Appendix A - Faculty Evaluation Criteria
(Revised and Approved by Faculty, November 2008; Revised November 2009; Spring 2016; Spring 2018; removed old overlap with journal list policy Spring 2020)

This Appendix provides guidance for determining the level of faculty performance in teaching, sustained engagement activity and professional activity/service. A certain amount of subjectivity and judgment must be used by the committee when determining the level of a particular activity. Many of the items listed intentionally carry qualifiers such as “effectively” “significant” and “judged as” to indicate that faculty should provide evidence and make a case for why they place certain activities at certain levels. Committees should not be necessarily constrained to counting activities that are compensated or appear to match an item listed with no supporting evidence and/or narrative to make a case for counting an activity at a particular level. In addition, there can be rare exceptions where the significance of an activity would result in an activity being elevated to a higher level. In the areas of teaching and service, a half level may be awarded if some activities at the next level are present, but they are not deemed significant enough to warrant a full-level increase (example: a 3.5 could be awarded if numerous level 3 activities are present and one or two level 4 activities are present).

TEACHING

Teaching evaluations are a necessary, but not sufficient, component of assessing teaching performance. When assessing teaching scores, other factors can be considered, including the courses taught, trends in scores, etc. In addition, faculty development efforts to improve teaching should be recognized as part of the evaluation process.

It is recommended that the maximum a faculty member’s teaching performance rating can be raised based on teaching development activities is one Level. For example, if the department chair reviews the annual teaching activities and teaching narrative provided by a faculty member and determines that the faculty member merits a Level 3 (Satisfactory) teaching score for the year, the chair may then consider raising the faculty member’s evaluation based on faculty teaching development activities during the year (e.g. Master Teacher, Lilly, Faculty Commons Programs etc.). However, the chair should limit the increased rating due to development activities to a maximum of one level. In the example provided above, a rating of 3 could only be raised to a 3.5 or 4 based on development activities.

Teaching Designations

Level 1: A faculty member whose teaching is not acceptable. The faculty member is judged as having significant problems as judged by his/her peers and chair/director and is failing to meet the minimum teaching expectations identified in Level 2. Some indications of unacceptable teaching from peer and student evaluations may include: the faculty member makes no effort to improve teaching, the faculty member does not seem prepared for
classroom activities, does not seem current on the subject matter, shows little enthusiasm for the subject matter or classroom interaction, does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner, does not manage the classroom well, is not available to students, etc. This level of performance often leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department chairs/directors and by teaching evaluations consistently below the department and college averages. This professor should not be in the classroom at Ohio University.

**Level 2:** The activities listed in Level 2 define the minimum expectations for teaching. A faculty member who earns a Level 2 rating may meet the minimum expectations for teaching, but their teaching still needs improvement and observation. This level of performance occasionally leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department chairs/directors and by teaching evaluations below the department and college averages. The faculty member meets the following minimum expectations:

- **X** Having an appropriate (as defined by the department, college and University) syllabus which is distributed at the first meeting of the class.
- **X** Collecting and submitting required assessment data to support Assurance of Learning efforts for courses that are part of that effort.
- **X** Meeting with the class at the scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances.
- **X** Incorporating current AACSB business context and functional area requirements into appropriate courses as defined by the College and departmental curricular missions
- **X** Incorporating library and computer resources into appropriate courses as defined by the College and departmental curricular missions
- **X** Adhering to college policies regarding student evaluations and obtaining adequate student evaluations in all courses taught without consistent serious problems as judged by departmental peers.
- **X** Being available in his/her office during posted office hours (as specified by departmental policy) unless there is an unavoidable conflict
- **X** Returning examinations and assignments with comments in a timely manner
- **X** Submitting course grades in a timely manner
Level 3: A faculty member in this Level performs satisfactorily based on student evaluations and a peer review of the relevant teaching materials. Teaching evaluation scores are typically near the department and college averages. In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, the faculty member is judged as providing a positive learning environment which is conducive to student learning. This faculty member would benefit from developing behaviors such as those described in Level 4 and 5.

Satisfactory performance is typically demonstrated through activities such as:

- Showing evidence of continuous improvement of existing course content and delivery for all courses taught as judged by departmental peers.

