

**(Approved – August 21st 2025)**

**POLICY TITLE: HHP Non-Tenure Track Faculty Annual Review and Merit Rating**

**SECTION I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

The goal of this policy is to provide a common framework and a set of detailed procedures for conducting annual faculty performance evaluations of all non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty members in the Department of Health and Human Performance (HHP) at the University of Houston. This policy is intended to codify a faculty performance evaluation process that is open, fair, and transparent, which incorporates both faculty peer review and administrative review by the department chair. HHP NTT faculty members will be evaluated based on the activities they perform in the workload domains described in the current UH Faculty Workload policy ([MAPP 12.05.01](#)). For HHP NTT faculty members, these workload domains are research/scholarship, teaching, and service to the university or profession.

In addition, as per the requirements of the current [UH Faculty Annual Performance Review \(F-APR\) policy](#), when creating criteria for evaluating faculty performance at UH, it is incumbent upon academic departments to ensure that those faculty activities identified as being of value to the academic unit and discipline are also clearly aligned with the strategic goals of the department, college, and university. It is also expected that the results of the departmental annual faculty performance evaluation process should inform and guide (rather than dictate) any administrative recommendations made by the department chair concerning merit-based salary adjustments for NTT faculty members.

**SECTION II. EXISTING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

This departmental policy and its accompanying procedures are based on requirements described in the following University of University policies:

University of Houston Faculty Workload policy ([MAPP 12.05.01](#))

[University of Houston Faculty Annual Performance Review \(F-APR\) policy](#) (Office of the Provost)

**SECTION III. DEFINITIONS**

**Numerical Score** – the numerical score assigned to a faculty member reflecting the professional activities performed in a particular workload domain during the previous 12-month evaluation period. Faculty activities for the previous 12-month evaluation period are reported using the Faculty Activity Report and evaluated using the criteria detailed in Appendix 1. Faculty members are required to submit a Faculty Activity Report on an annual basis.

**Annual Performance Rating** – Faculty members will be assigned an annual performance rating in each workload domain on an annual basis.

## **SECTION IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATING NTT FACULTY PERFORMANCE**

All HHP NTT faculty members should expect and are entitled to receive an open, fair, and transparent annual performance evaluation. In addition, HHP NTT faculty members should expect and are entitled to their performance being evaluated using criteria that are not only appropriate to their discipline, academic rank, and professional responsibilities but are consistently applied when evaluating HHP NTT faculty members holding the same academic rank and similar professional responsibilities. However, any performance evaluation criteria developed by the department must be consistent with the mission of a nationally recognized, Tier One research university while being clearly aligned with the strategic goals of the department, college, and university.

In accordance with university policy, faculty performance/activity data must be submitted by faculty members to their department on an annual basis.

## **SECTION V. EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

### **V. (i) Submission of Faculty Annual Activity Report**

The date by which faculty members must submit their faculty activity report for the previous 12-month evaluation period is subject to change but will normally be prior to the end of the fall semester. The specific date will be communicated to the faculty by the department chair.

### **V. (ii) Department Chair – (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement**

The Department Chair will meet with each faculty member annually to discuss role and performance expectations. At this meeting, the Chair and faculty member will agree on the faculty member's workload expectations for the upcoming 12-month evaluation period expressed in terms of percent (%) effort in each of the three (3) faculty workload domains (e.g., research/scholarship, teaching, and service), with total effort to equal 100%. The agreement on (%) percent effort expectations in each workload domain will be documented between the department chair and faculty member prior to the beginning of the next 12-month evaluation period. A copy of this agreement will be provided to the review committee as part of the evaluation process.

### **V. (iii) Annual Performance Evaluation Exceptions**

All active non tenure-track faculty members shall be evaluated annually with the following exceptions:

- faculty who are on approved, non-academic leave without pay for the entire 12-month evaluation period under review,
- faculty who have 100% effort in an administrative position.

For non tenure-track faculty who are on other types of approved paid leave (e.g., family medical leave, extended sick leave, administrative leave), depending on the length of the approved paid leave, the evaluation period will be prorated to account for the time spent on leave.

