

Faculty Evaluation Plan

Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education

Morehead State University

This document outlines the procedures and expectations to be used for on-going professional evaluation of faculty in the Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education in the College of Education. The evaluation for Performance Based Salary Increases will be for one calendar year beginning January 1st and ending December 31st. Tenure and promotion evaluations will be based upon the academic year. This document addresses the requirements stipulated in the following University policies:

- PAC -1 Definition of Academic Titles
- PAC - 2 Promotion Review,
- PAC - 27 Tenure Review,
- PAC - 29 Faculty Workload,
- PAC - 30 Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty, and
- PAC - 34 Alternative Career-Track Faculty
- PAC- 35 Faculty Evaluation Plans

Table of Contents

<u>Framework for Evaluation</u>	1
<u>Tenure</u>	2
<u>Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor</u>	4
<u>Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor</u>	4
<u>Annual Evaluation Procedures</u>	5
Annual Self-Evaluation.....	5
Departmental Review	5
Peer and Chair Review Option.	5
Chair Review Option	6
College Level Review.....	7
College Faculty Evaluation Committee.....	8
Appeals	8
<u>Performance Expectations</u>	10
Regional Engagement.....	11
Teaching.....	12
Professional Achievement	15
Service	17
Overall Levels of Performance	19
<u>Related Processes</u>	19
Post Tenure Review	19
Instructor Evaluation.....	20
<u>Annual Productivity Report</u>	22

Faculty Evaluation Plan

Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education

Morehead State University

This document provides the policies and information that govern the following in the Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education: annual evaluation, Performance-Based Compensation Increase (PBCI) procedures, tenure, promotion, and evaluation of fixed term faculty.

Morehead State University PAc-30: *Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty* states:

It shall be the policy of Morehead State University to systematically evaluate individual faculty performance by means of a departmental faculty evaluation process, which specifies performance expectations in teaching, professional achievement, and service and which is consistent with University guidelines for faculty evaluation. All returning tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to participate in the process of evaluation as specified in their departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan.

Performance-based compensation will be based on the concept that criteria exist in the areas of teaching, professional achievement, and service against which the performance of individual faculty will be compared for evaluation. These criteria will not be a set of fixed universally-applied standards, but a set of flexible standards which will accommodate the unique nature of the disciplines in which faculty teach, engage in professional achievement activities, and serve. The application of the standards should accommodate the specific role of the individual within the department and should recognize the variables which affect opportunities for professional achievement and service.

Morehead State University Pac-35: *Faculty Evaluation Plans* states:

The FEP shall include: A description of other requirements (if any) of the department not already stated in University, college, or school policy for faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion and for performance-based compensation increases.

Framework for Evaluation

Evaluation of faculty in a college of education is a complex multi-dimensional undertaking. It cannot take a one-size-fits-all approach. It must have the flexibility to respond to the following considerations.

- 1) It must be applicable to individuals at various stages in their careers in a manner that encourages them to make meaningful decisions. Within the context created by some of the other factors outlined here, individual faculty members must be able to decide how to use their time and energy without being penalized because they deviate from some arbitrary standard.
- 2) The basis for evaluation needs to be responsive to the long-term mission and the current priorities of the academic department. Faculty members in a college of education must be aware that they are part of a collaborative enterprise, which requires them to balance their personal agendas against the needs of the organization.

- 3) While we are all part of a college of education, we represent a wide array of disciplines. Each of these disciplines has its own set of opportunities and expectations related to professional practice, scholarly productivity, and service to the discipline.
- 4) Finally, this framework for evaluation must articulate consistent standards of quality that, while responding to the diversity of the faculty, are recognized within the college and across the University.

The framework presented in this document attempts to provide a practical structure for meeting this challenge.

Central to the process outlined in this document is the annual self-evaluation document and the Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA) if applicable developed by each faculty member. In this annual presentation of their activities, faculty members are required to concisely make the case that during the last year they have spent their time in activities that have contributed to their students, their discipline, and the University. In this presentation they should demonstrate a rational decision making process about where they put their time and energy. Based on this, administrators and peers can, within a collegial relationship, evaluate and provide constructive feedback on these efforts. In addition to reviewing activities of the past year, this documents calls for the development of a personal growth plan for the next year. Thus, it is that the annual review provides each faculty member with an opportunity to identify benchmarks in an ongoing process of continuous improvement.

The Department's Faculty Evaluation Plan and/or the FWA provides the basic statements of the standards and criteria for evaluating an individual's academic work and as such has direct implications for a number of other processes beyond the annual Performance Based Salary Increase (PBCI) process. However, PBCI is separate from these other processes; and, consequently, meeting or exceeding PBCI criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision. PBCI evaluations are based on annual performance whereas tenure and promotion evaluations are based on the cumulative performance. Importantly the criteria for annual evaluation ratings and the criteria for those used to determine PBCI eligibility should be markedly similar.

The University processes for granting of tenure and promotion to professor uses the criteria outlined within this document as the basis for decision-making. In a similar light, this document provides the criteria and process for post tenure review and evaluation of instructors.

Tenure

The process for progress towards tenure is defined in PAc-27. The Department evaluation process is based on the criteria defined in PAc-27 and reflects growth in the criteria identified for annual performance review.

- 1) The Department Tenure Review Committee will annually evaluate all non-tenured faculty. In compliance with PAc - 27 the Department Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department.
- 2) All non-tenured faculty must submit a cumulative contract renewal portfolio annually, as outlined in PAc-27. (Contract renewal is based on the academic year rather than the calendar year.
- 3) All probationary faculty members must be observed teaching at least once annually by the chair and/or senior colleagues (as designated and initiated by the chair or the immediate supervisor). The results of these observations must be included in the annual portfolio and in the final application for tenure.

