Child & Family Studies

Evaluation Guidelines

Approved by CFS Faculty: March 18, 2022

UNIVERSITY of SOUTH FLORIDA

Child & Family Studies
College of Behavioral & Community Sciences

Contents

- Professor/Class Code 9001
- Associate Professor/Class Code 9002
- Assistant Professor/Class Code 9003

- Research Professor/Class Code 9101
- Associate Research Professor /Class Code 9102
- Assistant Research Professor/Class Code 9103

- Assistant in Research/Class Code 9121
- Associate in Research/Class Code 9120
- Research Associate/Class Code 9166

CFS Evaluation Guidelines
Purpose of this Document

Child and Family Studies (CFS) is a department in the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences. CFS has over 275 faculty and staff, four academic programs, and three research divisions. Its research portfolio is approximately $60 million annually. Given its complexity, CFS divided the task of developing its faculty evaluation criteria by academic program, and by faculty career paths. This document and the evaluation guidelines were all created and voted upon by CFS faculty.

The guidelines have all been approved by faculty who voted via a Qualtrics survey method. The guidelines are organized in this document by academic program and by career path. There is one group of tenured and tenure earning faculty who were not hired to serve in an academic program, so their guidelines were developed to reflect their status and assigned faculty duties.

Applied Behavior Analysis Programs (MA, MS, PhD) – 42.2814
(Approved Unanimously by Faculty 12/10/2021)

All faculty (Tenured faculty, Tenure-earning faculty, and Instructors) will receive an annual evaluation based on their assigned duties. Tenure-line faculty members will have assigned duties in Teaching, Research, and Service. Instructors will have assigned duties in Teaching and may have assigned duties in Research and Service. The procedure for faculty evaluations will include a self-evaluation and an evaluation written by the faculty member's supervisor. Faculty members seeking tenure or promotion will also receive annual feedback as part of the evaluation regarding their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Annual evaluations will take into account the percentage of assignment to each of the formal evaluation categories: Teaching, Research, and Service. Faculty members who have administrative responsibilities (Program Director and Associate Director, or Program Coordinators) will describe their administrative activities under service. Spouses or partners may not evaluate each other.

Faculty are evaluated on a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rank and 1 being the lowest) as follows:

- Outstanding   5
- Strong   4
- Satisfactory   3
- Weak   2
- Unsatisfactory   1

Teaching
Evaluation of contributions to Teaching will be based on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and student evaluations. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make certain that their annual self-evaluation includes all necessary information for review by their supervisor. Evidence of teaching contributions provided in the self-evaluation may include, but are not limited to the following:
- Narrative self-assessment that discusses accomplishments in teaching for the year; teaching philosophy relative to the University, College, and Department; and individual teaching goals for the coming year.
- Documentation of efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success.
- Quality of student evaluations of teaching (in relation to the level and content of the courses taught, the number of students enrolled, and the percentage completing the evaluation), including the following:
  - Course evaluations relative to College and University means;
  - Summary of, and responses, to student comments; and

- - Plans for course improvements, additional training, mentorship, etc. to address the concerns and comments from students.
  - Peer review or observation of teaching. This could be completed by another faculty member in the Department or by someone outside the Department (e.g., the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, CITL).
  - Student mentoring such as the following:
    - Descriptions of all activities including the depth of involvement (supervisor, committee chair, committee member, etc.), status of the project, and outcomes including any presentations, submissions, or publications.
    - Doctoral dissertations.
    - Master's theses.
    - Undergraduate Honors Theses.
    - Undergraduate research assistantships and scholarships.
    - Directed research activities.
    - Dissertation committees at other institutions of higher education.
    - Other evidence of contributions to student development (e.g., undergraduate research assistants).
  - Training grant or research grant submission or administration that involves mentoring, student support, or personnel preparation.
  - Evidence of activities resulting in professional growth or development.
  - Publications and presentations relating to the science of teaching and learning.
  - Recognition of meritorious teaching.
  - Training of others in innovative teaching.
  - Other forms of documentation that indicate the quality of teaching activities.

Evaluative criteria:

The evaluative criteria are provided as guidelines. Ratings will be based on the information provided in the assessment, taking into account: 1) the faculty member's rank; 2) the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is assigned to teaching in the year under review; and 3) the distribution of their effort in advising, course development, teaching, and mentoring. Ratings should also be reflective of access and opportunities provided to the faculty member for teaching and mentoring.

An Outstanding (5) contribution to Teaching is typified by three or more of the following types of activities (and a mean rating of 3.0 or higher on courses taught during the year):
- - Student evaluations above the University average in all courses.
  - An outstanding peer review or observation of teaching by a faculty in- or out-of-unit, including the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning (CITL), or an outstanding Teaching evaluation by a Program Coordinator or Director.
  - Evidence of extensive efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to contribute otherwise to student success (including acceptance to graduate training programs, post-graduate training opportunities, faculty positions, and continued mentorship, as appropriate).

- o Attending a number of university-sponsored or external trainings for teaching.
- o Mentoring doctoral students in college teaching and/or participating in evaluating doctoral student instructors.
- o Submission of, receipt of funding for, or administration of, a large training grant reflecting extensive depth of involvement with multiple students.
- o Extensive student mentoring activities resulting in successful theses or dissertations and student presentations, publications, or submissions of manuscripts for publication, student receipt of awards. (This can also include dissertation and thesis committees at other institutions of higher education.)
- o Publications, invited presentations, and presentations relating to the science of teaching and learning.
- o Recognition for teaching and mentoring activities both within and outside of the university, including awards or invited presentations on teaching and mentoring.
- o Recruitment and mentoring of prestigious or competitive student fellowship recipients.
- o Successful efforts to recruit and support multiple students from traditionally marginalized groups.

A Strong (4) contribution to Teaching is typified by at least three of the following types of activities (and a mean rating of 3.0 or higher on courses taught during the year):
- o Student evaluations above the university average in most courses.
- o Evidence of some successful efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success (including acceptance into graduate training programs, post-graduate training opportunities, faculty positions, and continued mentorship, as appropriate).
- o A strong peer review or observation of teaching by a faculty in- or out-of-unit, including the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning (CITL).
- o Attendance at several trainings or workshops on teaching or course development.
- o Student mentoring activities resulting in the completion of theses or dissertations or presentations and publications or submissions of manuscripts for publication, including acceptance into graduate training programs, post-graduate training opportunities, faculty positions, and continued mentorship, as appropriate.
- o Submission of, receipt of funding for, or administration of, a small training grant with significant support of students.
- o Recruitment and mentoring of student fellowship recipients.
- o Evidence of efforts to recruit and support multiple at least one student from a traditionally marginalized group.

A Satisfactory (3) contribution to Teaching is typified by at least three of the following types of activities (and a mean rating of 3.0 or higher on courses taught during the year):
- o Student evaluations above the University average in some courses or at the university average in all courses.

- o Evidence of minimal efforts to improve content delivery, develop curriculum, or otherwise contribute to student success.
- o Attend at least one training or workshop on teaching or course development.
- o A satisfactory peer review or observation of teaching by a faculty in- or out-of-unit, including the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning (CITL).
- o Limited student mentoring activities resulting in delayed progress toward the completion of theses or dissertations; progress toward presentations and publications; or submissions of manuscripts for publication.
- o Submission for a training grant with support of students.

A weak (2) contribution to teaching is typified by student evaluations below the University averages in most courses and at least one of the following types of activities:
- o Evidence of minimal efforts to improve content delivery, develop curriculum, or otherwise contribute to student success.
- o Attend at one training or workshop on teaching or course development.
- o Minimal student mentoring activities with at least one student, but not resulting in the successful and timely completion of student projects, presentations, publications, or submissions.
- o A peer review or observation of teaching by a faculty member in- or out-of-unit, including the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning (CITL) that suggests the faculty member needs substantial improvement in teaching.

An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to teaching results is typified by student evaluations below the University averages in all courses and no evidence of other activities.

Research
Evaluation of contributions to research will be based on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and any other information known to the supervisor, taking into account the proportion of assigned faculty duties in research during the review year. Faculty in tenure lines will have assigned faculty duties in research and will be expected to engage in a thematic line of research resulting in publications, submission of external grants, and receipt of extramural funding. Instructors will be evaluated on research when they have assigned faculty duties devoted to research. In such cases, instructors will be expected to conduct research resulting in publications and presentations commensurate with the percentage of time assigned to research that year. Information to include in self-evaluation is as follows:

- Narrative self-assessment that discusses the focus of the research program; expresses contribution to the faculty member's field of study and to the university, college, and department goals; evaluates progress against the goals from the previous year and relative to career status; and sets goals for the coming year. Discussion of FTE contributed to research or any related issues should be clearly delineated.
- Extramural grants funded/submitted, including:
  - o Nature and extent of the faculty member's contribution to the research or training program (e.g., role of faculty member as reflected in principal

investigator or co-principal investigator status; extent of research activities involved; mentoring of grant personnel such as junior faculty, post-docs, or students).
- o Type of funding source (e.g., federal, state, foundation, corporate, university internal; quantity of funds involved).
- Record of competitive honors and awards for research, or mentored student research.
- Description of the number and evidence of the quality of peer-reviewed articles; book chapters; or books published, submitted, and/or accepted; including:
  - o Nature and extent of the faculty member's contribution to the research.
  - o Quality of the journals or books according to indicators such as impact factors, acceptance rates, quality of publisher, and/or influence of publication on a particular research community.
  - o Citations of the faculty member's work.
- Scholarly presentations including:
  - o Proper reference format with full author list.
  - o Nature of the presentation (invited/contributed, peer-reviewed/non-peer reviewed), role of faculty member, special status (e.g., won award, keynote, panelist, etc.)
  - o Title and scope (e.g., international, national, regional, local).
- Reviews of books and articles.
- Evidence of professional development in research.