### **V. (iv) Faculty Review Committee Composition**

The Committee shall have four members elected at large from the eligible faculty under CLASS bylaws, with a representative from each of the four program areas currently represented in HHP. A program area may choose to forfeit their seat for a team to an at-large, elected seat, however, no more than two representatives from one program area may serve concurrently. Each member will serve a three-year term. No person may serve consecutive terms. The terms will be staggered such that up to two new members will be elected each year.

The Committee shall meet immediately following the deadline for faculty members to submit their annual faculty activity report. During this organizational meeting, the Committee shall elect a Chair from amongst the returning committee members, review the objectives and procedures of the review process, and set a timeline for completing their report and delivering it to the Department Chair at least one week ahead of the deadline for the Department chair to provide merit salary recommendations to the Dean.

#### V. (v) Faculty Review Committee Evaluation Process

Each committee member will independently review and score all NTT faculty activity reports using the evaluation criteria contained in Appendix 1. Additionally, committee members will not score their own reports, and each member will score all other committee members' activity reports. Each faculty member will be scored with respect to their activities in each of the three (3) workload domains (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching, and service) during the previous 12-month evaluation period.

When arriving at numerical scores, the Committee members should take into consideration:

- (a) the faculty member's rank
- (b) the enumerated expectations for (%) percent effort in each workload domain documented between the faculty member and department chair as described in Section V. (ii) above
- (c) the university's expectations as it relates to being a Tier One research university.

These considerations are expected to affect the committee members' scores. For example, the same annual activities may produce markedly higher scores for a clinical assistant professor than they would for a clinical full professor because the expectations of the department and university for faculty members of those two ranks differ considerably. Similarly, a faculty member with a 75% workload expectation should have considerably different levels of activity in the workload domain compared to another faculty member with a 10% workload expectation.

Within these conceptual guidelines, each Committee member may use his or her discretion in assigning numerical scores for the 12-month evaluation period under review. Final numerical scores may be made as decimal values in 0.25 increments. Each workload domain (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching, and service) should receive a single numerical score that maps to the following faculty performance criterion scale dictated by the University:

- 1 - Below expectations of the department & university
- 2 - Consistent with expectations of the department & university
- 3 - Above expectations of the department & university
- 4 - Excellence considering the expectations of the department & university

Numerical scores should be made based only on the information provided in the faculty activity report. Faculty members who fail to submit a faculty activity report for the 12-month evaluation period under review will receive a score of 1 in each workload domain. The Committee members may provide written comments on their scoring forms in addition to their numerical scores. A committee member who scores a faculty member with a numerical score of 4 or a numerical score below 2 in any workload domain is required to supply a written comment explaining the rationale for their score. Scores must be assigned independently of the other Committee members. Committee members will submit their scoring forms to the Committee chair.

Once all members have completed their scoring forms, the Committee chair will review the scoring forms to identify obvious discrepancies (e.g., widely disparate scores in one workload domain for a particular faculty member) or ambiguities (e.g., scoring error or skipped score). While it is expected scores will vary among the committee members, this review will allow the Committee chair to identify and address potential inconsistencies or conflicts that may affect the validity of the review process. The Committee chair may review issues with the Committee for clarification as necessary, such as providing justification for disparate scores, or address them individually, such as asking a committee member to complete a missing score. Under no circumstance is the Committee chair to alter or edit the scores without the knowledge and consent of the Committee.

#### V. (vi) Faculty Review Committee Report to Department Chair

Once the initial committee scoring process is complete, the Committee chair will compile a summary report and distribute it to the Committee members.

The committee will meet to discuss any discrepancies in APR scores for each individual NTT faculty member. Any committee member may choose to change their initial APR score determinations after the discussions. For any APR scores that are not unanimous, an average of the domain scores from each of the committee members will be used to determine the final APR score of the full committee. Feedback in the form of written commentary will accompany each final APR score for each NTT faculty member and must include both positive supporting comments as well as areas for improvement.