- 4) As noted below under the discussion of evaluation of teaching (page 12), faculty members are strongly encouraged to seek formal student feedback on the quality of instruction for every course. At the minimum, probationary faculty must provide documentation of this feedback for at least two courses a semester during the probationary period. All course evaluations submitted for annual reviews must likewise be included in the final application for tenure.
- 5) Over the course of his/her probationary period, a candidate for tenure should have:
 - a) Consistently earned above average ratings on evaluation of teaching and have observations by the chair and/or department colleagues that demonstrate high achievement in teaching,
 - b) Been active as a scholar as reflected in multiple scholarly presentations at least at the regional level and should have some publications, and
 - c) Served on a variety of committees across campus, served in leadership roles, and/or provided significant service to an area school, school district, or other appropriate professional settings.
- 6) In addition to these achievements non-tenured faculty should have fulfilled basic duties and expectations, which include attending faculty meetings regularly, meeting and starting classes on time, maintaining regular availability to students, advising regularly, and fulfilling various departmental service functions (participating in TEP interviews and assisting in schedule development, for example). Faculty who do not fulfill these duties may not qualify for tenure even if the quantity of work in the annual PBCI portfolio earns them high ratings.
- 7) All non-tenured faculty shall be allocated one mentor from within or outside the home department. The mentor may or may not be within the discipline area but should be from within the College of Education unless otherwise specified in the FWA. The non-tenured faculty shall retain a mentor until the non-tenured faculty submits their final tenure portfolio. The mentor may be reviewed and/or re-assigned at the request of either the mentor or the non-tenured faculty.
- 8) The faculty mentor should assist the non-tenured faculty member in the compilation of tenure portfolios. They should meet with the non-tenured faculty before submission of the tenure portfolio and discuss the annual review.
- 9) The mentor must make written recommendations to the Department Tenure Review Committee based on their discussions with the non-tenured faculty member. The recommendations of the mentor should be available to the non-tenured faculty member before submission to the Department Tenure Review Committee.
- 10) The Department Tenure Review Committee will review non-tenured faculty portfolios and the recommendations of the Department mentor. They will make one of the following recommendations to the Chair.
 - a) The candidate's contract should be renewed and the non-tenured faculty member is on the correct course for consideration of tenure.
 - b) The candidate's contract should be renewed, but the candidate is not performing to the level commensurate for consideration of tenure.
 - c) The candidate's contract should not be renewed.
- 11) The Chair will write his/her evaluation of the non-tenured faculty member (per PAc 27) and, prior to submitting the report, will meet with each non-tenured faculty member to

discuss the evaluation. The Chair's written evaluation will be made available to the faculty member. After meeting with the faculty member, the chair's written report will be sent to the Dean along with the portfolio and the recommendation of the Department Tenure Review Committee.

- 12) The Dean of the College will submit a recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs based on the recommendations of the Department Tenure Review Committee and the Chair. (PAC 27)
- 13) If the non-tenured faculty member disagrees with the recommendation of the Department Tenure Review Committee, the Department Chair, and/or the Dean of the college, he/she may submit a letter of response at any point in the process to any of the administrators involved. (Pac 27)

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

- 1) The Promotion Process is guided by PAC-2 -Promotion Review. The criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are the same as those for Tenure.
- 2) Therefore, in compliance with PAC 27, all faculty members awarded tenure by the University Tenure Committee shall automatically be promoted to associate professor.
- 3) PAC – 1 Academic Titles.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

- 1) The Promotion Process is guided by PAC – 2: Promotion Review.
- 2) PAC- 1: Academic Titles

Department Promotion Committee. All faculty applying for promotion must submit a portfolio to the Department Promotion Committee. After reviewing the candidate's portfolio the Department Promotion Committee will make a recommendation to the Chair to support or decline the application for promotion.

Criteria for Promotion. Although successful annual evaluation cannot be the sole determining factor in the decision of the Department's Promotion Committee to support or decline an application, the criteria defined under the heading of "performance expectations" of this Faculty Evaluation Plan should be used in determining successful professional growth in the areas of teaching, professional achievement, and service as defined in Pac 2. While the faculty member's cumulative record of performance may be considered, the focus for this review will be placed on the period since the last promotion.

The College of Education provides a unique service to the schools within the region and collaborates across the University in relation to both curriculum and administrative functions. Given this mission, these services should be reflected in the promotion process. To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member should have a **consistent record** (i.e., across at least a 5 year period after promotion to associate professor) of

- Above expected evaluations of teaching,
- Above expected service at the local, state, regional and/or national levels, and
- Professional achievement at the regional and/or state levels with some recognition of his/her scholarship at the national level.
- These standards for promotion should correlate to regular recognition as performing at **above expected** or **outstanding** level during time in rank.

Faculty applying for promotion to professor should have fulfilled basic duties and expectations which include fulfilling appropriate classroom responsibilities (i.e. online, face-to-face, etc.), maintaining appropriate availability to students, advising of students, participating in departmental and/or college service, and regularly attending faculty meetings.

Annual Evaluation Procedures

The following sections outline the procedures for submission, review, and appeal of annual Performance Based Salary Increase (PBCI) reviews within the College of Education.

The sole exception to the review process will be faculty on sabbatical leave. They will receive the same PBCI rating as awarded at the departmental level the previous year. They will not be eligible for a fourth share for the year in which they took a sabbatical. (If the previous year's award was a fourth share, only a three will be received for the sabbatical year.)

Annual Self-Evaluation

In accordance with University guidelines (PAC: 27), all tenured and tenure track faculty members will prepare and submit the items outlined below by the date designated by the Provost on the annual academic calendar. The annual review is for the calendar year.

Annual Goals. Each faculty member should include his or her goals for the previous year on the form provided and indicate if each goal was met. The faculty member may briefly explain the reasons for not meeting any goals in the narrative section of the Annual Productivity Report. The faculty member should indicate goals for the next year on the bottom of the form.

Annual Productivity Report. Complete the attached Annual Productivity Report. (See attached example). If the University-approved database has been proven secure and available, each department may choose to complete the report through the University-approved database (e.g., Faculty180, etc.). Each faculty member is required to complete the self evaluation located at the top of each section as well as the overall self rating at the end of the Annual Productivity Report. The faculty member should provide a short justification for their self evaluation following the listing of activities. The justification should be provided for each of the three sections on teaching, professional achievement and service.

Faculty should have supporting evidence (i.e. proposals, syllabi, publications, etc.) available for review upon request.