Evaluative criteria:

The evaluative criteria are provided as guidelines. Ratings will be based on the information provided in the assessment taking into account: 1) the faculty member's rank; 2) the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is assigned to research in the year under review; and 3) the faculty member's goals for the year from the previous year's self-evaluation. Higher and lower research assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for each category. Note that promotion to Associate Professor requires at least one submission of a federal grant proposal as Principal Investigator (PI), and promotion to Professor requires receipt of at least one federal grant or other major extramural grant as PI.

An Outstanding (5) contribution to research is typified by *three or more* of the accomplishments listed below.
- o Funding of, or submitted application for, federal (or other major extramural) grant.
- o Carrying out roles and responsibilities in the faculty member's grant-funded research.
- o Publications with USF student(s) in peer-reviewed journals.
- o Publication of book chapters.
- o Publication of a book.
- o Submission of articles with USF student(s) to peer reviewed journals,

- o Presentations at regional, national, and international conferences,
- o Invited conference presentations, seminars, workshops, or other invited talks.
- o Technical report development related to grants.
- o Examples of activities/products leading to an outstanding rating may include:
  - • a) Receipt of major extramural grant funding or submission of a high impact extramural grant as a PI, PD, or Co-PI, or fulfillment of one of these grant roles and/or responsibilities to the faculty member's funded grant, b) publishing at least one peer-reviewed article or book chapter with USF students, c) submission of at least one article with USF students to a peer reviewed journal, d) presentations (including invited presentations) at regional, national, or international conferences.
  - • a) Publication of multiple peer reviewed articles or book chapters with USF students, b) submission of peer-review manuscripts with USF students, c) presentations at national or international conferences.

A Strong (4) contribution to research is typified by *three or more* of the accomplishments listed below:
- o Funding of, or submitted application for, federal (or other major extramural) grant.
- o Carrying out roles and responsibilities in grant-funded research.
- o At least one publication with USF student(s) in a peer-reviewed journal.
- o Publication of a book chapter.
- o Publication of a book.
- o Submission of an article with USF student(s) to a peer reviewed journal.
- o At least one presentation at a regional, national, and international conference
- o Invited conference presentations, seminars, workshops, or other invited talks.
- o Technical report development related to grants.
- o Examples of activities/products leading to a strong rating may include;
  - • a) Funding or submission of an extramural grant as PI, PD, or Co-PI, or fulfillment of one of these grant roles and/or responsibilities on the faculty member's funded grant, b) publication or submission of a peer reviewed article or chapter with USF students, c) one or more conference presentations.
  - • a) Publication of one peer-reviewed article or book chapter with USF students, b) submission of at least one article to a peer-reviewed journal with USF students, and c) at least one conference presentation.

A Satisfactory (3) contribution to Research is typified by *two* of the accomplishments listed below:
- o Funding of, or submitted application for, federal (or other major extramural) grant.
- o Carrying out roles and responsibilities in the faculty member's grant-funded research.
- o At least one publication with USF student(s) in a peer-reviewed journal.

- o Publication of a book chapter.
- o Publication of a book.
- o Submission of an article with USF student(s) to a peer reviewed journal.
- o At least one presentation at a regional, national, and international conference.
- o Invited conference presentations, seminars, workshops, or other invited talks.
- o Technical report development related to grants.
- o Examples of activities/products leading to a satisfactory rating may include:
  - • Documentation of progress or significant contribution to a grant submission; Fulfillment of grant roles and/or responsibilities and development of grant related technical report
  - • a) Publication one peer reviewed article or book chapter with USF students, b) submission of a manuscript to a peer reviewed journal or book with USF students, and c) at least one conference presentation.

A Weak (2) contribution to research is characterized by unclear, minimal, or insufficient evidence of research activities, as evidenced *by one of the accomplishments below:*
- o Funding of, or submitted application for, federal (or other major extramural) grant.
- o Carrying out roles and responsibilities in grant-funded research.
- o A publication in peer-reviewed journal.
- o Publication of a book chapter.
- o Submission of an article with USF student(s) to a peer-reviewed journal.
- o Presentations at regional, national, and international conferences.
- o Invited conference presentations, seminars, workshops, or other invited talks.
- o Technical report development related to grants.

An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to research is reflected by evidence of the following:
- o Failure to demonstrate a grant or contract development in progress or submission.
- o Failure to submit or demonstrate progress of a peer-reviewed journal manuscript or a lesser impact article or book chapter;
- o Did not present in the evaluation period a high impact research presentation, as evidenced by the quality of the outlet, impact of the presentation, and status of the presenter (e.g., workshop organizer at a major conference, invited address at a major conference; invited colloquium talk to a highly ranked program)

Service

Evaluation of contributions in the area of Service will be based on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and any other information known to the supervisor. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make certain that their annual self-evaluation includes all necessary information for review by the supervisor. Potential information to be included in the self-evaluation is as follows:

- • Narrative self-assessment that completes the following:

- o Discusses the nature of the Service activities to advance a scholarly discipline, contribute to a profession, and/or impact families, schools, the Department, College, University, and community;
  - o Expresses contribution to University, College, and Department goals;
  - o Evaluates progress against the goals from the previous year and relative to career status; and
  - o Sets goals for the coming year.
- Service as a Division or Program Director, Associate Director, or Program Coordinator:
  - o Describe how one has fulfilled the role and explain how the amount of work performed is commensurate with the associated service assignment.
- Service on University, College, and Department committees:
  - o Describe responsibilities, type, and degree of involvement; and
  - o Whether membership is elected or appointed.
- Service as it relates to mentorship:
  - o Formal and informal mentoring of faculty relating to teaching and/or research.
- Service to the profession:
  - o Formal activity in societies, organizations, or agencies in the discipline or related to the discipline beyond paid membership
    - Scope and status of society (e.g., international, national, state, local; disciplinary or interdisciplinary membership);
    - Describe responsibilities, type, and degree of involvement (e.g., chair, co-chair, fellow, board/senior member, member); and
    - Indicate whether elected or appointed.
  - o Peer-review activities, including:
    - Grant review activity (such as funding agency, depth and extent of involvement); and
    - Peer reviews for books, articles, or conferences (specify type and number of items reviewed and for which publisher, journal, society, committee, or Department).
  - o Editorial activity
    - Journal or series editor or associate editor (describe scope and nature of activities, time commitment, quality of outlet);
    - Formal appointment to editorial, review, or advisory boards (describe scope and nature of involvement)
  - o Seminars, workshops, and community-based training activities primarily oriented to continuing professional education in the discipline or related to the discipline, such as:
    - Extent and nature of participation (e.g., organizer, participant, discussant);
    - Status of venue (e.g., international, national, state, or local organization);
    - Whether participation was invited or submitted.
  - o Inter-Institutional Invitations

- Invitations to participate in promotion and tenure process or related academic evaluations, program evaluations, etc.
- Describe nature and extent of invitation, standing of institution.
- Service to the community
  - Describe the nature and extent of the activity including:
    - The community involved (e.g., global, national, regional/state, local);
    - Extent of curricular engagement between university and community (e.g., address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrichment to the scholarship of the institution);
    - Outreach activity (i.e., provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community);
    - Partnership activity (e.g., collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources such as research, capacity building, economic development, etc.).

Evaluative Criteria:

Evaluation of contributions in the area of Service falls into three general categories: to the University, to the profession, and to the community. University Service is further broken down into Service to the department, the college, and the university at large. The evaluation will be based on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and any other information known to the person conducting the evaluation. Evaluation of Service will take into consideration the percentage of faculty duties devoted to Service and stated goals from the previous year.
Note: In order for a faculty member to earn a Satisfactory, Strong, or Outstanding rating in Service, a faculty member must be regularly involved in faculty meetings and must actively contribute to the life of the department/program.

An Outstanding (5) contribution to Service is characterized by engagement in many of the following types of activities, commensurate with the percentage of duties assigned to service:
  - Substantial service to the program in a Director, Associate Director, or Coordinator role when applicable;
  - Active participation in faculty meetings and governance;
  - Service on University, College, or Department committees;
  - Service as it relates to mentoring and leadership;
  - Service to the profession in the form of engagement and leadership in organizations related to the discipline;
  - Peer review activities and editorial roles in the publication of scientific works;
  - Peer-review activities for conference and scientific meeting programs;
  - Peer review in the funding process;
  - Organization and participation in scientific meetings, seminars and workshops;
  - Outreach or service to the community and other institutions, including positive media and social media representations of the field; and

- o Awards for service-related activities.

