

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS
Judaic Studies Program/Dean's Office
December 13, 2006

Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluation of a faculty member is conducted by the Program Director, who draw upon the annual report and render assessments for each of the four basic categories of teaching, research and service/professional development and other assigned duties. From these assessments, an overall evaluation is derived.

The following procedure will be employed in the Program for the execution of faculty evaluations:

- 1) The faculty member prepares an annual report according to the categories designated on the report form.
- 2) The faculty member submits the Faculty Annual Report to the Program Director.
- 3) The proposed written evaluation is presented to the faculty member within ninety days after the end of the performance period being evaluated.
- 4) The faculty member is given the opportunity to discuss the evaluation with the Director.
- 5) The final evaluation is signed and dated by the Program Director and the faculty member.

Categorical assessments (and thus overall evaluations) are based upon the following kinds of standards of merit. The paradigmatic activities listed are not necessarily exhaustive, and other relevant activities may be counted by the Program Director if so requested by the faculty member.

I. Teaching

- A. Meeting classes as scheduled, including giving the final during the final exam period.
- B. Student evaluations, including written comments.
- C: Classroom peer-review(s), as assigned by the Program Director or requested by faculty member.
- D. Evidence of excellence and rigor in teaching that can be documented through review of syllabi, classroom visits, review of examinations given, or other methods
 1. A copy of the syllabus for each course must be submitted to the Program Director at the beginning of each semester.
 2. A classroom visit by the Program Director must be completed for each class each semester.
- E. Demonstrable interdisciplinarity of courses, if relevant.
- F. Supervision of student research projects or theses.
- G. Academic advisement.
- H. Additional evidence of extra teaching effort or other evidence of quality teaching such as the following:
 1. Awards or other kinds of formal recognition.

2. Development of new academic programs of study, new courses, new textbooks, and significant revisions to existing courses or textbooks.
3. The development and successful implementation of innovative pedagogical techniques and/or materials.
4. Scholarly activity related to teaching.

The activities outlined above are not rank-ordered. However, it is expected that meritorious performance as teachers will be evidenced by indicators of pedagogical success, as well as effort. Faculty members may demonstrate their effectiveness as teachers by multiple means, including measures of student satisfaction, measures of student success, and/or peer review or recognition.

II. Research and Creative Activity:

The following activities will be considered in assessing the merit of faculty research and creative activity. All research and creative activities should be related to the faculty member's disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise.

1. Publication of scholarly books, articles, book reviews, and commentaries.
2. Translation of scholarly books and articles.
3. Editing of scholarly books and journals.
4. Production of scholarly materials in alternative media.
5. Scholarly presentations at professional conferences.
6. Funded grant activity.
7. Submission of grant applications, book proposals, essays or other relevant work for professional review and consideration.
8. Demonstration of interdisciplinarity in research, if relevant.

The activities outlined above are not rank-ordered. However, the following general principles will apply in assessing the merit of scholarly and creative activities:

1. Books rank above articles, articles rank above published reviews and commentaries.
2. Authored books rank above edited books or textbooks.
3. Peer-reviewed activities rank above non peer-reviewed activities.
4. Work published in international or national journals or presented at international or national conferences ranks above work published in regional or state journals or presented at regional or state conferences.
5. Publications rank above presentations.
6. Funded grant proposals rank above grant submissions.
7. Work accepted for publication, presentation, or distribution ranks above work submitted.
8. Work-in-progress that has not been presented, submitted, accepted, contracted, or funded will not be counted.
9. Peer-reviewed electronic publications will be evaluated according to the same principles as print publications, namely those listed above.
10. Articles will count only one time, either in the year they are accepted or the year they are published. Book and book chapters will count only time, either in the year they are in press or the year they are published.

11. In cases of multiple authorship, the first author shall be assumed to be the primary author unless information is provided that indicates otherwise.

III. Service and Professional Development

A. University Service

1. Membership and active and effective participation on Office, College or University committees; Faculty Senate.
2. Organizing, or participating in, workshops or seminars related to the mission of the Office, College or University.
3. Coordination of special academic programs.
4. Advisor to campus organizations.
5. Other service (such as special assignments)

B. Professional Service

1. Offices or special responsibilities in professional organizations related to academic discipline
2. Membership in professional organizations related to academic discipline.
3. Attendance at professional meetings related to academic discipline.
4. Participation in, as well as organization of, conferences, courses, workshops and seminars designed to enhance competence and understanding in academic or scholarly contexts
5. Review academic manuscripts
6. Serve in an editorial capacity for an academic publication
7. Membership on professional organization advisory boards

C. Public Service

1. To public schools or to other community or state organizations.
2. As consultant due to professional expertise related to one's academic discipline.
3. As moderator or guest on television or radio programs or as commentator in print media.