Departmental Review

This section outlines two options for annual review at the departmental level: peer and chair review or chair only review. Each department in the college shall determine by majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty which option to use. A department may elect to switch their annual review procedure option as long as any change is approved before the beginning of the calendar year for which that option will apply.

Peer and Chair Review Option.

- 1) All eligible tenured and tenure track faculty will use the guidelines below and their best professional judgment to evaluate each faculty member's annual self-evaluation portfolio.

2) If any faculty member deems a colleague's professional activity as below expected in any of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) he/she must accompany this assessment with a concise rationale. The rationale may be anonymous, but must only address the criteria as outlined in this document. These rationales will be available to the Chair and the faculty member concerned.

3) Recommendations for merit shares will be determined by averaging **overall performance evaluation ratings** awarded by the peer review process. A committee appointed by the Chair will conduct this summary. The following scale will be used to convert the average into merit shares recommendations.

3.5 - 4.0	Recommended for fourth share
2.5 - 3.49	3 Shares
1.5 - 2.49	2 Shares
.5 - 1.49	1 Share.
<.5	0 Shares

- 4) A summary of the results and original evaluation forms will be submitted to the Chair.
- 5) The chair will prepare a written confirmation and rationale of the merit share awarded for each tenured and tenure track faculty by the date designated by the Provost. This report should summarize the material from the peer review. If the chair is aware of information unavailable to the faculty that either will positively or negatively influence the final rating, he or she may consider that. When the chair elects to award a merit rating different from that recommended by the faculty he or she must specifically address this discrepancy in the notice to the individual faculty member.
- 6) Any faculty member may request a face-to-face meeting with the chair to obtain clarification of the rationale for the assigned rating.
- 7) Each faculty member who receives an overall rating of “less than expected performance” (see page 19) will meet with the departmental chair to identify areas for professional growth during the next year. The actions identified to address areas of deficiency shall be integrated into the faculty member’s individual plan for professional development (see annual self evaluation, page 5) and should be explicitly addressed in the next year’s self-evaluation. Regardless of other ratings, faculty members who receive a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.
- 8) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her Performance Based Salary Increase award, he/she may initiate the Appeal Process outlined on page 9.
- 9) All materials related to this review, including faculty self-evaluation portfolios, original evaluation forms, and evaluation summaries will remain in the possession of the chair until after the final date for appeal.

Chair Review Option

- 1) The departmental chair will review the self-evaluation portfolio for all eligible tenured and tenure track faculty using the guidelines below and his/her best professional judgment.
- 2) This evaluation should use a format similar to that found in the Overall Levels of Performance. The rating in each area should be accompanied by a rationale that integrates both strengths and needs.

- 3) Faculty overall performance evaluation ratings will be determined using the criteria outlined under “Overall Levels of Performance” on page 19 of this document.
- 4) The chair will prepare a notice and rationale of the merit share awarded for each tenured and tenure track faculty by the date designated by the Provost.
- 5) Any faculty member may request a face-to-face meeting with the chair to obtain clarification of the rationale for the assigned rating.
- 6) Each faculty member who receives an overall rating of “less than expected performance” will meet with the departmental chair to identify areas for professional growth during the next year. The actions identified to address areas of deficiency shall be integrated into the faculty member’s individual plan for professional development (see Annual Self Evaluation, page 5) and should be explicitly addressed in the next year’s self-evaluation. Regardless of other ratings, faculty members who receive a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.
- 7) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her Performance Based Salary Increase award he/she may initiate the Appeal Process found on page 9.
- 8) All materials related to this review, including faculty self-evaluation portfolios, will remain in the possession of the chair until after the final date for appeal.

College Level Review

- 1) The chairs and the Dean will constitute the College PBCI Review Committee.
- 2) Upon recommendation by the department for a fourth share, a faculty member’s annual evaluation portfolio will be forwarded to the Dean for consideration. Nominated portfolios will remain in the Dean’s office until the period for reviews and appeals has elapsed.
- 3) No additional material will be required for review at the College level unless requested by the committee. However, faculty members are advised to have supporting material available so that it can be delivered in a timely fashion.
- 4) The College review process will occur within the time frame announced for PBCI process on an annual basis by the Provost.
- 5) Each member of the committee should review the portfolio of every nominated faculty member. This review should follow the criteria outlined below and use the framework provided in this document.
- 6) After initial review, the committee may elect to request submission of supporting material from any faculty member.
- 7) After all committee members have reviewed all portfolios and any requested supporting material has been submitted and reviewed, the committee will meet to make its determination of whose achievement merits a 4th share. In general this judgment will reflect the affirmation that the nominated faculty member has truly achieved a **distinguished** level of performance as described under “Overall Levels of Performance” on page 19 of this document.
- 8) The Dean will prepare a memorandum for each nominated faculty informing them of the committee’s action by the date designated by the Provost. If the judgment of the lower level review that a faculty member’s performance was at the distinguished level is not affirmed, the Dean’s memorandum must give specific rationale for this action.

College Faculty Evaluation Committee

Membership. The College Faculty Evaluation Committee (CFEC) shall consist of two faculty members elected from and by each department in the college in the fall of the academic year for a one-year term. All voting members of the Committee shall: (1) be full-time faculty; (2) be tenured or in a tenure-track position; and (3) have served at least one full year at the University. Chairs and the Dean shall not serve on this committee.

The Committee shall elect their chair from the membership of the Committee by September 15 of the academic year at a first meeting convened by the college Dean.

Duties/Responsibilities. This committee is to provide on-going faculty oversight to the PBCI process by fulfilling the following responsibility:

- 1) Annually the committee shall review this document and respond to any other authorities such as the President, the Provost, the Dean, or various committees of the Faculty Senate calling for updating or revising this FEP. In this process, it shall be responsible for revising and submitting proposed revisions to the faculty, chairs, Dean, Faculty Senate, and other administrators as necessary, for approval.

