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The guidelines were developed to ensure all faculty contribute equitably to the Department’s mission of teaching, research, and service. It is recognized that workload policy overlaps with RPT, annual evaluations, and merit pay increases. These guidelines provide supplementary framework for annual faculty evaluations in teaching, research, and service categories, and how they link to workloads.

The teaching component of the workload of a lecturer or senior lecturer is ordinarily eight (8) course equivalencies, whereas for tenure-track the workload is variable. The variable workload for tenure-track faculty allows them to meet their diverse obligations in research and scholarship, teaching & advising, and service.

The Annual Evaluation Guidelines uses the following five ratings to evaluate quality of the performance:

1. Performance quality consistently exceeds expectations
2. Performance quality meets, and in some cases exceeds, expectations
3. Performance quality satisfactorily meets all expectations of the position
4. Performance quality is below expectations in many categories
5. Performance quality is unsatisfactory

This document first elaborates on the general expectations for each of the ratings.

**Teaching**

The faculty member shall satisfactorily complete the teaching related duties in their workload agreement, and demonstrably contribute to the education of students. Each Department faculty member evaluated under this category is expected to teach courses effectively with sufficient rigor generally within their area of expertise and according to the departmental needs. The quality of teaching effectiveness will be assessed reflecting the indicators summarized in Table 1. This is not an exhaustive list; other indicators of teaching effectiveness will be considered as appropriate. As much as possible, any one of the criteria below (including student evaluations) should be used to help assess the overall quality and educational effectiveness of the instructor’s courses, keeping in mind that each of these criteria comprises just one component of the overall assessment. In evaluating teaching, the Chair will also consider mitigating factors beyond the control of the faculty member, such as the times, overall teaching load, level of the course, and physical support for lectures (e.g., location of a class, performance of hardware, teaching assistant/grader support).

**Table 1: Performance indicators for teaching effectiveness**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Rating in  Teaching | Qualitative Indicators | Guiding Quantitative  Indicators (1 is lowest desirable score; 5 is highest) |
| 1. Performance quality consistently exceeds expectations | * Is a well-prepared, organized, engaging and stimulating teacher. * Maintains high standards for amount, level and quality of work expected from students. * Effectively encourages independent and creative student thinking, discovery and learning. * Employ high-impact practices (e.g., project-based learning, service-learning) * Employ strategies that help improve students’ communication skills * Continuously work on improving courses (well-maintained online resources, incorporate new technologies, incorporates current examples and applications in class, updates topical coverage in courses). * Proactively incorporates justified student   feedback and suggestions made by the peers.   * Fosters an inclusive learning environment * Keeps current with teaching resources (such as textbooks and websites) and with scholarly literature on teaching. * Attend seminars, workshops, sessions meant to improve teaching. * Receives student evaluations that, in light of both the quantitative "Overall Instructor" and "Course Learning" ratings as well as written student comments, indicate that students perceive the course(s) given by the instructor as being excellent. * Receives excellent peer evaluations (based   on class visitations or other forms of assessment), if available.   * Generate feedback from students and   other faculty members that is generally highly positive, with significant outstanding comments.   * Is successful in teaching a range of courses -   -- by level or topic --- as needed in the Department.   * Is accessible to students outside of class, including during posted office hours. * Proactively collects and reports ABET- related data in their courses.   Has won a teaching award. | * Student teaching evaluations of ≥ 4.3 in both "Overall Instructor" and "Course Learning" |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Performance quality meets, and in some cases exceeds, expectations | * Shows evidence of teaching effectiveness in most categories, but not to the level of Rating of 1. * Receives student evaluations that are still very positive but not at same level as the Rating of 1. * Generates feedback that is highly positive but to a lesser degree than a Rating of 1. * Proactively incorporates student feedback and suggestions made by the peers. * Fosters an inclusive learning environment * Proactively collects and reports ABET- related data in their courses. | * Student teaching evaluations of ≥ 4.0 in both "Overall Instructor" and "Course Learning" |
| 3. Performance quality satisfactorily meets expectations of the position | * Shows evidence of teaching effectiveness in most categories, but not to the level of a Rating of 2. * Receives student evaluations that are still generally positive and near CEMS average. * Generates feedback that is generally positive. * Fosters an inclusive learning environment * Makes themselves available to students in a basis commensurate with the faculty member’s teaching assignments, and maintains office hours. * Incorporates student feedback and suggestions made by the peers. * Is available to students at least in office hours, which are appropriately scheduled. * Collects and reports ABET-related data in   their courses in a timely manner. | * Student teaching evaluations of ≥ 3.75 in both "Overall Instructor" and "Course Learning" |
| 4. Performance quality is below expectations in many categories | * Shows only marginal evidence of success in the above-mentioned categories. * Receives mostly satisfactory, but a significant number of poor, student evaluations and comments. * Generates feedback that is generally satisfactory, but significant number of poor student and peer evaluations. * Is not proactive but incorporates student feedback and suggestions made by the peers. * Does not foster an inclusive learning environment. * Is generally available to students at least in office hours; office hours are not appropriately scheduled. * Is not consistently responsive in collecting and reporting ABET-related data in their courses in a timely manner. | * Student teaching evaluations of <3.5 in both "Overall Instructor" and "Course Learning" |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Performance quality is unsatisfactory | * Consistently receives mediocre or poor student teaching evaluations. * Generates feedback from peers and students about teaching performance that is often negative. * Either does not have appropriate office hours or does not reliably attend scheduled office hours. * Does little to maintain or improve present courses. * Does little to keep abreast of important general studies, textbooks and pedagogical materials germane to the courses they teach. * Exhibits inconsistent attendance or frequent tardiness at classes (has substitutes more than a few times). * Is unresponsive to students’ needs. * Does not foster an inclusive learning environment * Does not respond to normal student questions or requests in a timely and appropriate fashion. * Does not adhere to deadlines related to courses and students. * Is avoided by students as a teacher, advisor, or supervisor. * Does not cover required course material. * Is not responsive in collecting and reporting ABET-related data in their courses in a timely manner. | * Student teaching evaluations of <3.0 in both "Overall Instructor" and "Course Learning" |

