**Annual Evaluations (contract-required Guidelines, approved by the requisite 2/3 vote):**

I. **Definition**

The purpose of annual evaluation is to recognize meritorious faculty performance in teaching; scholarship/research activity; and professional service and governance.  The Chair will evaluate faculty using the terms “Far Exceeds Expectations,” “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Below Expectations,” and “Unsatisfactory” for each of the three categories listed above.  The evaluation will be based on performance in assigned activities during the previous year (including the previous summer, fall, and spring semesters).  Special assignments, sabbatical leave activities, and other contributions documented in the faculty member's annual report must also be considered in evaluations.  In evaluating faculty members, the chair will make qualitative assessments about the character of work performed in each of the three following categories.

II. **Teaching Effectiveness**

All faculty in the department will meet and teach their classes as scheduled throughout the semester, hold the required number of office hours prescribed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement in consultation with the chairperson, submit the required annual self-evaluation including the teaching narrative by the established deadline, and maintain the professional decorum set forth in Article 10.3 Academic Responsibility of Faculty Members in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The following activities may be included, with documentation, in the faculty member’s self-evaluation to be used to assess the quality of his or her teaching:

1. teaching of new or revised courses at the undergraduate and graduate level that incorporate innovative and effective teaching techniques and materials, as demonstrated by syllabi, materials and assignments.
2. directing of independent studies, directed readings, internships, conferences with student participation, and other mentorship activities, as demonstrated by syllabi, materials and assignments, letters and programs.
3. assessments of teaching in the form of ISQ’s, optional student evaluations administered by the faculty member, or peer evaluations from faculty or other qualified observers.
4. assessments of student learning, including samples of student work.
5. engagement in professional development and the scholarship of pedagogy, in the form of published articles on teaching in the faculty member’s discipline, attendance and presentation at workshops and conferences on teaching, and other activities.
6. recognitions and awards for outstanding teaching.
7. any other documented activities relevant to the faculty member’s teaching.

III. **Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Performance**

Teaching that *Far Exceeds Expectations* may be demonstrated by:

1. the teaching of courses that employ highly effective and innovative teaching strategies.
2. other evidence of excellence in classroom instruction, as demonstrated by peer review, internal or external awards or recognition, and written evaluations submitted by students.
3. The development of new courses or the substantial revision of existing courses which prove to be highly effective or innovative.
4. direction of students in challenging and academically sophisticated DIS, DIR, and/or research projects, as demonstrated by syllabi, assignments, assessments and other teaching materials.
5. challenging and academically sophisticated mentorship of graduate or topical studies students.
6. ISQ scores well above the university mean for effectiveness of instruction.
7. publication of articles on teaching in the faculty member’s discipline, or delivering papers or holding leadership positions at conferences or other professional activities dedicated to teaching.

Teaching that *Exceeds Expectations* may be demonstrated by:

1. the teaching of new courses that employ mostly effective teaching strategies.
2. high quality classroom instruction, as demonstrated by peer review, internal or external awards or recognition, and written evaluations submitted by students.
3. direction of students in DIS, DIR, and/or research projects.
4. the development of new courses or the substantial revision of existing courses which prove to be mostly effective.
5. dedicated mentorship of graduate or topical studies students.
6. ISQ scores above the university mean for effectiveness of instruction.
7. attendance at conferences or other professional activities dedicated to teaching.

Teaching that *Meets Expectations* may be demonstrated by:

1. the teaching of courses that employ some effective teaching strategies.
2. acceptable classroom instruction, as demonstrated by peer review, written evaluations submitted by students, or other evidence of acceptable instruction.
3. ISQ scores generally at the university mean for effectiveness of instruction
4. the posting and maintenance of at least the minimum office hours (5 hours per week).

Teaching that is *Below Expectations* may be demonstrated by:

1. insufficient evidence of effective classroom instruction, as demonstrated by peer review, written evaluations submitted by students, and other evidence.
2. little evidence of thoughtful design or revision of courses in order to achieve effective teaching.
3. ISQ scores consistently below the university mean for effectiveness of instruction.
4. failure to maintain the minimum office hours (5 hours per week).