Appeals

- 1) The College of Education PBCI Appeals Committee shall be composed of six elected tenured faculty, two representing each of the departments in the College of Education. Each department shall elect their representatives by October 1 of each academic year. Members of the College Faculty Evaluation and the PBCI Appeals Committee may not serve on both committees at the same time. The term of service for each member of the PBCI Appeals Committee shall be one year, starting October 1 and ending September 30. There will be no limit on the number of terms a faculty member may serve. Each year the committee shall elect one member as chair. A quorum shall be five members in attendance with at least one representative from each department in attendance. Decisions shall be based upon a majority vote of the committee members in attendance at a committee meeting. Voting shall be by secret ballot. All information will be confidential.
- 2) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her department PBCI evaluation, he/she may request a meeting with the department chair (or next level supervisor) to discuss the evaluation. The purpose of the meeting will be to determine if a satisfactory resolution can be reached through informal discussion. If the appellant and the department chair reach agreement, the chair will within five working days provide for the appellant and the Dean a written description of the agreement.
- 3) If the disagreement is not satisfactorily resolved, the department chair (or next level supervisor) will indicate within five working days the reasons for not changing the evaluation. Only after this process is complete may the appellant appeal to the COE PBCI Appeals Committee. To file an appeal, the faculty member must succinctly state in writing the reasons he/she believes the evaluation should be changed. The statement must be filed with the Dean of COE within five working days after receiving the department chair's written rejection of the informal appeal. The appeal may be based upon procedural or substantive grounds.
- 4) The department chair will provide copies of the appellant's PBCI portfolio, the original evaluation and the written rejection of the informal appeal to the PBCI Appeals Committee.

5) The PBCI Appeals Committee will meet separately with the appellant and the department chair within 7 working days after the Dean of COE receives a written appeal. The committee will review all pertinent written material and may request additional material if necessary. If the appellant requests a rating of 1, 2, or 3 (shares) the committee will, by a majority vote, render a written decision. The decision shall be the final step of this appeal process.

6) If the appeal deals with the decision not to recommend for a fourth PBCI share, the same procedure will be followed as outlined in step 5. The PBCI Appeals Committee may decide to deny the appeal. A copy of the written denial with justification shall be made available to the appellant, department chair, college dean and the Provost.

If the PBCI Appeals Committee decides the appeal is justified, they shall report their recommendation to the Dean of COE. The Dean (or next level supervisor) and the two department chairs not involved in the appeal shall determine if a fourth share shall be awarded. The department chair involved in the appeal shall not be involved in the decision to award or not award a fourth share. The written PBCI Appeals Committee decision shall be made available to the appellant, the department chair, college dean and the provost.

7) A faculty member who is nominated for a PBCI fourth share by the department but is denied the fourth share at the College of Education level shall have five working days from the date of notification to inform the Dean in writing of the intent to appeal the decision.

The Dean shall have five working days to meet with the faculty member. Both parties should make every effort to resolve the differences regarding the fourth share evaluation in an informal setting. The Dean shall advise the faculty member and the appropriate chair in writing regarding the results of this meeting within two working days following the date of the meeting.

If the Dean and the faculty member do not resolve their differences through informal discussion, the faculty member who decides to pursue the appeal shall file a letter of appeal with the chair of the PBCI Appeals Committee within five working days after receiving notification from the Dean. The letter of appeal must explicitly state the basis for the appeal.

The PBCI Appeals Committee Chair shall schedule a meeting within seven working days. The committee will review the written recommendations and meet with the faculty member, department chair and the Dean. The committee's written decision shall be communicated to all parties. The committee's decision shall be final and conclude the committee's responsibilities in the appeals process.

Step 7 shall complete the PBCI appeals process for the College of Education. Appellants who do not accept the decision at the college level may have access to other reviews or appeals if provided by Morehead State University policy.

Performance Expectations

The following sections outline specific guidelines for the evaluation of teaching, professional achievement, and service. Each section contains the following three elements.

- 1) A **narrative introduction** that provides a context for the material provided in to the two accompanying tables.
- 2) A matrix that provides a **rubric** for synthesizing each faculty member's activities during the preceding year. The matrix describes the expectation for performance at each of three levels. It then provides an example of what performance at that level might look like. These descriptions are intended to be descriptive not prescriptive.
- 3) This is followed by a **list of relevant activities**. Within these lists, individual activities are weighted on a three-level scale that attempts to account for the relative time and effort involved in each activity. This scale of expected, above expected, and outstanding is not intended to negatively reflect on any activity or the efforts of any faculty members. It simply tries to capture the extra effort that is involved in bringing some projects to fruition.

This framework acknowledges various ways in which faculty can contribute to the mission of the college. It suggests that sometimes "lower-rated activities" can indeed *trump* a "higher-rated activities." For example, publication of a peer-reviewed journal article has traditionally been a highly valued activity at a University and it should be. Within a school of education a central part of the scholarly enterprise should entail conveying state of the art information to local practitioners. Traditionally, such activities were frequently discounted as "just service" and not contributing to professional achievement. The scale used in this document reflects the fact that a professional development workshop for a local school is valued but less so than the substantial effort involved in bringing an article to press. However, within this framework, an individual faculty member can demonstrate that an ongoing series of well-developed professional workshops certainly merit consideration that equals or exceeds a single publication.

As per Pac-35 requirements, relative weighting of the categories for Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service are as follows:

Teaching 60%; and

A combination of Scholarly Productivity and Service up to 40%.

The weighting of the latter two duties (scholarly productivity and service) shall be determined by the individual faculty, and agreed upon with the department Chair. The total percentage of all three areas must equal 100%.

Regional Engagement

Engagement with the communities in our region is central to the mission of Morehead State University and the College of Education. As cited in Pac-35: If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond. This is not a separate category of the FEP, but should be reflected in the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service as appropriate. It is understood that regional engagement will typically contribute to performance at the **above expected level** or higher in each of these three areas. The following table outlines some ways in which regional engagement may be seen in faculty members' activities. This table is not intended to be comprehensive, but merely to suggest some examples of scholarship of engagement which reflects,

... collaboration between higher education institutions and their communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.).