The Committee must vote to approve the final report to the Department chair, after which no edits can be made.

The final Committee report to the Department chair shall contain:

1. The average numerical score assigned by the Committee for each workload domain for each NTT faculty member for the 12-month evaluation period under review;
2. All written comments (if any) provided by Committee members;

## **SECTION VI. DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### VI. (i) Department Chair Rating

As per the current [UH Faculty Annual Performance Review](#) policy, the Department chair is ultimately responsible for determining a faculty member's final performance ratings for the previous year. The Department chair will rate each faculty member independently before receiving the Committee's summary report, using the same rating system as the Committee (see Appendix 1). In making their ratings, the department chair may use information in addition to that reported on the annual faculty activity form, such as existing documentation outside that was submitted by the faculty member, requested or submitted written statements, or individual interviews or discussions.

However, to ensure that peer review is meaningfully incorporated into the departmental faculty performance review process, the numerical scores independently generated by the Committee and the Department chair in each of the three (3) workload domains (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching, and service) shall be averaged to determine the faculty member's final numerical score in each workload domain for the previous 12-month evaluation period.

#### VI. (ii) Disagreement between Committee and Department Chair on Final Numerical Scores

After averaging, if the Department chair disagrees with the faculty member's final numerical scores for the previous 12-month evaluation period, as per university policy, the Department chair may choose to unilaterally change the final numerical scores to more closely reflect their own evaluation of the faculty member's performance. However, in any such case, prior to the Department chair making such a change, the Department chair must provide the Committee with a written justification and rationale as to the reasons behind their decision to unilaterally change the final numerical scores for the previous 12-month evaluation period. This justification and rationale will be shared with the faculty member.

### **SECTION VII. REPORT TO THE FACULTY**

Prior to meeting to discuss the next year's expectations with the Department chair, each faculty member will receive a written report from the Committee and the Department chair documenting their final numerical scores in each of the three (3) workload domains for the current 12-month evaluation period, any written comments from the Committee or Department chair, summary score statistics (mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum, quartiles, etc.) computed across the entire department and by academic rank, and their annual performance ratings in each of the three workload domains.

In addition, during the meeting between the Department chair and the NTT faculty member to discuss yearly expectations, the Department chair shall explicitly reserve time during the meeting to discuss the faculty member's ongoing trajectory towards promotion to Clinical or Instructional Associate Professor, promotion-in-rank from Clinical or Instructional Associate to Clinical or Instructional Professor, or in the case of Clinical or Instructional Professors, maintaining productivity and professional growth. That discussion should include guidance from the Department chair as to whether or not the faculty member is on track to be promoted, as well as a discussion of what actions (if any) the Department chair suggests the faculty member take in order to ultimately receive positive recommendations from the department NTT Promotion Review

committee and/or the Department chair for their promotion. The discussion between the department chair and the faculty member concerning promotion shall be documented in writing and acknowledged by both parties separate from the annual (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement described in Section V (ii) above.

## **SECTION VIII. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW VS. PROMOTION REVIEW**

The NTT faculty **annual performance review process** is designed to provide **ongoing, formative assessments** of an NTT faculty member's yearly contributions. In contrast, the **promotion review process** is a **cumulative, long-term evaluation** of an NTT faculty member's contributions spanning, at a minimum, the faculty member's probationary period in the department. Unlike the annual performance review process, the promotion review process determines the career progression of an NTT faculty member (i.e., granting of promotion) while signifying their overall excellence within the institution and the academy.

While it is reasonable to assume a non-tenure track faculty member who consistently receives annual numerical scores and performance ratings of 3 or above (i.e., above expectations or excellence) throughout the course of their probationary period is on track to be recommended for promotion by the department, it must be remembered that the granting of promotion is a separate evaluation process involving both "arms-length" external reviewers, and multiple levels of internal review within the University. As such, it should be clear to those non-tenure track faculty members seeking promotion that while their annual performance ratings should reflect a positive trajectory toward promotion, annual performance ratings are not considered part of the promotion review process.

