

# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & KINESIOLOGY POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES

Approved by HLKN'S Executive Committee  
January 12, 2017

These guidelines are in accordance with University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01, *Post-Tenure Review* and govern tenured faculty members in the College of Education and Human Development. Much of the language in this document was taken almost verbatim from the University's and College of Education and Human Development documents with some modifications to fit the context of the Department of Health & Kinesiology (HLKN).

Post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected productivity. Post-tenure review is comprised of review by tenured faculty peers serving on division annual A1 evaluation committees as well as annual performance reviews by the department head (i.e., A2 evaluations).

## A. DEPARTMENT EXPECTATIONS

- 1 In accordance with University Rule, The College of Education and Human Development expects tenured faculty to perform satisfactorily at teaching; research, scholarship or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e. g administration, program coordinator, division chair, etc.) throughout their career.
- 2 Load requirement on these assignments may be modified but should not go to zero in any category. A decrease in expectation in one category should be matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another category. However, volume of work does not equate to quality.
- 3 Alternate work assignments (such as administration, program coordinator, division chair) may replace one or more categories in certain situations but only with the written approval of department head and dean. Faculty are to be reviewed based on the assigned duties (this would include administrative assignments) of their position.
- 4 Faculty with 100% administrative appointments (for example, associate deans and department heads) will be reviewed by their immediate supervisor (in this case, the dean)

## B. FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2: "*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.*"

- 1 In the Department of HLKN, tenured faculty are housed in three divisions (i.e., Health Education, Kinesiology, and Sport Management). Therefore, each division has developed Roles, Responsibilities and Expectations, division and rank specific annual evaluation processes (A1) and Post-Tenure Review (PTR) criteria. These guidelines are aligned and establish clear criteria evaluating faculty performance in the annual review as well as the separate post-tenure periodic review. These A1 guidelines were developed with faculty input and approved by Division Faculty, the Department Executive Committee, the Department Head, the Dean, and the Dean of Faculties. Recommendations for changes in the approved guidelines are made annually by the division A1 Review Committee's and disseminated prior

to the academic year in which they are to be used.

- 2 Each year, HLKN faculty submit documentation of evidence of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service through a CEHD A1 portal. The A1 materials submitted are evaluated by an A1 review committee organized by the Chair of each division to verify and approve requested credits. In addition, they also evaluate whether the faculty member is meeting minimal A1 and division specific Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations in each area. Therefore, *two sets of documents guide the annual evaluation: the A-1 document and the Roles and Responsibilities document specific to each division*. The finalized A1 is then forwarded to the department head who reviews materials submitted and prepares an A2 annual performance review. The A2 annual performance review considers A1 credits earned; whether the faculty member is meeting division specific Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations; and other information available to the department head in determining whether the faculty member is satisfactory in each area evaluated and therefore eligible for merit. As per CEHD policy, a faculty member must be found to be satisfactory in each area of the annual performance evaluation (teaching, research, service) in order to be eligible for merit. If the faculty member is eligible for merit, merit is allocated based on a 3 year average of credits earned on their A1 evaluations to make sure that if there are years in which no merit is available the faculty members contributions are rewarded.
- 3 HLKN Divisions have established categories of “Satisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” and “Unsatisfactory” for teaching, scholarship, and service with criteria for each category clearly defined in the division specific Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations. These criteria serve as a guide for the department head to consider when rating faculty on their A2 annual performance review although the department head can consider other information not submitted on the A1 in their review. Exemplary faculty are deemed to be those who are found to be eligible for merit based on the A2 Annual Performance Review, those who are performing in the top 10% of all tenure track faculty based on A1 credits earned or vote of faculty; and, recommendation of the department head.
- 4 An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single category: teaching; research, scholarship or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e. g. administration, program coordinator, division chair, etc.) A rating of needs improvement in any two categories will equate to an “Unsatisfactory” rating on the annual evaluation.
- 4 An annual A2 performance review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria established in the A1 guidelines. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. A written improvement plan, developed by the faculty in collaboration with the department head, must be included with the report to the dean. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (Post-Tenure Review) of the faculty member.
- 5 Immediately upon receiving an “Unsatisfactory” or “Needs Improvement” rating, the faculty must work with the department head to develop the improvement plan. For teaching, this plan should take 1 year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g. research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may take up to 3 years to complete successfully. However, milestones must be established for each year of the plan. The ranking of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the ranking will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”.
- 6 A faculty with an unsatisfactory rating will be ineligible for merit. A “Needs Improvement” rating in one area **does not** disqualify one from merit.