Regional Engagement in Teaching
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Embedding service learning activities within a course.• Systematic coordination of field experiences in support of effective instruction by cooperating teachers.• Design and delivery of the course in collaboration with community agency personnel.• Development of school improvement projects as part of course assignments.• Developing school-based action research projects.• Develop a designated regional engagement courses.
Regional Engagement in Professional Achievement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presenting a workshop on research-based practices to community agency personnel.• Research, model development, technical assistance, or professional development projects designed in collaboration with community agencies.• Grants developed in conjunction with community agencies.• Technical assistance/collaboration with local schools.• Collaborating with community agency personnel to design and deliver professional development activities.• Providing community agencies with technical assistance for data analysis.
Regional Engagement in Service
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing a content specific workshop for the community.• Service on the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program committees• Service on Site-based Councils• Working with student groups to develop community service projects.• Assisting community agencies, such as libraries, to conduct a community service project

Teaching

Teaching is central to the role of regional universities like Morehead State. Therefore, the evaluation of teaching is central to the overall evaluation of individual faculty members. The importance of this aspect of evaluation emphasizes that it is not a simple task. The extensive literature on evaluation of teaching makes it clear that this is one of the greatest challenges facing schools and colleges today. Factors such as student preparation, subject matter, teaching philosophy, level of course, and others make it very difficult to come up with a simple scheme for evaluating teaching.

There seems to be strong consensus that evaluation of effective teaching cannot be reduced to a single number on a form completed by students. Nonetheless, student perspective on the quality of instruction is a critical component in achieving this task. Faculty members are encouraged to systematically collect formal student feedback on every course.

The framework provided in this document tries to avoid the pitfall of reducing evaluation of teaching to a single number. The down side of this decision is that effective evaluation of teaching becomes a much more complex undertaking. Multiple factors have to be considered. These can include student perceptions, student outcomes, peer and administrative review, review of teaching activities and materials, review of tests and other assessments, and an understanding of the faculty member's individual philosophy of teaching. Like all else in this document, this section is not prescriptive. Individual faculty and departments need to explore innovative ways of effectively evaluating instruction. **(Please note: In the examples used in this section reference is made to a T-score on the IDEA evaluation form. This is only an example. It does not imply that this instrument or this score is the standard for evaluation of teaching in the College of Education.)**

In addition to what goes on in the classroom, a variety of other factors are directly related to quality of teaching. These can include time and effort devoted to advising, supervising field experience, supervising clinical practice candidates, supervising practica candidates, efforts at program revision, pursuit of external funds to improve program resources or student opportunities, variety of courses taught, the development of expertise related to instruction, efforts at recruitment, and other evidence of commitment to students and teaching. These factors merit serious consideration. For example, an extensive commitment of time and energy to advising 50 or more advisees makes a substantial contribution to individual and program success.

In this college, the task is further complicated by the fact that for many of us pedagogy is our subject matter. This means that for some faculty members the boundary between teaching and professional achievement is less than clear. However, it also means that the modeling of effective pedagogical practice is intrinsic to the role of faculty member in a teacher education program.

Online and ITV course evaluations. Non-tenured Faculty in online and ITV courses shall use, departmentally approved teacher evaluation forms through Blackboard delivery in addition to IDEA.

Levels of Performance for Teaching

1-Expected	2-Above Expected	3-Outstanding
<p>The faculty member will consistently deliver effective instruction by using good pedagogical practices.</p> <p>Evidence of efforts to maintain skills and knowledge needed to stay current in field and delivery of instruction.</p> <p>Evidence indicates consistent availability and accessibility to students advisees</p> <p>Student feedback on teaching, peer review, and other sources indicate the average level of rating</p>	<p>The faculty member will build on best practice strategies to develop new approaches to enhance students learning.</p> <p>A clear commitment to continuous improvement in the quality of instruction will be evident.</p> <p>Evidence indicates consistent engagement with students and commitment to student success though quality advising</p> <p>Student feedback on teaching, peer review, and other sources indicate the above average level of rating</p>	<p>The faculty will use a varied array of strategies to assure a high degree of student engagement and productivity.</p> <p>Commitment of time and resources will demonstrate the highest degree of engagement in teaching.</p> <p>Evidence indicates substantial engagement with students and commitment to student success though advising and other activity</p> <p>Student feedback on teaching, peer review, and other sources indicate the highest level of rating. Student outcome data demonstrates the effectiveness of instruction.</p>
<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDEA forms with scores in the average range • Good advisee evaluations • Regular <u>availability to students</u> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Or</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>other comparable activities</i></p>	<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of student evaluations with consistent high ratings • High ratings on peer reviews • Authorship of a major program revision • Good advisee evaluations • Regular <u>availability to students</u> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Or</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>other comparable activities</i></p>	<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of new web-based support for classes • A grant to support student attendance at conferences • Good advisee evaluations • Regular <u>availability to students</u> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Or</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>other comparable activities</i></p>

