Dakota State University

Faculty Annual Review Guide

Updated 2026

Faculty Annual Review Process 1
Overview 1
Annual Review Ratings and Language 1
Annual Reviews 1
Ratings and Salary Adjustments 1
Evaluation Process 2
Evaluation Timeline 3
Activities, Behaviors and Documentation Requirements 4
Faculty Annual Review Process for Faculty with Professorial Rank 4
Expectations of Faculty Holding Professorial Rank 4
Professional Development Plans (PDP) 5
Formal Teaching Evaluation and Peer Review 5
Standards of Performance 5
Path to Obtain Tenure or Post-Tenure Promotion 6
Faculty Annual Review Process for Instructor/Lecturer Rank Faculty 7
Expectations of Faculty Holding Instructor/Lecture ranks 7
Formal Teaching Evaluation and Peer Review 7
Standards of Performance 7
Faculty Annual Review Process for Professor of Practice 8
Expectations of Faculty Holding Professor of Practice Rank 8
Standards of Performance 8
Faculty Annual Review Process for Research Faculty 9
Fixed Term Contract for Research Faculty: 9
Expectations of Faculty Holding Professorial Rank 9
Formal Teaching Evaluation and Peer Observation 9
Standards of Performance 10
Faculty Annual Review Process for Librarians 11
Expectations of Faculty Holding Librarian ranks 11
Standards of Performance 11

Faculty Annual Review Process

Overview

This document provides guidance to faculty members and those who evaluate them. The information that follows clarifies the standards and expectations that Dakota State University uses to evaluate its faculty during the annual evaluation process.

Faculty members will be notified of substantive changes in the expectation documents by August 1 with application of new criteria in the reviews of the subsequent academic year.

Related documents include BOR Policies 4:11, 4.13 and 4.38.

This document was adopted in 2023. Future revisions will be made by a committee of faculty members and administrative appointees.

Annual Review Ratings and Language

The faculty member will be rated by the dean in each of the areas of teaching/advising, research/creative scholarship, and service, using one of four ratings: *substantially exceeded expectations (3), exceeded expectations (2), met expectations (1), or failed to meet expectations (0)*. Ratings will be based on the level of performance reasonably expected for a faculty member of the applicable rank. Those are the only terms the University will use during the annual evaluation process.

Annual Reviews

The faculty member provides a report documenting key activities conducted to meet their individual expectation for teaching/advising, scholarship, and service. The annual faculty report should emphasize key activities and is not intended to be a comprehensive portfolio of all activity over the evaluation period. Faculty will describe their most significant accomplishments for the academic year (summer, fall, spring) in Service (two-page max), Teaching (two-page max), Advising (two-page max), and Scholarship (two-page max). In the two pages, faculty members should focus on their most significant accomplishments in each of the categories. The document should be single-spaced, using a 10-point font with one-inch margins on all sides. The document should address the work assigned to the faculty member for the academic year, which typically should include documentation of teaching/advising, research/creative scholarship, and service. Faculty who do not focus on all three areas (e.g., Research Faculty, Instructors, Librarians, and Professors of Practice) should provide documentation for only the applicable areas of focus. The evaluation is conducted by, and the ratings are assigned by, the dean, except in cases where a conflict-of-interest exists, such as when the dean and the faculty member under evaluation are spouses or are related.

Ratings and Salary Adjustments

The annual salary adjustment process requires that each faculty member be categorized into one of four ratings with respect to their performance in teaching/advising, research/creative scholarship, and service: substantially exceeded expectations (3), exceeded expectations (2), met expectations (1), or failed to meet expectations (0) of the level of performance reasonably expected for a faculty member of the applicable rank. The performance ratings shall be assigned to each area of responsibility assigned to the faculty member, which may include a combination of teaching, research, and/or service workload responsibilities. The ratings for each area of responsibility will be multiplied by the percent of effort assigned to each area of workload responsibility, and then the sums will be added together to derive an overall, weighted performance rating per Section 4 of BOR Policy 4.13. Any faculty who has an overall rating of less than 1, will be assigned a 0. These ratings