- Being prepared for the classroom (speaking to the topic area, demonstrating preparation through logical and informative lectures, class exercises or other related pedagogical tools) Note - this could be measured by peer review or through student evaluations.

- Maintaining an updated teaching portfolio judged as average by peers. The teaching portfolio must be submitted with the self-evaluation form and must follow the approved College of Business format.

- Participation in a faculty development initiative focused on teaching improvement requiring low levels of time, effort, or formality. (e.g. 1-hour workshop; having a colleague watch a class and provide informal feedback, etc.).

- Sharing of Teaching Best Practices from Conferences or Workshops with COB Faculty at a Presentation or Brown Bag Lunch.

- Effectively teaching an assigned overload course on a regional campus or in an executive education program

Level 4: A faculty member who is recognized by peers and students in valid documented evaluations as an above average teacher typically has teaching evaluations above the department and college averages.

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, a significant level or number of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of above average teaching.
Maintaining an updated teaching portfolio demonstrating teaching judged as above average by departmental peers. The teaching portfolio must be submitted with the self-evaluation form and must follow the approved College of Business format.

X Participating effectively as the subject in a teaching improvement effort involving classroom visitations with feedback or participation in multiple faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement. These efforts are characterized as requiring more formality, effort, and rigor than Level 3 activities.

X Preparing a course without additional compensation that they are teaching for the first time.

X Preparing a course in which intellectual property rights are assigned to the College of Business and/or Department.

X Effectively teaching extremely large sections. (The Faculty Evaluation Committee will judge whether the sections taught would constitute a large section. Evidence from the Faculty Annual Evaluation Form will be used in making this determination. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to make the case that a course should be considered a large section.)

X Participating effectively in an effort targeting the integration of disciplines (cluster, etc.)

X Demonstrating significant incorporation of active and applied learning in courses taught

X Effectively leading a group of faculty to deliver a multi-section, coordinated course

X Effectively supervising Thesis/Dissertation committees, participating in the departmental Honors’ Programs or tutoring Honors Tutorial Students.

X Effectively supervising Independent Study/Internship judged as significant by departmental peers.

X Having teaching evaluations judged by departmental peers as above average for similar courses. Complete results from the teacher evaluation for all courses taught during the evaluation period must be submitted with the self-evaluation form.

X Having a larger than normal number of assigned preparations per year on
the Athens campus (for faculty with teaching reductions for intellectual activities, the normal number of preparations will be less than that for faculty without such reductions).

- Receiving departmental teaching honors
- Being readily available to students at times other than posted office hours for discussion and counseling.
- Participating in faculty development activities focused on teaching judged as above average by peers.
- Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts. The peer review must be submitted with the self-evaluation form.

**Level 5:** A faculty member who is clearly excellent in the classroom compared with his or her colleagues. This person exhibits many of the following traits: attends seminars or colloquia for improvement; tries new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom; shares successful techniques with colleagues; and receives teaching evaluations significantly higher than department and college averages. A faculty member that receives a Level 5 typically includes regular peer review of teaching in their annual development activities.

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, a significant number or level of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of excellent teaching:

- Receiving a University Professor Award or other COB teaching award judged as significant by departmental peers (Awards that last more than 1 year, such as a University Professor Award, can be included as part of the faculty narrative for the entire term of the award.).

- Developing and successfully delivering a new, standalone course without additional compensation at the request of the department or college in support of the department or college mission judged as being significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

- Developing and successfully delivering a new, standalone course, in which intellectual property rights are assigned to the College of Business and/or Department, at the request of the department or college in support of the department or college mission judged as being significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

- New contributions to interdisciplinary/interdepartmental curriculum
integration judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

X Teaching evaluations judged by departmental peers as excellent. Complete results from the teacher evaluation for all courses taught during the evaluation period must be submitted with the self-evaluation form.

Maintaining an updated teaching portfolio demonstrating materials and methods judged by departmental peers as excellent. Such a portfolio should contain documented evaluations of classroom performance; attendance at seminars or colloquia for improvement of teaching; and other materials expected in an excellent teaching portfolio. Participation in a faculty development initiative focused on teaching improvement. The teaching portfolio must be submitted with the self-evaluation form and must follow the approved College of Business format.

