

Sustained Performance Evaluation Policy and Criteria

Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology

September 1, 2017

The principles for the Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) of faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methods (EDLRM) align with the mission of our Department as well as with the College of Education, [union] protections of faculty rights and responsibilities and the Provost's October 3rd, 2016 memorandum.

The Department will have an SPE review committee to review Associate and Full Professors, and this committee will be comprised of tenured faculty at these ranks only. This committee's recommendation will be transmitted to the Department Chair who, without modification, will inform the COE Dean of the faculty's decision. SPE faculty files will be kept in the COE personnel files.

The intent of SPE is to promote active engagement in the activities of the academy that effectively demonstrate engagement in Departmental activities which meet the criteria listed below. To this end, the Department will review candidates according to select criteria from three sources.

1. The five (5) required items from the Provost's SPE memo (October 3, p.2) (see Appendix A).

- a. a current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review,
- b. copies of the faculty member's last seven annual assignments and annual evaluations,
- c. a copy of the report of the previous SPE, if available,
- d. a copy of the published performance expectations from the faculty member's academic unit (see Articulation of Unit Expectations below), and
- e. a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

2. Select criteria from the College of Education's (COE) Promotion and Tenure (P & T) Document (See Appendix B)

Articulation of Unit SPE Expectations

▪ Scholarship

MEETS	EXCEEDS
Over a 7-year period, the candidate meets criteria for SPE (1.5% raise). Candidate should provide:	Over a 7-year period, the candidate meets criteria for SPE (3.0% raise). Candidate should provide:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of an average of one indicator of excellence from COE P&T criteria for scholarship (one indicator of excellence per year); or, ▪ Evidence of submitting a grant of \$4999 or above; or, ▪ Evidence of formal or informal mentoring of a junior colleague in scholarship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of being an author/co-author of a published book; or ▪ Evidence of more than an average of one indicator of excellence from COE P&T criteria for scholarship; or ▪ Evidence of a grant funded for \$4999 or above; or ▪ Evidence of formal or informal mentoring of multiple junior colleagues in scholarship.

▪ **Teaching**

MEETS	EXCEEDS
Meets Criteria for SPE (1.5% raise). Candidate should provide:	Exceeds Criteria for SPE (3% raise). Candidate should provide:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of SPOT ratings showing that, on average, teaching performance is equal to or less than 3.99 out of 5; and, ▪ Evidence of successful chairing of two doctoral dissertations to completion over the seven-year period; and, or, ▪ Evidence of successfully serving as the primary methodologist on two dissertations through completion over the seven-year period; and, ▪ Evidence of an average of one indicator of excellence per year from COE P&T criteria for teaching; or ▪ Evidence of formal or informal mentoring of a junior colleague in teaching. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of SPOT ratings showing that, on average, teaching performance is equal to or less than 2.99 out of 5; and, ▪ Evidence of successful chairing of four doctoral dissertations to completion over the seven-year period; and, or ▪ Evidence of successfully serving as the primary methodologist on four dissertations through completion over the seven-year period; and, ▪ Evidence of more than an average of one indicator of excellence from COE P&T criteria for teaching; or, ▪ Evidence of formal or informal mentoring of multiple junior colleagues in teaching.

▪ **Service**

MEETS	EXCEEDS
Meets Criteria for SPE (1.5% raise). Candidate should provide:	Exceeds Criteria for SPE (3% raise). Candidate should provide:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A minimum of an average of one indicator per year of providing service in a manner consistent with internal service (e.g., program, college and university service) and external service (e.g., local, state, national, international service); or, ▪ Evidence of formal or informal mentoring of a junior colleague in service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More than an average of one indicator per year leading service (e.g. chair, director, active officer) in a manner consistent manner with internal service (e.g., program, college, and university service) and external service (e.g., local, state, national, international service); or, ▪ Evidence of formal or informal mentoring of multiple junior colleagues in service.

3. EDLRM Core Values (See Appendix C)

- a. Educational Leadership (EL)
- b. Social Responsibility (SR)
- c. Research and Scholarship (R&S)
- d. Community of Learners (CoL)

In all reviews, the Department's values [of active engagement in the activities of the academy] and the candidate's work needs to be aligned to the core values of the department. Department core values are cross walked within the SPE criteria table. **The SPE criteria are for sustained performance evaluation purposes and should not be used to infer progress toward promotion to full professor.**

- **Overall**

A faculty member who *meets* SPE criteria in all 3 areas will earn an overall rating of "meets." A faculty member who *exceeds* SPE criteria in all 3 areas will earn an overall rating of "exceeds." Faculty who receive two out of three "meets" expectations will receive a "meets" expectations overall. Faculty who receive two out of three "exceeds" expectations will receive an "exceeds" expectations overall. A faculty member whose performance "does not meet" expectations in any area will receive an overall rating of "fails to meet expectations" and will be referred to the department chair for further review.