are used in the calculation of the merit portion of annual raises for faculty. If deficiencies are identified, a dean may recommend a faculty improvement plan see BOR Policy 4:13 Section 1.4 for details on that process. If student opinion surveys indicate serious deficiencies in a faculty member's performance, corrective action may be recommended in line with BOR Policy 4:13 section 3.2. The annual performance ratings by the dean may be reviewed by the provost and the provost may make adjustments based on an independent review of the college performance assessment and the activities reported by that faculty member for that year. Any changes made to the ratings will be conveyed to the faculty member.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation will be headed by the college dean for faculty holding professorial, lecturer, and professor of practice ranks. The evaluation will be headed by the library director for faculty holding librarian rank. The evaluation will be headed by the Vice President of Research for faculty holding research ranks. The evaluator will discuss workload and performance expectations with each faculty member. For new faculty members, these conversations will take place during the first four (4) weeks of their first term in service. For continuing faculty members, these conversations will take place during the annual evaluation. The discussions should consider the expectations of the college, the individual's annual professional development plan (if applicable), and their discipline performance standards for faculty members holding like rank. Such discussions will be repeated whenever a significant change of an individualized annual workload is anticipated, whether that change is due to an administrative decision or a faculty member's discovery of new opportunities for research or service. In the event of a disagreement about the individualized workload and performance expectations, the Provost will be consulted to resolve the differences. Faculty members may also make use of the Ombudsperson to help resolve issues.

The evaluator will provide written commentary to the faculty member indicating evaluation in each of the categories of faculty responsibility drawing upon materials submitted by the faculty member and any additional relevant information available to the dean.

Included in the evaluation must be comments about the faculty member's performance in teaching and academic advising; research, scholarship or creative activity; or service, all as appropriate in light of the faculty member's workload assignments and responsibilities implicit in service at the specific rank. These comments are intended to provide information as to whether, consistent with contemporary standards of the institution, the faculty member achieved, exceeded, or fell short of the level of performance reasonably expected of faculty members of like rank, experience and tenure status, and with comparable professional responsibilities and resources.

In addition to comments about performance at the faculty member's current rank and tenure status, the evaluator may also comment about progress towards achieving the levels of performance that, in keeping with institutional standards, justify a recommendation for promotion to a more senior rank or, for untenured faculty members holding professional ranks, award of tenure. Such comments will be made, as appropriate, for all faculty members progressing to a more senior rank. Comments must address each area of professional responsibility.

Comments about progress towards promotion or tenure will not be deemed to give rise to a contractual entitlement to favorable action, nor will they be deemed to require unfavorable action, on subsequent applications for promotion or tenure. Such comments will not be construed as binding the discretion of deans, their successors in office, or promotion or tenure committees.

The faculty member and the evaluator will meet to discuss the written evaluation. A copy of the evaluator's comments will be given to the faculty member prior to the time of the meeting. The

faculty member will acknowledge receipt of the evaluation document. The completed performance evaluation will be in written form and signed by the evaluator(s) with a copy furnished to the faculty member. The faculty member will have ten working days within which to respond in writing to the performance evaluation. All such responses will be attached to the completed performance evaluation and placed with the evaluation in the faculty member's personnel file.

Closing the Loop

The Provost will review the completed evaluation and may revise any ratings suggested by the evaluator. Copies of any revisions made by the Provost will be sent to the faculty member . The faculty member may submit a response within the five (5) working days which will be attached to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the President. The Dean or Provost will make appropriate comments to the President about performance, contract renewal, salary increase, promotion, or tenure. This process must be finished before March 1 for all faculty completing at least their second annual performance evaluation. This process must be finished before March 15 for all faculty members in their first year of appointment. Additional processes are outlined in BOR Policy 4:13 Sections 1.5 and 1.7.

Evaluation Timeline

(If dates occur on the weekend or holiday, the due date is the next working day thereafter.)

The evaluation process will follow the timelines as indicated below.

From the end of spring semester-September 15 (January 15 for faculty in their first year of appointment): Faculty members will submit information for the annual review.

Within 30 days of receiving the annual review: The evaluator will review the material and provide written feedback to the faculty member.