A Strong (4) contribution to Service is reflected in engagement in several of the following types of activity commensurate with the percentage of duties assigned to Service:
- o Substantial Service to the program in a Director or Coordinator role, when applicable;
- o Active participation in faculty meetings and governance;
- o Service on University, College, or Department committees;
- o Service as it relates to mentoring and leadership;
- o Service to the profession in the form of engagement and leadership in organizations related to the discipline;
- o Peer-review activities and editorial roles in the publication of scientific works;
- o Peer-review activities for conference and scientific meeting programs;
- o Peer review in the funding process;
- o Organization and participation in scientific meetings, seminars, and workshops;
- o Outreach or Service to the community and other institutions; and
- o Awards for service-related activities

A Satisfactory (3) contribution to Service is reflected in participation in two Service activities relative to rank and the percentage of duties assigned to Service:
- o Substantial service to the program in a Director or Coordinator role when applicable;
- o Active participation in faculty meetings and governance;
- o Service on University, College, or Department committees;
- o Service as it relates to mentoring and leadership;
- o Service to the profession in the form of engagement and leadership in organizations related to the discipline;
- o Peer-review activities and editorial roles in the publication of scientific works;
- o Peer review in the funding process;
- o Organization and participation in scientific meetings, seminars, and workshops;
- o Outreach or Service to the community and other institutions;
- o Awards for service-related activities.

A Weak (2) contribution to Service is reflected in one of the following:
- o The faculty member participates only in faculty meetings with no other Service evident.
- o The effort reported as Service is obviously not commensurate with the assigned effort in that area (i.e., someone is assigned .25 for Service but only shows evidence of work that should take 1 hour a month).

An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to Service is reflected because a faculty member shows insufficient evidence of service activities, and does not even attending faculty meetings.

Child & Adolescent Behavioral Health Program (MS) – 44.0000
(Approved by Faculty Majority 12/09/2021)

For all faculty members (Tenured/Tenure-Earning. Research Professors, Research Associates, Instructors) who teach within the Child & Adolescent Behavioral Health (CABH) Master of Science program, the Program Director will contribute to their annual evaluation in the area of teaching. Teaching is usually not the primary assignment for many of the faculty who teach within the CABH program, and typically, the CABH Program Director is not their supervisor. Therefore, the CABH Program Director will contribute to the evaluation for the teaching activities (teaching a course, advising, comp exam administration, developing/revising a course), made by the faculty who teach within the CABH master's program if the CABH program director is not the faculty's direct supervisor. The Program Director will utilize the evaluation guidelines that are developed for each of the career paths for providing the contribution to the annual evaluation of the faculty who teach within the CABH program. Spouses or partners may not evaluate each other.

Rehabilitation & Mental Health Counseling Programs (MA) – 51.1505/ Marriage & Family Therapy (MS) – 51.2310 (Approved Unanimously by Faculty 12/15/2021)

All faculty and staff within the Child & Family Studies (CFS) Department will receive an annual performance evaluation. All evaluations must be signed by the evaluator and the CFS faculty or staff evaluated before submission to the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences (CBCS) Assistant Dean, in the case of faculty, and to the Human Resources Director, in the case of staff. Evaluations of CFS faculty and staff will follow USF Human Resources policies, procedures, and any applicable Collective Bargaining Agreements.

All tenured, tenure-earning, research faculty, and instructors will complete an annual report based on their assigned duties. Faculty will be evaluated according to performance of their assigned faculty duties. The procedure for faculty evaluations will include a self-evaluation and an evaluation written by the faculty member's supervisor. Faculty in junior ranks and those seeking tenure or promotion will also receive annual feedback as part of the evaluation regarding their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Faculty assigned duty forms determine the research, teaching, and service loads of faculty. Annual evaluations will take into account the percentage of assignment to each of the formal evaluation categories including Research, Teaching, Service and, when appropriate, Administration. Spouses or partners may not evaluate each other.

Faculty are evaluated on a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rank and 1 being the lowest) as follows:

- Outstanding   5
- Strong   4
- Satisfactory   3
- Weak   2
- Unsatisfactory   1

All evaluative criteria are guidelines. Ratings will be based on all information provided and will consider the amount of effort assigned to each faculty. Significantly higher and lower assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for each category.

If a faculty member is not satisfied with the Evaluation Summary prepared by the evaluator (Department Chair or equivalent), the faculty member may pursue additional review and evaluation per current UFF collective bargaining guidelines.

Teaching (Tenure Track faculty)
Evaluation of contributions to teaching will be based on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation, student evaluations, peer reviews or observations of teaching, and any other information known to the Directors and to the Department Chair. The number of students in the section and the response rate will be considered when evaluating student evaluations.

- An Outstanding (rating = 5) contribution to teaching is typified by at least four (4) of the following types of activities:
    a. Student evaluations above the University average in all courses.
    b. An outstanding peer review or observation of teaching by a faculty within or outside of the unit, including the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning.
    c. Evidence of efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or contribute otherwise to student success.
    d. Evidence of efforts to manage and develop community partnerships for student training and mentoring.
    e. Attend at least one training or workshop on teaching or course development through the Academy for Teaching and Learning Excellence (ATLE), which has merger with the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning (CITL).
    f. Administration of a training grant reflecting extensive depth of involvement with multiple students.
    g. Student mentoring activities resulting in student presentations.
    h. Student mentoring activities resulting in student publications or submissions.
    i. Publication and presentations relating to the science of teaching and learning.
    j. Chairing at least one master's thesis or doctoral dissertation committee.
    k. Serving as a member on at least two Master's thesis or one Doctoral dissertation committee. Mentoring early career or midcareer faculty (doctoral students at other universities, postdocs, assistant professors, associate professors).
    l. Activities that promote knowledge translation (KT) to the field. KT is a transformative concept that links the best elements of both broad fields and, in particular, adds educational elements to the work of researchers and others.
    m. Supervise at least one independent study.
    n. Honors such as awards for teaching, contribution, and mentorship.
    o. Development of training materials and direct training related to teaching and training grants.

- A Strong (rating = 4) contribution to teaching is typified by at least three (3) of the types of activities listed above.
- A Satisfactory (rating = 3) contribution to teaching is typified by at least two (2) of the types of activities listed above.
- A Weak (rating = 2) contribution to teaching is typified by at least one (1) of the types of activities listed above.
- An Unsatisfactory (rating = 1) is assigned when none of the types of activities listed above are evidenced.

Teaching (Instructor)

Evaluation of contributions to teaching will be based on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation, student evaluations, peer reviews or observations of teaching, and any other information known to the Directors and to the Chair. The number of students in the section and the response rate will be considered when evaluating student evaluations.

- An Outstanding (rating=5) contribution to teaching is typified by an average student teaching evaluation for the year above the college average and at least **two** of the following types of activities listed below.

- A Strong (rating =4) contribution to teaching is typified by an average student teaching evaluation for the year above the University average and at least **two** of the following types of activities listed below.

- A Satisfactory (rating=3) contribution to teaching is typified by an average student teaching evaluation for the year about the University average and at least **one** of the following types of activities listed below.

- A Weak (rating=2) contribution to teaching is typified by an average student teaching evaluation for the year below the University average and at least **one** of the following types of activities listed below.

- An Unsatisfactory (rating=1) contribution to teaching results is typified by an average teaching evaluation for the year below the University average with **no** evidence of teaching improvement related to the below list of activities.

  a. A completion of a peer review or observation of teaching by a faculty within or outside of the unit including the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning with evidence of course improvement based on the review/observation. Categories of peer review of teaching include review of the following: Syllabi, Canvas page, Live observation, student comments from past evaluations of the course, and overall impressions.
  b. Evidence of efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or contribute otherwise to student success (revision of course content, new course development, curriculum development)
  c. Evidence of efforts to manage and develop community partnerships for student training and mentoring
  d. Administration of a large training grant reflecting extensive depth of involvement with multiple students.
  e. Student mentoring activities resulting in student presentations and publications/submissions.
  f. Publications and presentations relating to the science of teaching and learning.
  g. Honors such as awards for teaching contribution and mentorship.

h. Attend at least two training or workshops on teaching or course development through the Academy for Teaching and Learning Excellence (ATLE), which has merger with the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning (CITL).

i. Supervise at least two independent study.

Research

Evaluations at the Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling (RMHC) Program level will include an assessment of the quality of the faculty's work and consider field-appropriate evidence of the significance of research and scholarly work, as well as the faculty's assignments and associated activities within CFS. A faculty member may present the following types of evidence of a significant research program: reviews of books and articles; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, and fellowships; criticism and reviews of creative work; reviews of grant applications; citations of the faculty member's work; evidence of contributions to policy and practice; the quality and significance of journals, series, and presses by which the candidate's work is published or of other venues in which it appears; invited, refereed, or non-refereed status of publications; research awards and acknowledgements; and invitations and commissions.

