline or profession.
- (iii) Committee, task force, team, or other formal group involved in the governance of the University or any of its parts.

3.3 ACADEMIC ADVISORS

3.3.1 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR ADVISING/TEACHING (ACADEMIC ADVISORS)

Academic advising is an integral form of education, and academic advisors are expected to demonstrate professional competencies in the categories of advising/teaching, professional development, and service. An academic advisor shall state objectives with regard to all applicable Criteria and Standards as part of his/her PDP at the beginning of the evaluation year. At the end of the evaluation year, the academic advisor shall substantiate performance with respect to all applicable Criteria and Standards by adducing evidence in some form that is acceptable, by prior agreement, to his/her supervisor. Advisor level shall be considered in assigning ratings.

CRITERIA

Advising/teaching is the most important of the three categories of professional activity for an academic advisor. The following Criteria are held in common by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and are complementary to the model proposed by Boyer (1990, *Scholarship*

Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate). Demonstrated support of these Criteria may be used by an academic advisor to evidence performance in advising/teaching:

Required

- (a) Advising competence: Sufficient command of the advising/teaching process, including techniques and approaches (best practices) used in advising/teaching.
- (b) Integration: Sufficient familiarity with the requirements of College programs (majors and minors) to advise students effectively according to program, including interdisciplinary programs; and sufficient familiarity with relevant University policies and procedures.
- (c) Reflection: Utilizing thoughtful examination of advising/teaching methods and objectives as well as critical feedback of others with the goal of learning from and improving on one's own advising/teaching.

Optional]]

- (d) Innovation and Application: Experimenting with or implementing new strategies to improve the advising/teaching process as well as a demonstrating the ability to solve problems related to advising/teaching that arise during interactions with students.
- (e) Stewardship: Alignment of advising/teaching activities with the missions and broader goals of the College or University.

STANDARDS

The following Standards apply to the Criteria of advising/teaching identified in §3.3.1. It is incumbent upon the academic advisor to provide a narrative with supporting evidence, addressing the appropriate Standards below, that describes how his/her advising/teaching supports the Criteria articulated. A partial list of activities is provided in Appendix 7 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence advising/teaching for academic advisors in the College.

- (a) Reflection: Self-assessment and supervisor evaluations, with additional evaluative input from students as available.
- (b) Peer advising: Including, but not limited to, observations, peer coaching, and mentoring.
- (c) Development of specific procedures, programs and policies that demonstrate innovation and application.
- (d) Applying the results of assessment to sustaining or improving advising/teaching effectiveness, which may include, but is not limited to, the identification of existing advising/teaching strengths and areas for development, creation of strategies for improvement and continual effectiveness, incorporation of feedback

from peers and students, and appropriate revision of advising/teaching programs, policies, and materials.

- (e) Stewardship: Contributions to general education, interdisciplinary studies, culturally diverse perspective, service learning, ecological perspective, civic engagement, and or any other relevant mission.
- (f) Advising environment: Different advising environments present different challenges to an academic advisor. Although not a Standard per se, advising environment should be considered as an influential factor in the evaluation of advising performance, as it provides a context in which advising takes place.
 - (i) Advisor: Student Ratio
 - (ii) Additional workload due to new programs or program revisions
 - (iii) Effects of University resources available for advising

3.3.2 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (ACADEMIC ADVISORS)

It is understood that a continuous career-long commitment to professional development is essential for academic advisors of any level. It is incumbent upon an academic advisor to describe to his/her supervisor how professional development activities projected for an evaluation year bear on the Criteria for professional development. Moreover, at the conclusion of the evaluation year, the academic advisor responsible for clarifying to his/her supervisor how professional development activities completed during the evaluation period achieved, in whole or in part, previously stated objectives.

CRITERIA

The Criteria that may be used to indicate professional development are:

- (a) Discipline focus: Undertaking professional development activities that are generally recognized as appropriate for the discipline of advising.
- (b) Interdisciplinarity: Professional development that cultivates intellectual breadth by seeking connections with disciplines represented in the College or University.
- (c) Pedagogy: Professional development that examines and promotes effective pedagogy or best advising/teaching practices.
- (d) Mentorship: Professional development activities that allow and encourage the meaningful involvement of students or colleagues.