Similarly, while it is reasonable to assume a non-tenured faculty member seeking promotion from associate to full professor rank who consistently receives annual numerical scores and performance ratings of 3 or above (i.e., above expectations or excellence) throughout the time spent at Associate level is on track to be recommended for promotion-in-rank by the department, the granting of promotion-in-rank is a separate evaluation process involving both "arms-length" external reviewers, and multiple levels of internal review within the University. As such, it should be clear to faculty members seeking promotion to full professor that while their annual performance ratings should reflect a positive trajectory toward promotion, annual performance ratings are not considered part of the promotion review process.

## **SECTION IX. REVIEW AND RESPONSIBILITY**

This policy must first be reviewed and agreed to by the HHP NTT faculty, followed by review and approval from the Department chair, Dean, and Office of the Provost. Subsequently, the NTT Faculty Review Committee will review it on an annual basis.

After annual review, if the committee believes substantive changes to any part of the policy are required in order to: 1) bring the policy in line with superseding College or University policies, or 2) enact changes suggested by the department chair, a departmental standing committee with responsibilities involving NTT issues, or the NTT faculty as a whole, the committee will bring these changes to the HHP NTT faculty for review and agreement as soon as possible, followed by review

and approval of these changes by the Department chair, Dean, and Office of the Provost. All changes made to the initially approved policy must be documented in the “Revisions Log” appearing in Section IX below.

Non-substantive changes (such as date changes, wording changes that do not change the policy's intent, etc.) will require only a unanimous vote of the NTT faculty review committee, but the Committee chair must document them in the “Changes Log” appearing in Section IX below.

## **SECTION X. APPROVALS**

### **Initial Policy Approval**

<b>Entity</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
HHP Faculty			August 21 <sup>st</sup> 2025
HHP Department Chair			August 21 <sup>st</sup> 2025
CLASS Dean’s Office			
Office of the Provost			

### **Revisions Log**

<b>Purpose of Revision</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES**

HHP NTT faculty members are involved in various research, professional, teaching, and service activities that span a diverse set of health-related disciplines, including nutrition, sport and fitness administration, athletic training, and exercise science. However, there is universal expectation that all faculty instructors deliver high-quality instruction and adequately fulfill their service obligations, consistent with the goals of the department and university.

With regard to evaluating the quality of faculty efforts in the teaching domain, faculty effort is typically directed towards areas related to a faculty member's role in the delivery of student instruction, the curation of the academic curriculum, student mentoring, and enhancing the teaching mission of the profession. While student evaluations of teaching (SETs) are recognized as being somewhat problematic from a methodological perspective, they continue to provide a broadly accepted and consistent (if not always accurate) means of evaluating student perceptions of faculty teaching and instruction. In addition, the receipt of peer-reviewed awards or recognitions related to teaching excellence also serves as an important indicator of teaching quality. As part of curating the academic curriculum, faculty members are responsible for regularly updating the content and/or instructional materials of their existing classes, redesigning previously taught classes, as well as developing new classes or academic programming depending on the needs of the academic unit. In addition to their primary responsibilities in the delivery of student instruction and curation of the academic curriculum, serving in a variety of roles faculty members play a critical role in mentoring and advising students at all academic levels inside and outside of their departments. Further, faculty members may also expend effort towards developing new teaching materials of value to the broader academy, such as textbooks, non-academic courses, or professional training materials, and engage in community-based teaching or service, which may or may not involve internally or externally funded efforts.

With regard to evaluating faculty service, service activities can be categorized based on who benefits from that service. The categories include service related to the department, college, and university, service related to the profession, service related to the community, service related to professional development (including mentoring of faculty colleagues), and service related to disseminating information to the general public through the media. Unlike when evaluating faculty activities in either the research/scholarship or the teaching domains (where there are at least some quantitative and qualitative performance metrics generally accepted by the academy), evaluating a faculty member's activities in the service domain is inherently subjective, and based on factors such as the perceived importance of the service activity, or the reputational impact of performing a particular service activity to the faculty member, the department and/or the institution. When evaluating service, rank will be taken into account with the expectation that higher ranked NTT faculty will provide service leadership such as a committee chair within the department, college or university or mentoring other faculty.

