

## Faculty Evaluation Supporting Document

The College of Education created a faculty evaluation checklist to clarify expectations for faculty. The checklist allows us to clearly define levels of performance that will ensure promotion and tenure, and reliably differentiate levels of performance across teaching, scholarship, and service.

When funding for merit-based raises is available, we create an overall score for each faculty member, based on your negotiated workload. For most faculty, the overall score is computed with teaching weighted 60%, scholarship weighted 20%, and service weighted 20%.

### ***Evaluation Process***

The evaluation process involves multiple steps: (1) faculty self-evaluate their own performance, (2) department chairs and heads complete an initial evaluation and meet with faculty to discuss the evidence items for checklist criteria and reconcile potential differences in checklist scores, (3) faculty and department chairs and heads meet to reconcile potential differences in checklist scores and go over the evidence items for checklist criteria, and (4) department chairs meet and review each faculty member's performance to verify the checklist is applied consistently across departments. Each year as faculty complete a self-evaluation, department chairs will hold meetings to discuss items on the checklist that are not clear and discuss how best to capture activities/accomplishments. These meetings are intended to provide opportunities for faculty to be part of the continuous improvement of the checklist.

### ***Levels of Performance***

*Meets Expectations.* The level of performance required to meet expectations has been set to ensure successful promotion and tenure. If a faculty member meets expectations every year in teaching, scholarship, and service, he or she will be well situated to earn tenure.

*Exceeds Expectations.* The level of performance required to exceed expectations has been set to demonstrate a faculty member is “*truly and demonstrably outstanding among their peers.*”

*With Distinction.* The level of performance required to earn distinction is purposely set very high. One is not expected to be able to sustain this level of productivity from year to year.

For each area of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and service), there is a list of criteria you must satisfy to meet expectations. If all the criteria are not satisfied, you have not met expectations. Your department chair will collaborate with you to develop a plan for improving your performance. If all the criteria are satisfied, you have met expectations. You should proceed to the next set of criteria and evaluate whether you have satisfied the criteria to exceed expectations; you need to satisfy at least four criteria to exceed expectations in teaching and at least three criteria to exceed expectations in research and service. If you have satisfied the requirements to exceed expectations, proceed to the next set of criteria and evaluate whether you

have satisfied the criteria to be with distinction; you need an additional three criteria to be with distinction (total of seven for teaching and six for research and service).

In Faculty 180, the criteria are presented as a checklist. The items included on the checklist were intended to capture the *most* common activities in teaching, scholarship, and service; however, not all activities are represented by an item on the checklist. Accomplishments that are not represented by an item on the checklist should be described in the narrative field, so they can be weighed in your evaluation. The items on the checklist represent a wide range of activities to capture the range of activities faculty undertake in teaching, scholarship, and service. The items are not necessarily viewed as equivalent. For example, in research, presenting at a conference and publishing a sole-author article in a top-tier journal are both items on the checklist, but these are not equivalent activities. You are expected to have evidence for the items you have checked. ***You will describe the evidence in the narrative field provided in Faculty 180. The narrative field is the place to highlight your extraordinary accomplishments, make the case for giving weight in the evaluation for specific accomplishments, and describe accomplishments that are not represented by items on the checklist.***

Below we provide more detailed explanations to help clarify certain criteria and use of the checklist.

### ***Evaluation of Teaching***

The narrative field should be used to describe the evidence for items you have checked on the checklist, highlight your extraordinary accomplishments, make the case for giving weight in the evaluation for specific accomplishments, and describe accomplishments that are not represented by items on the checklist. For example, you might highlight successfully teaching a heavily enrolled class or tackling difficult diversity issues in class.

**To meet expectations, you must have done ALL of the following:**

- Earned average course evaluations of 3.5 or higher across all courses.  
**Low enrollment courses can be used in computing the average course evaluation; however, you should give less weight to courses with low enrollment because these evaluations provide less reliable evidence of the true quality of instruction.**
- Aligned course to standards and included standards in syllabus as required by department.
- Completed rubrics, key assessments, and submitted student learning outcome data at the end of the semester as required by department.
- Made minor adjustments to courses.
- Completed advising activities and associated paperwork.