- (e) Stewardship: Professional development activities that are aligned with objectives that support the mission of the College.

STANDARDS

The following Standards apply to the Criteria of professional development identified in §3.3.2. It is incumbent upon the academic advisor to provide a narrative with supporting evidence, addressing the appropriate Standards below, that describes how his/her professional development activities support the Criteria articulated. A partial list of activities is provided in Appendix 8 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence professional development for academic advisors in the College.

- (a) Engagement in activities that contribute substantively to the ability to advise students.
- (b) Engagement in activities that contribute substantively to the pedagogical and programmatic resources that benefit advising services within the College and University.
- (c) Engagement in activities that contribute substantively to peer mentoring.
- (d) Extent that professional development contributes to the missions of the College or University.
- (e) Engagement in activities that contribute to academic disciplines supported by the College.

3.3.3. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR SERVICE (ACADEMIC ADVISORS)

Service includes service to the University or any of its parts, service to the advising profession, and community service that derives from the academic advisor's association with the University or profession. Activities qualifying as service shall be verifiable with respect to an academic advisor's individual participation and responsibilities. Activities for which there is remuneration beyond academic advisor salary (other than nominal honoraria or reimbursement of expenses) shall not qualify as service. It is incumbent upon an academic advisor to describe to his/her supervisor how service activities projected for an evaluation year bear on the Criteria for service. Moreover, at the conclusion of the evaluation year, the academic advisor is responsible for

clarifying to his/her supervisor how service activities completed during the evaluation period achieved, in whole or in part, previously stated objectives.

CRITERIA

The following Criteria are held in common by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences. Demonstrated support of one of more of these Criteria may be used by an academic advisor to evidence performance in service:

- (a) Discipline benefit: Contributions to the health and development of programs sustaining the advising profession within the University and those professional associations dedicated to the advancement of advising/teaching practices in the broader academic community.
- (b) Outreach: Promotion of professional dialogue, cooperation, and accomplishment with communities beyond the University.
- (c) Stewardship: Alignment of service activities with objectives that support the missions of the College or University.

STANDARDS

The following Standards apply to the Criteria of service identified in §3.3.3. It is incumbent upon the academic advisor to provide a narrative with supporting evidence, addressing the appropriate Standards below, that describes how his/her professional development activities support the Criteria articulated. A partial list of activities is provided in Appendix 5 as a guide only to the spectrum of activities that evidence service for academic advisors in the College.

- (a) Level of productive involvement that benefits academic advising
 - (i) Within the College
 - (ii) Within the University
 - (iii) Externally via professional organizations
- (b) Level of productive involvement with constituencies external to the University
- (c) Level of productive involvement with College or University governance and operations

4 PROMOTION

In accordance with the promotion policies outlined in the CBA, the faculty in each of the established colleges/units at FGCU develop and vote on specific criteria to be applied to

promotion decisions at all levels of the process. These criteria are framed to provide guidance to faculty members regarding expectations of achieving promotion, to indicate the breadth and depth of performance factors considered in the promotion process, and to align promotion decisions with the university's mission and the mission of the college. The evaluation process in the College of Arts and Sciences is grounded in the requirements detailed in Section 2 (performance Expectations by Rank and Level); implemented each year through the procedures detailed in Section 3 (Annual Evaluation); and further applied to exemplary performance in promotion cycles.

Faculty members are eligible to apply for promotion after four (4) full years in rank or level (see CBA 14.1.B), with the understanding that eligibility for promotion and readiness for promotion are separate issues. A strong application for promotion will provide clear evidence that the faculty member demonstrates meritorious performance during time in rank/level, is performing currently at the higher rank/level, and indicates a future trajectory of valuable contributions to the university, the community, and the profession.