### C. PERIODIC PEER REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY (Post-Tenure Review)

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted **no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution.** The evaluation should be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service, and other assigned responsibilities, and must include peer review of the faculty member. The expectations of faculty at the periodic peer review must be aligned with the expectations established by the faculty and department head in the A1 guidelines.

While the annual review is a snapshot of faculty performance over a year (or three years in the area of scholarship for most departments), the periodic peer review is a more comprehensive review and assesses faculty performance over a period of time (no more than six years) established by the department and written in the post-tenure review guidelines.

Note: The Periodic Peer Review is the Post-Tenure Review.

1. The purpose of the Periodic Peer Review is to:
  - a. Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member;
  - b. Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;
  - c. Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; and
  - d. Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.
2. Each department will establish clear guidelines for Post-Tenure Review and will address:
  - a. In the Department of HLKN, periodic peer-review will be conducted annually as part of the annual A1 evaluation by the tenured members (at least 3) serving on the A1 review committee. Committee membership is determined annually by vote of the division and/or assignment by the Division Chair.
  - b. Criteria for rating of faculty performance in each of the assigned areas of responsibility (see section H) have been developed with input from faculty and in alignment with the department annual review (A1) and faculty Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations Recommendations. The tenured faculty members serving on the annual A1 review committee (at least 3) serve as peers for the Periodic Peer Review. ***The tenured faculty serving on the Periodic Peer Review Committee review the annual A1, CV, and documentation submitted by the tenured faculty members; minimal criteria described in the division specific Roles, Responsibilities and Expectations; and on criteria described in Section H and make a recommendation to the department head of whether the tenured faculty member met minimum expectations or not for teaching, research, and service for post-tenure review.*** This recommendation is forwarded to the department head and considered in preparing the A2 annual performance evaluation of tenured faculty members. ***The department head evaluation will include assessment of annual performance based on A1 materials submitted; division specific Roles, Responsibilities and Expectations; criteria described in Section H; and, any other information available to the department head.*** The department head will include in the A2 Annual Performance Review a determination of whether the faculty member should undergo professional development review or not; develop a professional development plan; and/or,

recommendations about progress made toward promotion (if applicable). Rationale for ratings will be described in the A2 Annual Performance Review.

3. A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review
4. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review
5. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically state the deficiencies, in writing. The faculty in collaboration with the department head will immediately develop an improvement plan to address the deficiency.
6. For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted by the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department the department head will share the report with the department head of the secondary department.
7. No later than May 31, each department will provide to the dean a listing of faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. This report will be submitted to the Dean of Faculties.

#### **D. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW**

The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional

1. A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives (a) three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (b) an “Unsatisfactory” Periodic Peer Review (Post-tenure Review) or (c) upon request of the faculty member. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.
2. The professional review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee) unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
3. Within one month of notification of a Professional Review, the faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative

work.

- 4 The department head will add to the dossier any additional materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- 5 The Professional Development Review must be completed within three months of the submission of the dossier and will result in one of three outcomes:
  - a. **No deficiencies** are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,
  - b. **Some deficiencies** are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee states the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. As mentioned in Item 2.4, the faculty member in collaboration with the department head develops an improvement plan to remedy the deficiencies.
  - c. **Substantial or chronic deficiencies** are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" acceptable to the dean.

## **E. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental criteria) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the department head and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

1. Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will include the following:
  - a. specific deficiencies to be addressed;
  - b. specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
  - c. an outline of the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
  - d. time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
  - e. specific criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
  - f. resources to be committed by the department in support of the plan.

## 2. Annual Assessment.

The faculty member and department head will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies, and a progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and the dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the professional development plan.

## 3. Completion of the Plan.

- a. When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the College community.
- b. If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

## **F. APPEAL**

1. If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4 *Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights*.
2. If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final.
3. If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final.
4. If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

## **G. VOLUNTARY POST-TENURE REVIEW**

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review by making a request to the department head.

## **H. DIVISION SPECIFIC CRITERIA**

Each division in the Department of Health & Kinesiology has developed criteria based on their division specific Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations that describe outcomes expected to fall within unsatisfactory, needs improvement, and satisfactory categories. They have also develop an A1 evaluation

instrument that describes the number of credits a faculty member would obtain for various performance outcomes. The tenured faculty serving on the Periodic Peer Review Committee review the annual A1, CV, and documentation submitted by the tenured faculty members as well as minimal criteria described in the division specific Roles, Responsibilities and Expectations and make a recommendation to the department head of whether the tenured faculty member met minimum expectations or not for teaching, research, and service for post-tenure review based on criteria described in Section H. These materials and the recommendation of the Periodic Peer Review committee will be consider by the department head in development of the A2 evaluation and recommendation of whether a faculty member needs to undergo professional development review and/or develop a professional development plan to address deficiencies noted.