While NTT faculty's research and scholarly efforts vary depending on the many types and roles NTT faculty represent, it should be acknowledged all NTT faculty perform their duties within an educational environment that is nationally recognized as a research focused, Tier 1 university. Typically, most NTT roles and responsibilities highlight the primary role of teaching and a secondary



role of service. Thus, NTT may be expected to incorporate research activities as part of their overall contributions. This will be determined by their rank and job title primarily, but also through discussion with their program colleagues, department chair, and overall department goals and objectives. Research and scholarship activities are important both directly and indirectly. The latter may be more congruent with NTT faculty in the sense that high quality teaching is informed by scholarship or impactful service is guided by evidence-based research. NTT faculty's contributions in research are evaluated as an important, complimentary contribution to the overall department's research and scholarship production.

## **FACULTY PERFORMANCE METRICS**

### **Numerical Scores**

Each HHP NTT faculty member will, on an annual basis, receive up to three (3) numerical scores reflecting the professional activities they have performed in each of their three (3) possible workload domains during the previous 12-month evaluation period. Numerical scores will be assigned based on the type and number of activities completed in each workload domain, where numerical scores will be directly linked to the faculty member meeting certain specified minimum criteria in each workload domain (see below).

### **Annual Performance Ratings**

Each HHP NTT faculty member will receive an annual performance rating in each of their three (3) possible workload domains.

## **PROCEDURE FOR ASSIGNING NUMERICAL SCORES**

### **General Considerations**

The numerical scores assigned annually to an HHP NTT faculty member are directly linked to the faculty member meeting specified minimum criteria in each of their three (3) possible workload domains. Additional activities reported by the faculty member that are not listed as part of the minimum criteria for a particular workload domain may be credited toward the faculty member's numerical score in that workload domain. However, such additional activities cannot be substituted for any activity listed as part of the minimum criteria for that workload domain, nor can crediting the faculty member for these additional activities result in a numerical rating that exceeds that associated with meeting the minimum criteria required to receive the next highest performance rating. For example, a faculty member who meets the minimum criteria to receive a numerical rating of at least 2 cannot receive a numerical rating higher than 2.9 without first meeting the minimum criteria required to receive a numerical rating of 3.

In the teaching domain, faculty activities directly related to meeting the academic and operational needs of the department (i.e., high-quality student instruction, curation of the curriculum, student mentoring and advising, funded or unfunded development of new academic programming) shall be evaluated as being of higher value than those activities not directly related to the needs of the department. In the service domain, faculty activities most important to servicing the needs of the department, university, the surrounding community, and the academy-at-large will be evaluated as

being of higher value than those considered less directly related to these outcomes. In addition, the reputational impact of performing a particular service activity to the faculty member, the department and the institution will also be factored into the evaluation. In the research and scholarship domain, faculty activities directly related to the publication, funding, or recognition of research and scholarship shall be evaluated as being of higher value than those activities not directly related to these primary outcomes.

The final numerical score assigned for each workload domain will initially be based on the faculty member fulfilling a minimum number of defined activities in that workload domain. In addition, when conducting their evaluations, individual committee members and the department chair have, at their discretion, the ability to assign a higher value to a particular activity in any workload domain if they view that activity as being of significantly higher quality or impact. For example, developing high quality, original teaching materials in creating a new course for the department would be scored higher than updating course materials to reflect current information. Additionally, serving on a committee that requires a heavy time commitment throughout the year should be scored higher than a service commitment that requires meeting once a year for a couple of hours.

