

Annual Faculty Performance Review Process in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages

Process:

Faculty members under annual review can expect to be evaluated carefully and in good faith by their colleagues, who will compare the achievements of the faculty members under consideration to those of other faculty members in the same department. Faculty members subject to review should understand that the process of review is competitive and, as a consequence, no absolute definitions of satisfactory performance can be given in advance.

All tenured / tenure-track faculty as well as promotion eligible NTT faculty submit annual activity reports. An elected departmental committee (Faculty Evaluation Committee) reviews the reports and assigns a score (1-5). The FEC applies the departmental guidelines (see below) with the understanding that not all scholarly, teaching and service activities will fit neatly into this rubric and some flexibility must be allowed when evaluating individual faculty. Faculty are informed of their score and may appeal to the committee.

The committee reports its recommendations to the chair. The chair conducts an independent review of the reporting faculty and determines the final score, which is forwarded to the Dean.

Unless specific directions for merit raise calculations are issued by the Provost or Dean of the college, merit raises are based primarily on the numerical combined score earned by a faculty member in the annual performance review conducted by the FEC. The chair may make adjustments to account for relevant factors the chair may be aware of such as time-in-rank, cumulative performance over several years, documented negative performance issues of which the FEC might not be aware, or extraordinary performance (e.g. two books in one year). If the adjustment exceeds 0.5 percentage points, the chair will provide a justification to the FEC and the faculty member.

A. Guidelines For Tenured / Tenure Track Faculty

- **Overall:** Faculty receiving a 5 in research or teaching will receive an overall score of 5 unless the score in one of the three areas reviewed is below 3. Otherwise, the percentages are 40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service.

- **Research (40%)**

| | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | Book Published or edited (the latter may be at the discretion of the committee); national or international grant or local, external research grant in an amount over \$20,000, used to support research, receiver of grant must be principle investigator |
| 4+ | If more than one of the criteria for 4 are met or at discretion of the committee |
| 4 | Book in press; 2 articles published; 1 article published that is substantial in length; 1 article published in a prestigious journal |
| 3+: | 1 article published |
| 3 | Work accepted for publication |
| 2 | Work in progress |
| 1 | No scholarly activities, no work in progress |

- **Teaching (40%)**

| | |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | Teaching award received |
| 4+ | Normal teaching load (in most cases this is 3/3) plus dissertation committee member or director of an honors thesis; unpaid overload; study abroad (even if work is paid); extra teaching such as guest lecturing for WCL courses; new course developed |
| 4 | Normal teaching load with good / outstanding teaching evaluations and/or curriculum / course development, above average student mentoring |
| 3 - 3+: | Normal teaching load with little or no curriculum / course development, average to good teaching evaluations |
| 2 -1 | Substandard performance in assigned teaching duties |

- **Service (20%)**

| | |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | Director of program without course reduction; extraordinary amount/nature of service; service within the discipline at a national level; substantial amount of fund raising and community engagement |
| 4 - 4+ | Demonstrably substantial university or college committee work; program director with one course release and significant program-building service or also serving on university / college committees |
| 3- 4 | Normal load of MCL/program service work |
| 2 -1 | Service falls below normal load or does not meet expectations |

B. Guidelines For Promotion-Eligible NTT Faculty

The following general guidelines have been established for use by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, who will assign a score of 1–5 for each NTT faculty member on the basis of documentation submitted each year by the faculty member. These guidelines are meant to be flexible. Not all scholarly and teaching and service activities will fit neatly into this rubric. It is assumed that 80% of the workload for NTT faculty will be teaching and 20% will be service and/or research unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment.

Guidelines for Evaluating Instructional Faculty

(5) Outstanding: will be awarded on a case by case basis when an NTT faculty member exceeds contract obligations through significant service, curriculum development, publications, or other professional activities that benefit the department, or if they are the recipient of a college or university teaching award or an internal or external grant

(4) Excellent: superior teaching performance plus significant curriculum or professional development and/or significant departmental service

(3) Satisfactory: good teaching performance, service and/or research

(2) Improvement needed: documented poor teaching performance, insufficient departmental service or professional or curriculum development

(1) Unsatisfactory: At the discretion of the FEC committee

B. Guidelines For Lecturers:

Lecturers can expect to be evaluated carefully and in good faith each year by their Program Directors. (In the case of lecturers without a Program Director, the Chair of the Department will appoint a reviewer.) The review will be conducted on the basis of course syllabi (to be submitted each semester by the lecturer), course evaluations, grade distributions, and class observation. Class observations will be conducted during the first semester of teaching and periodically thereafter. Lecturers may submit additional evidence of teaching performance (such as tests or assignments or examples of graded work) if they desire. Lecturers will be evaluated with a rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.