Teaching Activities

Expected:	Above Expected:	Outstanding:
<p>Teaching Evaluations. Low average/midrange to average/midrange scores on a student evaluation instrument (<i>For example:</i> average T-score of 37-44 on IDEA form) or other evidence of effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration and/or evidence such as student outcome data, etc. that demonstrates commitment to teaching and effective practice.</p> <p>Additional Considerations/Support Materials Needed when primary teaching evaluation data is below indicated criteria. Include documentation from the following-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching workload (number of different preps, and upper and lower division distribution, number of students, etc.) • Participation in workshops to improve teaching • Relevant research to improve teaching <p>You must also complete one of the options for Teaching Effectiveness listed under Above Expected/Better.</p> <p>NOTE: It is expected that at all levels of teaching performance, instructors will be available to their students on a regular basis.</p>	<p>Teaching Evaluations. Average/midrange to high average/midrange scores on student evaluation instrument (<i>For example:</i> average T-score of 45-55 on IDEA form) or other evidence of meritorious teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administrators. and/or evidence such as student outcome data, etc. that demonstrates commitment to teaching and highly effective practice.</p> <p>Additional Support Needed when primary teaching evaluation data are below indicated criteria. Include documentation from the following-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant research (applied instructional research) • Participation in teaching improvement activities • Develop instructional materials • Revise, develop a course • Explain teaching evaluations material • Clarify workload and implications linked to performance <p>Teaching Effectiveness Options- You must complete two of the options below for an Above Expected rating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional engagement activities in support of teaching • Participate in teaching/advising development. • Teach a new course • Show evidence of quality supervision of clinical practice, field experience candidates or other clinical practica candidates • Create/revise existing program • Create/revise existing course • Develop teaching software • Earn a teaching award • Secure a teaching grant • Administer an ongoing teaching grant • Use innovative techniques in existing course, first time being implemented • Serve as an academic advisor for students (Registrar's, Record) • Written student evaluations linked to course objectives. Include summary info. • Include pre-test/post test info. Showing significant student improvement over the course of a semester • Video documentation of teaching performance accompanied by plans, goals, etc. • Document significant and appropriate use of technology • Other comparable teaching activities...or outstanding achievement in teaching 	<p>Teaching Evaluations. High average/midrange to high/upper range scores on student evaluation instrument (<i>For example:</i> average T-score of 56-63 on IDEA form) or other evidence of outstanding teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration and/or evidence such as student outcome data, etc. that demonstrates commitment to teaching and exemplary practice.</p> <p>You must also complete three of the options for Teaching Effectiveness listed under Above Expected.</p> <p>Additional Support Needed when primary teaching evaluation data are below indicated criteria. Include documentation from the following-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant research (applied instructional research) • Participation in teaching improvement activities • Develop instructional materials • Revise, develop a course • Explain teaching evaluations material • Clarify workload and implications linked to performance • Chairing an Ed.D., Ed.S. committee • Serving on an Ed.D., Ed.S committee

Professional Achievement

The area of professional achievement has traditionally been the most clearly defined area in the evaluation of University faculty. Often viewed as synonymous with scholarship, this area of activity is seen as the contribution of the individual to their primary discipline. This typically includes continuing professional development, research, grantsmanship, publications, and presentations. One ongoing source of difficulty for faculty members in colleges of education has been the fact that their area of professional achievement often entails pedagogy. This has led to some difficulty when colleagues from areas other than education review their achievement. As noted above this evaluation can be further complicated because a legitimate area of professional achievement for education faculty can involve working directly with practitioners in public schools. The College of Education defines professional achievement broadly to include a number of activities in which the faculty member is involved. This may include extending academic discourse through original research, communicating scholarly discourse to other professionals through writing and formal scholarly presentations, contributing to public discourse and public education through creative productions and publications, and extending their own expertise through professional development. When the nature of professional association leadership is linked to conference or workshop development for the purpose of contributing to the on-going education of peers, professional association leadership may be included in this category

Levels of Performance for Professional Achievement		
1-Expected	2-Above Expected	3-Outstanding
The faculty member remains current in the field and participates in professional organizations.	In addition, the faculty member is actively engaged in professional dialogue in their discipline through presentation, small projects, and/or writing.	In addition, the faculty member is making a substantive contribution in their discipline through presentations, projects, and/or publications.
<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership in a professional organization • Attendance at one professional meeting at the state, regional, or national level • Or other comparable activities 	<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting the criteria for expected performance and • Make a peer reviewed presentation to a professional meeting • Write and submit a scholarly grant • Provide ongoing technical assistance to a school or district • Or other comparable activities 	<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting the criteria for above expected performance and • Have a scholarly grant funded • Publish a chapter in an edited text • Or other comparable activities

Professional Achievement Activities

<p align="center">Expected: Any two of the following:</p>	<p align="center">Above Expected: Expected plus any two of the following:</p>	<p align="center">Outstanding: Above expected plus any two of the following</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current membership in a local, state, regional, or national professional organization • Attending local, state, regional, national, or international professional meetings in your discipline • Earning CEU's from MSU faculty development workshops or other partial day workshops (for example: training on a specific software or discipline specific software or peripheral) • Maintaining a unit or departmental Web site (as it meets ADA guidelines and other University requirements) • Documented articles submitted for publication, abstracts submitted for grants, or completed grant applications- internal or external (all must contain date of submission and estimated turn-around-time from source); • Or equivalent activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional engagement activities which contribute to professional achievement • Either author or co-author publication in a local, state, or regional refereed publication (includes conference proceedings) • Serve on an editorial board of a journal and/or review manuscripts for journals in your discipline • Serve as reviewer for local, state, or regional refereed conference abstracts, or textbooks in your field • Direct internal or external grant activities • Undertake a collaborative project with schools which results in applied research • Author a unit or departmental Web site; course Web site for supplement or solely Internet teaching • Creating and implementing multimedia for a face-to-face, ITV course • Complete workshop related to your professional responsibilities (of one or more days), or other continuing education • Obtain professional licensure • Do an original, formal presentation of research literature to professional educators • Present to Department or Unit meeting, brown bag series • Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refereed, or Invited presentation at a local, state, regional, national or international professional organization meeting (includes departmental meeting, workshop for schools, or faculty symposium for MSU) • Travel abroad to present to a refereed or invited professional meeting • Creating and implementing multimedia for an online course • Refereed presentation to national or international professional organization • Either author or co-author publication in national, international journals (includes ERIC and refereed conference proceedings). • Edit, co-edit, and/or authorship of a book • Obtain an internally funded grant • Obtain an externally funded grant • Publish a monograph, textbook, video, or CD-ROM as author or co-author • Receive a prestigious award from MSU or a professional association • Receive a fellowship or faculty research award • Write an invited chapter in a book • Complete a graduate or undergraduate course or week long or more workshop related to your professional responsibilities • Other activities deemed Above Expected which relate directly to the mission of the college and University (for example: teacher certification, or other licensure maintenance) • Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities

Service

The area of service allows faculty members to demonstrate how they are meeting their responsibilities as professionals to contribute to the institution, their discipline, and the community. As a member of the University community, every faculty member has an obligation to contribute to the effective running of the institution. This document sees this as an important role, but one not limited to what occurs on campus. Traditionally, universities have acknowledged the obligation of faculty as professionals with specialized expertise to contribute to the community beyond the institution. As noted throughout this document, this college places high priority on the need for faculty to be involved with and contribute to the successful running the public schools in our region. So while service cannot overshadow teaching and professional achievement, it plays an important part in how faculty members fulfill their responsibilities. The framework in this document attempts to give faculty members flexibility in determining how they will meet this obligation.