By October 15: The evaluator will meet with the faculty member to discuss the written evaluation. Within ten (10) working days following the meeting with the dean: The faculty member may provide a written response to the evaluator’s performance evaluation.

By February 1: The Provost may make adjustments based on an independent review.

Within five (5) working days following Provost input: Faculty member may submit a response which will be attached to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the President.

By March 1 (March 15 for faculty in their first year of appointment): Completion of the annual evaluation process as depicted above.

By April 30: Peer review (all faculty) and formal teaching evaluation (pre-tenure tenure-track faculty, instructors and professors of practice in their first 6 years, and faculty seeking promotion), per schedule. (See Appendix A)

Activities, Behaviors and Documentation Requirements

Documented practices (PROVIDED BY THE PROVOST OFFICE):

- Student opinion survey results from evaluation year
- Workload from evaluation year
- Courses taught during evaluation year
- Sample syllabi from evaluation year
- Number of advisees from evaluation year
- Committee membership, including search committee memberships, from evaluation year
- Grant activity from evaluation year

Documented practices (PROVIDED BY THE FACULTY MEMBER):

- Faculty will document their professional behaviors in each area of assigned responsibility in reference to the DSU Standards document to highlight their activities within the evaluation year.
- Faculty will submit an updated CV along with their self-evaluation.
- Faculty will submit a formal teaching evaluation if conducted during the evaluation year (required for pre-tenured faculty and instructors in evaluation years 1, 3, and 5), along with their self-evaluation.

Faculty Annual Review Process for Faculty with Professorial Rank

This section applies to faculty members holding professorial rank. Most such faculty members are tenured or are on the tenure track. This section also applies to Librarian series and Lecturer series faculty members who have chosen to retain professorial rank.

Note: That due to the conversion of the Spring 2020 semester due to COVID-19, all faculty members who were tenure-track during that semester had the tenure clock suspended for one year. Thus, persons who would have been scheduled for tenure review in the fall of 2022 would not be required to submit materials until the fall of 2023. However, faculty members can "opt out" of this process and maintain their current schedule. A faculty member who chooses to opt of the "stop-the-clock" process will need to communicate that to their dean and to the Provost at least six months prior to their intended review date.

Expectations of Faculty Holding Professorial Rank

The mission and vision of the University place certain expectations upon its faculty. First and foremost, its faculty is comprised of excellent teachers who are deeply committed to student learning and to providing an environment in which students can discover their potential and prepare for their future. The faculty has the responsibility to discover and disseminate new knowledge through research and creative scholarship. Further, the faculty has the responsibility to apply its expertise in service to the University, the broader community and the profession.

The University recognizes that research and creative scholarship take diverse forms, and it is that diversity that gives the University its unique character. Thus, traditional disciplinary research, creative writing, performance, artistic expression, and the scholarship of teaching and learning are all among the forms of research and creative scholarship celebrated and valued by the University.

The demands upon the faculty are substantial. The goal of the University is to have a faculty that is as productive and effective as is possible given the resource base and working conditions that exist

at any given time. The standards set forth below are meant to be challenging, but not unrealistic, and the discipline addenda should reflect a level of challenge that accounts for the staffing, workload, and degree-level of the discipline. There must be a realistic relationship between the expectations of the discipline and the specific mission and working conditions of the discipline. The University will continually strive to optimize its support of faculty activities, and each discipline will, through its more senior faculty and leadership, provide appropriate mentoring to its junior faculty to help ensure that those faculty members contribute to the quality and effectiveness of the program while undergoing individual professional development.

Professional Development Plans (PDP)

The PDP is required for Tenure-Track Faculty, recommended for Tenured Associate Professors, and not Expected for Tenured Professors. Tenure-track faculty members are responsible for proposing annual professional development plans in teaching, scholarship, and service. Tenured faculty members seeking promotion to professor should complete at least three years of annual professional development plans to outline progress towards promotion prior to submitting their application. These professional development plans are a part of the annual review process.