Teaching that is *Unsatisfactory* may be demonstrated by:

1. no evidence of thoughtful design of courses in order to achieve effective teaching strategies.
2. ISQ scores consistently well below the university mean for effectiveness of instruction.
3. no evidence of effective classroom instruction, as demonstrated by peer review, written evaluations submitted by students; and/or classes not offered regularly as scheduled.
4. failure to post or maintain any office hours.
5. failure to submit the required annual self-evaluation.

IV. **Research/Scholarship Activities**

All faculty in the department will maintain active research/scholarly agendas. The following priority-order list of research/scholarly activities and evidence from other sources, such as internal or external research awards, will be used by the chairperson to assess each faculty member's annual performance:

* + 1. a peer-reviewed, authored book published during the previous year, to include legitimate digital scholarly venues;
		2. a peer-reviewed, co-authored book published during the previous year, to include legitimate digital scholarly venues;
		3. a peer-reviewed, edited or co-edited book published during the previous year, to include legitimate digital scholarly venues;
		4. an external, competitive, funded, research grant;
		5. a peer-reviewed, authored chapter or article that appeared in a scholarly publication or journal, to include legitimate digital scholarly venues;
		6. an internal, competitive, funded research grant;
		7. a documented, active research program (examples: documented progress on an article, chapter or book; completion of scholarship that has been accepted but not published; completion of a grant proposal that has not been finally reviewed);
		8. a scholarly paper presented at an international, national, regional, or state meeting;
		9. a scholarly paper presented at another university by invitation;
		10. a review essay published in a scholarly journal, to include legitimate digital scholarly venues;
		11. an entry published in an encyclopedia or reference book, to include legitimate digital scholarly venues, when that entry requires original primary source research and/or when that entry is peer reviewed;
		12. an entry published in an encyclopedia or reference book, to include legitimate digital scholarly venues;
		13. a book review published in a scholarly journal, to include legitimate digital scholarly venues.

Public history productions may also qualify as research/scholarly activity. Public history is the application or presentation of historical work to a non-academic audience. Authored or edited books, chapters, and articles that have undergone a blind peer-review process and include original research will be valued in the same way as those included above even if they are directed toward a popular audience. Public history productions that do not undergo a peer-review process and/or lack original research will be valued similarly to the non-research based scholarly productions listed above (for example, an entry in an encyclopedia or reference book) that are of comparable length and quality.

V. **Criteria for Assessment of Research/Scholarship Activities**

A rating of *Far Exceeds Expectations* may be attained by one of the following accomplishments:

1. the publication of a peer-reviewed, authored or co-authored book;
2. the publication of a peer-reviewed, edited or co-edited book;
3. the awarding of a major external, competitive, funded, research grant;
4. the publication of one or more peer-reviewed, authored chapters or articles that are of superior quality and make a substantial contribution to the field.

A rating of *Exceeds Expectations* may be attained by one or a combination of the following accomplishments:

1. the publication of a peer-reviewed, authored chapter or article;
2. substantial, documented progress toward publication of a book or other major project, including written contact with a publisher;
3. presentation(s) at international, national, regional, or state meetings;
4. publication of multiple review essays, entries in an encyclopedia, or book reviews;
5. the awarding of a significant internal, competitive funded research grant.

A rating of *Meets Expectations* may be attained by some combination of the following:

1. a documented, active research program intended to result in scholarship published in peer-reviewed publications;
2. presentation at an international, national, regional, or state meetings;
3. publication of a review essay, an entry in an encyclopedia, or a book review in a scholarly journal;
4. Submission of an internal, competitive, funded research grant.

A rating of *Below Expectations* may be attained by one of the following actions:

1. providing insufficient evidence of an active research program;
2. making insufficient progress on scholarly activities.