The three categories of professional activity in which ranked faculty will be evaluated for promotion are *teaching*, *scholarship*, and *service*; the three categories of professional activity in which instructors will be evaluated for promotion are *teaching*, *service*, and *professional development/scholarship*; and the three categories of professional activity in which academic advisors will be evaluated for promotion are *advising/teaching*, *professional development*, and *service*. Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 set forth the Criteria established for each of these categories and the Standards by which performance with regard to these Criteria may be assessed. Demonstrated support of these Criteria will be used by a faculty member to evidence performance in teaching, advising/teaching, scholarship, professional development, and service as appropriate according to rank and level.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member applying for promotion to present a fully supported, deeply reflective narrative as part of a portfolio that is based on clear evidence and analysis of past performance, and strong potential for future growth. Documentation from successive annual evaluation cycles provides the foundation for the promotion application, augmented by the compilation of evidence of professional accomplishments over time, and explicated through the multilayered narrative provided by the faculty member.

4.1. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION (RANKED FACULTY)

The following are examples of criteria that may be used to indicate readiness for promotion:

4.1.1 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

REQUIRED CRITERIA

(a) Consistently strong record of teaching competence and effectiveness, evidenced by evaluations from students, peers, and supervisor(s).

- (b) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of pedagogical skills.
- (c) Evidence of participation in program/department curriculum development and management.
- (d) Evidence of a program to generate scholarly work (broadly defined) beyond that required for a terminal degree in the discipline, and to disseminate that work publicly in a venue (e.g. print, performance, presentation, physical product, etc) that is peer reviewed and appropriate to scholarly practices in the discipline, including those practices representative of community-engaged scholarship.
- (e) Consistent record of service activity in several areas, one of which should represent an active and sustained commitment.

OPTIONAL CRITERIA

In addition to the above required criteria faculty members may also choose to address the following, which are significantly valued by the College and will enhance the promotion application:

- (f) Experience with interdisciplinary teaching and/or scholarship.
- (g) Experience with innovative pedagogical strategies.
- (h) Record of substantive participation at professional meetings.

4.1.2 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR

REQUIRED

- (a) Consistently strong record of teaching competence and effectiveness evidenced by evaluations from students, peers, and supervisor(s).
- (b) Demonstrated program of effective curriculum development and/or pedagogical innovation over time.
- (c) Record of mentoring of faculty colleagues.
- (d) Evidence of an established program of externally peer-reviewed scholarship and/or creative activity, including those activities representative of community-engaged scholarship.
- (e) Evidence of substantial participation within the faculty member's professional community.
- (f) Demonstrated involvement and evidence of leadership in active and sustained service activities in several areas.

OPTIONAL

In addition to the above required criteria faculty members may also choose to address the following, which are significantly valued by the College and will enhance the promotion application:

- (g) Record of peer-reviewed pedagogically related scholarship.
- (h) Demonstrated effort to secure external support for pedagogical and scholarly activities.
- (i) Dissemination of innovative course content outside the University.
- (j) Recognition by peers, professional societies, and/or community groups for exemplary service activities.

4.2 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION (INSTRUCTORS)

4.2.1 INSTRUCTOR I TO INSTRUCTOR II

- (a) Consistently strong record of teaching competence and effectiveness, evidenced by evaluations from students, peers, and supervisor(s).
- (b) Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvement of pedagogical skills.
- (c) Evidence of participation in program/department curriculum development and management.
- (d) An active commitment to service in at least one area.
- (e) Evidence of professional development activity (broadly defined).

4.2.2 INSTRUCTOR II TO INSTRUCTOR III

REQUIRED

- (a) Consistently strong record of teaching competence and effectiveness evidenced by evaluations from students, peers, and supervisor(s).
- (b) Demonstrated program of effective pedagogical development and innovation over time.
- (c) Demonstrated commitment to curriculum and program development.

(d) Evidence of significant activity in professional development (broadly defined).

(e) Consistent record of service activity in several areas, one of which should represent an active and sustained commitment.

OPTIONAL

In addition to the above required criteria faculty members may also choose to address the following, which are significantly valued by the College and will enhance the promotion application:

(f) Significant record of scholarly activities (broadly defined).

