

Faculty Member Evaluation Criteria

(Approved 4/20/2022)

Preamble

The purposes of faculty member evaluation are to encourage performance at the highest levels, to indicate areas where improvements are needed, and to provide a factual basis for making personnel decisions (including decisions about promotion, tenure, allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review). This document supplements the JMU Faculty Handbook by stating explicit criteria to be used by the Computer Science department in conducting faculty member evaluations.

Criteria are stated in the categories of teaching, professional service, and scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. Different criteria may be established in any category for purposes of evaluating an individual faculty member by mutual agreement of the department head and that faculty member. It would be prudent to make such an agreement in advance of the activity and record it in the faculty member's anticipated activity report.

In some categories the criteria for achieving a rating of satisfactory or excellent are expressed in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions. For example, to receive an excellent rating in service, one activity from the Quality group is necessary and two are sufficient. In this case, the determination of whether a single activity is adequate will depend on the effort and impact associated with that activity. Since these determinations are potentially subjective, faculty members are encouraged to resolve ambiguities in advance by consulting with the unit head during the preparation of the anticipated activities document.

Faculty members are encouraged to write a short summary placing their efforts in the three categories in context and arguing how what they have done is sufficient for a satisfactory or excellent rating in each category.

I. Teaching

For a **satisfactory** rating, **all** the following activities are **necessary and sufficient**.

A. Satisfactory Group

1. Produced syllabi that clearly stated course objectives, content, texts, schedule, and student evaluation procedures
2. Produced up-to-date materials and assigned work appropriate to the course level and content
3. Prepared for class meetings thoroughly
4. Held classes and started on time
5. Used effective teaching methods
6. Posted and kept sufficient office hours
7. Answered students' inquiries promptly
8. Showed concern and respect toward students
9. Graded objectively and returned graded assignments promptly
10. Interacted with students and peers in a professional manner
11. Advised students about curricula, schedules, and professional preparation
12. Received satisfactory student teaching evaluations

For an **excellent** rating, **three** of the following activities are **sufficient** provided **at least one** of them is from the Quality Group. **One** activity from the Quality Group is **necessary**.

B. Effort Group

1. Supervised one or more independent studies, honors theses, or masters theses
2. Played a major role in developing new courses or significant program revisions
3. Attended teaching workshops or participated in other teacher development activities
4. Applied for a government or foundation grant, award, or contract to fund teaching or course, curriculum, or program development
5. Supported teaching-related activities beyond regular teaching load (directed student learning, comprehensive exams, reader for theses/projects)
6. Adopted new teaching techniques or significantly improved course materials based on peer feedback or evidence in the research literature

C. Quality Group

1. Received an excellent evaluation from a peer review committee
2. Received an award or special recognition for teaching
3. Received significant funding to support educational activities
4. Received excellent student teaching evaluations

II. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

For a **satisfactory** rating, **two** of the activities from the Effort Group (or comparable activities) are **necessary and sufficient**.

For an **excellent** rating, **one** of the activities from the Quality Group (or a comparable activity) is **necessary**. **Two** of the activities from the Quality group are **sufficient**.

A. Effort Group

1. Presented or served on a panel at a professional conference
2. Published in a non-refereed professional forum
3. Attended some scholarly gathering, such as a conference or tutorial
4. Presented research results at a faculty seminar or colloquium
5. Reviewed monographs, books, or articles for publication
6. Served on a grant review panel for a national professional organization (e.g., NSF, DoD, etc.)
7. Submitted a proposal for a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract to support research
8. Consulted outside the university in a way that increased the faculty member's expertise
9. Produced artifacts demonstrating professional or scholarly expertise such as technical reports, questions for national standardized tests (e.g., the GRE), or fielded software products
10. Produced evidence of work in progress that will likely culminate in a scholarly contribution to the discipline or its pedagogy
11. Served as Principal or Co-Principal Investigator on a continuing grant

B. Quality Group

1. Published a monograph or book in the past two years
2. Received a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract to fund research
3. Published a book review, book chapter, or encyclopedia article
4. Published an article in a refereed journal, conference, or workshop, or in some other refereed forum
5. Received a professional achievement or special recognition award
6. Presented an invited lecture or published an invited paper outside the university
7. Created and delivered a professional tutorial or workshop that required creation of material or creative synthesis of existing material

III. Professional Service

For a **satisfactory** rating, **all** the following activities are **necessary and sufficient**.

A. Satisfactory Group

1. Actively participated in departmental service
2. Attended Department, College and University meetings (as appropriate)
3. Attended a reasonable number of student-focused activities (e.g., club meetings, talks by outside speakers, recruiting events)
4. Satisfied faculty obligations as stated in the faculty handbook
5. Provided satisfactory service in a leadership position in the department (only if applicable)

For an **excellent** rating, **one** of the following activities (or a comparable activity) is **necessary**. **Two are sufficient**.

B. Quality Group

1. Played a significant role in department, college, or university committees, task forces, etc.
2. Held a leadership position in a major professional organization
3. Provided excellent service in a leadership position in the department
4. Received a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract primarily to fund instructional equipment or software for laboratories
5. Performed a leadership activity for a major professional conference or meeting
6. Served as an editorial board member of a professional journal
7. Delivered an established professional tutorial or workshop
8. Actively served as a faculty advisor to a student group (e.g., ACM, UPE, etc.)
9. Played a major role in an effort to increase departmental, college, or university resources
10. Played a major role an effort to enhance scholarship or pedagogy in the department, college, university, or profession
11. Provided support for mission critical department or university functions, such as server support, course scheduling, etc., in addition to regular duties
12. Provided state-of-the-art computing advice or support outside the department
13. Provided significant help with public relations events or student recruiting
14. Accepted service tasks that constituted an inconvenience or hardship (such as teaching an uncompensated overload course)