

Annual Review Guidelines

Descriptions of Activity Scores

The PAC will establish a numerical rating or activity score in each of the three areas (research, teaching, and service) for each individual faculty member. This rating or score is based on a numerical rating from 1-10, with "10" being the highest.

Outstanding (9 to 10) - High

General characteristics – high productivity with excellent results; very active, high achievement

Teaching: superior evaluations or evidence of superior classroom performance as judged by student and peer evaluations; evidence of student productivity

Research: highly productive research of superior quality as evidenced by excellent reviews of creative work; extramural grant funding; consistently high-quality publications; invited presentations of national and/or international ranking

Service: superior service to Dept, College, University or community; outstanding professional ethicacy displayed toward meeting goals and mission of department and displayed in work with colleagues and enhancing a sense of teamwork

Excellent (7 to 8) – Above Average

General characteristics: above average productivity with good quality

Teaching: excellent classroom performance as judged by student and peer evaluations; evidence of student productivity

Research: consistently productive research of excellent quality; invited/adjudicated work of regional or state ranking

Service: very strong commitment to Department, College, University or Community; Obvious professional ethicacy displayed in work with colleagues and with sense of teamwork.

Very Good/Satisfactory (4 to 6) – Medium/Average

General characteristics: consistent productivity of good quality

Teaching: good student and peer evaluation, but clear indication of more attention needed to be given to teaching preparation and course development; student evaluations clearly mixed and course updating may be needed

Research: consistently productive research of quality, but more local presentations; few, if any, adjudicated reviews or reviews of mixed opinions of work

Service: good service to Department, College, University, or Community; clearly making attempts to work as a strong team member

Needs Improvement (2 to 3) - Low

General characteristics: minimal productivity

Teaching: fair student and peer evaluations, but more in the low range than mid-high evaluation range; clear signs of needed attention to course and syllabi development
Research: consistently lower than average efforts; few, if any, presentations with no adjudicated reviews of work; little effort made toward professional development, presentations or creative output
Service: fair to minimal service to Department, College, University, or Community; difficulty in working as a team member

Unsatisfactory (0 to 1)

General characteristics: substandard performance in most areas
Teaching: consistently poor student evaluation; two or more unsatisfactory peer reviews
Research: no recognizable attempt to produce creatively; publications have not been forthcoming; no efforts to make presentations on any level or be involved in professional activity
Service: essentially little to no service to Department, College, University or Community; difficulty in working toward team projects and meeting goals of group

Merit Categories

Category I: Outstanding (activity score of 9 to 10) – High

Category II: Excellent (activity score of above 7 to 8) – Above Average

Category III: Very Good/ Satisfactory (activity score of 4 to 6) – Medium/Average

Category IV: Needs Improvement (activity score of 2 to 3) – Low

Category V: Unsatisfactory (activity score of 0 to 1)

Department Chair Annual Workflow Submission:

During the 2024 for 2023 annual performance, department chairs were required to translate all departmental metrics into a three-point evaluation scale in Workflow. Below is a common scale for departments in CLASS.

Categories I&II = Exemplary

Categories III&IV = Satisfactory

Category V = Unsatisfactory