### **Assignment of Numerical Scores Within Workload Domains**

The following tables detail the type and number of faculty activities needed to satisfy the minimum criteria associated with receiving a particular minimum numerical score in each workload domain (i.e., research and scholarship, teaching and service) and make up the faculty Activity Report. **An activity may only be documented under one work domain and may not be counted toward your total score more than one time. When describing activities that have a lot of variability in time and work commitment (e.g., committee work or continuing education), a description must be included that quantifies the amount of effort invested. The expectation is the amount of work effort in a work domain should equal the individual percentage of work determined in the goal sheet at the beginning of the cycle. For example, committee work that requires a weekly 1-hour meeting and 3 hours of additional weekly work would equate to a 10% work effort, based on a 40-hour work week.**

Any faculty member who fails to fulfill the minimum requirements to receive a numerical score of “2” in any workload domain will be assigned a numerical score of “1” in that workload domain.

#### **(A) Research/Scholarship Workload Domain**

Listed below are the type and expected number of research/scholarship activities that each HHP NTT faculty member by academic rank is expected to have completed during the previous 12-month evaluation period in order to receive, at a minimum, the corresponding numerical score. In addition, the evaluation process will factor in the terms of the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement for the 12-month period under evaluation.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “2” or above (i.e., consistent with expectations of the department and university) (\*based on 10% effort). At least 1 from the list below.

	1 publication (to a professional organization or an academic journal)
	1 national, regional, or internal research presentation

	Small internal grant submission (up to \$10K)
	Co-PI on federal grant (submission or ongoing)
	Co-PI on large internal/small external grant (submission or ongoing)
	Other (must include supportive comments)
	Substitution Activity Approved by Department Chair

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “**3**” or above (i.e. above expectations of the department and university). At least 1 from the list below in addition to meeting criteria for a numerical score of “**2**.”

	Submit or re-submit large external grant
	Large internal grant submission (over \$10K, e.g., GEAR/CITE)
	Small external grant submission (up to \$50K)
	2 publications (to a professional organization or an academic journal)
	PI/co-PI on on-going grant (large internal, any external)
	Other (must include supportive comments)

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “**4**” (i.e., excellence considering expectations of the department and university). At least 1 from the list below in addition to meeting criteria for a numerical score of “**3**.”

	Large external grant scored/funded (over \$50K)
	3 publications (to a professional organization or an academic journal)
	Scholarly book
	Other (must include supportive comments)

#### (B) Teaching Workload Domain

In the case of the teaching workload domain, all HHP NTT faculty members, regardless of academic rank, are normally expected to be actively involved in the delivery of student instruction, the curation of the academic curriculum, and student mentoring activities during the previous 12-month evaluation period. In addition, the evaluation process will account for differing expectations associated with academic rank and factor in the terms of the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement for the 12-month period under evaluation.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “**2**” or above (i.e., consistent with expectations of the department and university) (\*based on 80% effort).

	Teaching assigned courses
	Student teaching evaluations generally note a positive experience
	Majority of Student Teaching Evaluation Scores within 1 S.D. of college or department means (whichever one is lower)
	Maintaining up to date course materials (e.g., syllabi, new textbook editions, lecture slides and recordings, etc.). Provide description in comment box.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “**3**” or above (i.e. above expectations of the department and university) includes earning 8 points or more based on activities with assigned point values listed below.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “**4**” (i.e. excellence considering expectations of the department and university) includes earning 15 points or more based on activities with assigned point values listed below.

Value: 1 point each

	Mentoring 1 - 3 students (this includes multiple meetings with student over the course of the semester or year to support their research, career path, etc. – must include student names and nature of mentoring in comment box)
	Honor student (1 student)
	Participated in 1 – 2 guest lectures/invitations to speak in classes outside of your assigned teaching load (teaching in a higher education institution)*
	Attended continuing education focused on DEI, teaching techniques, improving online learning, simulation, etc.*
	Other (must include supportive comments)

\* These must include a description of the time/work commitment (e.g., # hours, outcomes/deliverables, if applicable).

