

Annual Review of NTID Faculty Guidelines for Evaluation of Performance Categories

According to RIT Policy E.07 (“Annual Review of Faculty”):

“A faculty member receives a performance evaluation for each area *as appropriate and according to one's plan of work*, and an overall evaluation. The performance categories for evaluating all faculty members with respect to their annual plans of work shall be: *Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, and Unsatisfactory*.

- *Outstanding* reflects performance that represents a truly exceptional level of accomplishment.
- *Exceeds Expectations* reflects performance that exceeds the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member.
- *Meets Expectations* reflects the performance that meets the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member.
- *Does Not Meet Expectations* reflects performance that does not meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member. This rating indicates a deficiency beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.
- *Unsatisfactory* reflects performance that repeatedly fails to meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member in a way that reflects disregard of previous reviews or other documented efforts to provide correction or assistance.”

The following matrix provides a guideline for assignment of performance ratings to NTID faculty in the annual review process in the teaching/tutoring, communication, scholarship and service categories. The examples given in each cell are intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

Rating	Teaching/Tutoring	Scholarship	Service	Communication
Outstanding	Demonstrated excellence in teaching/tutoring effectiveness and accomplishments as evidenced by student ratings, chairperson observations, peer testimonials, awards, and/or other evidence Class product, innovation, and/or achievement disseminated, awarded, etc.	Dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarship of exceptional quality and/or quantity in relation to discipline norms, such as: major publication, patents, catalogues, screenings, online publishing, exhibition at nationally or internationally-recognized venue, major commissioned	University committee participation and leadership Introduces and leads new initiative via committee work Lead position in professional or service organization in the field	Demonstrated achievement at high levels of improvement of communication abilities, use of technology for instruction, and/or awareness of Deaf culture as documented through student evaluations, SLPI ratings, certification, or peer feedback.

	<p>Award: teaching, grant (such as PLIG, FEAD, professional development)</p> <p>Leadership in curriculum/program development.</p>	<p>work, consulting, jurying, awards, grant awards, etc.</p>	<p>Directs community service initiatives</p> <p>Service award(s)</p> <p>Leadership: Performance of leadership responsibilities and duties exceeds expectations as outlined in plans of work, with truly exceptional examples of accomplishments and contributions.</p>	<p>Develops and presents workshops focusing on improving an aspect of communication.</p>
Exceeds Expectations	<p>Demonstrated very good teaching/tutoring effectiveness as evidenced by student ratings, chairperson observations, peer testimonials, and/or other evidence.</p> <p>Introduces new pedagogical practices in course(s) by way of subjects, technology, assignments, classroom participation, project, student initiatives, interdisciplinary, study abroad, flipped classroom, myCourses, use of Wallace Center in course development, etc.</p> <p>Contributed to curriculum improvements and/or program development, wrote and/or taught new course, co-taught new course, collaborative pedagogical practice across program, school, college, or university, etc.</p>	<p>Disseminated peer-reviewed scholarship through research, publications, presentations, innovative pedagogy and/or creative activity exceeding discipline norms.</p>	<p>School or college committee with identifiable, demonstrated leadership.</p> <p>Active participation in professional organization.</p> <p>Service to community organization with identifiable contributions.</p> <p>Leadership: Performance of leadership responsibilities and duties exceeds expectations as outlined in plans of work, with significant examples of accomplishments and contributions.</p>	<p>Demonstrated enhancement of communication ability, and/or awareness of Deaf culture as documented through student evaluations, SLPI ratings, certification, or peer feedback.</p> <p>Contributed to the development and or/ presentation of workshops focusing on improving an aspect of communication .</p>