**Scholarship and Research**

The faculty member shall conduct, stimulate, and disseminate research and scholarship that advances the state of the art of knowledge. The chair will take into account differences of research and scholarship norms in various subdisciplines of EBE and interdisciplinary activities. Each EBE tenured, tenure-track and research faculty member evaluated under this category is expected to maintain and be able to document an active scholarship program that includes some or all of the following:

* Research and writing leading to publication of articles in refereed scholarly journals, books, or conference proceedings.
* Authoring or editing scholarly monographs, textbooks, or reference books that present new ideas or incorporate the faculty member’s scholarly work.
* Mentoring or supervising of student research projects, including doctoral or master’s theses to completion, undergraduate Honors theses, student research projects and other student research not normally part of coursework. Publishing with these students.
* Securing extramural funding to sustain their research program, including the support of graduate students.
* Delivery of papers at scholarly conferences or in seminars or colloquia at UVM or at other universities or research institutes.
* Authored published book or research article reviews.
* Authored patents, software or new media-based scholarly material that is widely disseminated and peer reviewed.

To ensure that the quality of scholarship and research is not lost, Table 2 includes both qualitative and quantitative measures to assist in guiding performance rating. It is to be noted that the table does not include an exhaustive list; other indicators of excellence will be considered as appropriate. It should also be noted that the Quantitative Indicators are calculated over a 3-year sliding window.

**Table 2: Performance indicators for scholarship and research**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Rating in  Scholarship and Research | Qualitative Indicators | Guiding Quantitative Indicators |
| 1. Performance quality consistently exceeds expectations | * Has had articles published in refereed leading journals * Has written or edited a significant book * Has been active in submitting research proposals and has obtained significant research grants * Has been very active in supervising and graduating graduate students many of whom were funded on grants * Has published with students   Has given keynotes, seminars and papers at major conferences and/or other institutions   * Shows meaningful   collaborations with others   * Strong evidence of undergraduate research mentoring * Has filed disclosures or has had patents awarded * Fosters an inclusive research environment * Advances scientific knowledge and contributes to the achievement of societally relevant outcomes | * 8 scholarly contributions (top journal papers, top conferences, book chapters or patents) per year * F&A of $100k/yr or annual research expenditure of   $300k/yr   * Advisor to ≥ 6 graduate students, most funded on extramural grants * Graduates ≥ 2 graduate students/yr |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Performance quality meets, and in some cases exceeds, expectations | * Shows evidence of success in the scholarship categories, but not to the level of a Rating of 1. | * 4 scholarly contributions (top journal papers, top conferences, book chapters or patents) per year * F&A of $60k/yr or annual research expenditure of   $200k/yr   * Advisor to ≥ 4 graduate students, most funded on grants * Graduates ≥ 1.5 graduate students/yr |
| 1. Performance quality satisfactorily meets all expectations of the position | * Shows evidence of success in the scholarship categories, but not to the level of a Rating of 2. | * 2 scholarly contributions (top journal papers, top conferences, book chapters or patents) per year * F&A of $30k/yr or annual research expenditure of   $100k/yr   * Advisor to ≥ 2 graduate students funded on grants * Graduates ≥ 1 graduate   students/yr |
| 1. Performance quality is below expectations in many categories | * Shows some evidence of recent work or work in progress on scholarly articles, books, grant proposals, presentations at scholarly meetings, seminars, symposia, or workshops, etc. that will ultimately lead to peer   reviewed work. | * 1 scholarly contribution (good quality journal papers, conferences, book chapters or patents) per year * Annual research expenditure of $50k/yr * Advisor to ≥ 1 graduate student * Graduates ≥ 0.5 graduate students/yr |
| 1. Performance quality is unsatisfactory | * Shows very little evidence of recent work or work in progress on scholarly articles, books, grant proposals, presentations at scholarly meetings, seminars, symposia, or workshops, etc. that will ultimately lead to peer reviewed work. * Has none to very little research mentoring of graduate or undergraduate students. * For research-track faculty members: is not regularly able to obtain full funding to support the FTE percentage of the position. | * Less than 1 scholarly contribution (good quality journal papers, book chapters or patents) per year * No research funding or funded graduate students for last 3 years * Graduates < 0.5 graduate students/yr |