X Participation in faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement judged as significant by department and college peers (e.g. Master Teacher Conference).

X Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts judged as significant by peers. The peer review must be submitted with the self-evaluation form.

SUSTAINED ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Research/Scholarly Engagement

The evaluation of intellectual contributions as part of the assessment of research/scholarly engagement is linked to the journal list policy. For reference, the following information below is incorporated here for reference, but any changes to that policy apply.

Relevant Journal List Policy Language

For purposes of categorizing Intellectual Contributions, the college will maintain a journal list organized into four levels as follows:

1. Elite Journals – a small group of the best business journals;
2. Top Journals – the next group of journals that hold quality ratings just below the A category;
3. High Quality Journals – a group of journals that do not have quality ratings equal to Elite or Top, but that are widely considered to have a quality rating higher than most peer-reviewed outlets; and
4. Acceptable Journals - all other peer-reviewed journals.
The College shares its list of Elite, Top, and High Quality level journals publicly but will not maintain a comprehensive list of journals that qualify for Acceptable status. It should be noted that the College still acknowledges and credits peer-reviewed research in Acceptable Journals. The Elite, Top and High Quality tiers are based on external data consistently applied across departments.

While the journal lists are divided by discipline to create an obvious link between faculty members’ discipline and their publications, this should not be interpreted as a restriction in the journal outlets a faculty member can target for publication. The College supports and encourages cross-disciplinary research by acknowledging and counting research published in peer-reviewed outlets that appear on any of the College department journal lists – not just the list from the faculty member’s discipline.

This also means that the quality ranking of journals should not be over-applied to the evaluation of particular pieces of research and should not be used a substitute for evaluating each article on its own merits and in the context of the entire research agenda of a faculty member and its trajectory of time.

**Assessment of Intellectual Contributions**

Intellectual Contribution Activities will be placed in the following levels for the annual performance review process:

- An Elite Journal Publication = 5 Rating for Two Years
- Top Journal = 5 Rating for One Year
- Two High Quality Journals = 4.5 Rating for One Year
- High Quality Journal = 4 Rating for One Year
- Two Acceptable Journals = 4 Rating for One Year
- One Acceptable Journal = 3.5 Rating for One Year
- One Peer-reviewed Conference = 3 Rating for One Year

**Level 1**

No evidence of research activity

**Level 2**

The minimum expectation for research activity may be met with at least one of the following activities:

X Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed journal

X Submission of manuscript or instructional software to publisher

X Submission of paper to peer-reviewed academic, professional, or pedagogical meeting
X Documented progress on or completion of a manuscript/working paper
X Submission of an external grant proposal
X Funding of an internal grant request
X Attendance at a Research Development workshop, seminar, or conference. The faculty member should describe the impact of the development activity in the narrative.
X Invited published papers

A Group I faculty member who has no course reductions for research cannot be evaluated as being a "Level 2" in three successive years. If this happens, the faculty member will be rated as a "Level 1" until a rating of at least Level 3 has been achieved.

Level 3

Achievement of at least one of the following results:
X Submission of external research grant proposal judged as being significant by peers and departmental chairs/directors
X Presentation of peer-reviewed paper, workshop, symposia, poster-session, etc., at an acceptable academic, professional, or pedagogical conference or meeting
X Invited published papers judged by peers as requiring significant effort or having a significant impact based on quality or publication outlet.
X Publication of a case or paper in peer-reviewed meeting proceedings or book
X Publication of chapter in scholarly book, professional book or textbook
X Publication of book review in peer-reviewed journal
X Publication of editorials or research comments in professional or academic publication.

Level 3.5

X Publication of one Acceptable Journal article

Level 4

Evaluation in Level 4 is earned by achievement of one of the following results:
X Publication of a High Quality Journal article
X Publication of two Acceptable Journal articles
X Publication of peer-reviewed research monograph
X Publication of a new edition of a scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as significant by department peers and chair/director
X Publication of instructional software judged as significant by the faculty’s peers and departmental chair/director
X Funding of an external research grant (including OURC and Baker) judged as significant (in terms of level of exposure or funding by departmental peers and chairs/directors. Grants funded for multiple years can be counted once.