4.3 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION (ACADEMIC ADVISORS)

General criteria for promotion are as follows:

(a) Annual evaluations must consistently demonstrate that the academic advisor applying for promotion exceeds the performance norms for his/her level in advising/teaching, with balanced contributions to professional development and service according to expectations for the appropriate advisor level.

(b) The advisor applying for promotion must show an overall record of significant accomplishment, a pattern of increasing success, and recognition by peers for that success.

The following criteria indicate readiness for promotion for academic advisors:

4.3.1 ACADEMIC ADVISOR I TO ACADEMIC ADVISOR II

(a) Consistently strong record of advising/teaching competence and effectiveness evidenced by evaluations from students, peers, and supervisor(s).

(b) Demonstrated commitment to innovation and ongoing improvement of advising/teaching skills.

(c) An active commitment to service in at least one area.

(d) Demonstrated evidence of professional development activities related to program, policy, and advising/teaching improvement.

4.3.2 ACADEMIC ADVISOR II TO ACADEMIC ADVISOR III

(a) Consistently strong record of advising/teaching competence and effectiveness evidenced by evaluations from students, peers, and supervisor(s).

- (b) Demonstrated commitment to improvement and innovation in advising/teaching.
- (c) Demonstrated commitment to leadership in policy and program development.
- (d) Presentations delivered at advising/teaching professional development events.
- (e) Demonstrated commitment to mentoring advising colleagues.
- (f) Consistent record of service activity in several areas, one of which should represent an active and sustained commitment.
- (g) Completion of a Masters degree in advising, counseling, education, administration, or a discipline supported by the College.

4.4 ROLE OF THE PEER REVIEW AND SUPPORT COMMITTEE

The PRSC has three functions, as determined by the College governance documents, and by the duties specified in the FPED:

- (a) To provide assistance and guidance to faculty members preparing documentation for the annual evaluation process, and to facilitate appeals by faculty members with regard to annual performance reviews.
- (b) To advise and mentor faculty with regard to the promotion process, portfolio development, and related issues.
- (c) To review applications for promotion from in-unit faculty members in strict adherence to the guidelines provided in the PECAP, and to render a recommendation to the Dean. The PRSC will perform its duties with particular attention to the timelines specified in the FPED.

APPENDIX 1: DEFINITIONS

In the event that other university documents are revised such that there is a change in nomenclature for any of these definitions, the new name shall take precedence over the old.

APDR- Annual Professional Development Report submitted by faculty to supervisor (see Appendix 2 for format and content).

BOT - Board of Trustees of FGCU.

CBA- Collective Bargaining Agreement, if any, existing during the period of applicability of the PECAP, or its successor document in force, that constitutes the formal contract between the FGCU BOT and any union duly authorized to act on behalf of faculty at FGCU, and regulates the terms of employment for FGCU faculty.

CGT- College Governance Team, or its functional successor within the College.

CMYA - Continuing Multi-year Appointment: Employment contract of three-year duration with an automatic renewal provision contingent upon performance criteria being met.

College- College of Arts and Sciences

Community-engaged scholarship (CES) - The scholarship of engagement is the collaborative generation, refinement, conservation, and exchange of mutually beneficial knowledge by the community and academy with validation by peers in both the community and academy. CES involves faculty operating in partnership with the community and results in scholarship deriving from teaching, discovery, integration, application or engagement. The engagement element is a feature of scholarly activities, not a separate activity; therefore it *unequivocally distinguishes* CES from classification as a service activity. FGCU is classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a “community-engaged institution”.

Portfolio- Tangible materials that provide evidence of performance for evaluation purposes.

Evaluation Conference- Face-to-face meeting between supervisor or other evaluator and faculty member under review to discuss draft evaluation documents.

Evaluation Year - Arbitrary year corresponding to the evaluation cycle that runs from May 1st to April 30th.

FAR- Faculty Activity Report: Pre-formatted summary time sheet for faculty required each semester by the State of Florida.