Evaluation of contributions to Research will be based on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and any other information known to the Director and to the Chair, taking into account the proportion of faculty devoted to research during the review year and the allocation of their efforts to active and further research activities. Due to the multidisciplinary nature of the Program, scholarship takes many forms and often involves collaboratively generated contributions to new knowledge, as well as improvements in service delivery, practice, education, and training. For example, in some years, faculty may not seem to be productive when grants are active and require significant efforts in report development and research dissemination, or faculty time may focus on development, submission, and conducting pilot studies to further their research activities. During those years, faculty without funding, or with less funding, should not be counted against the faculty's record of scholarly activity and productivity. These guidelines assume typical assignments. Higher and lower assignment allocation percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for research. Understandably, publications, grants or other products may appear only after lengthy or extensive effort, and this is particularly true of community-engaged and/or interdisciplinary work at the local, national, and/or international levels. As such, research funding, time, and effort may fluctuate annually. Research activity is recognized despite funding outcomes given the fierce competitiveness of grant funding and lengthy resubmission processes.

Please refer to the Governance Document Guidelines for Annual assignments to determine "typical" assignments.

- An Outstanding (rating=5) contribution to research is typified by achieving at least 5 of the activities described below:
  a. A minimum of one funded or renewal application from an external funding source as a Principal Investigator (PI), Project Director (PD), or Co-PI.
  b. Submission or resubmission of at least one external funding application as a Principal Investigator PI, PD, or Co-PI.

c. A minimum of two funded or renewal applications from an external funding source as a Co-Investigator, Consultant, or Key Personnel.

d. Submission or resubmission of at least two external funding applications as a Co-Investigator, Consultant, or Key Personnel.

e. Publication or "in press" of at least two peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and/or books.

f. Submission and/or resubmission of at least two peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and/or book prospectus.

g. Managing of Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling Program funded grant activities or fulfillment of roles/responsibilities on a grant as evidenced by the grant report/outcome or a letter from PI indicating time and efforts spent managing a grant.

h. Submission or resubmission of one or more peer-reviewed manuscripts co-authored with students.

i. Publication or "in press" of one or more peer-reviewed manuscripts co-authored with students.

j. Technical report development (e.g., white paper; grant report; self-study or program evaluation report; intervention training manual/handbook).

k. Honors such as awards for research contribution and scholarship.

l. At least two presentations at state, national, or international level, as evidenced by the quality of the outlet, impact of the presentation, and status of the presenter (e.g., Workshop organizer for major conference, special symposium, Keynote, invited address at a major conference; invited colloquium talk for a highly ranked program or highly respected institute).

m. Service on research committees or research conferences.

n. News article, interview, or webinar participation, social media highlights related to research activity.

- A Strong (rating=4) contribution to research is typified by achieving at least four (4) of the activities described above.

- A Satisfactory (rating=3) contribution to research is typified at least three (3) of the types of activities listed above.

- A Weak (rating=2) contribution to research is typified at least two (2) of the types of activities listed above.

- An Unsatisfactory (rating=1) is typified at least one of the types of activities listed above.

Service

Evaluation of contributions in the area of Service falls into three general categories: 1) to the University, 2) to the profession, and 3) to the community. University service is further broken down into service to

the Department, the College, and the University at large. Public/community service activities are defined as activities that benefit the public and community at large (i.e., local, state, regional, national, international), the profession, and the University. Professional services include service to county, state, and federal agencies, as well as contributions to specific professional organizations, and can include student engagement.

The evaluation will be based on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and any other information known to the Director and to the Chair. Note that assistant professors, visiting instructors, and newly hired instructors, who are typically given minimal service assignments, might receive a rating based on the expectation from their direct supervisor simply through regular engagement within the Department and through active engagement in their constituency with minimal additional responsibilities outside of the Department.

Note: In order for a faculty member to earn a Satisfactory, Strong, or Outstanding rating in Service, a faculty member must attend Departmental meetings and must make a meaningful contribution to the Department through participation and service (e.g., committees & councils).

- An Outstanding (rating=5) contribution to service is characterized by participating in at least three types of activities listed below.
- A Strong (rating=4) contribution to service is characterized by participation in at least two types of activities listed below.
- A Satisfactory (rating=3) contribution to service is characterized by participation in at least one type of activity listed below.

   a. At least one service activity beyond the Department (i.e., service to the University or College, profession, or community).
   b. At least one leadership level position in the activity (e.g., committee or council Chair or Co-Chair, an editorial position, workshop organizer, organization board member, or senator).
   c. Service as a Chair of at least one service activity in the program/department (e.g., admission, recruitment, curriculum, diversity committee, etc.).
   d. Service as a member in the program/department in at least two activities (e.g., program admission, recruitment, curriculum, diversity committee, etc.).
   e. Service as a member to professional or community committees.
   f. Presentation to local businesses, agencies, or schools.
   g. A leadership level position in the Department, College, or University activities.
   h. At least one leadership level position in a professional and/or community service position (e.g., Committee Chair or Co-Chair, an editorial position, member of editorial board, workshop organizer, or organization board member).
   i. Multiple service activities performed for recognized societies, organizations, or publishers as Chairs, Co-chairs or Directors.

- A Weak (rating= 2) contribution to service is reflected in any one (1) of the following:
    a. The faculty member participates in only the faculty meetings with no other service being evident.
    b. The faculty member does not participate in Department faculty meetings.
    c. The effort reported as Service is obviously not commensurate with the assigned effort in that area (i.e., someone is assigned .25 for Service, but only shows evidence of work that should equal one (1) hour vs. 10 hours per month).

- An Unsatisfactory (rating =1) contribution to Service is reflected because a faculty member shows insufficient Service, evidence by absence from required faculty and constituency meetings or fulfilling other assigned service duties. This does not apply to those who are on approved leave, sabbatical, or are on reduced or temporary appointments.

Tenure and Tenure Earning Professor Career Path
Professor/Associate Professor/Assistant Professor
(Faculty not associated with an academic program)
(Approved by Faculty Majority 12/16/2021)

Draft Guidelines for CFS Tenure-Earning and Tenured Faculty Evaluation:
(Adapted from Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of CSD Faculty)

Faculty will be evaluated in whatever areas they are assigned effort, according to the amount of effort they are assigned in each category. Tenure-earning and tenured faculty are typically assigned effort in the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service, though their assigned effort in each area may vary due to position, rank, or external awards across years.

Faculty are evaluated on a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rank and 1 being the lowest) as follows:

- Outstanding   5
- Strong   4
- Satisfactory   3
- Weak   2
- Unsatisfactory   1

If a faculty member is not satisfied with the Evaluation Summary prepared by the evaluator (Department Chair or equivalent), the faculty member may pursue additional review and evaluation per current UFF collective bargaining guidelines. Spouses or partners may not evaluate each other.

Teaching

Evaluation of contributions to Teaching will be based only on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and student evaluations. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make certain that their annual self-assessment includes all necessary information for review by the supervisor or Department Chair. Evidence of teaching contributions provided in the self-evaluation may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Narrative self-assessment that discusses teaching philosophy relative to University, College, Department, and individual teaching goals, including setting forth teaching goals for the coming year.
- Documentation of efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success outside of the typical requirements of one's course load.
- Quality of student evaluations of teaching (in relation to the level and content of the courses taught, the number of students enrolled, and the percent completing the evaluation), including:
  - Ratings in relation to the size, level, and nature of content of the course taught;
  - Summary of, and responses to, student comments; and

- o Plans for course improvements, additional training, mentorship, etc., to address the concerns and comments from students.
- Peer review or observation of teaching. This could be completed by another faculty member in the Department, or by someone outside the Department (e.g., Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning; CITL).
- Student mentoring, such as:
  - o Descriptions of all activities, including the depth of involvement (supervisor, committee member or chair, etc.), status of the project, and outcomes, including any presentations or publications/submissions.
  - o Ph.D. dissertations.
  - o Master's theses.
  - o Undergraduate Honors Theses.
  - o Undergraduate research assistantships and scholarships.
  - o Directed research activities or IDS 4914 (courses with zero credit).
  - o Dissertation committees at other institutions of higher education.
  - o Other evidence of contributions to student development.
- Training grant or research grant administration that involves mentoring, student support, or personnel preparation, including:
  - o Nature and type of administration, including depth of involvement in post-doc or student mentoring;
  - o Number of post-docs or students involved, and number directly supervised; and
  - o Outcomes including any presentations or publications/submissions.
- Evidence of professional growth or development.
- Publications and presentations relating to the science of teaching and learning.
- Recognition of meritorious teaching.
- Training of others in innovative teaching.
- Other forms of documentation that indicate the quality of teaching activities as represented within the **CFS Tenure and Promotion Guidelines** document.

Evaluative criteria:
The evaluative criteria are provided as guidelines. Ratings should be based on the information provided in the assessment, taking into account: 1) the faculty member's rank; 2) the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is devoted to teaching in the year under review; and 3) the distribution of their effort in advising, course development, teaching, and mentoring. Ratings should also be reflective of access and opportunities provided to the faculty member for teaching and mentoring.

- A rating of Outstanding (5) contribution to Teaching is warranted when the faculty member demonstrates excellence in teaching. Examples of excellence in teaching may be reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:
  - o Outstanding quality student evaluations of teaching in courses.

- Extensive student mentoring activities resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and concrete outcomes (e.g. presentations, publications/submissions, grant proposals, etc.).
- Administration of training grants, mentoring programs, or other efforts reflecting extensive depth of involvement with multiple students; significant support of the University's teaching mission through support of students; and concrete outcomes (presentations, publications/submissions, grant proposals, etc.) by supported students.
- Evidence of extensive efforts to improve content delivery, to engage in professional development of teaching, to develop curriculum, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of typical requirements of one's course load.