Level 4.5

Evaluation at Level 4.5 is earned by publication of 2 High Quality Journal Articles

Level 5

Evaluation in Level 5 is earned by

X Publication of an Elite Journal article earns a Level 5 rating for two consecutive years.

X Publication of one Top Journal article

X Publication of a new scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as significant by department peers and chair/director.

Activity Reporting Times

Unless noted otherwise, intellectual contributions should be counted as follows:

X Books, book chapters, instructional software and monographs in the year of copyright, acceptance date or publication date. The faculty member must clearly state which date is to be considered.

X Journal publications in the year of formal acceptance or publication date. The faculty member must clearly state which date is to be considered.

X Papers presented in the year the meeting is held

Banking of Intellectual Contributions
For purposes of evaluation, faculty may "bank" intellectual contributions. In other words, faculty may decide to have certain intellectual contributions count in another year. All peer-reviewed publications (articles and equivalents under the Tenure and Promotion policy) can be “banked” up to two years. This can be done as long as the faculty member clearly indicates which publication is going to count in which year. This would mean that an article with a publication date in 2012 can be counted in 2012, 2013 or 2014. Faculty also still have the option of counting an article in the year of acceptance or publication which essentially gives a faculty member a four-year window into which they can count the publication for evaluation purposes if an acceptance occurs the year before publication. Departmental chairs/directors will be required to maintain a record of which publications are counted in which year in the Faculty Annual Evaluation Form.

**Applied/Practice Engagement**

Faculty meeting the sustained engagement activity requirement through applied/practice engagement will be evaluated in terms of the number of points they have accumulated under Appendix A in the Standards for Faculty Qualification Policy. For new faculty, points earned for activities before being hired but within the past 5 years are to be included as part of the rolling five-year total for purposes of determining academic qualification. However, only points earned within the past year are considered "new" points.

- **Level 1** - No activities in the last five years related to maintaining sustained engagement
- **Level 2** - Participated in activities that have added at least 1 to 4 new points to the rolling five-year total
- **Level 3** - Participated in activities that have added 5-7 new points to the rolling five-year total
- **Level 3.5** - Participated in activities that have added 8-9 new points to the rolling five-year total
- **Level 4** - Participated in activities that have added 10-12 new points to the rolling five-year total
- **Level 3** - Participated in activities that have added 13-14 new points to the rolling five-year total
- **Level 5** - Participated in activities that have added 15-19 new points to the rolling five-year total. Adding 20 or more points results in Level 5 for two years

**PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY/SERVICE**

**Level 1**
There is no evidence of professional activity at this level. The faculty member does not meet many of the Level 2 requirements for Service.

**Level 2**

The minimum expectations for service include the following activities. A faculty member that fails to meet minimum expectations for service within the department and college can have their service evaluation reduced even if some higher level service activities are present:

**Service**

- X Serving on an active departmental committee or task force; contributions are evaluated as acceptable by the chair of that committee or task force
- X Regular attendance (in-person or virtually) at department meetings (approximately half of scheduled meetings).
- X Regular attendance (in-person or virtually) at college meetings (approximately half of scheduled meetings).
- X Being a member in a professional organization
- X Attendance at one or more university or college commencement ceremonies including (but not limited to) Freshman Convocation, Fall Commencement Ceremony, Spring Undergraduate Commencement Ceremony, or Spring Graduate Commencement Ceremony.

**Level 3**

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for service, a significant level or number of professional or service activities can be used as evidence of satisfactory performance such as the following:

**Professional Activity**

- X Attendance at one professional meeting
- X Participation in a professional development activity related to the Faculty Development Plan from the previous year. Professional activities are those activities which contribute to the teaching and/or research capabilities of the faculty member. It must be a documented activity which is approved by the departmental chair.
Service

X Serving on an active departmental committee or task force judged as significant by departmental peers; contributions are evaluated as acceptable by the chair of that committee or task force

X Serving on a college CIT with a positive evaluation from the Team Leader or other approved alternative demonstrating regular attendance to CIT meetings and contributing to the work and activities of the CIT.