FMYA - Fixed Multi-Year Appointment: Employment contract of specific duration with no automatic renewal provision.

FPED - Faculty Performance Evaluation Document, the document that specifies basic policies, procedures, and criteria for the various types of faculty evaluation at the university.

Good Standing - Under contract as a full-time faculty member with no probationary status resulting from an unfavorable performance evaluation that withstands any appeal.

In-unit - Under contract in a faculty position governed by any CBA in force; unless noted otherwise, the term *faculty* shall mean *in-unit faculty*.

PDP- Professional Development Plan (see Appendix 2 for format and content).

PECAP - Performance Evaluation Criteria and Process document (this document) specific to the College.

PET - Peer Evaluation of Teaching, broadly defined as an activity that relies on the input and critical feedback of colleagues to improve one's teaching effectiveness and may include (but is not limited to) the use of teaching cells, teaching squares, peer coaching, evaluation of a classroom visit, etc.

PIP - Performance Improvement Plan: Remediation measure associated with substandard performance under the terms of any CMYA or fixed multi-year appointment, and which is expressed as a modification of a subsequent PDP.

PRSC- Peer Review and Support Committee: Standing committee within the College that participates in all faculty performance reviews except annual reviews and sustained performance evaluations.

PRR- Performance Review Report submitted by supervisor to faculty..

Remediation Year - Evaluation year following the evaluation year for which a finding of "*overall unsatisfactory*" has been recorded.

Service Year - Full year of service consists of two semesters of full time employment as Faculty; such semesters not necessarily in sequence, summer terms excluded.

SPE - Sustained Performance Evaluation: Longer term performance review for either tenured or CMYA faculty. FMYA faculty undergo a reappointment evaluation instead.

Supervisor- Chair of the College Department in which the faculty member holds an appointment.

VPAA- Vice-President, Academic Affairs: chief academic officer of the University.

APPENDIX 2: TEMPLATES FOR DOCUMENTATION

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PDP)

1) Short-term Objectives and Long-term Goals

General statement of short-term objectives and long-term goals, including percentage of time allocated to teaching, advising, scholarship, professional development and service (as applicable). Short-term objectives are defined for the evaluation year for which the PDP is being created. Long-term goals are defined for a 3-year period for individuals on continuing contracts and as the length of the contract for individuals on fixed multi-year contracts. Any unanticipated changes in assignments or activities should be provided to the supervisor in the form of an amended PDP. The PDP should provide a narrative outlining how planned or anticipated activities will "meet" or "exceed" the stated objectives based on the Criteria and Standards provided in the Annual Evaluation section of the PECAP.

2) Teaching (Advising/Teaching for academic advisors)

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term goals, including time and resources required to achieve the objectives and goals.
- (b) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives and goals, including a list of classes to be taught.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating achievement of the objectives and goals. This must include self and student evaluations. Although not required for a specific evaluation year, peer evaluation of teaching is required for promotion and should be conducted periodically so that a faculty member can incorporate this additional feedback into his/her teaching praxis.

3) Scholarship/ (Professional Development/Scholarship for instructors; Professional Development for academic advisors)

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term goals, including the time and resources required to achieve the objectives and goals.
- (b) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives and goals.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of objectives and goals (e.g. publications, drafts, participation in workshops or seminars).

4) Service

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term goals.
- (b) Specific activities planned to achieve the objectives and goals.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of the objectives and goals. This must include a list of chairs for committees served on and contacts for other types of service activities.

5) Promotion

As required by the CBA, the supervisor will provide the faculty member with written feedback on progress toward promotion as part of the annual evaluation process. A faculty member who anticipates applying for promotion within two years should provide a statement in the PDP notifying his/her supervisor of this intent.

