SOAN Faculty Performance Expectations

Professional faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching and service (see section 5.224 and 5.226). Professorial faculty members will be measured against the expectations listed under teaching, scholarship and service (see sections 5.224-5.226).

All faculty members should be making progress toward performing at the preferred level in each of the areas applicable to their appointment. The acceptable level describes the minimum performance expected for continued employment. Note: unacceptable performance is defined as below an acceptable level and may require a plan for correction (see 5.370).

The preferred level describes the average or typical performance level for a faculty member making good progress toward final promotion. The exceptional level would characterize and recognize faculty who demonstrated significant achievements, well beyond the preferred level.

All faculty members must have the educational background required and have completed the required years in rank prior to the effective date of promotion or the required years of service prior to the date of awarding of tenure or a three-year extendable appointment (see section 5.223).

In addition, the faculty member's performance portfolio must be reviewed and demonstrate that there are sufficient contributions in each of the areas appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. Faculty must meet or exceed the acceptable performance level in each area applicable to their appointment. The number of areas required to exceed the acceptable level gradually increases (see table below) until all areas must be at the preferred level for final promotion (Senior Instructor 2 or Full Professor). Note: exceptional performance is not expected, nor required for promotion to any rank, however faculty members may elect to replace preferred performance in two areas with acceptable performance in one area and exceptional performance in the other.

Minimum Promotion and Tenure Performance Requirements

	Min Acceptable	Min Preferred	Min Exceptional
SR Instructor 1 (3 year extendable appt.)	1	1	
SR Instructor 2	1	OR	1
Associate	2	1	
Tenure	1 2	OR	1
Professor	1	3 — OR — 1	1

In reviewing the characteristics at each level, no faculty member will exactly fit the description in any one column. The evaluation goal is to identify the column that best describes an individual faculty member's performance in this area.

Teaching Performance Levels

Acceptable Student Learning Experience Survey Reflection

• Evidence of reflective review of Student Learning Experience Survey results, including evidence of responsive adaptation or improvement of instruction

Classroom Instruction

- Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction, such as
- Professional development activities that impacted instruction
- Work with colleagues that impacted instruction
- Evidence of effective practices, such as
- o Reflection and self-improvement
- o Engaging teaching methods
- Providing meaningful classroom experiences

Curricular Development

- Integrates courses into departmental programs, such as
- Effectively prepares students for subsequent courses
- Effectively builds on students prior learning
- Effectively addresses dept'l learning outcomes

Departmental Needs

• Cooperates with program faculty in meeting departmental loading needs

Student Learning Experience Survey Reflection

Preferred

• Evidence of reflective review of Student Learning Experience Survey results, including evidence of responsive adaptation or improvement of instruction

Classroom Instruction

- Evidence of a commitment to improve instruction (see acceptable column)
- Beyond evidence of effective practices (see acceptable column), also shares successful and/or innovative practices with colleagues

Curricular Development

 Beyond integrating courses into departmental programs (see acceptable column), also is an effective partner in curricular and program design and delivery

Mentoring

 Actively involved in some student mentoring activities

Departmental Needs (see acceptable column)

Exceptional Student Learning Experience Survey Reflection

• Evidence of reflective review of Student Learning Experience Survey results, including evidence of responsive adaptation or improvement of instruction

Classroom Instruction

- Recognized by colleagues as a highly skilled and knowledgeable instructor
- Models excellent teaching
- Demonstrates attention and responsiveness to student needs

Curricular Development (see preferred column)

Mentoring

- Significant student mentoring activities (either in quantity or quality of work with students)
- Mentors colleagues to develop their instructional abilities (assessment, curricular design, effective delivery, etc.)

Departmental Needs (see acceptable column)

Service Performance Levels

Acceptable **Preferred Exceptional Departmental Service** (see **Departmental Service Departmental Service** (see acceptable column) acceptable column) Active participant in dept'l work: Advising students in dept'l programs; writing letters of **University/Professional Service University/Professional Service** (see preferred column) recommendation; assisting at University service on active preview days, registration committees (at least one and orientation activities; and committee every year under Leadership other advising related review, more if committee(s) is Recognized as a faculty activities not very active). Active service leader on campus in professional organization or Effective contributor on his/her fair share of dept'l capacity may substitute for a Served in multiple leadership committees University committee. roles Effectively carrying out his/her fair share of Effective partner in Significant accomplishments individual dept'l tasks accomplishing assignments at the institutional level as a faculty leader (either multiple University/Professional Service Leadership committees or taskforces, as Some activity beyond department Some documentable a program director, as a or program (e.g. serve on active department chair, or other accomplishment in a leadership University committee most years role at the departmental, significant leadership under review). Active service in institutional or professional responsibilities resulting in professional organization or multiple documentable level during period under capacity may substitute for a review (department chair, achievements that furthered University committee. program coordinator, faculty the institutional mission) program director, chair active

committee, lead taskforce, significant individual task, etc.)

Scholarship Performance Levels

Acceptable	Preferred	Exceptional
Originality • A combination of at least three publications, presentations, reports, and/or grant applications is cited. • Each publication, presentation, report, and/or grant application cited includes a significant original contribution from this faculty member. Meaningfulness • Must include at least one publication which:	Originality A combination of at least four publications, presentations, reports, and/or grant applications is cited. Each publication, presentation, report, and/or grant application cited includes a significant original contribution from this faculty member, with at least two as sole or lead author/editor. Meaningfulness Must include at least two publications which: Make a contribution to the field, and/or Meaningfully engage students in research. May include one or more presentations May include modest external grant award(s) Review Most publications, presentations, reports, and/or grant applications cited passed at least a moderately competitive review process, including at least one formally refereed article that underwent a highly competitive review process. Dissemination At least two publications, presentations, reports, and/or grant applications cited were nationally or internationally disseminated.	Originality The quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, reports, and/or grant applications cited were well above average with a significant original contribution from this faculty member, as sole or lead author/editor. Examples: A combination of at least five publications, presentations, reports, and/or grant applications, including at least three publications A single pivotal publication in the field, widely recognized for its impact, which results in invitations to conferences, workshops or other follow-up activities Meaningfulness Recognized as a scholar/expert in field (either in a multi-state region, nationally or internationally) Examples: Significant national publication Invited speaker at major conference Consultant for significant state or national body Reviewer (journals, grants) Conference panel organizer Journal editorship Sizable external grant award(s) See examples listed under originality regarding quantity and/or quality of publications, presentations, reports, and/or grant applications cited passed at least a moderately competitive review process, including at least two formally refereed articles that underwent a highly competitive review process. Dissemination At least three publications, presentations, reports, and/or grant applications cited passed at least two formally refereed articles that underwent a highly competitive review process.

Revised January 2021