- A rating of Strong (4) contribution to Teaching may be reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:
    - Strong quality (or better) student evaluations of teaching in courses.
    - Considerable student mentoring activities resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions).
    - Support or contribution to the administration of training grants, mentoring programs, or other efforts that significantly support of the University's teaching mission through support of students, and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations, publications/submissions, grant submissions, etc.) by supported students.
    - Evidence of some successful efforts to engage in professional development, to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success outside of the typical requirements of one's course load.

- A Satisfactory (3) contribution to Teaching may be reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:
    - Satisfactory quality (or better) student evaluations of teaching in most courses.
    - Student mentoring activities with at least one student resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions).
    - Evidence of minimal efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success outside of typical requirements of one's course load.

- A Weak (2) contribution to Teaching may be typified in a combination of the following examples of activities:
    - Unsatisfactory quality student evaluations of teaching in most courses.

- o Limited or absent student-mentoring activities or failure of successful or timely completion of student projects and/or progress toward concrete outcomes (e.g., presentations and publications/submissions).
  - o Demonstration of insufficient effort to introduce needed improvement in content delivery, curriculum development, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of typical requirements of the assigned teaching load.
- An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to Teaching results from no evidence of satisfactory teaching or mentoring.

Research

Evaluation of contributions to research will be based only on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make certain that their annual self-assessment includes all necessary information for review by the supervisor or Department Chair. Information to include in self-evaluation:

- Narrative self-assessment that discusses the focus of the research program; expresses contribution to the faculty member's field of study and to the University, College, and Department goals; evaluates progress against the goals from the previous year and relative to career status; and sets goals for the coming year. Discussion of FTE contributions to Research, or any related issues, should be clearly delineated.
- Research grants or training grants funded/submitted, including:
  - o Nature and extent of the faculty member's contribution to the research or training program (e.g., role of faculty member as reflected in Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator status; extent of research activities involved; mentoring of grant personnel such as junior faculty, post-docs, or students).
  - o Type of funding source (e.g., federal, state, foundation, corporate, University, internal; quantity of funds involved).
    - Records of competitive honors and awards.
- Description of the number and evidence of the quality of peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or books submitted and/or accepted, including:
  - o Nature and extent of the faculty member's contribution to the Research (e.g., role of faculty member as reflected in authorship status; extent of research activities involved such as multiple or single experiments, case study or studies, systematic literature review, narrative review, edited volume, monograph, etc.).
  - o Quality of the journals or books according to indicators such as impact factors, acceptance rates, quality of publisher, and/or influence of publication on a particular research community.
  - o Citations of the faculty member's work.
- Scholarly presentations such as:

- o Proper reference format with full author list.
- o Nature of the presentation (invited/contributed, peer-reviewed/non-peer reviewed), role of faculty member, special status (e.g., won award, keynote, panelist, etc.).
- o Title and scope (e.g., international, national, regional, local).
- Reviews of books and articles.
- Evidence of contributions to policy and practice, including the public dissemination of white papers, reports, evaluations of programs, etc.
- Evidence of professional development.

Evaluative criteria:

The evaluative criteria are provided as guidelines. Ratings should be based on the information provided in the assessment, taking into account: 1) the faculty member's rank; 2) the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is devoted to Research in the year under review; and 3) the distribution of their effort to further their research activities (taking into account years where other activities, such as grants, publications, book chapters and presentations may predominate, and years without funding), grant development and submissions may predominate. The guidelines given assume typical assignments. Higher and lower assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for each category. See the **Governance Document Guidelines on Annual Assignments** in order to determine "typical" assignments.

- An Outstanding (5) contribution to Research may be reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:
  - o Funding or submission of one or more competitive or external grant or contract proposals, reflecting the faculty member's research agenda and the alignment with University, College, and/or Department goals; and taking into consideration the nature of the funding source; size of grant; and extent of activities to be funded.
  - o Publication or submission of articles, book chapters, or book(s).
  - o Publication of a significant contribution to the field of study through white papers, monographs, or in another professional format.
  - o Invited presentation(s) at national/international conferences in the faculty member's field of study.
  - o Other professional presentations, workshops, and dissemination efforts relevant for the field of study at the local, state, national, or international level.
  - o Significant contribution to the field of science through impact in such areas as legislation, policy, service provision, research, or treatment/clinical practice.

- A Strong (4) contribution to Research may be reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:

- Contribution to the funding or submission of grant or proposal, or taking primary responsibility for funding, submission, or execution of one or more small grants, such as internal awards, or pilot/exploratory efforts (including unfunded or self-funded efforts).
  - Publication or submission of a single article or book chapter.
  - Lead or sole presenter for one or more presentations at national/international conferences in the faculty member's field of study.
  - Support or contribution to efforts in the field of science, in such areas as legislation, policy, behavioral health service provision, research, or treatment/clinical practice.

- A Satisfactory (3) contribution to Research may be reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:
  - Documentation of progress or significant contribution to a grant submission.
  - Preparation for publication or submission of one or more articles or book chapters.
  - Contribution or participation (co-presenter, facilitator, etc.) at local, regional, or national presentations or workshops.

- A Weak (2) contribution to Research may be characterized by evidence of minimal progress in the faculty member's field of study. This may be reflected in a significant portion of the faculty member's assignment devoted to Research, with concomitant evidence of the failure to achieve the following:
  - Documentation of progress on a grant or contract proposal submission.
  - Publication or submission of an article or book chapter.
  - Contribution or participation (co-presenter, facilitator, etc.) at local, regional, or national presentations or workshops.

- An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to Research may be reflected by evidence of very little or no progress in the field of study, as reflected in the following:
  - Failure to make progress on a grant or contract proposal submission.
  - Failure to make progress in the preparation for publication or submission of any article or book chapter.
  - Failure to participate in presentation or dissemination efforts or to contribute to such efforts of others.

Service

Evaluation of contributions in the area of Service will be based only on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and any other information known to the supervisor or the Department Chair. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make certain that their annual self-assessment includes all necessary information for review by the supervisor or Department Chair. Potential information to be included in the self-evaluation:

- Narrative self-assessment that discusses the nature of the service activities to advance a scholarly discipline, contribute to a profession, and/or impact families, schools, the Department, College, University, and community; expresses contribution to university, College, and Department goals; evaluates progress against the goals from the previous year and relative to career status; and sets goals for the coming year.
- Service as a Division or Program Director:
  - Describe how one has fulfilled the Director role. Explain how the amount of work performed is commensurate with the Service assignment associated with the Director office.
- Service on University, College, or Department committees, including:
  - Description of responsibilities, type, and degree of involvement; and
  - Whether elected or appointed to the role.
- Service as it relates to mentorship:
  - Formal and informal mentoring of faculty relating to teaching and/or research.
- Service to the profession:
  - Formal activity in societies, organizations, or agencies in the discipline, or related to the discipline, beyond paid membership:
    - Scope and status of society (e.g., international, national, state, local; disciplinary or interdisciplinary membership).
    - Describe responsibilities, type and degree of involvement (e.g., member, board/senior member, chair, co-chair, fellow).
    - Whether elected or appointed to position.
  - Peer-review activities, including:
    - Grant review activity (include funding agency, depth, and extent of involvement).
    - Peer reviews for books, articles, or conferences (specify type and number of items reviewed and for which publisher, journal, society, committee, or Department).
  - Editorial activity:
    - Journal or series editor or associate editor (describe scope and nature of activities, time commitment, quality of outlet).
    - Formal appointment to editorial, review, or advisory boards (describe scope and nature of involvement).
  - Seminars, workshops, and community-based training activities (not academic preservice), primarily oriented to continuing professional education in the discipline or related to the discipline.
    - Extent and nature of participation (e.g., organizer, participant, discussant).
    - Status of venue (e.g., international, national, state, or local organization.)
    - Whether participation was invited or submitted.
  - Inter-Institutional Invitations.

- Invitations to participate in promotion and tenure process or related academic evaluations, program evaluations, etc.
- Describe nature and extent of invitation, standing of institution.
- Service to the community:
  - Describe the nature and extent of the activity including:
    - The community involved (e.g., global, national, regional/state, local).
    - Extent of curricular engagement between University and community (e.g., address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, and enhance community well-being and enrichment to the scholarship of the institution).
    - Outreach activity (i.e., provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community).
    - Partnership activity (e.g., collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources such as research, capacity building, economic development, etc.).

Evaluative criteria:

All evaluative criteria are rough guidelines. Ratings should be based on the information provided in the assessment taking into account: 1) the faculty member's rank; 2) the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is devoted to service in the year under review; and 3) the distribution of their effort to further their service activities. Higher and lower assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for each category. See the **Governance Document Guidelines on Annual Assignments** in order to determine "typical" assignments. Ratings should also be reflective of access and opportunities provided to the faculty member for service activities.

Note: In order for a faculty member to earn a Satisfactory, Strong, or Outstanding rating in Service, a faculty member must minimally be regularly involved in Departmental and Constituency meetings, and must actively contribute to the life of the Department and those Constituencies.

