

Berle

Mario Stano

Howard Goldstein

\$WHQWKEHò—
RdatsRulsfOdr

°GH€S

G P9 KWU U%aB

Stationær

Chag

Skion

Chag

Skion

Department of Communication Faculty Annual Evaluation Criteria

A. General

In alignment with college and university guidelines and CBA, the department conducts an annual review of faculty activity. Although the annual review of activity over the preceding calendar year plays an important role in institutional processes such as raises and merit pay and evaluating progress toward tenure and promotion, these processes and expectations for annual evaluation and tenure/promotion are separate, and faculty are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the processes and expectations for both annual review and tenure/promotion. Consequently, a majority of years leading to tenure/promotion does not guarantee a favorable tenure/promotion decision since the latter is based on a full record; multiple years leading to tenure/promotion does not necessarily preclude being approved for tenure/promotion.

Note:

1. In all categories below, faculty will only be evaluated in which they have an annual assignment of effort. For example, instructional faculty will not be evaluated on research unless their annual assignment includes a percentage of effort in research.
2. Faculty members will be responsible for submitting a complete annual report in the designated format by the designated deadline. For classes/assignments that take substantial amount of time, it is helpful to provide additional explanation and supporting materials to the FEC.
3. In cases of significant disruptions to normal working conditions (illnesses, emergencies, etc.), faculty members will endeavor to provide the FEC with information on the impact of the disruption on their work performance and the FEC will endeavor to take the completion when evaluating performance for that year.

B. Evaluation Procedure

In the early spring, faculty will be informed of the deadline for submitting their information to the department for purposes of evaluation. This process involves preparation and submitting supporting documentation (e.g., course syllabi, letters from an editor) in the Faculty Information System in Archivum, which can be done at any time during the year.

The Faculty Evaluation Committees will review the submitted and, using the guidelines below, will arrive at a numerical evaluation score for each member of the faculty. FEC reviews all tenured and pre-tenure faculty as well as instructional faculty. All FEC members participate in the discussion of each member's performance. Assistant professors and only professors decide on numerical ratings for assistant professors and only professors decide on numerical ratings for associate professors. The numerical evaluation should be made in view of the university's standards.

-submitted report of annual activity. Performance in each assigned area of responsibility will be:

weak unsatisfactory

The evaluation committee will submit a brief narrative commentary on the evaluation. At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the department will submit a summary report to the university.

review, the chair of the FEC will enter the evaluations and narratives into the Archivum system and DocuSign. The faculty member has up to seven days to review and sign off, which initiates the process.

The department Chair will conduct an independent evaluation of all the faculty, using the materials submitted. They will submit their numerical and narrative evaluations in Archivum. Faculty will have up to seven days to review and sign, then the evaluations move to CAS.

Note 1: Faculty who do not submit materials for an evaluation will likely be assigned an unsatisfactory for that academic year assessment.

Note 2: The department will ensure that spouses and partners do not evaluate each other.

C. Expectations

1. Teaching

The primary method of assessing excellence in teaching; hence, we encourage instructors to provide evidence of successful teaching that captures engagement and commitment to undergraduate and/or graduate programs in the following manner:

- x Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
- x Submission of a grant proposal
- x Service as a journal editor or associate editor
- x Organizing a scholarly conference
- x An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)
- x A major engaged research publication for academic audience (e.g., white paper)

5. Publication of a single authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution if co-authored), including in a handbook AND any one of the following:

- x Publication of a review essay with substantive length and some original contribution assessing the state of the field
- x Submission of a single authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution if co-authored), including in a handbook
- x Substantial progress on a book manuscript (authored)
- x Publishing a book review or encyclopedia entry
- x Submission of a grant proposal
- x Service as a journal editor or associate editor
- x Organizing a scholarly conference
- x An independently reviewed creative work (e.g., performance, exhibition)
- x A major engaged research publication for academic audience (e.g., white paper)

For an outstanding rating, the overall scholarly record should reflect that the faculty member is in the process of developing or has developed a well-articulated, organized, coherent, and systematic program of scholarship.

b. **Strong (4.0)** should be awarded for any of the following

1. Publication of a single authored or co-authored article or book chapter in a peer reviewed journal or edited volume (with evidence of substantial contribution if co-authored), including in a handbook [What distinguishes this from a 5 is the absence of (1) additional items listed after a 5].

2. Publication of a revised edition of a book (with evidence of substantial revision).

3. Any

x

\$SSURYHG EOFFR YRVW.V

Note: A

service in one additional area that is well beyond the standard assignment, for ex