



**ANNUAL REVIEW EVALUATION AND CRITERIA  
(Effective AY 2018-19)**

**Annual Reviews and Statement of Expectations**

“Faculty with less than full-time administrative responsibilities will be evaluated annually by faculty peers and appropriate administrators. The Annual Review shall be conducted during the semester following the year being evaluated. For first-year faculty, the first year’s review will encompass only the first semester” (1.4.6.1 & 1.4.6.2.1, Conditions of Faculty Services, COFS).

Performance shall be evaluated overall and in the areas of designated responsibility. These areas would include two or more of the following (generally all three for tenured/tenure-track faculty): (1) student-related responsibilities (including teaching, advising, and mentoring), (2) scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; and professional development, and (3) service (including service to the profession, department/school/college/university and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university).

Each benefit-eligible faculty member is required to have an approved Statement of Expectations (SOE; COFS 1.4.5.1). This SOE serves both to articulate expected responsibilities for the coming year and also as the basis for evaluation of performance in the annual review process. The evaluation of performance incorporates both the projected activities of the faculty member and also the unit criteria as described in this document. Thus, while a faculty member may exceed the list of activities articulated in the SOE, the judgement of performance is also guided by unit criteria. In other words, setting low standards in an SOE is not a pathway to high ratings, nor is setting high standards penalized—both cases must be evaluated in light of approved criteria and the judgement of the reviewers.

When preparing your SOE, review the COE SOE Guidelines (2016) and the Office of the Provost SOE Guidelines (2017). These two documents are available on the COE SharePoint site.

**Unit Level Criteria**

COFS (Section 1.4.6.1.1) also provides guidelines regarding ratings to be used for annual reviews. Specifically, each faculty member shall be evaluated in the areas of designated responsibility using a four point scale, with one (1) (corresponding to an unsatisfactory rating, two (2) corresponding to a satisfactory rating, three (3) corresponding to a meritorious rating, and four (4) corresponding to a rating of highly meritorious. No faculty member can be rated unsatisfactory overall unless he or she is rated unsatisfactory in one or more areas. Whether a rating of unsatisfactory in one or more areas is a basis for an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory will depend upon the percentage of the faculty member’s efforts assigned to those area(s) in the Statement of Expectations and the application of the applicable academic unit criteria to the faculty member’s performance.”

Criteria are developed at the college unit level for each of the three major areas under the SOE: Student-Related Activity; Scholarly Work and Service. The COE has developed criteria at the college level which are applicable to faculty in all departments in the college. Changes in a faculty member’s focus over time are reflected in an SOE. For example, generally a faculty member with no scholarship responsibilities, or one who has become less active in scholarship or creative activity, will not have workload allocation for that purpose. Additionally depending on unit needs and capacity, a faculty member may be provided an increase in load allocation for select activities. These differing workload load allocations will be evaluated so that outcomes are proportionate with the load provided.

## **A NOTE ON CRITERIA**

Multiple criteria are provided for each area of review. Reviewers are aware that not all criteria may apply to all faculty in the College of Education. For example, a faculty without a terminal degree may not be eligible to chair a dissertation; similarly, not all faculty participate in school partnership experiences. However, an effort was made to include a fairly comprehensive list of criteria under each area so faculty have the option to excel on criteria that match their training, background and strengths in light of available opportunities. Moreover, additional criteria may be considered upon review and approval by the respective department chair.

## **Description of Ratings**

***Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Ratings.*** In order to earn a rating of “Satisfactory”, all criteria under the respective areas (e.g., student-related and service or student-related, research/scholarship and service) under review must be met to achieve this rating. While evidence or artifacts for many of the criteria listed may be provided or addressed in the annual review summary/reflection statement, it may be difficult for a faculty member to provide direct evidence for specific areas under the “Satisfactory” column to allow a faculty review committee to make a determination of whether a faculty member meets/does not meet the criteria. Faculty members could address these criteria in their reflection statement whenever possible. Please note that chairs may have information (e.g., submission of syllabi by faculty) that is often not available to faculty review committees and may use this information in addition to the material submitted for review to determine the department chair’s rating of performance in each of the three areas. In all cases, this additional information or lack thereof has been shared with the faculty member. Faculty members who do not meet all the criteria in the “Satisfactory” column for each area under review will receive a rating of Unsatisfactory for that area. They are not eligible for higher ratings in that area.