- An Outstanding (5) contribution to Service may be reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:
  - Service beyond the Department in multiple activities (i.e., service to the University or College, profession, or community).
  - A leadership level position in the activities (e.g., committee chair or co-chair; an editorial position, such as editor, associate editor, or editorial board member; or organization board member/officer).
  - Multiple activities for societies, organizations, or publishers.
  - Note that newly hired assistant professors, who are typically given minimal service assignments, might receive this rating simply through eager engagement in the life of

their Department and through active engagement in their constituency with minimal additional responsibilities outside of the Department.

- A Strong (4) contribution to Service may be reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:
  - For associate or full professor, at least one Service activity beyond the Department is required (i.e., service to the University or College, profession, or community).
  - For associate or full professor, at least one leadership level position in the activity (e.g., committee chair or co-chair, an editorial position, workshop organizer, organization board member).
  - At least one activity for a local, state, national, or global society, organization, or publisher.

- A Satisfactory (3) contribution to Service may be reflected in participation in at least one service activity:
  - For associate or full professor, at least one service activity beyond the Department is required (i.e., service to the University or College, profession, or community).

- A Weak (2) contribution to Service may be reflected in any one of the following:
  - The faculty member participates in only the faculty meetings and constituency meetings with no other service being evident.
  - The faculty member does not participate in the life of the Department through faculty meetings. The effort reported as Service is obviously not commensurate with the assigned effort in that area (i.e., someone is assigned .25 for service but only shows evidence of work that should take one hour per month).

- An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to Service is reflected when a faculty member shows insufficient evidence of Service, not even attending faculty and constituency meetings.

Research Professor Ranked Career Path
Research Professor/Associate Research Professor/Assistant Research Professor
(Approved Unanimously by Faculty 12/06/2021)

The purpose of this document is to describe the College of Behavioral & Community Sciences (CBCS) guidelines for the annual evaluation of faculty in the Research Professor career path. The Research Professor path includes the ranks of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor. Faculty hired in the Research Professor career path are expected to contribute primarily to the research mission of the College and, over time, are expected to develop an independent, coherent research program consistent with the College mission. These guidelines are designed to (a) support high standards in annual evaluation to ensure a comprehensive, rigorous, and fair review of the faculty member's contributions in each area(s) of assigned duties and (b) be in alignment with promotion guidelines for the research professor career path.

Faculty hired in the Research Professor career path are typically supported by contracts and grants with set deliverables which may dictate a faculty member's primary job responsibilities. These responsibilities must be considered when annually evaluating faculty. Research faculty may be given teaching and/or service assignments depending upon their funding source. University teaching is permissible with approval from the chair/director, depending on the source of funding supporting the position. Thus, evaluation for Research Faculty may involve three components as applicable:

- Research/scholarly work (including community-engaged scholarship);
- Teaching or comparable activity (including professional training, technical assistance, advising, student research mentoring, and community-engaged instruction);
- Service to the University, the profession, and the community.

Yearly evaluations should be rooted in the mission, goals, and educational needs of the department or school and college as well as the importance of the contributions the candidate has made toward achieving the mission and goals of the unit, college, and university. When applicable, evaluations should also reflect the faculty member's progress toward promotion, consistent with these ideals. Spouses or partners may not evaluate each other.

Community Engagement: Spanning across all possible areas (e.g., research, teaching, and service), community engagement is integral to the mission and vision of USF. As defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, [international] global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity." While some faculty engagement may come in the form of public service, any of the three categories of faculty activity could entail community engagement, and could in some way "address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good." Community engagement that is undertaken by faculty to "enhance curriculum, teaching and learning and prepare educated, engaged citizens" may be included and evaluated as part of teaching, and community engagement undertaken to "enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity" may be included and evaluated as part of a research faculty assignment.

Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service

For each area that is part of faculty's assigned duties, faculty are evaluated on a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rank and 1 being the lowest) as follows:

- Outstanding   5
- Strong   4
- Satisfactory   3
- Weak   2
- Unsatisfactory   1

Note: In all categories below, Florida Statute 241.731 decrees that in evaluating the competencies of a faculty member, primary assessment shall be in terms of his or her performance of the assigned duties, and such evaluation shall be given adequate consideration for the purpose of salary adjustments, promotions, reemployment, and tenure. In other words, faculty will only be evaluated in effort areas in which they have an annual assignment of effort.

Faculty may appeal their annual evaluation score by requesting a review of their vita and self-assessment by the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences.

Evaluative criteria

All evaluative criteria are rough guidelines. Ratings will be based on all the information provided and will consider the amount of effort assigned to each faculty in each of the categories (e.g., Research, Teaching, Service), and information provided in the faculty self-evaluation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make certain that their annual self-evaluation includes all necessary information for review by the supervisor or Chair.

Research Faculty in this Department have varying responsibilities, often determined by grant funding. This might include directing community-based agencies, overseeing research or contractual grant activities, conducting research activities, teaching classes, serving on student thesis and dissertation committees, and/or performing service activities, etc.

Due to the diversity of activities in which faculty engage and the percentage of FTE across categories, the emphasis for the ratings will be on process/effort toward agreed upon goals and proportion of time. The goals should be selected by the faculty and discussed with their Supervisor at the beginning of each year and should relate to the specific activities under each category as appropriate (e.g., Research, Teaching, Service) and proportion of FTE devoted to each activity. Annual evaluation criteria should be based on progress and effort toward these goals.

In order to provide guidance of activities that should be included in the goals, this document provides examples for each of the three areas of Research, Teaching, and Service that reflect the alignment of the evaluation guidelines with the promotion package for the department.

Research

Scholarship takes many forms, including independently conducted as well as collaboratively generated research and scholarly projects, contributions to new knowledge, community improvement, and consensus-driven or evidence-based practice. These activities in CBCS range from research (creation and attainment of new knowledge, whether basic or applied) to the development and implementation of community-engaged activities/programs and improved standards of practice. The purpose of research and scholarly work is the substantive advancement of a field of inquiry or practice, whether by the generation of new knowledge and technologies or consensus-driven and evidence-based practices within the discipline.

Examples of research activities may include but are not limited to:

- Preparing, submitting, revising, publishing peer-reviewed articles (accepted or submitted), books, or book chapters
- Writing for submitting, revising/resubmitting, awarded contracts and grants (awarded or submitted)
- Preparing, submitting, editing technical reports/grant-related annual reports
- Directing/conducting/implementing awarded research grant and contact projects
- Preparing, submitting accepted/invited peer-reviewed presentations at conferences (accepted or submitted)
- Demonstrating influence on policy and practice (e.g., collaborating with leaders of policy and practice)
- Reviewing of books and articles
- Receiving competitive honors, awards, and fellowships
- Reviewing grant applications
- Participating in invited publications

The type of documentation will vary among fields, units, and individuals. Evaluation should not be expected to use forms of documentation that are not typical in their disciplines. Evaluation of applied research should consider potential or actual impact on policies and practices.

It is noted that in some areas of scholarship, publications or other products may appear only after lengthy or extensive effort, and may be found in a wide range of venues, both of which can be particularly true of community-engaged and/or interdisciplinary work at the local, national, and/or international levels. Evidence of community-engaged research as well as international/global scholarship may be demonstrated by peer-reviewed publications, as well as by high-profile products such as non-peer reviewed publications, technical reports, formal presentations to local, national, or international agencies, or other products as designated by the department/school.

For collaborative and co-authored scholarship, the evaluation should include consideration of the candidate's role and contribution to the work, consistent with standards of disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary scholarly practice.

The body of work of a candidate must be judged against the appropriate national and/or international standards within the area of research and scholarly activities, balancing the significance and quality of contributions with the quantity of scholarly products, including publications and other scholarly products commensurate with the faculty member's assigned duties.

Teaching/Professional Training/Technical Assistance

Throughout this document, the word teaching shall refer to instruction in university classes, professional training, and technical assistance.

If teaching is part of a faculty member's assigned duties, the record of activities must provide evidence of excellence in teaching. This includes a record of effective, high-quality instruction, as specified by the relevant academic unit.

Effective teaching (i.e., teaching that results in learning for those taught) requires a thorough knowledge of the subject; the ability to communicate that knowledge clearly through media appropriate to the subject, discipline, and the needs of learners; and the ability to work with, motivate, and serve as an inspiring role model for learners.

Examples of teaching activities include:

- Instructional materials (such as case studies, discussion prompts, group projects), assessment activities and products (such as papers, tests, performances, problem sets), and other material used in connection with courses (course syllabi);
- New curriculum development or course redesign;
- Involvement in curriculum development or other collaborative instructional efforts and reflection of new developments in the field in course content;
- Implementation of new teaching pedagogies and adaptation to new formats and media through incorporation of emerging technologies;
- Professional development activities and efforts at improvement of teaching activities;
- Peer and/or expert observations and evaluations; student performance on pre- and post-instruction measures; exemplary student work and outcomes;
- Records of advising and mentoring;
- Supervision of teaching assistants; and
- Dissertation and/or thesis director or committee membership.

Approaches to teaching and concomitant sources of evidence of teaching/training effectiveness may vary across fields, units, and candidates, and consequently, variance may also be expected.