APPENDIX 2 (CONT'D): TEMPLATES FOR DOCUMENTATION ANNUAL

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT (APDR)

1) Achievement of Short-term Objectives and Long-term Goals

The ADPR will be written to show the level of achievement of the objectives and goals stated in the corresponding PDP. The ADPR shall recap the short-term objectives and long-term goals of the PDP and identify the percentages of time allocated to teaching, advising, scholarship, professional development, and service (as applicable). Short term is defined as the evaluation period covered by the PDP. Long term is defined as the length of contract for individuals on either FMYAs or CMYAs. Any amendments to the PDP shall be discussed in the ADPR. The faculty member should also address in the APDR any challenges encountered in accomplishing specific activities in support of the objectives outlined in the PDP. The APDR should discuss how the activities conducted during the evaluation period "met" or "exceeded" the objectives in the PDP, based on the Criteria and Standards provided in the Annual Evaluation section of the PECAP.

2) Teaching (Advising/Teaching for academic advisors)

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term goals, including time and resources required to achieve the objectives and goals.
- (b) Specific activities conducted to achieve the objectives and goals, including a list of classes taught.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating achievement of the objectives and goals. This must include self and student evaluations.

3) Scholarship (Professional Development/Scholarship for instructors; Professional Development for academic advisors)

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term goals, including the time and resources required to achieve the objectives and goals.
- (b) Specific activities conducted to achieve the objectives and goals.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of objectives and goals (e.g. publications, drafts, participation in workshops or seminars).

4) Service

- (a) Short-term objectives and relation to long-term goals.
- (b) Specific activities conducted to achieve the objectives and goals.
- (c) Evidence for evaluating the achievement of the objectives and goals. This must include a list of chairs for committees served on and contacts for other types of service activities.

APPENDIX 3: EXAMPLES OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES

This list is intended as a guide to the spectrum of activities that can be used to evidence performance in the category of teaching, and is not exhaustive. These examples address teaching conducted both inside and outside the traditional classroom setting.

- Development of new courses and programs
- Substantive revisions in repeated courses taught
- Teaching innovations (e.g., inquiry-based learning, service learning, alternative delivery methods)
- Integration of appropriate technology
- Team teaching
- Participation in teaching cells, teaching squares, peer coaching, mentoring or teaching breakfasts
- Demonstrated application of self-assessment to improve instructional effectiveness
- Contributions to general education, interdisciplinary studies, culturally diverse perspective, ecological perspective, service learning or civic engagement
- Design/production of advising/teaching or program materials adopted by the College (academic advisors)

- Guiding students in recital preparation
- Mentorship of undergraduate student research projects
- Serving as graduate student major professor

- Serving on graduate student thesis committee
- Serving as Honor's student research advisor
- Serving on Honor's student thesis committee
- Mentoring teaching assistants, student workers, and student interns
- Mentorship of K-12 student research projects

APPENDIX 4: EXAMPLES OF SCHOLARLY PRODUCTS (for Ranked Faculty)

This list is intended as a guide to the spectrum of activities that can be used to evidence performance in the category of scholarship, and is not exhaustive. These examples address scholarly products that are pedagogical in nature as well as those that are more technically or creatively oriented.

- Technical books based on original research
- Research monographs
- Book chapters
- Translations of technical books/articles
- Articles and essays, including those in non-academic media considered acceptable for the discipline
- Published book reviews
- Conference/professional presentations
- Patents
- Licensable computer programs
- Technological innovations
- Journal problem solutions
- Publication of case study analyses
- Metastudies
- Edited collection of works
- Analytical reports generated as expressions of community-engaged scholarship
- Writings (e.g. amicus briefs) that address the philosophical basis of the law

- Book length works of a substantially creative nature
- Production of visual/creative art in all media
- Articles, essays, poems, and stories of a substantially creative nature
- Theatrical productions (scenic design, lighting design, sound design, playwriting, and directing)
- Musical compositions
- Performances of theatrical or musical works
- Readings of original works
- Translations of creative works
- Curating exhibits or collections

- Exhibition/performance, publications and reviews
- Film, video, audio

- Textbooks
- Expository articles
- Anthologies
- Research on educational topics
- Commentary on curricular issues
- Commentary on teaching

methodologies Development of
teaching technologies Development of
instructional aids

Peer-reviewed contracts or grant proposals
Non-competitive contracts or grant proposals

APPENDIX 5: EXAMPLES OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES

This list is intended as a guide to the spectrum of activities that can be used to evidence performance in the category of service, and is not exhaustive. Service includes service to the University or any of its parts, service to the discipline or profession, service rendered in interdisciplinary efforts, service related to teaching, and community service that derives from the faculty member's or academic advisor's association with the University, discipline, or profession.