Formal Teaching Evaluation and Peer Review

Pre-tenure faculty will undergo formal teaching evaluation conducted by their dean or department chair by April 30 in years 1, 3 and 5 of teaching at DSU. Faculty who are awarded 5 or more years of credit for prior service must participate in at least one formal teaching evaluation prior to application for tenure. A copy of any formal teaching evaluation will be included by the dean in the Faculty Annual Review for the associated year. Faculty must reflect on any actions taken or planned as a result of formal teaching evaluation within the self-reflection of Faculty Annual Review.

All pre-tenure faculty in years 2, 4 and 6 of employment at DSU, and all tenured faculty members, will demonstrate their commitment to continuous improvement through participation in peer observation and feedback (peer review) annually. Peer review will be conducted by a DSU faculty peer selected by each faculty member. The faculty member may include documentation from the peer review in their self-reflection for Faculty Annual Review if desired, but it is not required. The faculty member must indicate the name of the peer, date, and course reviewed, and reflect on any actions taken or planned as a result of the peer review within the self-reflection of Faculty Annual Review. Feedback from peers will not be used by the dean in their rating for Teaching, though the actions taken or planned may be considered.

Standards of Performance

All evaluative decisions shall be based upon the assigned duties and allocated efforts of the faculty member during the periods under review. The amount and quality of work produced in an area depends upon the allocated effort based on the University workload document with any relevant appendices. For example, a faculty member assigned 10% effort in research, and one assigned to 50% effort, would have different research expectations, but the quality of the work is expected to remain the same.

Note: Faculty who are located off-campus or at a distance are held to the same standards as on-campus faculty and are expected to participate in the appropriate service activities of the academic discipline and university.

Note: In documenting scholarship contributions there are numerous reputable venues for scholarly manuscript and creative works publication, including fee for publication, online, conference proceedings and traditional formats. Information contained in the CV need not be repeated in the

narrative. The recognition and importance of the different forms and presentations of scholarship will vary depending upon the role of a discipline and the individual faculty member's assignment.

Note: Impact of publications or presentations may be demonstrated by the following examples: Journal/conference acceptance rate; Journal impact factor (Eigenfactor, number of subscribers; etc.); Nature of manuscript review process (peer, editorial, technical, etc.; double-blind or single-blind peer review); or Frequency with which work has been cited in other works. Impact of Creative Work may be demonstrated by providing information on the Prestige of venue; Sponsorship; Viewership (virtual or in person); Juried show details, including acceptance rate for juried show or nature of the jury process; Awards and Honors received; or Peer Review, PR and Press Coverage of the event. The different faculty ranks have various expectations as noted below.

Assistant Professor (Approaching Tenure)

Context: Faculty in this rank are pre-tenure and working towards tenure. Some recently appointed Assistant Professors are new to the profession and need time to adjust to the demands of the profession. However, all need to be able to demonstrate competence and contribution in teaching, scholarship and service as they come up for consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty coming in with prior service credit should be aware that those years are counted as part of the tenure probationary period.

Associate Professor

Context: The assumption is that faculty members at this rank have typically achieved tenure and thus have demonstrated the capacity and ability to meet the standards of performance expected of this rank. However, it is also recognized that the university is best served by utilizing the specific expertise and skills of a given faculty member. As a result, the time allocations for instruction, scholarship and service may vary across individuals. As an example, a given individual post-tenure may best serve the university with increased time allocations for instruction or service and less in scholarship and others may have increased time allocations to research.

Professor

Context: The assumption is that faculty members at this rank have been recognized for the quality and impact of their teaching, scholarship and service contributions to the university and the discipline and that they serve as role models and mentors for faculty just beginning their academic careers. However, it is also recognized that the university is best served by utilizing the specific expertise and skills of a given faculty member. As a result, the time allocations for instruction, scholarship and service may vary across individuals. As an example, a given individual at the professor rank may best serve the university with increased time allocations for instruction or service and less in scholarship and others may have greater time allocations to scholarship or service. Moreover, faculty members at this rank play a leadership role in the department and in their discipline.

Path to Obtain Tenure or Post-Tenure Promotion

For faculty members seeking tenure or promotion to Full professor, it is important to work closely with their dean to ensure they meet the requirements and expectations for promotion. Maintaining a consistent percentage effort towards their responsibilities in teaching/advising, research, and service is crucial to their success. Regularly checking in with the dean to discuss progress and receive feedback is highly recommended. Collaborating with the dean in this way can provide valuable guidance and support, helping faculty members to better understand the promotion criteria and expectations and take the necessary steps to achieve tenure or promotion to Full Professor.