Evaluation of teaching/training must take into consideration several elements:

- an academic unit's instructional mission;
- an instructor's assignment of duties within unit; and

- class size, scope, and sequence within the curriculum, as well as format of delivery and the types of instructional media utilized.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should consider the wide range of factors that impact learning and success. Moreover, effective teaching and its impact on learning can take place in a variety of contexts:

- in campus classrooms;
- team teaching;
- online;
- in the field;
- in clinical settings;
- in professional training workshops;
- through service learning activities, community engagement and internships;
- in laboratories;
- within on- and off-campus communities, in organizations, in education abroad settings; and
- through mentoring of students, including undergraduate and graduate student research.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness in formats and settings outside the university should include documentation of the impact of participant learning on practice, application, systems, and policy.

Technical assistance is the timely provision of specialized advice and customized support to resolve specific problems and increase individual and organizational capacity (Barton, 2004). Capacity development is the "process by which individuals, organizations, institutions, and societies develop abilities (individually and collectively) to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives (Godfrey et al., 2002). Technical Assistance is provided to (1) help individuals and organizations access resources on specific topics and challenges; (2) assist with policy planning and program implementation; and (3) develop capacity and produce demonstrated impacts at multiple levels. Technical Assistance involves multi-level capacity building along four interrelated dimensions:

- The development of individual skills and the conditions to ensure that skills are used productively;
- The development of effective organizations within which individuals can work;
- The strengthening of interrelationships among entities;
- The development of enabling environments for addressing issues across societal sectors

Technical assistance may be conducted through a variety of activities including: professional training, consultation, expert advice, reviews, policy analysis, provision of resources, and other relevant activities.

Service

The evaluation of Service refers to the candidate's contributions to (1) the University (which could be at the level of Department/school, College, or University), (2) the professional field or discipline, and (3) to the community. If Service is part of a faculty member's assigned duties, candidates for promotion must have made substantive contributions in one or more of these areas.

Service to the University, such as service on the USF Faculty Senate, College Councils, and committees, should go beyond a simple enumeration of membership and should consider the contributions the

faculty member made to the process, and include a description of the extent and nature of the services rendered.

Service to the profession may include:

- service to organizations,
- editorial review boards, and
- other forms of contributions.

Service to the community may include contributions to local, state, federal or international agencies and institutions.

Service must relate to the basic mission of the University and capitalize on the faculty member's special professional expertise. The normal service activities associated with good citizenship are not usually evaluated.

Research Associate Unranked Career Path
Assistant in Research/Associate in Research/Research Associate
(Approved Unanimously by Faculty 12/10/2021)

Faculty will be evaluated in whatever areas they are assigned effort, according to the percentage amount of effort they are assigned in each effort category (Research, Teaching, Service). *Assistant In* faculty are typically assigned effort only in the Research effort category, but occasionally also engage in the categories of Teaching and Service.

Faculty are evaluated on a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rank and 1 being the lowest) as follows:

- Outstanding   5
- Strong   4
- Satisfactory   3
- Weak   2
- Unsatisfactory   1

The Executive Committee may create a point system and/or rubric to provide increased rigor and consistency to the evaluation. Such a system shall not be used in a manner that alters or supersedes this Appendix. If they do so, this document must be approved by a vote of the faculty before it is used.

Note: In all categories below, Florida Statute 241.731 decrees that in evaluating the competencies of a faculty member, primary assessment shall be in terms of his or her performance of the assigned duties, and such evaluation shall be given adequate consideration for the purpose of salary adjustments, promotions, reemployment, and tenure. In other words, faculty will only be evaluated in effort areas in which they have an annual assignment of effort. Spouses or partners may not evaluate each other.

Teaching
Evaluation of contributions to teaching will be based on the amount of effort faculty are assigned to this category; information provided in the faculty self-evaluation; student evaluations; and any other information known to the Department Chair regarding academic advising, course preparation, and teaching of undergraduate or graduate courses. At times, the most appropriate person to evaluate a faculty member's teaching contributions in a specific program (e.g., Child & Adolescent Behavioral Health – CABH) may be faculty within the program rather than their direct supervisor. In such cases, a meeting between the faculty member, the supervisor, and the faculty evaluating the teaching contribution may be necessary to ensure everyone has the information needed to complete the evaluation and review process fairly and effectively.

Information to consider including in the self-evaluation:
- Narrative self-assessment that discusses teaching philosophy relative to University, College, Department, and individual teaching goals, including setting forth teaching goals for the coming year.

- Documentation of efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of the typical requirements of one's course load.
- Quality of student evaluations of teaching (in relation to the level and content of the courses taught, the number of students enrolled, and the percent completing the evaluation)
    - Ratings in relation to the size, level, and nature of content of the course taught
    - Summary of and responses to individual student comments
    - Plans for course improvements, additional training, mentorship, etc. to address the concerns and comments from students
- Peer review or observation of teaching
  This could be completed by another faculty member in the Department, or by someone outside the Department (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence).
- Student mentoring/Academic Advising
    - Descriptions of all activities should include the depth of involvement (servings as Chair, Supervisor, Committee member, etc.), status of the project, and outcomes, including any presentations or publications/submissions.
    - Doctorate (Ph.D.) dissertations
    - Doctorate (Ph.D.) student research rotations
    - Audiology Doctoral Projects
    - Master's degree theses/Applied Field Experience Projects
    - Undergraduate Honors Theses
    - Directed research activities
- Training grant or research grant administration that involves mentoring, student support, or personnel preparation
    - Nature and type of administration, including depth of involvement in post-doc or student mentoring
    - Number of post-docs or students involved, and number directly supervised
    - Outcomes including any presentations or publications/submissions

Evaluative criteria:
The evaluative criteria are provided as guidelines. Ratings will be based on all of the information provided and will take into account the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is devoted to teaching in the year under review, the distribution of their effort in advising, course development, teaching and mentoring. Ratings should also be reflective of access and opportunities to the faculty member for teaching and mentoring. The guidelines given assume typical assignments. Higher and lower assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for each category. See the Governance Document Guidelines on Annual Assignments in order to determine "typical" assignments.

- An Outstanding (5) contribution to teaching is warranted when the faculty member demonstrates quality in teaching. Examples of quality in teaching will be reflected in a combination of the following types of activities:

- o Outstanding quality student-evaluations of teaching in all courses;
- o Extensive Student mentoring/Academic Advising activities, with students resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and concrete outcomes (Applied Field Experience Projects, presentations, and publications/submissions);
- o Administration of a training grant reflecting extensive depth of involvement with multiple students, significant support of the Department's teaching mission through support of students, and concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions) by supported students; and/or
- o Evidence of extensive efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of typical requirements of one's course load.

- A Strong (4) contribution to teaching is reflected in a combination of the following examples of activities:
  - o Strong quality (or better) student evaluations of teaching in all courses;
  - o Considerable Student mentoring/Academic Advising activities with students resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions);
  - o Administration of a small training grant with significant support of the Department's teaching mission through support of students, and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions) by supported students; and/or
  - o Evidence of some successful efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of the typical requirements of one's course load.

- A Satisfactory (3) contribution to teaching is reflected by the following types of activities:
  - o Satisfactory quality (or better) Student evaluations of teaching in most courses;
  - o Student mentoring activities with at least one student resulting in successful and timely completion of student projects and progress toward concrete outcomes (presentations and publications/submissions); and/or
  - o Evidence of minimal efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of the typical requirements of one's course load.

- A Weak (2) contribution to teaching is reflected by the following types of activities:
  - o Unsatisfactory quality student evaluations of teaching in most courses;
  - o Limited or absent student-mentoring activities or failure of successful or timely completion of student projects and/or progress toward concrete outcomes (e.g., presentations and publications/submissions); and/or
  - o Demonstration of insufficient effort to introduce needed improvement in content delivery, curriculum development, or to contribute otherwise to student success outside of the typical requirements of the assigned teaching load.

- An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to teaching results from no evidence of satisfactory teaching or mentoring.

Research

Evaluation of contributions to research will be based only on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make certain that their annual self-assessment includes all necessary information for review by the supervisor or Department Chair. Additionally, a meeting between the faculty member and the supervisor may be necessary to ensure they both have the information needed to complete the evaluation and review process fairly and effectively.