***Meritorious or Highly Meritorious Ratings.*** Before being considered for a Meritorious or Highly Meritorious rating in any of the three areas, the faculty member must first meet all the requirements listed under Satisfactory that are applicable for their rank/title and include evidence/artifacts related to the criteria in that area. Each area provides specific criteria to achieve a rating of Meritorious or Highly Meritorious. To receive an overall rating of Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious or Highly Meritorious, percentage of effort allocated to each area is factored into the calculation (see page 6-7 for examples on how to calculate the overall rating). Please note that for each area, the faculty review committee reserves the right to use a lower count than what is specified in the criteria provided they are consistent and include justification for their rating based on the quality and overall performance of a specific achievement documented by the faculty.

## **Self-Reflection Statement**

Each annual review evaluation must include a self-reflection statement that describes performance on specific criteria in relation to the SOE and provide evidence of being reflective practitioners and scholars and include artifacts related to the criteria chosen for evaluation. Reviewers may use evidence presented to support additional criteria if applicable. Samples of effective self-reflection statements will be made available in the SharePoint site. The final determination of the rating will be the judgment of the Faculty Status Committee and the Department Chair.

<b>TEACHING/STUDENT-RELATED</b>	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Meritorious /Highly Meritorious (2 from the following list for Meritorious or 4 for Highly Meritorious )</b>
<p>1. Meeting the teaching expectations as outlined in the SOE (e.g., 3/3 load, 4/4 load);</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Including a self-reflection statement addressing SOE expectations and review criteria and any concerns that may have arisen during the year and if so actions to address these concerns</p> <p>AND</p> <p>3. Being available to meet with students and holding office hours (as indicated in the syllabi)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>4. Creating a classroom environment that is professional and courteous, and which creates an optimal environment for student learning (student comments do not contradict this or self-reflection statement addresses these issues if prevalent in comments)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>5. Currency in the field as evidenced by updated and current syllabus</p> <p>AND</p> <p>6. Student Opinions Survey results generally favorable with at least some positive or constructive comments as determined by the reviewers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong ratings on student teaching opinion surveys with the majority of comments being positive or constructive (reflection statement should explain anomalies in teaching evaluations as a result of unique circumstances) <b>OR</b> Participation in peer observations of teaching with positive feedback and implementation of this feedback (discussed in reflection statement)</li> <li>• Undergraduate/Graduate students participation in university sponsored research events (e.g., Educate2Act, Undergraduate Research Symposium, 3MRP, Graduate Research Poster Session, etc.)</li> <li>• Receiving grants, or other funding to improve teaching instruction/curriculum development and providing evidence of work completion</li> <li>• Uncompensated teaching overload (e.g., independent study, expanded course sections; supervising/creating a unique field experience to meet a student's need)</li> <li>• Attending workshop(s) and conference(es) which are directly related to teaching and enhancing teaching ability</li> <li>• Evidence of a refinement and modification to an existing course to enhance student learning outcomes (e.g., could be a new assignment, technology, etc.)</li> <li>• Evidence of teaching a course in a new format (e.g., previously in person, now online, Collaborate Ultra or flipped classroom, etc.)</li> <li>• Evidence of practicum placement activities/or other activities (e.g., Organizing a literacy night; Child Find Screenings, NAU Science and Engineering Day) to enhance student learning experiences. Please note if a faculty member is receiving reassigned time for program coordination, these activities are not part of the reassignment.</li> <li>• Evidence of advisement/mentoring of students impacting student achievement/retention/progress in the program/job placements</li> <li>• Providing support to students beyond duties listed in reassigned time (if applicable)</li> <li>• Evidence of directing and mentoring undergraduates/graduate research activities</li> <li>• Teaching/working in innovative settings or using innovative techniques that benefit student learning (e.g., school partnerships)</li> <li>• Chaired 1 completed dissertation/thesis</li> <li>• Member/Chair of 2 or more dissertation/thesis committees</li> <li>• Demonstrating other meritorious/highly meritorious teaching activities not described above as determined and approved by Department Chair (e.g., receiving an award such as Teacher of the Year, taking on additional responsibilities related to enhancing teaching, etc.)</li> </ul>