Note: This PTR document is intended to provide general guidance regarding *annual minimal faculty engagement and productivity levels expected of tenured faculty members* within the divisions. Moreover, to identify faculty who need improvement in one aspect of their job (research, teaching or service) and would benefit from a formal development/improvement plan and team. The criteria offered below should not be interpreted as the minimum criteria needed for achieving tenure and promotion or replace the recommended levels of productivity noted in division specific Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations.

### ***Division of Health Education***

The Health Education Division (HED) tenure-track faculty have provided input on the following annual Post Tenure Review - Periodic Peer-Review guidelines. Research productivity and scholarship will be based on (a) dissemination of scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, 1<sup>st</sup> edition edited and non-edited books); (b) grant activities; and (c) scholarly presentations at national/ international conferences. Teaching performance will be based on student course evaluations, peer-review of teaching, graduate mentoring engagement, and teaching awards. Service performance will be based on engagement in department, college, university and/or professional engagement. Exemplary faculty are deemed to be those who are found to be eligible for merit based on the A2 Annual Performance Review, those who are performing in the top 10% of all HED tenure track faculty based on A1 credits earned; and, recommendation of the department head.

<b>RESEARCH</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
1. Published no peer-reviewed journal articles OR a total of two (2) or fewer publications over the prior 3-yr period; AND 2. Did not submit (PI, Co-PI, Co-I) grant activities; AND 3. Does not have active grants as PI, Co-PI or Co-I; AND 4. Did not disseminate research via national/international presentations; AND/OR 5. Did not disseminate scholarship in the form of books (first edition).	1. Published only one (1) peer-reviewed journal OR a total of 3 or fewer publications over the prior 3-yr period; OR 2. Submitted or lead (PI, Co-PI, Co-I) grant activities; OR 3. Currently engaged in active grants as PI, Co-PI or Co-I; OR 4. Disseminates research via national/international presentations; OR 5. Disseminates scholarship in the form of books (first edition)	1. Published at least two (2) peer-reviewed journal articles per year; OR a total of four (4+) publications over the prior 3-yr period; AND/OR 2. Submitted grant activities as PI or Co-PI; AND/OR 3. Currently receiving funds via active grants as PI, Co-PI, or Co-I; OR 4. Disseminates research via national/international presentations; AND 5. Disseminates scholarship in the form of books (first edition).
<b>TEACHING</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>

<p>1. Average annual teaching evaluation <math>\leq 3.49</math> on the following item “<i>The Instructor taught the class effectively</i>”; AND</p> <p>2. Not a current Chair/Co-Chair on at least one (1) thesis or dissertation committee; AND</p> <p>3. Not a current member of a thesis or dissertation committee.</p>	<p>1. Average annual teaching evaluation of 3.5 – 3.99 on the following item “<i>The Instructor taught the class effectively</i>”; AND</p> <p>2. Not a current Chair/Co-Chair of a thesis or dissertation committee; OR</p> <p>3. Member on only one (1) thesis or dissertation committee.</p>	<p>1. Average annual teaching evaluation of <math>\geq 4.0</math> on the following item: “<i>The Instructor taught the class effectively</i>”; OR</p> <p>2. Average annual teaching evaluation of <math>\geq 4.0</math> on <i>any 2</i> of the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “At the beginning of the semester, the instructor explained the evaluation process for this course”</li> <li>- “Class lectures, discussion, and/or activities were related to the stated objectives”</li> <li>- “Procedures for determining course grades were appropriate”</li> <li>- “The instructor was knowledgeable concerning the course content”</li> <li>- “The instructor was well prepared for class meetings”</li> <li>- “The instructor provided prompt feedback regarding my performance”</li> <li>- “The instructor responded constructively to questions asked in class”</li> <li>- “The instructor required a level of knowledge that included, but went beyond, memorization of facts”</li> <li>- “The instructor provided an opportunity for instructional assistance outside of class”; OR</li> </ul> <p>3. Satisfactory peer teaching evaluation by a representative from the Center for Teaching Excellence; OR</p> <p>4. Teaching award; AND</p> <p>5. Chair/Co-Chair of at least one (1) thesis or dissertation committees; OR</p> <p>6. Member on at least two (2) thesis or dissertation committees.</p>
<b>SERVICE</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>

1. No service on any department, college, or university committees; AND 2. No evidence of professional engagement.	1. Service on only 1 department, college, or university committees; AND 2. Evidence of 1 professional engagement.	1. Service on at least 2 department, college, or university committees; AND 2. Evidence of 2 professional engagements.
---	--	---

***Division of Kinesiology***

The Kinesiology Division (KINE) tenure-track faculty have provided input on the following annual review guidelines. Research productivity and scholarship will be based on (a) dissemination of peer-reviewed publications; (b) external grant submission or funding; and, (c) scholarly presentations at national/international conferences. Teaching performance will be based on student course evaluations, peer-review of teaching, graduate mentoring engagement, and teaching awards. Service performance will be based on engagement in department, college, university and/or professional engagement. Exemplary faculty are deemed to be those who are found to be eligible for merit based on the A2 Annual Performance Review, those who are performing in the top 10% of all KINE tenure track faculty based on A1 credits earned; and, recommendation of the department head.