**If all of the items on the list above have been satisfied, you have met expectations. You should proceed to the next set of items and evaluate whether you have satisfied enough items to exceed expectations. For**

**Evaluation of Teaching, you are expected to satisfy four different items to exceed expectations.**

To exceed expectations, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet expectations, and (B) done at least four of the following:

- Earned average course evaluations of 4.5 or higher on all courses.  
**If your course evaluations were 4.7 or higher, you have satisfied this item here AND will also satisfy the course evaluation item in with distinction.**
  - Provided documentation from a respected teaching peer outlining distinguished teaching skills.  
**The observations can be conducted by chairs, heads, or colleagues. The Center for Teaching and Learning also conducts observations.**
  - Developed or substantially revised a course.  
**This could include planning and leading whole group seminars for TE Unit (PY Seminars).**
  - Participated substantively in program revision/development.
  - Provided documentation from liaison school or agency colleagues outlining distinguished work with K-12 colleagues and/or pre-service teachers and/or school or community counselors.
  - Developed new school or community partnerships leading to student placements.  
**This could include recruiting new mentor teachers in a building.**
  - Worked extensively with students on graduate or undergraduate research beyond assigned workload.  
**Evidence of working extensively with students includes publishing with students, supporting presentation of research at conferences—including the Undergraduate Research Conference, the Graduate Showcase, the Three Minute Thesis. Other evidence includes successfully advising students through an independent study, directed research, or thesis, or serving on a supervisory committee for a dissertation or thesis (whether at Boise State or another university).**
- Program coordinators are compensated for recruiting and supporting students through application and completion of the program, so these activities should not be counted here—they are administration.**
- Provided evidence of excellence in advising.  
**Evidence of this is graduating students in a timely manner, working with students to help them publish or present at a conference or Boise State's research showcase.**
  - Included evidence of positive impact on P-12 student learning.
  - Included service-learning in at least one course.
  - Received an award for teaching excellence.

- Worked with a student to create a candidate development plan.

**If you have satisfied the requirements to exceed expectations, proceed to the next set of items and evaluate whether you have satisfied the requirements to be with distinction. You are expected to do an additional four criteria (a total of eight) to be with distinction.**

**NOTE. The items for exceeds expectation and with distinction are identical for Evaluation of Teaching, except the average course evaluation is higher for with distinction.**

**To earn distinction, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet and exceed expectations, and (B) done an additional three of the following:**

- Earned average course evaluations of 4.7 or higher on all courses.
- Provided documentation from a respected teaching peer outlining distinguished teaching skills.
- Developed or substantially revised a course.
- Participated substantively in program revision/development.
- Provided documentation from liaison school or agency colleagues outlining distinguished work with K-12 colleagues and/or pre-service teachers and/or school or community counselors.
- Developed new school or community partnerships.
- Worked extensively with students on graduate or undergraduate research beyond assigned workload.
- Provided evidence of excellence in advising.
- Included evidence of positive impact on P-12 student learning.
- Included service-learning in at least one course.
- Received an award for teaching excellence.
- Worked with a student to create a candidate development plan.

### ***Evaluation of Scholarship***

**The annual evaluation process is aligned to expectations for promotion and tenure. Meeting expectations every year should ensure positive external reviews and successful promotion to associate professor. External reviewers evaluate scholarly productivity first and foremost in terms of publications; therefore, publishing is required to meet expectations. Thus, although submitting an external grant and presenting at a conference would satisfy two items on the list to meet expectations, this does not include publishing and would not meet expectations for a given year.**

**For Evaluation of Scholarship, you need NOT satisfy *different* criteria related to publishing. For example, publishing two sole author articles would satisfy only one item but it would satisfy the item twice, so it would count as satisfying two items.**

The narrative field should be used to describe the evidence for items you have checked on the checklist, highlight your extraordinary accomplishments (e.g., provide the impact factor or readership of a journal in which you published), make the case for giving weight in the evaluation for specific accomplishments (e.g., you might make the case that a chapter in a prestigious handbook should be weighed as much as a journal article), and describe accomplishments that are not represented by items on the checklist. For example, you might include webinars or podcasts that are related to scholarship.