Value: 2 points each

	Mentored 4 - 5 students (this includes multiple meetings with student over the course of the semester or year to support their research, career path, etc. – must include student names and nature of mentoring in comment section below)
	Honor students (2 students)
	Teaching award finalist (internal or external)
	Contributed to a textbook/course material development*
	Completed a course overhaul/major course adjustment (this includes implementing a new set of materials/textbook, major curriculum change, etc. - must include description in comment box)*
	Coursework beyond normal duties such as writing intensive course, high external class workload, or course overload (describe in comment box)*
	Participated in community engagement teaching/service learning*
	Participated in 3 – 5 guest lectures/invitations to speak in classes outside of your assigned teaching load (teaching in a higher education institution)*
	Other (must include supportive comments)

\* Must include a description of the time/work commitment (e.g., # hours, # pages/papers reviewed, # additional accommodations/student support services, additional time meeting with students, lab sections, examples of materials developed or syllabus changes, etc.)

Value: 3 points each

	Honor students (3 students)
	Mentored 6+ students (this includes multiple meetings with student over the course of the semester or year to support their research, career path, etc. – must include student names and nature of mentoring in comment section below)

	Teaching award recipient (internal or external)
	Grant (internal or external)
	Developed textbook/course material*
	New course development (new to curriculum)*
	Other (must include supportive comments)

\* Must include a description of the time/work commitment (e.g., # hours, example of materials developed, etc.)

### (C) Service Workload Domain

Faculty activities in the service workload domain included those related to service to the department, college, and university, service related to the profession, service related to the community, service related to professional development, and service related to disseminating information through the media. In addition, the evaluation process will account for differing service expectations associated with academic rank and factor in the terms of the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement for the 12-month period under evaluation.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “2” or above (i.e., consistent with expectations of the department and university). **Checking at least 3 of the items below is considered meeting expectations and must be completed before consideration of a higher score (“A” or “B” may be counted more than once if serving on multiple committees).** (\*based on 20% effort)

	A. Elected/appointed department committee assignment*
	B. 1 external committee assignment (college/university/professional/community)*
	C. 1 student or professional activity outside of assignment workload (e.g., student club, info sessions, participation in student-led activities, program marketing) *
	D. Maintained yearly accreditation and/or program standards if applicable
	E. Delivered lectures, workshops to local or regional community (e.g., non-academic) groups or audiences (one day of presenting), participated in interviews with the public*
	F. Other (must include supportive comments)

\* These must include a description of the time/work commitment (e.g., # hours, outcomes/deliverables, if applicable).

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “3” or above (i.e., above expectations of the department and university). At least 1 from the list below in addition to meeting criteria for a numerical score of “2.”

	Implemented substantial change/improvement to departmental processes or committee productivity (provide explanation)*
	2 college/university committees or leadership for 1*
	2 professional and/or community committees or leadership for 1*
	2 combination of college/university/professional/community committees or leadership for 1*
	Maintained cyclic accreditation/program standards (e.g., site visit, self-study development, program review)*

	Delivered lectures or workshops to local or regional community (e.g., non-academic) groups or audiences (two plus days of presenting)*
	Additional service activities/responsibility beyond your assigned workload (provide details in the comment box below including hours and related activities)*
	Other (must include supportive comments)

\* These must include a description of the time/work commitment (e.g., # hours, outcomes/deliverables, if applicable).

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of “4” (i.e., excellence considering expectations of the department and university). At least 1 from the list below in addition to meeting criteria for a numerical score of “3.”

	3 college/university committees or leadership for 2*
	3 professional and/or community committees or leadership for 2*
	3 combination of college/university/professional/community committees or leadership for 2*
	Received service excellence award from university, association, or community group
	Received career achievement award from local or regional professional association
	Named Fellow (or equivalent) of professional association/society
	Other (must include supportive comments)

\* These must include a description of the time/work commitment (e.g., # hours, outcomes/deliverables, if applicable).

### **PROCEDURE FOR ASSIGNING ANNUAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS**

To align with the University’s faculty annual performance review, departments are required to assign annual performance ratings in each workload domain that clearly distinguish between faculty performance that is “not meeting expectations” and that which is “meeting expectations” or above.

Annual performance ratings will be reported to the College and University using the following scale:

- 1 - Below expectations of the department & university
- 2 – Consistent with expectations of the department & university
- 3 – Above expectations of the department & university
- 4 – Excellence considering the expectations of the department & university