<b>RESEARCH</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<u>none of the following:</u>  1. First/senior author of a peer-reviewed publication 2. External grant submission 3. Active external grant 4. National/international conference presentation	<u>only one of the following:</u>  1. First/senior author of a peer-reviewed publication 2. External grant submission 3. Active external grant 4. National/international conference presentation	<u>at least two of the following:</u>  1. First/senior author of a peer-reviewed publication OR 3 peer-reviewed publications over the prior 3-yr period. 2. External grant submission 3. Active external grant 4. National/international conference presentation
<b>TEACHING</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
1. <3.49 average of student evaluations; 2. Not a current Chair/Co-Chair on at least one (1) thesis or dissertation committee; AND 3. Not a current member of a thesis or dissertation committee.	1. 3.5-4.0 average of student evaluations; 2. Not a current Chair/Co-Chair of a thesis or dissertation committee; OR 3. Member on only one (1) thesis or dissertation committee.	1. >4.0 average of student evaluations; OR 2. Satisfactory peer teaching evaluation by a representative from the Center for Teaching Excellence; OR 3. Teaching award; AND 4. Chair/Co-Chair of at least one (1) thesis or dissertation committees; OR 5. Member on at least two (2) thesis or dissertation committees.
<b>SERVICE</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>

1. No service on any department, college, or university committees; AND 2. No evidence of professional engagement.	1. Service on only 1 department, college, or university committees; AND 2. Evidence of 1 professional engagement.	1. Service on at least 2 department, college, or university committees: AND 2. Evidence of 2 professional engagements.
---	--	---

### *Division of Sport Management*

The Division of Sport Management (SPMT) has adopted PTR criteria for research, teaching, and service. Annual PTR review of the following criteria will be based on annual criteria as noted below. Review of research productivity shall be based on the volume of original scholarship in the following areas: (a) scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles; 1<sup>st</sup> edition edited books, and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition authored books) and (b) external funding (i.e., grant/contract submissions and procurements external of CEHD). Teaching performance will be based on student course evaluations, peer-review of teaching, graduate mentoring engagement, and teaching awards. Service performance will be based on engagement in department, college, university and/or professional engagement. Exemplary faculty are deemed to be those who are found to be eligible for merit based on the A2 Annual Performance Review, faculty vote; and, recommendation of the department head.

<b>RESEARCH</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
1. Zero (0) scholarly publications on annual review; OR a total of two (2) or fewer publications over the prior 3-yr period. 2. Zero (0) external grant/contract submissions; OR one (1) or fewer grant/contract submissions over the prior 3-yr period. 3. No national/international presentations.	1. One (1) scholarly publication on annual review; OR a total of 3 or fewer publications over the prior 3-yr period. 2. No grant or contract submissions; OR one to two (1-2) external grant/contract submissions over the prior 3-yr period. 3. Only 1 national/international presentation.	1. Two (2) scholarly publications on annual review; OR a total of four (4+) publications over the prior 3-yr period. 2. One (1) active grant or submission; OR three (3+) external grant/contract submissions over the prior 3-yr period. 3. Two(2) national/international presentations
<b>TEACHING</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
1.<3.49 average on annual student evaluations. 2. Not a current Chair/Co-Chair on at least one (1) thesis or dissertation committee; AND 3. Not a current member of a thesis or dissertation committee.	1. Between 3.50 to 3.99 on annual average student evaluations; AND, 2. Not a current Chair/Co-Chair of a thesis or dissertation committee; OR 3. Member on only one (1) thesis or dissertation committee.	1. At least a 4.00 on annual average student evaluation; OR 2. Satisfactory peer-teaching evaluation by a representative from the Center for Teaching Excellence, OR 3. Teaching award; AND 4. Chair/Co-Chair of at least one (1) thesis or dissertation committees; OR 5. Member on at least two (2) thesis or dissertation committees.

<b>SERVICE</b>		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
1. No service on any department, college, or university committees; AND 2. No evidence of professional engagement.	1. Service on only 1 department, college, or university committees; AND 2. Evidence of 1 professional engagement.	1. Service on at least 2 department, college, or university committees: AND 2. Evidence of 2 professional engagements.