**To meet expectations, you must have done at least two of the following:**

- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Published a second-author article, with a student as first author, in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.

**Departments provide the dean with a list of top-tier and second-tier journals. Nonetheless, you should highlight top-tier publications in your narrative in Faculty 180.**

- Authored or co-authored book.

**You should highlight when a book or chapter was published by a top academic press (e.g., Oxford Press) in your narrative in Faculty 180.**

- Published any combination of two (a) co-authored articles in top-tier or second-tier journals or (b) book chapters.
- Submitted an external grant funding, contract funding, or internal grant funding.
- Presented at a conference.
- **Conference presentations can only be counted once (i.e., this item is satisfied regardless of the number of presentations). Conference proceedings are typically considered as a conference presentation; however, in some fields conference proceedings are highly valued. Faculty can make the case in the narrative that the proceedings for a conference that are subject to rigorous review should be weighed in your evaluation.**

\*Note. Faculty are expected to publish 1.5 articles per year; therefore, 1 publication only meets expectations following a year with at least two publications.

**If you have satisfied at least two of the criteria related to publishing or satisfied the same criterion twice, you have met expectations and should**

**proceed to evaluate whether you have satisfied the criteria to exceed expectations. For Evaluation of Scholarship, you are expected to satisfy three additional criteria to exceed expectations.**

**To exceed expectations, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet expectations, and (B) done at least three of the following:**

- Received internal or external grant or contract funding, including continued funding.
- Submitted a large external grant.
- Keynote speaker at major conference.
- Received an external award or recognition for distinguished scholarly activity.
- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Published a second-author article, with a student as first author, in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Authored or co-authored book.
- Published any combination of two (a) co-authored articles in top-tier or second-tier journals or (b) book chapters.

**For Evaluation of Scholarship, you are expected to satisfy three additional criteria to be with distinction. Note the list of criteria for with distinction are smaller more difficult to meet than those for exceeding expectations.**

**To earn distinction, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet and exceed expectations, and (B) done an additional three of the following:**

- Received internal or external grant or contract funding, including continued funding.
- Submitted a large external grant.
- Keynote speaker at a major conference.
- Received an external award or recognition for distinguished scholarly activity.
- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Published a second-author article, with a student as first author, in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Authored or co-authored book.
- Published any combination of two (a) co-authored articles in top-tier or second-tier journals or (b) book chapters.

**The examples below illustrate how the checklist is used.**

**Example of Exceeds Expectations:**

**You published two first-author articles and two co-authored articles in second-tier journals, had a conference presentation, and submitted two large external grants.**

**You satisfied the requirements to meet expectations. You could use one first-author publication and the conference presentation to meet expectations and carry forward one first-author publication, two co-authored articles, and two external grant submissions. You would satisfy the criteria for exceeding expectations. Thus, under the exceeds expectation checklist, you would check the following criteria:**

- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Published two or more co-authored article(s) in top-tier and/or second-tier journals.
- Submitted a large external grant. (TWICE)

**You would describe the four criteria checked in the narrative box in Faculty 180 and self-evaluate as a 3 (exceeds expectations).**

**Example of With Distinction:**

**You published four first-authored articles in second-tier journals, one co-authored article in a second-tier journal, one book chapter, had a conference presentation, submitted a large external grant, had continued funding on a large external grant, and hit on a new large external grant.**

**You satisfied the requirements to meet expectations. You could use one first-author publication and the conference presentation to meet expectations and carry forward three first-author articles, one co-authored article and one book chapter, one submitted external grant, one continued large external grant, and one newly funded grant.**

**Under Exceeds Expectations you would check the items below and carry forward one first-author publication, one co-authored publication, one book chapter, one continued large external grant, and one new grant.**

- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal. (TWICE)
- Submitted a large external grant.