<b>RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP</b>	
<p><i>Criteria under meritorious and highly meritorious is based on 20% of the SOE assigned to scholarship. Increased percentages assigned to scholarship will result in faculty providing evidence of additional criteria commensurate with allocation of time assigned to scholarship. Please note that publications should only be counted once (either at acceptance, in press or in print)</i></p>	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<p><b>Meritorious /Highly Meritorious (2 from the following list for Meritorious and 4 for Highly Meritorious). To receive a highly meritorious rating, at least 1 of the 4 artifacts must include an artifact from #1, 2 or 3 that was published/accepted within the last three years of the current review period.</b></p>
<p>1. Completes the activities listed in the approved SOE for the review period and includes evidence or artifacts supporting the activities listed. Judgment of the performance higher than satisfactory is based on criteria provided in the Meritorious and Highly Meritorious column.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Self-reflection statement highlighting how research artifacts are tied to an established research agenda and how it is tied to the mission of NAU/COE</p>	<p><b>Self-reflection statement</b> highlighting how research artifacts are tied to an established research agenda and how it is tied to the mission of NAU/COE</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Research Artifacts*</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Refereed (juried/peer-reviewed article) published in reputable journals to be determined by department FSC (a list will be provided to the Dean)</b></li> <li>2. <b>Authored and edited books/textbooks, book chapters published in a recognized publishing house</b></li> <li>3. <b>PI or Co/PI on Externally funded grants (\$25,000) or more</b></li> <li>4. Publication of a new edition of a book/textbook</li> <li>5. Refereed (juried/peer-reviewed article) published in state or local journal</li> <li>6. Original curriculum products published through a recognized publishing house</li> <li>7. Refereed presentations at international/national conferences</li> <li>8. Funded internal research grants (\$5,000 or more)</li> <li>9. Invited address or keynote speeches or scholarly topics</li> <li>10. Submission of external grant proposal of \$25,000 or greater (federal, state or foundation)</li> </ol> <p><b>Additional Scholarly Artifacts (You will need at least 2 or a combination of two of the artifacts listed below to count towards a single artifact)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local or state presentations/paper</li> <li>• Other scholarly work that results in a useful product that is not published in a peer-reviewed publication or established publishing house (consult with your Department Chair to determine how your work should be acknowledged.)</li> <li>• Non-refereed professional publications (i.e., magazine or newsletter articles)</li> <li>• Test/book reviews</li> <li>• Completion of major data collection/Conducted detailed analysis of data collected as outlined in the SOE</li> <li>• Evidence of significant work completed to establish a comprehensive and/or collaborative research project, including submitting an IRB application</li> </ul> <p><i>*Each of the criteria may be used twice with no limit for items # 1, 2 3 &amp; 7) to meet the requirement related to the number of artifacts during the review period.</i></p>