Faculty Annual Review Process for Instructor/Lecturer Rank Faculty

This section applies to faculty members holding instructor/lecture ranks.

Expectations of Faculty Holding Instructor/Lecture ranks

The mission and vision of The University place certain expectations upon its faculty. First and foremost, its faculty is comprised of excellent teachers who are deeply committed to student learning and to providing an environment in which students can discover their potential and prepare for their future. Further, the faculty has the responsibility to apply its expertise in service to the broader community and the profession. Instructors/Lecturers may or may not have service expectation depending on the particular needs of the unit and the individual faculty member's contract.

The demands upon the faculty are substantial. The goal of the University is to have a faculty that is as productive and effective as is possible given the resource base and working conditions that exist at any given time. The standards set forth below are meant to be challenging, but not unrealistic. There must be a realistic relationship between the expectations of the unit and the specific mission and working conditions of the unit. The University will continually strive to optimize its support of faculty activities, and each unit will provide appropriate mentoring to its newer faculty to help ensure that those faculty members contribute to the quality and effectiveness of the program.

Formal Teaching Evaluation and Peer Review

Instructor-rank faculty in their first 6 years at the university will undergo formal teaching evaluation conducted by their dean or department chair by April 30 in years 1, 3 and 5 of teaching at DSU. Instructors who are awarded 5 or more years of credit for prior service must participate in at least one formal teaching evaluation prior to application for promotion to lecturer or senior lecturer. A copy of any formal teaching evaluation will be included by the dean in the Faculty Annual Review for the associated year. Instructors must reflect on any actions taken or planned as a result of formal teaching evaluation within the self-reflection of Faculty Annual Review.

All instructors in years 2, 4 and 6 of employment at DSU, and all other instructors, lecturers, and senior lecturers, will demonstrate their commitment to continuous improvement through participation in peer observation and feedback (peer review) annually. Peer review will be conducted by a DSU faculty peer selected by each faculty member. The faculty member may include documentation from the peer review in their self-reflection for Faculty Annual Review if desired, but it is not required. The faculty member must indicate the name of the peer, date, and course reviewed, and reflect on any actions taken or planned as a result of the peer review within the self-reflection of Faculty Annual Review. Feedback from peers will not be used by the dean in their rating for Teaching, though the actions taken or planned may be considered.

Standards of Performance

All evaluative decisions shall be based upon the assigned duties and allocated efforts of the faculty member during the periods under review. The amount and quality of work produced in an area depends upon the allocated effort based on the University workload document with any relevant appendices. For example, a faculty member assigned 10% effort in service would not be expected to accomplish as much as one assigned 50%, but quality work and impact is expected in both instances. Note: Faculty who are located off-campus or at a distance are held to the same standards as on-campus faculty and are expected to participate in the appropriate service activities of the academic discipline and university.

Faculty Annual Review Process for Professor of Practice

This section is intended to outline the criteria and process of annual review for persons in the Professor of Practice rank. The Professor of Practice Series is intended for distinguished and eminent professionals, either practicing or retired, who contribute to the South Dakota Board of Regents by either teaching, contributing to the research and scholarly mission of the university and/or by providing service through their practical professional experience.

Current employed faculty in the lecturer rank or the research associate rank who desire to request a transfer to the Professor of Practice rank can only request a one-time transfer and will go through the proper DSU protocols for the appointment. Professor of Practice faculty are not eligible for tenure.

Faculty applying for a lateral transfer must adhere to the following:

- Instructors may be eligible to the Assistant Professor of Practice Rank,
- Lecturers and Research Associates may be eligible to the Associate Professor of Practice Rank, and
- Senior Lecturers may be eligible to the Professor of Practice Rank.

Expectations of Faculty Holding Professor of Practice Rank

The mission and vision of the University place certain expectations upon its faculty. Each Professor of Practice appointment may have unique expectations depending upon the particulars of the appointment and the annual contract.

