

## ***Merit Standards for Annual Review***

### ***Department of Health & Human Development***

*Faculty Approved November, 2004 (revised October 2011)*

Faculty members' (Instructional, Professional Practice, Extension) performance for merit shall be evaluated annually by the department head. Performance evaluation will be based on letter of hire, role statements, annual assignments, self-assessment, and a review of the individual's performance. In the three-tier model outlined below, faculty members will be evaluated as: below expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations in each of the categories of *Teaching*, *Research*, and *Service*, and consequently receive one *Overall* score that summarizes performance.

---

### **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

#### **Teaching**

*Quantitative:* Student perceptions of teaching effectiveness that report a mean of 3.5-3.9 (average for all courses) on the Knapp evaluation form or comparable scores on a departmentally approved form. A table of all teaching scores for the year would be submitted.

*Qualitative:* Self-evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness that takes into account factors that influence teaching. In addition, other evidence of teaching may be included such as: teaching awards, advising and other teaching related activities not included in annual teaching workload i.e. theses, professional papers, innovative teaching materials, program/project development, new courses, telecommunications, etc.

*Note:* Student perceptions of teaching effectiveness (quantitative) may not be used as the sole determinant in meeting expectations.

---

#### **Research**

*Quantitative:* One visible product presented or published which may include:

- Professional Publications (books, chapters in books, articles in refereed and non-refereed journals, book reviews, technical and research reports, or monographs)
- Professional Presentations and Workshops
- Externally funded grant proposal and grant administration
- Product Development (instructional media - films, videos, computer programs, software, educational projects, and innovative teaching materials)
- Professional Productions ( performance, choreography, juried and non-juried creative works)

*Qualitative:* Self-evaluation of research effectiveness that takes into account factors that influence research productivity. In addition other evidence of research may be included such as: research recognition awards, research in progress, pilot data, unpublished works, research team supervision or consultation.

---

## **Service**

*Quantitative:* Meets a minimum of 1 category below:

- Documented two semesters of university service (department, college )
- Documented professional service to professional organizations
- Documented public service to local, state and or national constituents

*Qualitative:* Self-evaluation of the value and importance of the service. In addition, other evidence of service may be included such as: service awards or recognition, professional consultation, editorial review boards, professional pro bono work and other service related activities.

---

## **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

## **Teaching**

*Quantitative:* Student perceptions of teaching effectiveness that report a mean of 4.0 or above (average for all courses) on the Knapp evaluation form or comparable scores on a departmentally approved form

*Qualitative:* Self-evaluation summary of teaching effectiveness that takes into account factors that influence teaching. In addition, other evidence of teaching may be included such as: teaching awards, advising and other teaching related activities not included in annual teaching workload i.e. theses, professional papers, innovative teaching materials, program/project development, new courses, telecommunications, etc.

---

## **Research**

*Quantitative:* Two or more visible products presented or published

- Professional Publications (books, chapters in books, articles in refereed and non-refereed journals, book reviews, technical and research reports, or monographs)
- Professional Presentations and Workshops
- Externally funded grant proposal and grant administration
- Product Development (instructional media - films, videos, computer programs, software, educational projects, and innovative teaching materials)
- Professional Productions ( performance, choreography, juried and non-juried creative works)

*Qualitative:* Self-evaluation of research effectiveness that takes into account factors

that influence research productivity. In addition other evidence of research may be included such as: research recognition awards, research in progress, pilot data, unpublished works, research team supervision or consultation.

---

### **Service**

*Quantitative:* Meets a minimum of 2 categories:

- Documented two semesters of university service (department, college)
- Documented professional service to professional organizations
- Documented public service to local, state and or national constituents

*Qualitative:* Self-evaluation of the value and importance of the service. In addition, other evidence of service may be included such as: service awards or recognition, professional consultation, editorial review boards, professional pro bono work and other service related activities.

---

### **BELOW EXPECTATIONS:**

Teaching:	Fails to meet established standards for Meets Expectations
Research:	Fails to meet established standards for Meets Expectations
Service:	Fails to meet established standards for Meets Expectations

### **Performance Rating Determination**

The **Teaching** component will be assessed as follows:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Value</b>
Fails to Meet	< 3.5 Knapp	0
Meets	3.5 – 3.9	1
Exceeds	4.0 or higher	2

◆ *The Teaching component may include a qualitative component that will be taken under consideration in conjunction with student evaluations.*

The **Research** component will be assessed as follows:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Value</b>
Fails to Meet	No visible product	0
Meets	1 visible product	1
Exceeds	2+ visible products *	2

◆ *The Research component table is structured without regard for author position on either abstracts or manuscripts. Grant work must be indicated as Primary, Co-investigator, or Consultant to a grant.*

The **Service** component will be assessed as follows:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Value</b>
Fails to Meet	No service category met	0
Meets	1 service category met	1
Exceeds	2+ categories met	2

The **Overall** Annual Review score will be made as follows:

<b>Assessment Scoring Translation</b>		
<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>EE</b>	A score of '2' in the <b>top two</b> workload assigned portions will result in an " <b>Exceeds</b> " (i.e. 50% Teaching, 40% Research)
<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>ME</b>	A score of '1' or higher in <b>every</b> portion will result in a " <b>Meets</b> "
<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>BE</b>	A '0' in <b>any</b> portion will result in " <b>Below</b> "

#### **Extraordinary Performance (EP)**

This category will only be applied to the overall rating. The numerical range of possible performance ranges from 0-6. If a faculty member scores '2' in each area (teaching, research, and service) for a total of 6, then the faculty member's Annual Review performance shall be judged *Extraordinary*.