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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I. Teaching and Instructionally-Related Activities (IRA) for Full-Time, Nontenure-Track Faculty out of 25 possible points**  **For Instructors, Lecturers (any rank), Clinical Faculty (any rank), and Professors of Practice** | | | | | |
| **Indicators** | **5**  **Extraordinary Performance** | **4**  **Exceeds Expectations** | **3**  **Meets Expectations** | **2**  **Partially Meets Expectations** | **1**  **Unacceptable Performance** |
| ***Student Evaluations*** | Mean responses to all or nearly all questions directly related to teaching skills in 1.00 to 2.00 range, with no means exceeding 2.00. | Mean responses to a majority of questions directly related to teaching skills in 1.00 to 2.00 range, with no means exceeding 2.50. | Mean responses to a majority of questions directly related to teaching skills in 1.00 to 2.50 range, with no more than two means exceeding 3.00. | Mean responses to a majority of questions directly related to teaching skills in 1.00 to 2.50 range, with no more than two means exceeding 3.50. | Mean responses to a majority of questions directly related to teaching skills exceed 4.00. |
| ***Peer Evaluations*** | Exemplary feedback across all or nearly all dimensions explored on the Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form. Overall rating of "exemplary." | Positive feedback across all or nearly all dimensions explored on the Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form with only minor suggestions for improvement. Overall rating of "proficient." | Mostly positive feedback across all or nearly all dimensions explored on the Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form, yet, several substantive suggestions for improvement were noted. Overall rating of "proficient" or "satisfactory." | Mixed feedback across the dimensions explored on the Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form. Several substantial/significant suggestions for improvement noted. Overall rating of "needs improvement." | Overall negative feedback across most dimensions explored on the Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form.  Numerous, marked deficiencies noted with need for multiple areas of improvement. Overall rating of "needs improvement" or  "unsatisfactory." |
| ***Assessment of Student Learning*** | No evidence of inconsistent grading standards. Strong evidence that the instructor used pedagogical strategies and assessment practices that facilitated student learning (i.e., setting clear goals, employing active learning techniques, providing substantive feedback, incorporating multiple forms of assessment) and accurately reflected student  performance. | No evidence of inconsistent grading standards. Some evidence that the instructor used pedagogical strategies and assessment practices that facilitated student learning (i.e., setting clear goals, employing active learning techniques, providing substantive feedback, incorporating multiple forms of assessment) and accurately reflected student  performance. | No evidence of inconsistent grading standards. Adequate evidence that the instructor used pedagogical strategies and assessment practices that facilitated student learning (i.e., setting clear goals, employing active learning techniques, providing substantive feedback, incorporating multiple forms of assessment) and accurately reflected student  performance. | Some evidence of inconsistent grading standards. Instructor can improve pedagogical strategies and assessment practices that facilitated student learning (i.e., setting clear goals, employing active learning techniques, providing substantive feedback, incorporating multiple forms of assessment) and accurately reflected student performance. | Grading practices do not evidence consistent standards. Instructor can improve pedagogical strategies and assessment practices that facilitated student learning (i.e., setting clear goals, employing active learning techniques, providing substantive feedback, incorporating multiple forms of assessment) and accurately reflected student performance. |
| ***Mentoring*** | There are multiple indicators of sustained excellence in mentoring activities. | There are a few indicators of sustained, high-quality mentoring activities. | There is more than one indicator of quality mentoring activities. | There is one indicator of quality mentoring activities. | There are no indicators of quality mentoring activities. |
| *E.g.*, Chairing a Barrett College honor’s thesis; serving as a committee member on a completed doctoral dissertation, master’s thesis or capstone project, or Barrett College honor’s thesis; supervising Barrett students’ honors contracts; offering honors-only courses; actively participating in CoPSCS Undergraduate Research Program; supervising independent studies and/or directed research projects;  assisting students with their own research at levels not warranting co-authorship. | | | | |
| ***Other Indicia of Engagement in IRA*** | There are multiple indicators of sustained excellence in IRA. | There are a few indicators of sustained, high-quality participation  in IRA. | There are a few indicators of quality participation in IRA. | There is one indicator of quality participation in IRA. | There are no indicators of participation in IRA. |