Service to the University or College (including contributions to a department, program, center or institute)

- Faculty Senate
- Program Leadership and/or Program Coordination
- Faculty Laboratory Coordinator
- Standing committee of the University or College
- Ad hoc committee of the University or College
- Council or advisory group/committee
- Event management
- Faculty advisor to a student organization
- Participation in recruitment events
- Presenting teaching workshops for the College, University, or Community
- Coordination and oversight of multiple sections of the same course

Service to the discipline or to interdisciplinary efforts

- Conference/workshop organization
- Contributions to professional association
- Editorial management/oversight of academic publications
- Referee for journals
- Referee for grant proposals
- Reviewer or juror

Service to the community/outreach

Community organization

Community event

Public schools

Expert contact or consultant

Development of educational programs for the community

Participating in community educational programs

Collaboration with news media to educate the general public

APPENDIX 6: EXAMPLES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT/ SCHOLARSHIP ACTIVITIES (INSTRUCTORS)

This list is intended as a guide to the spectrum of activities that can be used to evidence performance in the category of professional development/scholarship for instructors, and is not exhaustive.

Workshops, conferences, seminars, or training sessions on teaching

Workshops or training sessions on time management, grant writing, or portfolio development

Completed coursework

Professional certification

Technical books based on original research

Research monographs

Book chapters

Translations of technical books/articles

Articles and essays Published book

reviews Conference/professional

presentations Patents

Licensable computer programs

Technological innovations

Journal problem solutions

Publication of case study analyses

Metastudies

Edited collection of works

Book length works of a substantially creative nature

Production of visual/creative art in all media

Articles, essays, poems of a substantially creative nature

Theatrical productions (scenic design, lighting design, sound design, playwriting, and directing)

Musical compositions

Performances of theatrical or musical works

Readings of original works

Translations of creative works

Curating exhibits or collections

Exhibition/ performance, publications and reviews

Film, video, audio

Textbooks

Expository articles

Anthologies

Research on educational topics

Commentary on curricular issues

Commentary on teaching

methodologies Development of

teaching technologies Development of

instructional aids

Peer-reviewed contract or grant proposals

Non-competitive contract or grant proposals

APPENDIX 7: EXAMPLES OF ADVISING/TEACHING ACTIVITIES

This list is intended as a guide to the spectrum of activities that can be used to evidence performance in the category of advising/teaching for academic advisors, and is not exhaustive.

Advising of current and prospective students individually regarding major requirements, minor requirements, and course sequencing

Instructing students on efficient use of Gulfline for course schedule search, registration, degree evaluation, and other resources

Advising students in group sessions at transfer orientation and freshmen transition workshops

Advising students who are undeclared

Communicating with program leaders and department chairs about enrollment management

Coordinating with other advising units and student support offices on campus

Advising student-athletes regarding NCAA Division I academic regulations, including progression toward degree
Reviewing articulation of transferred coursework
Preparing and submitting course substitution requests
Contributing to campus-wide projects, including CAPP
Creating and updating major check sheets, minor check sheets, flow charts, and recommended advising tracks
Certifying CAS majors and minors for graduation
Reviewing prerequisite report (SFRRGAM) and notifying/dropping students
Exploring new methods of advising, including appropriate technologies

APPENDIX 8: EXAMPLES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (ACADEMIC ADVISORS)

This list is intended as a guide to the spectrum of activities that can be used to evidence performance in the category of professional development for academic advisors, and is not exhaustive.

Post-baccalaureate and graduate coursework
Attendance/presentation at conferences or workshops related to teaching or to the discipline
Publications related to advising/teaching or to the discipline
Formal presentations related to advising/teaching
Conference/workshop organization