A rating of *Unsatisfactory* may be attained by one of the following actions:

1. providing no evidence of any scholarly activity or productions;
2. failing to submit the required annual self-evaluation portfolio;
3. failing to maintain the professional decorum set forth in Article 10.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

VI. **Service Activities**

All faculty members in the department will fulfill assigned departmental responsibilities and attend department meetings. The following non-priority order list of service-related activities and evidence from other sources, such as internal or external awards, will be used by the chairperson to assess each faculty member's annual performance:

* + 1. serving on an active departmental, college, or university committee;
		2. chairing a departmental, college, or university committee;
		3. organizing a professional conference;
		4. chairing or commentating for a panel at a professional conference;
		5. reviewing a manuscript for a professional journal, bibliographic service, or scholarly publisher;
		6. reviewing proposals for a local, state, national, foreign, or international agency;
		7. serving as an invited consultant or spokesperson for a state, national, foreign, or international organization;
		8. serving the profession as an officer for a local, regional, state, national, foreign or international professionally-related organization;
		9. serving the profession by giving professionally related talks to local or regional groups, organizations, or schools;
		10. serving the profession by writing articles for non-juried, non-scholarly publications related to one’s discipline;
		11. participating in the governance process of the institution, which means significant service on department, college, or University-wide committees and councils beyond that associated with the expected responsibility to participate in the governance of the institution through regular department, college, or University meetings (service as UNF/UFF President, service on the UFF bargaining team, or service as an official UFF grievance representative shall be deemed “significant service”);
		12. Serving on juries for professional article and book prizes for professional associations and other reputable award-granting agencies;
		13. Serving on graduate thesis or dissertation committees at institutions beyond UNF.

VII. **Criteria for Assessment of Service**

A rating of *Far Exceeds Expectations* may be attained by one of the following activities in addition to the service activities that merit the rating of Exceeds Expectations (listed below):

1. committing an extraordinary amount of time to departmental, college, school, and/or university committees;
2. committing an extraordinary amount of time to professional service as a reviewer/chair/organization officer or through speeches/writing/consulting;
3. committing an extraordinary amount of time to other forms of service to local, state, national, foreign, and/or international organizations

A rating of *Exceeds Expectations* may be attained by some combination of the following activities in addition to the service activities that merit the rating of Meets Expectations (listed below):

1. serving on more than one departmental, college, and/or university committee;
2. chairing a departmental, college, or university committee;
3. reviewing a manuscript for a professional journal, bibliographic service, or scholarly publisher;
4. participating in the governance process of the institution;
5. significantly serving the profession in multiple forms

A rating of *Meets Expectations* may be attained by completing the following service activities:

1. fully participating in departmental activities;
2. serving on at least one departmental, college, school, or university committee;
3. serving the profession in at least one meaningful form;
4. submitting the required annual self-evaluation portfolio;
5. maintaining the professional decorum set forth in Article 10.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement

A rating of *Below Expectations* may be attained by one of the following actions:

1. infrequently participating in departmental activities;
2. infrequently serving on departmental, college, or university committees

A rating of *Unsatisfactory* may be attained by one of the following actions:

1. consistently failing to engage in service activities;
2. failing to submit required annual self-evaluation portfolio;
3. failing to maintain the professional decorum set forth in Article 10.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

VIII. **Materials to Submit**

Faculty must provide the following evaluation instruments to the chairperson:

* + 1. departmentally sanctioned peer reviews;
		2. all syllabi from the semester under consideration;
		3. sample course hand-outs;
		4. access to all course Canvas sites;
		5. student evaluations of courses (e.g. discursive evaluations and ISQS)
		6. copies of all scholarly or teaching activities or materials, in their original formats, along with evidence of professional recognition of said scholarship or teaching methodologies, when available;
		7. evidence of service activities;
		8. additional evidence for the chair to use in determining merit (the department chair is responsible for evaluating the quality and relevance of additional materials submitted in support of the annual report);

IX. **Materials from Persons other than Faculty Member**

The faculty member shall be shown all additional material submitted to the Annual Evaluation file from persons other than the faculty member, including information from peers, university officials, and students. The faculty member shall have the right to attach a written response to all such materials.