For most, the responsibilities will parallel those of the professorate or those of instructors. The DSU faculty is comprised of excellent teachers who are deeply committed to student learning and to providing an environment in which students can discover their potential and prepare for their future. Many faculty members have the responsibility to discover and disseminate new knowledge through research and creative scholarship as well as the responsibility to apply its expertise in service to the broader community and the profession.

Standards of Performance

All evaluative decisions shall be based upon the assigned duties and allocated efforts of the faculty member during the periods under review. The amount and quality of work produced in an area depends upon the allocated effort based on the University workload document with any relevant appendices. For example, a faculty member assigned 10% effort in research, and one assigned to 50% effort, would have different research expectations, but the quality of the work is expected to remain the same.

Note: Faculty who are located off-campus or at a distance are held to the same standards as on-campus faculty and are expected to participate in the appropriate service activities of the academic discipline and university.

Note: In documenting scholarship contributions there are numerous reputable venues for scholarly manuscript and creative works publication, including fee for publication, online, conference proceedings and traditional formats. Information contained in the CV need not be repeated in the narrative. The recognition and importance of the different forms and presentations of scholarship will vary depending upon the role of a discipline and the individual faculty member's assignment.

Note: Impact of publications or presentations may be demonstrated by the following examples: Journal/conference acceptance rate; Journal impact factor (eigen factor, number of subscribers;

etc.); Nature of manuscript review process (peer, editorial, technical, etc.; double-blind or single-blind peer review) or Frequency with which work has been cited in other works. Impact of Creative Work might be demonstrated by providing information on the prestige of venue, sponsorship, viewership (virtual or in person); Juried show details, including acceptance rate for juried show or nature of the jury process; Awards and Honors received; Peer Review, PR and Press Coverage of the event.

Faculty Annual Review Process for Research Faculty

This section applies to faculty members holding research professor ranks. The evaluation of research faculty will include an assessment of the research faculty member's original contributions to research, contribution to the effective work of any research teams to which the research faculty member has been assigned, grant awards, contracts received, intellectual properties issued or other measures of research accomplishment.

Fixed Term Contract for Research Faculty:

A fixed term contract may be either part-time or full-time and will be of a definite term. Terms exceeding one year, shall be approved by the Board. A fixed term contract will terminate automatically at the end of its term unless the Board expressly renews the contract. A fixed term contract will terminate automatically prior to the end of its stated term if the grant funds used to support the contract lapse and the research faculty member has not secured a new funding source. A fixed term contract creates no obligation of the Institution for continued employment beyond the term of the contract and non-renewal of the contract is not an action which can be grieved under BOR or Institutional policy. Receipt of successive fixed term contracts does not alter the nature of the fixed term contract and in no way enhances or creates a future interest in, or expectation of, continued employment in subsequent years.

Expectations of Faculty Holding Professorial Rank

The mission and vision of The University place certain expectations upon its faculty. Research faculty have the responsibility to discover and disseminate new knowledge through research and creative scholarship. Further, some research faculty will also have the responsibility to apply their expertise in service to the broader community and the profession.

The University recognizes that research and creative scholarship take diverse forms, and it is that diversity that gives the University its unique character depending upon the specific assignment for research faculty.

The demands upon the faculty are substantial. The goal of the University is to have a faculty that are as productive and effective as is possible given the resource base and working conditions that exist at any given time. The standards set forth below are meant to be challenging, but not unrealistic, and the discipline addenda should reflect a level of challenge that accounts for the staffing, workload, and degree-level of the discipline. There must be a realistic relationship between the expectations of the discipline and the specific mission and working conditions of the discipline. The University will continually strive to optimize its support of faculty activities, and each discipline will, through its more senior faculty and leadership, provide appropriate mentoring to its newer faculty to help ensure that those faculty members contribute to the quality and effectiveness of the program while undergoing individual professional development.

Formal Teaching Evaluation and Peer Observation

Professors of practice in their first 6 years at the university will undergo formal teaching evaluation conducted by the dean or department chair by April 30 in years 1, 3 and 5 of teaching at DSU.