Levels of Performance for Service		
1-Expected	2-Above Expected	3-Outstanding
The faculty member demonstrates consistent contribution to several services activities	The faculty member demonstrates substantial contribution to a variety of services activities	The faculty member demonstrates extensive contribution to a range of service activities and fulfills a leadership role.
<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service on departmental committees • Active membership on another college, University, or external committee or • Acting as advisor for a student group <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Or</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>other comparable activities</i></p>	<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service at the Expected level and • Additional institutional committee work • Service on a high demand committee or the faculty senate or • Community service or consultation related to professional discipline <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Or</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>other comparable activities</i></p>	<p>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service at the Above Expected level and • Awarding of a service related grant • Leadership role on a major institutional or external committee <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Or</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>other comparable activities</i></p>

Service Activities

Expected: Any two of the following:	Above Expected: Expected plus any two of the following:	Outstanding: Above expected plus any two of the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively serve on at least one standing department committee; • Actively serve on at least one standing college committee; • Actively serve on at least one standing University committee; actively serve on at least one ad hoc committee, sub-committee, or commission of the institution; • Actively serve on at least one off-campus center committee; • Actively serve on at least one KDE <i>or</i> EPSB state committee; • Actively serve as chair or secretary of a committee; • Actively serve as advisor of a student organization; • Participate in a round of TEP interviews; • Work with an intern in the KTIP or KPIP programs; • Undertake a professional presentation for a civic, business, or community organization; • Actively participate in community or state service; • Participate in other comparable professional service (e.g. off-campus recruiting, off-campus advising, SOAR, open house); • Submit a service grant proposal; • Other comparable service (or multiple activities within one of the categories above) • Meets on regular basis with school administrators; • Maintains department website; • Or equivalent activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service activities in support of regional engagement. • Work at a SOAR, open house, MSU night, or career day, • Hold an office in a local professional organization, • Speak at local community events, • Present an in-service activity, • Serve as a professional consultant, • Provide additional committee service • Holds office, local professional organization; • Do an accreditation visit; • Serve on KDE committee; • Serve on department committees; and • Serve on college committees; • Hold an office or chair a committee, • Direct a service grant, • Organize and implement a workshop, symposium, or conference, • Participate on a local, regional, or state curriculum committee, • Additional committee work, • Conduct a workshop • Hold office, state professional organization; • Hold office, regional professional organization; • Serve on committees for professional organizations; • Chair of committees for professional organizations; • Serve on University committees; • Serve on faculty senate; • Serve as interim chair; • Provide professional development for schools or community agencies; • Direct service grants; • Consult (in field); • Serve as program leader; • Participates in official University functions such as graduation, etc.; • Maintains regular availability to students • Provides professional services for community outreach activities • Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively serve a chair of a committee at MSU; • Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a state professional organization; • Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a regional professional organization; • Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a national professional organization; • Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a student organization; • Actively serve on a state or national committee related to the profession; • Actively participate in national service; • Actively participate on a committee that was exceptionally demanding of time and effort (e.g. TEC, Executive council of faculty senate; etc.) • Be awarded a service grant proposal; • Other comparable service • Hold office, national professional organization; • Major contribution to one or more University activities, • Leadership in one or more University activities, • Award for outstanding service, • Leadership role in national, regional, or state professional organization, • Consulting in a field related to the faculty's specialization, • Service-related grant, • Other meritorious activities • Successfully mentoring faculty to receipt of tenure • Successfully mentoring faculty to receipt of promotion • Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities

Overall Levels of Performance

The determination of a faculty member's **overall annual evaluation rating** is a holistic effort but in general, the following guidelines apply.

- To receive an overall rating as **distinguished** at the college level a faculty member must be rated as outstanding in at least two areas and above expected in the third area. A rating of “distinguished” means that activities during the past year demonstrate significant professional growth, and the highest degree of contribution to the University community and profession, including productivity, leadership, mentoring and modeling exemplary professional behavior.
- To receive an overall rating as **outstanding** a faculty member must be rated as outstanding in one area and above expected in two areas. This rating means that activities during the past year demonstrate ongoing professional growth, contribution to the mission of the department through high levels of productivity, leadership, mentoring, and modeling exemplary behavior.
- To receive an overall rating as **above expected** a faculty member must be rated as above expected in at least two areas. An overall rating at this level means that activities during the past year demonstrate ongoing professional growth and a contribution to the mission of the department beyond simply meeting the basic requirements of a faculty member in this department
- To receive an overall rating as **expected** a faculty member must be rated as expected in two or more areas. A rating of “expected” in an area indicates that the faculty member is meeting the basic expectation for performance and continuing professional growth for faculty members in this department.
- Any faculty member rated as **less than expected in either teaching, professional achievement or service** will not be considered for merit. In this case, the faculty member will meet with the departmental chair to identify goals for professional growth during the next year.
- Regardless of other ratings, any faculty member who receives a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.

Related Processes

Post Tenure Review

In compliance with PAc30 all tenured faculty must participate in an annual review. The criteria and the procedures outlined in this document provide a framework for ongoing evaluation of all faculty members after the granting of tenure. Further, this process provides for the development of a personal plan of correction if the tenured faculty member shall receive a less than expected rating in any area of professional activity.

Instructor Evaluation

As defined in PAc 34, “Instructors (formerly referred to as fixed-term instructors) are full-time employees contracted with full benefits for a one-year term with a teaching load of no more than 27 credit hours recommended. With the approval of the department chair and college dean, Instructors may have appointments renewed on an annual basis provided there are continued/justified instructional needs, adequate funds, and satisfactory evaluations according to departmental faculty evaluation plans (FEP). While Instructors will be evaluated primarily on teaching, they may provide service on departmental committees.”