Meets Expectations	<p>Taught/tutored according to Plan of Work</p> <p>Demonstrated good teaching/tutoring effectiveness as evidenced by student ratings, chairperson observations, peer testimonials, and/or other evidence.</p>	<p>Engaged in new scholarship activity through research, publication, presentation, innovative pedagogy and/or creative activity leading to the dissemination of peer-reviewed contribution.</p> <p>Dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarship in relation to discipline norms.</p>	<p>Membership on school, college, and/or university committees with identifiable contributes.</p> <p>Service to community organization.</p> <p>Leadership: Performance of leadership responsibilities and duties meets level of expectations as outlined in plans of work.</p>	<p>Established and implemented a communication plan with clearly stated goals for improvement.</p>
Does Not Meet Expectations	<p>Demonstrated poor teaching and/or tutoring effectiveness.</p> <p>Deficiency beyond what can be considered in the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.</p>	<p>Little or no scholarship through research, publications, presentations, innovative pedagogy and/or new creative activity.</p> <p>Deficiency beyond what can be considered in the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.</p>	<p>No membership on school and/or college committees; no service to community organization.</p> <p>Deficiency beyond what can be considered in the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.</p>	<p>Little or no clear action on a communication plan.</p> <p>Deficiency beyond what can be considered in the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.</p>
Unsatisfactory	<p>Repeated deficiencies in teaching and/or tutoring effectiveness as noted in previous reviews</p> <p>No demonstrable plan or strategy for improvement</p>	<p>Repeated deficiencies in scholarship through research, publications, presentations, innovative pedagogy and/or new creative activity.</p> <p>Repeated deficiency in scholarship as noted in previous reviews without any plan or strategy for improvement.</p>	<p>Repeated deficiencies in service membership and contributions to school, college, or university committees or to the community.</p> <p>Disregarded previous reviews concerning service and contributions.</p>	<p>Repeated deficiencies in identification and implementation of a communication development plan.</p> <p>Disregarded previous reviews concerning a communication plan.</p>

In order to assign overall ratings to faculty in each of the three portfolios, teaching/tutoring, communication, scholarship and service, chairpersons should apply the following criteria.

Please note, however, that:

- These are generic guidelines, not hard and fast rules.
- They do not cover all eventualities.
- They do not cover every possible combinations of individual category ratings (where the mix of individual ratings is different from the combinations set out below, chairs should exercise careful judgment).
- While the immediate point of an appraisal is to appraise past performance, the underlying goal is to improve future performance. A punitive approach is unlikely to achieve that goal.
- The basis for appraisal must always be the POW. Therefore, it is very important that POWs be written carefully and, if necessary, updated during the course of the academic year.
- Appraisals are individual. It is generally not a good idea to rate one faculty member based on a comparison with departmental peers.
- An overall rating of “Needs Improvement” requires that the chair and the faculty member agree upon an improvement plan for the following year.

Faculty on the Teaching/Tutoring Portfolio

The faculty member who:

- Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring
- Exceeds Expectations in at least two other categories
- Meet Expectations in remaining categories

has earned an overall rating of **Outstanding**.

The faculty member who:

- Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring
- Meets Expectations in all other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations**.

The faculty member who:

- Exceeds Expectations in teaching/tutoring
- Meets Expectations in at least two other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Meets Expectations**.

The faculty member who:

- Does Not Meet Expectations teaching/tutoring
- Does no better than Meets Expectations in all other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations**.

Faculty on the Balanced Portfolio

The faculty member who:

- Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring OR scholarship
- Exceeds Expectations in at least two other categories
- Meet Expectations in remaining categories

has earned an overall rating of **Outstanding**.

The faculty member who:

- Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring OR scholarship
- Meets Expectations in all other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations**.

The faculty member who:

- Exceeds Expectations in teaching/tutoring OR scholarship
- Meets Expectations in at least two other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Meets Expectations**.

The faculty member who:

- Does Not Meet Expectations teaching/tutoring OR scholarship
- Does no better than Meets Expectations in all other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations**.

Faculty on the Lecturer Portfolio

The lecturer who:

- Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring
- Exceeds Expectations in all other categories in the POW

has earned an overall rating of **Outstanding**.

The lecturer who:

- Exceeds Expectations in teaching/tutoring
- Meets Expectations in all other categories in the POW

has earned an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations**.

The lecturer who:

- Meets Expectations in teaching/tutoring

has earned an overall rating of **Meets Expectations**.