Information to consider including in the self-evaluation:
- Narrative self-assessment that discusses the focus of the research program and dissemination of research; individual contribution to grant implementation including meeting grant goals, expresses contribution to University, College, and Department goals; evaluates progress against the individual professional goals from the previous year and relative to career status; and sets goals for the coming year.
- Research grants or training grants funded/submitted (if required as part of the person's job responsibilities and duties)
  - Nature and extent of the faculty member's contribution to the research or training program (e.g., role of faculty member as reflected in the grant leadership position status; extent of research activities involved; mentoring of grant personnel such as post-docs or students).
  - Quality of the funding source (e.g., federal, state, foundation, corporate, university internal; quantity of funds involved)
- Description of the quality of peer reviewed articles (journal or book chapter) or books submitted and/or accepted (if required as part of the job responsibilities and duties)
  - Nature and extent of the faculty member's contribution to the research (e.g., role of faculty member as reflected in authorship status; extent of research activities involved such as a multiple or single experiments, case study or studies, systematic literature review, narrative review, edited volume, monograph, etc.).
  - Quality of the journals or books according to indicators such as impact factors, acceptance rates, quality of publisher, and/or influence of publication on a particular research community.
- Scholarly presentations
  - Proper reference format with full author list
  - Nature of the presentation (invited/contributed, peer-reviewed/non-peer reviewed), role of faculty member, special status (e.g., won award, keynote, panelist, etc.)
  - Title and scope (e.g., international, national, regional, local)

- Dissemination
    - For those whose duties involve research dissemination, documented achievement may include quantitative information such as the number of training activities, number of participants, evaluation data, evidence of impact as well as contributions to the field such as development of new training methods and new training curriculum.
- Technical Assistance
    - For those whose duties involve technical assistance to provide specialized advice and customized support to resolve specific problems and increase individual and organizational capacity, documentation should include activities such as professional training, consultation, expert advice, reviews, policy analysis, provision of resources, and other relevant activities.

Evaluative criteria:

The evaluative criteria are provided as guidelines. Ratings will be based on all of the information provided in the assessment, taking into account the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is devoted to research in the year under review, and the distribution of their effort to further their research activities. For instance, there are years where grants are active and generate dissemination and years without or with less funding where grant development, submissions, and startup may predominate. The guidelines given assume typical assignments. Higher and lower assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for each category. See the Governance Document Guidelines on Annual Assignments in order to determine "typical" assignments.

- An Outstanding (5) contribution to research is typified by achieving most of the activities described below:
    - Expanding activities beyond the standard activities of the Assistant In faculty line, including sustaining or extending funding or submission of a grant; significant contributions to University, College, Department, or Division Goals; expanding partnerships; service to professional organization; etc.
    - Fulfillment of grant roles and/or/responsibilities to the grant fulfilled to the highest degree possible.
    - Met all of the individual professional goals identified in your previous year's annual evaluation unless extenuating circumstances interfered with ability to do so.
    - Publication or submission of at least one high-impact article, book chapter, book, or high profile technical publication as determined by the quality of the outlet(s) and the influence that the publication(s) has to the field.
    - At least 1one high-impact presentation, as evidenced by the quality of the outlet, impact of the presentation, and status of the presenter (e.g., workshop organizer for major conference, invited address at a major conference, invited colloquium talk for a highly ranked program or highly respected institute).

- Evidence of providing technical assistance/consultation that resulted in substantial advancement of grant implementation or findings. (i.e., recipient evaluation or follow-up emails regarding product, resource, or tool provided).
- A Strong (4) contribution to research is typified by achieving most of the activities described below:
    - Fulfillment of grant roles and/or responsibilities to a high degree.
    - Have met most of the individual professional goals identified in the faculty member's previous annual evaluation, unless extenuating circumstances interfered with the ability to do so.
    - Publication or submission of at least one article, book chapter, book, or technical publication.
    - At least one high impact presentation, as evidenced by the quality of the outlet, impact of the presentation, and status of the presenter (e.g., workshop organizer for major conference, invited address at a major conference, invited colloquium talk for a highly ranked program or highly respected institute).
    - Evidence of providing technical assistance/consultation that resulted in advancement of grant implementation or findings. (i.e., recipient evaluation or follow-up emails regarding product, resource, or tool provided).
- A Satisfactory (3) contribution to research is typified by the activities described below:
    - Fulfillment of grant roles and/or responsibilities to a moderate degree.
    - Have met some of the individual professional goals identified in the faculty member's previous annual evaluation, unless extenuating circumstances interfered with the ability to do so.
    - At least one presentation, (e.g., workshop organizer for conference, presentation at a major conference; colloquium talk for a program or institute).
    - Dissemination of a technical assistance document, tool, or other publication.
    - Evidence of providing technical assistance/consultation that supported grant implementation or findings (i.e., recipient evaluation or follow up emails regarding product, resource, or tool provided).
- A Weak (2) contribution to research is characterized by unclear, minimal, or insufficient evidence of research activities, as evidenced by the failure to achieve one or more of the following:
    - Fulfillment of roles/responsibilities to the grant to a minimal degree.
    - Have met one of the individual professional goals identified in the faculty member's previous annual evaluation, unless extenuating circumstances interfered with the ability to do so.
    - Completed one presentation (e.g., workshop organizer for conference, presentation at a major conference, colloquium talk for a program, or institute).
    - Evidence of providing technical assistance/consultation supporting grant needs or findings (i.e., recipient evaluation, follow up emails, product, resource or tool provided).

- An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to research is reflected by insufficient evidence in one or more of the following:
    - Failure to fulfill roles/responsibilities to the grant.
    - Failure to meet the individual professional goals identified in the faculty member's previous annual evaluation, unless extenuating circumstances interfered with the ability to do so.
    - Failure to provide presentations (e.g., workshop, conference session, institute program).
    - Failure to provide technical assistance/consultation support of grant needs or findings (i.e., recipient evaluation or follow up emails or a product, resource or tool provided).

Service

Evaluation of contributions in the area of service will be based on the amount of effort, faculty self-assessment, and any other information known to the Department Chair, and will take into account the proportion of the faculty member's effort that is devoted to Service in the year under review. It is the faculty member's responsibility to make certain that their annual self-assessment includes all necessary information for review by the supervisor or Chair. Additionally, a meeting between the faculty member and the supervisor may be necessary to ensure they both have the information needed to complete the evaluation and review process fairly and effectively.

Information to consider including in the self-evaluation:
- Narrative self-assessment that discusses the nature of the service activities; expresses contribution to University, College, and Department goals; evaluates progress against the goals from the previous year and relative to career status; and sets goals for the coming year.
- Service on University, College, or Department committees (e.g., Child & Family Studies [CFS] Governance Council, Diversity Committee, etc.).
    - Describe responsibilities, type, and degree of involvement; and
    - Indicate whether position is elected or appointed.
- Service as it relates to mentorship.
    - Engaged in formal and informal mentoring of staff or graduate students, relating to research.
- Service to the profession.
    - Engaged in formal activity in societies, organizations, or agencies in the discipline or related to the discipline beyond paid membership
        - Scope and status of society (e.g., international, national, state, local; disciplinary or interdisciplinary membership);
        - Describe responsibilities, type, and degree of involvement (e.g., chair, co-chair, fellow, board/senior member, member);
        - Indicate whether elected or appointed.
    - Peer-review activities.

- Describe grant-review activity (include funding agency, depth, and extent of involvement).
- Describe peer reviews for books, articles, or conferences (specify type and number of items reviewed and for which publisher, journal, society, committee, or Department).
  - Editorial activity.
    - Describe journal or series editor/associate editor responsibilities (i.e., describe scope and nature of activities, time commitment, and quality of outlet).
    - Describe formal appointment to editorial, review, or advisory boards (describe scope and nature of involvement).
  - Seminars and workshops, primarily oriented to continuing professional education, related to professional organization/agency/society, in or related to the discipline, beyond grant-funded activities and without compensation.
    - Describe the extent and nature of participation (e.g., organizer, participant, or discussant).
    - Indicated the status of venue (e.g., international, national, state, or local organization).
    - Indicate whether participation was invited or submitted.
  - Inter-Institutional Invitations.
    - Describe invitations to participate in promotion and tenure process or related academic evaluations, program evaluations, etc.
    - Describe nature and extent of invitation, standing of institution.
- Service to the community
  - Describe the nature and extent of the service activity including:
    - The community involved (e.g., global, national, regional/state, local)
    - The extent of curricular engagement between university and community (e.g., address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrichment to the scholarship of the institution).
    - The outreach activity (i.e., provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community)
    - The partnership activity (e.g., collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources such as research, capacity building, economic development, etc.)

Evaluative criteria:

The evaluative criteria are provided as guidelines. Ratings will be based on all of the information provided and will consider the amount of effort assigned to each faculty. The guidelines given assume typical assignments. Higher and lower assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased

expectations for each category. See the Governance Document Guidelines on Annual Assignments in order to determine "typical" assignments.

Note: In order for a faculty member to earn a Satisfactory, Strong, or Outstanding rating in service, a faculty member must have service as part of their assigned effort and at minimum, be regularly involved in Departmental and Constituency meetings and must actively contribute to the Department and its Constituencies.

- An Outstanding (5) contribution to service is characterized by the following:
    - Significantly exceeds duties assigned under service.
- A Strong (4) contribution to service is reflected in participation in at least one high impact service activity relative to rank, and additional lesser impact service activities including:
    - Consistently and with excellence meets duties assigned under service.
- A Satisfactory (3) contribution to service is reflected in participation in at least one service activity relative to rank:
    - Meets most duties assigned under service.
- A Weak (2) contribution to service is reflected in any one of the following:
    - Seldom meets duties assigned under service.
- An Unsatisfactory (1) contribution to service is reflected because a faculty member shows insufficient evidence of service, not even attending faculty and constituency meetings.
    - Failed to meet duties assigned under service.

Dispute of Evaluation
If a faculty member is not satisfied with the Evaluation Summary prepared by the evaluator (Department Chair or equivalent), the faculty member may pursue additional review and evaluation per current UFF collective bargaining guidelines.