<b>SERVICE</b>	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Meritorious /Highly Meritorious (2 from the following list for Meritorious and 4 for Highly Meritorious. To receive a highly meritorious rating, at least 1 of the 4 service activities must include an activity from the list under Activities related to Leadership in Service)</b>
<p>1. Completes the activities listed in the approved SOE for the review period and includes evidence or artifacts supporting the activities listed. Judgment of the performance higher than satisfactory is based on criteria provided in the Meritorious and Highly Meritorious column.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>2. Attend the majority of department and respective program committee meetings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>3. Participate in accreditation / annual program reviews/seven year program reviews</p> <p>AND</p> <p>4. Attend the college-wide/faculty assembly meetings</p> <p>AND</p> <p>5. Participate in one or more departmental or college-wide committees</p> <p>AND</p> <p>6. Self-reflection statement highlighting service activities and accomplishments related to these activities (provide evidence). Evidence could be letter from committee chair detailing work, meeting agendas, etc.</p>	<p>Self-reflection statement highlighting service activities that are not part of reassigned duties, accomplishments related to these activities and the inclusion of evidence to support this work.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Participation in Service Activities*</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentoring faculty, including part-time faculty</li> <li>• Program-related administrative duties (not part of reassigned duties or release time which will be rated by supervisor) as in school-based partnerships, complex practicum assignments, collaboration with teachers, assessment/accreditation activities, program development, etc.</li> <li>• Grant-related administrative duties, such as project director, management (not bought out time which is rated by supervisor)</li> <li>• Reviews journal articles of recognized journal (at least 2 manuscripts in any given year)</li> <li>• Assisting with two or more recruiting and retention events (e.g., Discover NAU, meeting with prospects, etc.)</li> <li>• Evaluation/Consultation project for a school/agency</li> <li>• Active member of a committee. Committee could be within the college, professional or program-related committees related to the COE mission and goals.**</li> <li>• Serving as a faculty advisor for an active student organization</li> <li>• Finding, reporting, proposing a solution, and implementing the proposal to enhance department or college functioning</li> <li>• Serving as a reviewer of textbooks for publishers (at least one review each AY)</li> <li>• Use of professional skills in a service setting (e.g., Science Fairs; Robotics, etc.)</li> <li>• Performing other meritorious service or outreach activities not described above and approved by Department Chair</li> </ul> <p><b>Activities related to leadership in service (at least one from this list for Highly Meritorious)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership/Highly Active role in accreditation projects/reviews</li> <li>• Leadership role in national or state organization (e.g., President, Vice-President or member of an executive board, or equivalent)</li> <li>• Serving as a chair or as an active member of a committee with substantial responsibilities (e.g., search committee ; College P&amp;T Committee; Department FSC Committee) and excelling in committee responsibilities (include artifacts/evidence to demonstrate accomplishments and meeting deadlines)</li> <li>• Serving in roles such as Lead Faculty (for one or more courses) and excelling in these roles by providing mentorship to junior and part-time faculty teaching these classes</li> <li>• Leadership in a significant college-wide or university committee (e.g., College Council, College Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, University Graduate Committee, etc.)</li> <li>• For new faculty, participating in New Beginnings or other specific activities designed for new faculty (first three years)</li> <li>• Member of a Special Interest Group (or divisions) or other committees at the national or state level related to one's discipline. Other examples include membership on State Board of Education committees, Board of Psychological Examiners, etc.</li> </ul> <p><i>*Each of the activities listed may be used twice to meet the requirement for service in an academic year. Extensive committee work on a single committee/service activity may constitute as meeting the requirement of the bulk of the service load based on the self-reflection statement and submitted evidence.</i></p> <p><i>**There is no limit to the number of committees that one may serve and use towards meeting the requirement related to the number of service activities.</i></p>

Ratings range from 1-4 with 4 being highly meritorious and 1 being unsatisfactory. The ratings are then multiplied by the percentages allotted to each category. Overloads that earn supplemental pay are not calculated into the equation. The administrative release portion of a faculty member's will be evaluated by the department chair or supervisor for that activity and should not be factored into the overall rating by the faculty review committee. See examples below for clarification:

Faculty A

Category	% of Effort	Rating	Formula (% x Rating)
Student –Related	60	Highly Meritorious	4 x .60 = 2.40
Scholarship	15	Satisfactory	2 x .15 = 0.30
Service	25	Highly Meritorious	4 x .25 = 1.00
<b>Overall</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Highly Meritorious</b>	<b>3.7</b>

Faculty B

Category	% of Effort	Rating	Formula (% x Rating)
Student –Related	60	Unsatisfactory	1 x .60 = 0.60
Scholarship	20	Meritorious	3 x .20 = 0.60
Service	20	Highly Meritorious	4 x .20 = 0.80
<b>Overall</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>2.00</b>

Faculty C

Category	% of Effort	Rating	Formula (% x Rating)
Student –Related	80	Highly Meritorious	4 x .80 = 3.20
Scholarship	0	Not Applicable	
Service	20	Meritorious	3 x .20 = 0.60
<b>Overall</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Highly Meritorious</b>	<b>3.80</b>

Faculty D (Committee Review)

Category	% of Effort	Rating	Formula (% x Rating)
Student –Related	40	Highly Meritorious	4 x .40 = 1.60
Scholarship	20	Satisfactory	2 x .20 = 0.40
Service	20	Highly Meritorious	4 x .20 = 0.80
Administrative Reassignment	(20)		
<b>Overall Rating Without Reassignment %</b>	<b>80 (100)</b>	<b>Meritorious</b>	<b>2.80 (3.5)</b>

Formula for reduced percentage:  $2.8 / .8 = 3.5$

- 1.00 - 1.69 – Unsatisfactory
- 1.70 – 2.70 – Satisfactory
- 2.71 – 3.66 – Meritorious
- 3.67 – 4.00 – Highly Meritorious