**You would satisfy the requirement for with distinction.**

- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Authored or co-authored two or more book chapters. (Using one article from above to count as the second chapter.)
- Received external grant or contract funding. (TWICE: Continuing funding for one grant and one newly funded grant).

**You would describe the items checked in the narrative box in Faculty 180 and**

**self-evaluate as a 4 (with distinction).**

### ***Evaluation of Service***

The narrative field should be used to describe the evidence for items you have checked on the checklist, highlight your extraordinary accomplishments, make the case for giving weight in the evaluation for specific accomplishments, and describe accomplishments that are not represented by items on the checklist. For example, you might include webinars or podcasts that are related to service to an organization.

**To meet expectations, you must have done ALL of the following:**

- Served on a university, college or department committee or task force.
- Provided some service to a national, state, or local organization.

**Local organizations include schools. Facilitating placements, coordinating placements with other liaisons in a building fall under this item. This also includes participating on state or national task forces or teams (e.g., standards committees, special interest group—like SEL or literacy/math requirements). It also includes working on partnerships with local school districts for course activities.**

- Completed all tasks as assigned in service or administrative roles.

**If all of the items on the meet expectations list have been satisfied, you have met expectations. You should proceed to the next set of items and evaluate whether you have satisfied the requirement to exceed expectations.**

**For Evaluation of Service, you are expected to have three items to exceed expectations. You need NOT satisfy different items. For example, serving as Editor or Editorial Board Member for two journals would satisfy only one item but it would satisfy the item twice, so it would count as satisfying two items.**

**To exceed expectations, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet expectations, and (B) done at least three of the following:**

- Led a university, college or department committee or task force that produced a substantial product.

**Committees that produce substantial product include: (a) the IRB, (b) the Curriculum Committee, (c) a search committee, (d) Graduate Faculty Representative, and/or (e) the Scholarship Committee .**



**This includes serving on a task force that produces a unit template, new checklist. New signature assignment or process. It also includes serving as interview team leader with final letter responsibility.**

**You can make the case that a committee produced a substantial product in the narrative.**

- Led a university, college or department committee or task force that produced a substantial product.
- Received a Service Award.
- Served on multiple committees or task forces that produce a substantial product.
- Provided leadership to a national, state, or local organization.
- Mentored pre-tenured faculty members.
- Served on a university, college or department committee or task force, which produce a substantial product.
- Served on governing or advisory board of a national, state, or local organization.
- Served as an Editor or Editorial Board Member of an academic journal.
- Served on a grant review panel.
- Provided development time to CTL or K12 schools or agencies.
- Reviewed several manuscripts for a journal or conference.
- Provided trainings to community (e.g. continuing ed., professional development workshops).

**This includes providing professional development with mentor teachers at partner schools.**

**For Evaluation of Service, you are expected to check three additional items to be with distinction (a total of six). You are expected to satisfy three additional criteria to be with distinction. Note the list of criteria for with distinction does not include all the criteria included on the list for exceeding expectations.**

**To earn distinction, you must have (A) checked all the items to meet and three additional items in exceed expectations, and (B) done an additional three of the following:**

- Led a university, college or department committee or task force that produced a substantial product.
- Received a Service Award.
- Served on multiple committees or task forces that produce a substantial product.
- Provided leadership to a national, state, or local organization.
- Mentored pre-tenured faculty members.
- Served on a university, college or department committee or task force, which produce a substantial product.
- Served on governing or advisory board of a national, state, or local organization.
- Served as an Editor or Editorial Board Member of an academic journal.
- Served on a grant review panel.
- Provided development time to CTL or K12 schools or agency.

- Reviewed several manuscripts for a journal or conference.
- Provided trainings to community (e.g. continuing ed., professional development workshops).