| *E.g.*, Designing instruction aimed at enhancing student learning outcomes, such as experiential learning activities, critical incident projects, service learning activities, etc.; meaningfully assessing student learning outcomes through measurements, such as pre-/post-tests, portfolios, recursive writing assignments assessed by rubrics, etc.; employing strategies that enhance student success, such as self- reflection assignments, peer-group mentoring activities, student peer-review assignments, etc.; teaching awards from the University of a professional organization; organizing or facilitating workshops related to teaching and IRA; attending and participating in workshops related to teaching and IRA; organizing or facilitating professional development experiences for students; developing new courses as  the request of the School; designing, redesigning, or refreshing online courses; conducting peer evaluations of teaching for other nontenure-track faculty; directing or co-directing study abroad programs; presents or publishes innovations relating to teaching, pedagogy, or professional training. | | | | |
| **Scoring** | 0–7 = Unacceptable Performance 8–12 = Partially Meets Expectations 13–17 = Meets Expectations 18–22 = Exceeds Expectation 23–25 = Extraordinary Performance | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **II. Service for Full-Time, Nontenure-Track Faculty out of 5 possible points**  **Instructors with teaching loads of 15 credit hours per semester are not expected to engage in any service.**  **For Lecturers (any rank), Clinical Faculty (any rank), and Professors of Practice,**  **service in any single category suffices when the faculty member carries a teaching load of 12 credit hours per semester.**  **When any nontenure-track faculty member’s teaching load is reduced to allow more service, indicators may be reviewed more qualitatively.** | | | | | |
| **Indicators** | **5**  **Extraordinary Performance** | **4**  **Exceeds Expectations** | **3**  **Meets Expectations** | **2**  **Partially Meets Expectations** | **1**  **Unacceptable Performance** |
| **To the School** | Outstanding service and leadership as the chair or key member of two or more work-intensive SCCJ standing or *ad hoc* committees or as a highly- engaged faculty advisor to SCCJ student groups. | Outstanding service and leadership as a key member of a work-intensive SCCJ standing or *ad hoc* committee or as a highly-engaged faculty advisor to a SCCJ student group. | Ongoing and high-quality service as member of one or more SCCJ standing or *ad hoc* committees. | Service to the SCCJ through a single act of volunteered service, or ongoing service as member of a SCCJ standing or *ad hoc* committee that does not involve high-quality contributions. | No meaningful service to the SCCJ. |
| **OR**  **To the College or University** | Outstanding service and leadership as the chair or key member of two or more work-intensive CoPSCS standing or *ad hoc* committees or as a highly- engaged faculty advisor to College- or University-wide student groups. | Outstanding service and leadership as a key member of a work-intensive CoPSCS standing or *ad hoc* committee or as a highly-engaged faculty advisor to a College- or University-wide student group. | Meaningful service as a member of a standing or *ad hoc* CoPSCS or University committee and/or as a member of an advisory panel or group. | Service to the College or University through an isolated act of volunteerism. | No meaningful service to the College or University. |
| **OR**  **Scholarly Service** | Service as the Editor-in-Chief of a journal; completion of multiple external reviews of candidates for tenure or promotion; or completion of four or more *ad-hoc* peer- reviews of manuscripts for journals or scholarly presses. | Service as the Guest Editor of a journal or as the Associate Editor of a journal; completion of an external review of a candidate for tenure or promotion; or completion of three *ad-hoc* peer-reviews of manuscripts for journals or scholarly presses. | Service on the editorial board of a professional journal with regular peer reviewer responsibilities; and/or completion of two *ad-hoc* peer-reviews of manuscripts for journals or scholarly presses. | Completion of one *ad-hoc* peer-review of a manuscript for a journal or scholarly press. | No service to professional journals or scholarly presses; and no profession service to other colleges/universities as an external reviewer for a candidate for tenure or promotion. |
| **OR**  **Professional or Civic Service** | Leadership as an officer of a professional organization, community board, review panel, etc.; or leadership of a major community service undertaking. | Leadership as a non-officer board member of a professional organization, community board, review panel, etc.; or significant involvement in a major community service undertaking. | Service as a member of a committee for a professional organization, community board, review panel, etc.; or periodic participant in some community service undertaking. | No service to professional organizations, community boards, review panels, etc.; but periodic or isolated participant in some community service undertaking. | No service to professional organizations, community boards, review panels, or as a participant in any community. |