

## **MCL Annual Performance Review Guidelines**

### **Process:**

Faculty members under annual review can expect to be evaluated carefully and in good faith by their colleagues, who will compare the achievements of the faculty members under consideration to those of other faculty members in the same department. Faculty members subject to review should understand that the process of review is competitive and, as a consequence, no absolute definitions of satisfactory performance can be given in advance.

All tenured / tenure-track faculty as well as promotion eligible NTT faculty submit annual activity reports to the appropriate electronic platform. All work submitted for review must be documented and easily found. Documentation or links must be uploaded to electronic platform. Work that is not documented will not be taken into consideration. They may also be required to submit a one to two-pages (max) summary of activities directly to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This elected departmental committee (FEC) reviews the reports and assigns a score (1-5). A score of 2 and above demonstrates faculty performance “meets expectations.” A score of 1 demonstrates faculty performance “does not meet expectations.”

The FEC applies the departmental guidelines (see below) with the understanding that not all scholarly, teaching and service activities will fit neatly into this rubric and some flexibility must be allowed when evaluating individual faculty. Faculty are informed of their score and may appeal by email to the committee. If no activity report and/or supporting materials are submitted, faculty member will receive a score of zero. Service work should be documented through appointment letters and/or detailed descriptions of work performed.

The committee reports its recommendations to the chair. The chair conducts an independent review of the reporting faculty and determines the final score, which is forwarded to the Dean.

The chair may make adjustments to account for relevant factors the chair may be aware of, such as time-in-rank, cumulative performance over several years, documented negative performance issues of which the FEC might not be aware, or extraordinary performance (e.g. two books in one year). If the adjustment exceeds 0.5 percentage points, the chair will provide a justification to the FEC and the faculty member.

### **A. Guidelines For Tenured / Tenure Track Faculty**

**Overall:** Faculty receiving a 5 in research or teaching will receive an overall score of 5 unless the score in one of the three areas reviewed is below 3. Otherwise, the percentages are 40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service

(5) Book Published with academic press (e.g. monograph; co-authored or edited books at the discretion of FEC) or publication of digital work as substantive as a published book; different standards may be employed for applied linguists (e.g. a number of substantial academic articles with an impact similar to that of a book); substantial national, international, local, research grant (e.g. Fulbright/NEH/ACLS, etc.) used to support research; receiver of grant must be principle investigator; major scholarly monograph length books/digital projects with major impact in the field may warrant a score of 5 for one additional year in research. Faculty must petition the FEC for the 5 rating for the additional year and provide documentation.

(4+) Book in press; 2 academic articles published; contribution to an ongoing digital research project that is deemed by the FEC to be the equivalent of 2 published articles or if more than one of the criteria for 4 are met or at discretion of the committee.

(4) 1 academic article published that is substantial in length (6000 words or more); 1 article published in a prestigious journal or venue; contribution to an ongoing digital research project that is deemed by the FEC to be the equivalent of a lengthy published article; major updating of a digital research project; Sabbatical Leave/competitive internal grants

(3+) One article published; contribution to an ongoing digital research project that is deemed by the FEC to be the equivalent of a published article

(3) Work accepted for publication, or paper(s) read at professional conference

(2) Documented work in progress

(1) No scholarly activities, no work in progress

### **Teaching (40%)**

(5) Major Teaching award/grant received for teaching or course/didactic development

(4+) Normal teaching load with good to outstanding teaching evaluations plus study abroad (even if work is paid) or new course developed; or more than one of the following: Dissertation/M.A Thesis committee member or director of an honors thesis; unpaid extra teaching (i.e. independent study/grad section)

(4) Normal teaching load with good to outstanding teaching evaluations and/or curriculum/ course development (documented), above average student mentoring, unpaid extra teaching (i.e. independent study/grad section)

(3/3+) Normal teaching load with average to good teaching evaluations

(2) Satisfactory performance in assigned teaching duties

(1) Substandard performance in assigned teaching duties

## **Service (20%)**

(5) Director of program demonstrating substantial activity; faculty member with documented extraordinary amount/nature of service at Department, College or University Level; Documented extraordinary service within the discipline at a national/international level and/ or in the community; substantial and documented amount of fundraising and community engagement related to profession