Professors of practice who are awarded 5 or more years of credit for prior service must participate in at least one formal teaching evaluation prior to application for promotion. A copy of any formal teaching evaluation will be included by the dean in the Faculty Annual Review for the associated year. Professors of practice must reflect on any actions taken or planned as a result of formal teaching evaluation within the self-reflection of Faculty Annual Review.

All professors of practice in years 2, 4 and 6 of employment at DSU, and all additional professors of practice, will demonstrate their commitment to continuous improvement through participation in peer observation and feedback (peer review) annually. Peer review will be conducted by a DSU faculty peer selected by each faculty member. The faculty member may include documentation from the peer review in their self-reflection for Faculty Annual Review if desired, but it is not required. The faculty member must indicate the name of the peer, date, and course reviewed, and reflect on any actions taken or planned as a result of the peer review within the self-reflection of Faculty Annual Review. Feedback from peers will not be used by the dean in their rating for Teaching, though the actions taken or planned may be considered.

Standards of Performance

All evaluative decisions shall be based upon the assigned duties and allocated efforts of the faculty member during the periods under review. The amount and quality of work produced in an area depends upon the allocated effort based on the University workload document with any relevant appendices. For example, a faculty member assigned 10% effort in service would not be expected to accomplish as much as one assigned 50%, but quality work and impact is expected in both instances.

Note: Faculty who are located off-campus or at a distance are held to the same standards as on-campus faculty and are expected to participate in the appropriate service activities of the academic discipline and university.

Note: In documenting scholarship contributions there are numerous reputable venues for scholarly manuscript and creative works publication, including fee for publication, online, conference proceedings and traditional formats. Information contained in the CV need not be repeated in the narrative. The recognition and importance of the different forms and presentations of scholarship will vary depending upon the role of a discipline and the individual faculty member's assignment.

Note: Impact of publications or presentations may be demonstrated by the following examples: Journal/conference acceptance rate; Journal impact factor (eigen factor, number of subscribers; etc.); Nature of manuscript review process (peer, editorial, technical, etc.; double-blind or single-blind peer review) or frequency with which work has been cited in other works. Impact of Creative Work might be demonstrated by providing information on the prestige of venue, sponsorship, viewership (virtual or in person); Juried show details, including acceptance rate for juried show or nature of the jury process; Awards and Honors received; Peer Review, PR and Press Coverage of the event.

Faculty Annual Review Process for Librarians

This section applies to faculty members holding librarian rank.

Expectations of Faculty Holding Librarian ranks

The mission and vision of the University place certain expectations upon its faculty. First and foremost, its faculty is comprised of excellent teachers who are deeply committed to student learning and to providing an environment in which students can discover their potential and prepare for their future. Further, faculty have the responsibility to apply their expertise in service to the broader community and the profession. Librarians have service expectations and may have research expectations depending on the particular needs of the library and the individual faculty member's rank. Those holding Associate Librarian and Librarian rank will have research expectations.

The demands upon the faculty are substantial. The goal of the University is to have a faculty that is as productive and effective as is possible given the resource base and working conditions that exist at any given time. The standards set forth below are meant to be challenging, but not unrealistic. There must be a realistic relationship between the expectations of the unit and the specific mission and working conditions of the discipline. The University will continually strive to optimize its support of faculty activities, and each unit will provide appropriate mentoring to its newer faculty to help ensure that those faculty members contribute to the quality and effectiveness of the program.

Standards of Performance

All evaluative decisions shall be based upon the assigned duties and allocated efforts of the faculty member during the periods under review. The amount and quality of work produced in an area depends upon the allocated effort based on the University workload document with any relevant appendices. For example, a faculty member assigned 10% effort in service would not be expected to accomplish as much as one assigned 50%, but quality work and impact is expected in both instances.

Note: Faculty who are located off-campus or at a distance are held to the same standards as on-campus faculty and are expected to participate in the appropriate service activities of the academic discipline and university.

Appendix A

Teaching Evaluation Type	Years
Formal Teaching Evaluation	1, 3, 5
Peer Observation	2, 4, 6, 7+
Faculty Annual Review	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7+
One Formal Teaching Evaluation is required for any Subsequent Promotion	7+

Panic of 1837Table 1 - Teaching Review and Evaluation Schedule