A tenured faculty member may have greater teaching and service depending on the needs of the department; however, research and scholarship must be maintained at some level for tenured faculty.

**Service**

The faculty member shall perform beneficial service for the Department, College and University, or for regional, national or professional communities. The quality of service will be assessed reflecting the indicators summarized in Table 3. This is not an exhaustive list; other indicators of excellence in service will be considered as appropriate. The Chair shall take into account that because junior faculty members are generally advised by the Department to refrain from over- involvement in service and lecturers generally are assigned a small percentage of service on their workload, they should not be held to the same standards of productivity in service as tenured faculty. The Chair shall also recognize that certain kinds of professional service (e.g., refereeing of research works) are almost exclusively possible only for tenure-track or research-track faculty members. As noted at the outset, measures of quality will take into consideration the scope and intensity of service endeavors. Documentation in this area may include written feedback from leaders of a particular service activity.

**Table 3. Performance indicators for service effectiveness**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance Rating in  Service | Qualitative Indicators |
| 1. Performance quality consistently exceeds expectations | Professional Service:   * Is actively involved in professional organizations, possibly serving as an officer in the organization. * Serves as associate editor or editor-in-chief for a major journal. * Serves as a referee or reviewer for major journals, funding agencies, etc. * Serves as a guest editor for a journal special issue or specialty conference colloquium. * Serves on funding agency panels. * Organizes a professional conference, workshop or significant involvement in a professional conference.   University and Regional Service:   * Shows evidence of effective advising to undergraduate students. * Contributes significantly on standing and ad hoc Departmental, College or University committees, and on search committees. * Serves occasionally as chair or in a leadership role of such committees. * Makes unique or innovative service contributions to the Department, College or University. * Works as an advisor to student organizations. * Speaks in campus events and to student and community groups. * Participates in College and Departmental professional outreach activities. * Participates in University outreach or recruiting activities such as Admissions events. * Undertakes significant Departmental responsibilities such as facilities management and maintenance, web page design, or other contributions to the general fabric of the Department. * Regularly attends Department and College meetings and participates in College graduation ceremony. * Serves as a Faculty Mentor for theses, REUs, independent research or supervises independent studies. * Has won a service award or other special recognition. |
| 1. Performance quality meets, and in some cases exceeds, expectations | * Serves effectively in several of the areas, but not at the same level as a Rating of 1. * Generally considered to be a good advisor and mentor. * Attends Department and College meetings and participates in College graduation ceremony. |
| 1. Performance quality satisfactorily meets all expectations of the position | * Serves effectively in several of the areas under rating 1, but generally at a lower level as Ratings 1 or 2. * Generally considered to be a solid advisor and mentor. * Attends Department and College meetings and participates in College graduation ceremony. |
| 1. Performance quality is below expectations in many categories | * Serves in some areas under rating 1, but generally at a lower level as Ratings 1, 2 or 3. * Inconsistent in advising and mentoring. * Often misses Department and College meetings and does not participate in College graduation ceremony. |
| 1. Performance quality is unsatisfactory | * Provides little to no on-campus service. * Is not actively involved in professional organizations and local communities. * Consistently ineffective in advising and mentoring. * Consistently fails to attend Department and College meetings and does not participate in College graduation ceremony. |

**Flexible Workload**

The performance evaluations in scholarship and research, teaching, and service are collectively considered to guide teaching component of the workload. Table 4, which is applicable only to the tenured and tenure-track faculty, provides associated guidelines. Ordinarily, each faculty member is expected to teach at least one required undergraduate or graduate course in any given academic year.

To pursue innovative teaching techniques and significant service and/or outreach activities that are beneficial to the Department, College or University, faculty may request a reduced teaching load. Faculty should refer to the EBE Department Course Equivalency and Variable Workload policy for more guidance. The Chair (after consulting the Dean) may grant such requests contingent upon teaching and service needs within the Department, College and University, and the track record of faculty members’ teaching and service.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Teaching Load per Academic Year | Performance Ratings | | |
| Scholarship and  Research | Teaching | Service |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | 5 | 3 | 3 |