(4-4+) Program director with program-building service and/or serving on university/college/ department committees or/and within the discipline at a national level or in the community;  
faculty member with demonstrably substantial University, College, Department committee work and/or documented service within the discipline at a national/international level and/ or in the community

(3-3+) Normal load of MCL or/and College or University service work

(2-1) Service falls below normal load or does not meet expectations

## **B. Guidelines For Promotion-Eligible NTT Faculty**

The following general guidelines have been established for use by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, who will assign a score of 1–5, in which half-points may also be awarded, for each NTT faculty member on the basis of documentation submitted each year by the faculty member. These guidelines are meant to be flexible. Not all scholarly and teaching and service activities will fit neatly into this rubric. Unless other arrangements have been agreed upon between the chair and the NTT faculty, it is assumed that teaching is 80% of the standard workload and that the remaining 20% are service or research or a combination of both.

### **Guidelines for Evaluating Instructional Faculty**

(5) Outstanding: will be awarded on a case by case basis when an NTT faculty member greatly exceeds contract obligations through significant service, publications, or other professional and community activities that benefit the department. Truly exceptional cases (in the categories listed below) may warrant a score of 5 for one additional year. Faculty may petition for it by providing documentation. Scenarios demonstrating outstanding status might include, but are not limited to, superior teaching plus:

- awarding of a college or university teaching award
- awarding of a significant internal or external teaching or research grant
- book published or edited
- publication of multiple articles

- extraordinary amount/nature of service on university, college, or department level committees (especially without course reduction)
- extraordinary amount of fund raising and/or community engagement on behalf of the department or program.
- extraordinary amount/nature of administrative work on behalf of the department or program (especially without course reduction)
- extraordinary amount/nature of administrative or teaching work relating to study abroad

(4) Excellent: exceeds contract obligations through superior teaching plus significant service, publications, and/or other professional and community activities that benefit the department. Scenarios demonstrating excellence might include, but are not limited to, superior teaching performance, plus:

- internal teaching grant
- significant curriculum development
- significant amount of student mentoring/advising
- publishing an article
- book in press
- internal research grant
- significant fundraising and/or community engagement
- significant service work on university, college, or department-level committee(s)
- significant administrative or teaching work relating to study abroad
- uncompensated extra teaching within the University
- serving in dissertation/M.A Thesis/ honors thesis

(3) Satisfactory: fulfills contract obligations through good teaching performance, adequate amount of service and/or adequate research activities. Examples of scenarios demonstrating satisfactory status might include, but are not limited to, good teaching performance, plus:

- Expected amount of student mentoring/advising
- Submission of article or book proposal
- Submission of a grant proposal
- Fundraising and community engagement
- Work on university, college, or department-level committee(s)
- Administrative work relating to program or study-abroad
- Community outreach and engagement that benefits the department or program

(2) Improvement needed: documented poor teaching performance, insufficient departmental service or insufficient professional/research activities.

(1) Unsatisfactory: At the discretion of the FEC committee

### **C. Guidelines For Lecturers, professors of practice or visiting scholars**

Lecturers can expect to be evaluated carefully and in good faith each year by the FEC. The lecturer will submit course syllabi and student evaluations to the FEC and the program director. FEC will base their rating on the submitted materials and on the recommendation of the program director or appointed reviewer (in cases where there is no program director).

In the case of lecturers without a Program Director, the Chair of the Department may appoint a reviewer. Class observations will be conducted during the first semester of teaching and periodically thereafter. Lecturers are encouraged to submit additional evidence of teaching performance. Upon review of materials and recommendation of the program director or reviewer, the FEC will assign a rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

#### **Note:**

Faculty annual performance review does not dictate merit. Merit recommendations are made by the chair to the dean, then by the dean to the provost for final decision. Merit pay is centrally budgeted and allocated, and it is contingent on available funds.