D. Professional Development

IV. Other Duties

Faculty with a substantial assignment in the "Other" category should discuss evaluation of activities with the Program Director at the beginning of the evaluation year. If following this discussion, the Program Director determines the evaluation standards must deviate from this document for a faculty member with a substantial assignment in Other Duties, those standards must be placed in writing and on file in the department.

Ratings for Tenure Earning & Tenured Faculty

In determining which evaluative ratings ("Outstanding", etc.) to assign on annual reports in individual categories, as well as overall, the Program Director will adhere to the following guidelines. Ratings for individual categories will be based upon quality and quantity of performance (where quality under research is strictly correlated with the relative rankings indicated for specific activities). While it is not practicable to quantify the determination of ratings for individual categories, the following considerations are taken into account, for

example, as necessary conditions for a rating of "Outstanding" for tenure-earning and tenured members of the faculty.

Under teaching, student evaluations should be appreciably above College average, meaning at least one-half of one standard deviation above the college average. Faculty evaluations that range from one-half of one standard deviation below to one-half of one standard deviation above the college average will be eligible for an "Above Satisfactory" ranking, given ample performance in the Teaching category. Faculty with student evaluations below one-half of one standard deviation below the college average will receive no higher than a "Satisfactory" ranking.

Under research, scholarly work should be published/presented during the period covered by the annual evaluation, such work consisting of at least one book and/or a peer-reviewed professional article, or translation of a scholarly book, and/or multiple professional papers. An Outstanding ranking in research will normally require no less than one book publication, one peer-reviewed professional article, or a translation of a scholarly book. (Publication of a book or textbook may merit an "Outstanding" evaluation in research for two years. The OLIS Director can consider materials such as reviews and the book's substance to award this distinction.) Multiple professional papers, peer-reviewed and at international or national meetings, usually will meet the standard of "Above Satisfactory" unless the number or significance are great enough to justify an "Outstanding." Publication of a refereed book chapter in a scholarly book will be sufficient for an "Above Satisfactory" ranking. Preparation and submission of a professional article and delivery of a professional paper at a peer-reviewed international or national meeting will justify an "Above Satisfactory" ranking. At least one of these activities is the minimum required for a "Satisfactory," but may not be sufficient without evidence of other scholarly activity, such as applying for a research grant, reviewing scholarly articles or books. The absence of any research or creative activity will result in a conditional or unsatisfactory rating.

Under service, activity should be regular and significant and extend beyond the office level. "Outstanding" service should include multiple activities in more than one category within those listed as well as indications of the level and effectiveness of participation. "Above Satisfactory" service should include activities in more than one category within those listed as well as indications of the level and effectiveness of participation. "Satisfactory" service indicates that activities has taken place in one or more of the categories, with indications of the degree of participation. The absence of any service activity will result in a conditional or unsatisfactory rating.

Under other duties, it must be recognized that this category is likely to be exceptional and unique to the individual. Other university duties are occasionally assigned for special activities such as administrative duties or other special projects. Evaluation will be provided by the administration directly served. It is incumbent on the Program director to discuss any imbalance with the faculty member concerning the impact it may have on individual professional development and on the welfare of the Program. For the evaluation at hand, it is clear that no faculty member should experience a lowered annual rating for having accepted a responsible assignment.

Finally, a higher weighting will be accorded to the category of research, reflecting the expectations of the College and the University concerning suitability for tenure and/or promotion. Therefore, faculty members who aspire to tenure and/or promotion are admonished to achieve substantive results, especially in terms of more highly ranked research activities. Such aspirants are reminded that the expectations under research are considerably more demanding for promotion to Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor.

A formal table is provided for gauging the relative values of different activities. The relative weight of research/teaching/service will be 3/2/1. An “Outstanding” is worth 3 points, an “Above Satisfactory” 2 points, and a “Satisfactory” 1 point. In order to receive an “Outstanding” overall, one must have at least an “Outstanding” in Research and one other category.

	Research	Teaching	Service	Total
Outstanding	$4 \times 3 = 12$	$4 \times 2 = 8$	$4 \times 1 = 4$	22-24
Above Satisfactory	$3 \times 3 = 9$	$3 \times 2 = 6$	$3 \times 1 = 3$	18-21
Satisfactory	$2 \times 3 = 6$	$2 \times 2 = 4$	$2 \times 1 = 2$	12-17