X Serving on an active college committee or task force judged as significant by departmental peers; contributions are evaluated as acceptable by the chair of that committee or task force

X Community service judged as significant by departmental peers and departmental chair/directors

X Effectively serving on one or more active (i.e., the group met at least once during the year or that the position required some work) University committees as being significant by departmental peers and chairs/departments.

X Providing student advising judged as effective (meeting with a significant number of students and providing knowledgeable career/professional advice) by departmental peers

X Student placement or recruitment activity judged as significant by departmental peers.

X Serving as a session chair or serving in a voluntary capacity at a significant national or regional conference

X Undercompensated service activities (regional campus, Executive Education, HTC tutorials, Residential Learning Communities, etc)

X Uncompensated attendance at program specific events that are judged as significant by peers (examples: OMBA Leadership Development Program, PMBA cohort graduation celebration, etc.)

Level 4

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations of service, a significant level or number of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of above average performance. A faculty member earning a Level 4 in service will meet the minimum
expectations for service and typically be engaged in some Level 3 service activities.

Professional Activity

X Participating in a faculty internship, externship, or involvement in a project judged as significant by departmental peers

X Organizing a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.

X Book or manuscript reviewing judged as significant by departmental peers

X Attendance at multiple professional conferences

X Holding an office or serving as a member on an active committee or board of a professional organization (i.e., the group met at least once during the year or that the position required some work)

X Obtaining and maintaining significant professional certifications as judged by departmental peers

X Serving as a discussant in a significant national or regional conference judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors

X Effectively serving on the editorial board of a journal

Service Activity

X Effectively serving on multiple CITs as judged by the chair of the CITs.

X Effectively chairing an active departmental committee or task force that is judged as significant by departmental peers

X Effectively leading a special departmental project judged as significant by the departmental chair

X Effectively serving as advisor to an active club or student organization as determined by the members of that club or student organization

X Alumni relations/fund-raising activity judged as significant by departmental peers

X Career/professional advising efforts judged as significant by departmental peers

X Serving on one or more department committees or task forces that required a significant amount of time and effort. Faculty should provide a narrative
documenting both time and effort.

X Serving on one or more college committees or task forces that required a significant amount of time and effort. Faculty should provide a narrative documenting both time and effort.

X Serving on one or more university committees or task forces that required a significant amount of time and effort. Faculty should provide a narrative documenting both time and effort.

X Serving as an Officer for the College of Business Faculty

X Significant number or magnitude of undercompensated service (regional campus, Executive Education, HTC tutorials, Residential Learning Communities, etc)

X Engaging in an above average number of unreported service activities (e.g. Copeland Scholars, Corporate Leaders, receptions, speaking engagements, extra classes without compensation, etc)

**Level 5**

A significant level & number of professional or service activities listed below can be used as evidence of excellent performance. A faculty member earning a Level 5 in service will meet the minimum expectations for service and typically be engaged in some Level 3 and 4 service activities. A faculty member earning a Level 5 in service must also be engaged in some internal service activities for the department or college.

**Professional Activity**

X Effectively serve as the editor or assistant editor of a peer-reviewed journal

X Organizing and successfully presenting a management development program judged as significant by departmental peers

X Effectively serving as an officer in or chairing a significant state or national committee as judged by departmental peers

X Effectively serving as a track chair at a national or regional conference

X Organizing and successfully presenting a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as outstanding by departmental peers

**Service**
Effectively chairing a college CIT and submitting an annual report summarizing the activities and accomplishments of the CIT and an assessment of each member’s contribution to the CIT

Effectively serving as advisor to a significant active club or student organization where a significant time commitment is required: i.e., working with a student group on a major project as determined by the members of the student group or club

Serving effectively as a program director without release time or compensation

Effectively chairing an active university committee or task force

Serving as a COB Faculty Senator that regularly attends meetings.

Engaging in a significant number of unreported service activities (e.g. Copeland Scholars, Corporate Leaders, receptions, speaking engagements, extra classes without compensation, etc)

Serving as an approved teaching mentor for a college faculty member. This level of mentoring would typically be characterized by a close working relationship between the mentor and mentee and require significant time and effort while engaged in a formal and rigorous teaching development process.

Serving as an approved research mentor for a college faculty member. This level of mentoring would typically be characterized by a close working relationship between the mentor and mentee and require significant time and effort with documented progress towards publication.