Instructors will be evaluated primarily on their teaching by the department Chair (or Chair designee). The Chair (or Chair designee) will observe the instructor’s teaching, examine the teaching portfolio submitted by the instructor (including forms for student feedback on teaching, syllabi, tests and other material providing support for quality teaching) and evaluate his/her performance based upon the same criteria for teaching used in the evaluation of tenure track faculty. A written evaluation will be completed and submitted to the faculty member according to the time schedule set by the University.

Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be based primarily upon mentorship and teaching, when applicable. The evaluation instrument will be approved by the Department. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be completed by the Program Coordinator or Department Chair (or Chair designee).

Guidelines for Annual Productivity Matrix
Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education
Morehead State University

The attached productivity matrix is divided into three areas: Teaching, Professional Achievement, and Service. The matrix is designed to function as your annual vita for PBCI review. Immediately above each section heading you are provided an opportunity to self-rate yourself in that category.

Within each section, identify/cite information pertaining to your performance in that area for the calendar year under review. The information provided in the matrix will be used for evaluation as well as the additional documentation you provide in the review portfolio.

Note: The matrix provides a broad range of activities within each area. Not all individuals will complete every entry. You should complete every section that applies to your personal performance during the year.

**Morehead State University Department of Early Childhood, Elementary,
and Special Education**

Annual Productivity Report (Jan. 1-Dec. 31)

Teaching

Self-rating in this area (circle one):

Less than Expected Expected Above Expected Outstanding

SPRING COURSES	Credit Hours	Enrollment	Evaluation Attached
Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:			
SUMMER COURSES	Credit Hours	Enrollment	Evaluation Attached
Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:			
FALL COURSES	Credit Hours	Enrollment	Evaluation Attached
Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:			
NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS/ PRACTICUM STUDENTS			
<i>Evaluation MUST be included.</i>			
Spring: ST P	Summer: ST P	Fall: ST P	
DIRECTED STUDY PROJECTS		DIRECTED RESEARCH PROJECTS	
Spring:	Summer:	Fall:	Spring: Summer: Fall:
LIST EXIT EXAMS / OTHER INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENTS ADMINISTERED			
Spring:	Summer:	Fall:	

IDEA Evaluation of Courses

Course 1	Semester	IDEA Item	IDEA Raw T	IDEA Adjusted T
		Overall progress on objectives.		
		Improved student attitude		
		Overall excellence of teacher		
		Overall excellence of course		
Course 2	Semester	IDEA Item	IDEA Raw T	IDEA Adjusted T
		Overall progress on objectives.		
		Improved student attitude		
		Overall excellence of teacher		
		Overall excellence of course		
Course 3	Semester	IDEA Item	IDEA Raw T	IDEA Adjusted T
		Overall progress on objectives.		
		Improved student attitude		
		Overall excellence of teacher		
		Overall excellence of course		
Course 4	Semester	IDEA Item	IDEA Raw T	IDEA Adjusted T
		Overall progress on objectives.		
		Improved student attitude		
		Overall excellence of teacher		
		Overall excellence of course		

Professional Achievement

Self-rating in this area (circle one):

Less than Expected Expected Above Expected Outstanding

Professional Publications	Number	APA Reference (authors, titles, journals)
Refereed articles published		
Refereed articles in press		
Refereed articles under review		
Technical reports completed (program evaluations, monographs, etc.)		
Non-refereed articles / reviews published		
Non-refereed articles / reviews in press		
Books and Book Chapters	Number	APA Reference (authors, titles, publishers)
Books published		
Books in press		
Books under contract		
Chapters published		
Chapters in press		
Chapters under contract		
Other Media (CD-ROM, websites, videos, etc.)	Number	APA Reference (authors, titles, publishers, URLs)

Grants	Number	Titles	# of Years	Total Amounts
Federal grants awarded				
Federal grants submitted				
State grants awarded				
State grants submitted				
Other grants awarded (university, private, etc.)				
Other grants submitted (university, private, etc.)				

Presentations	Number	Presentation Title	Conference / Venue	Published in Proceedings
International / national refereed				
Regional refereed				
State refereed				
Invited presentations				

Membership in Professional Organizations	Names of Organizations to Which You Belong
International	
National	
Regional	
State	

Professional Development Participation (conferences, workshops, courses, in-service activities)	Dates

Professional Licensure or Certification (please list)

Other Professional Achievement Activities (please provide a bulleted list of other activities you would like considered)

Please provide a brief justification of your self-rating for Professional Achievement and a concise explanation of any unmet goals in this area last year.

Service

Self-rating in this area (circle one):

Less than Expected Expected Above Expected Outstanding

Association/Committee/Board Service	Office or Type of Service	Association/Committee/Board Title
National professional organizations		
Regional professional organizations		
State professional organizations		
Local professional organizations		
State level committee		
University standing/advisory committees		
University task forces / ad hoc committees		
College committees		
Departmental committees		
Other Service		
Other university service		
State / Community service		
Consultation		
School / Agency in-service activity		

Other Service Activities (please provide a bulleted list of other activities you would like considered)

Please provide a brief justification of your self-rating for service and a concise explanation of any unmet goals in this area last year.

Overall Self-Rating

Based on the rubric below, how would you rate your overall performance? (circle one):

Overall Self-Rating	Teaching	Professional Achievement	Service
0	Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding	Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding	Less than expected
	Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding	Less than expected	Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding
	Less than expected	Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding	Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding
1	Expected	Expected	Expected
	Above Expected or Outstanding	Expected	Expected
	Expected	Above Expected or Outstanding	Expected
	Expected	Expected	Above Expected or Outstanding
2	Above Expected	Above Expected	Above Expected
	Above Expected or Outstanding	Above Expected or Outstanding	Expected
	Above Expected or Outstanding	Expected	Above Expected or Outstanding
	Expected	Above Expected or Outstanding	Above Expected or Outstanding
3	Outstanding	Above Expected	Above Expected
	Above Expected	Outstanding	Above Expected
	Above Expected	Above Expected	Outstanding
	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
	Above Expected	Outstanding	Outstanding
	Outstanding	Above Expected	Outstanding
	Outstanding	Outstanding	Above Expected