

Rubric Edits and Revisions Process

The following changes were made throughout the rubric and efforts were made for consistency between the sections.

1. Reorganize the tables with outline (from Faculty Handbook) on top and 4 columns corresponding to the 4 evaluation scores below.
2. Divided tables so that single evaluation items (section or subsection) appear on a single page, rather than broken between pages. Reformatted columns widths to fit.
3. Changed language from “In addition, the faculty member must meet ___ of the following criteria:” to “In addition, the faculty member must document an average of ___ of the following items each year.” This change is to ensure that evaluations are of the portfolio itself and to clarify that these are annual expectations regardless of the type of portfolio (1, 3, or 5 year) that is being submitted.
4. A note was added indicating that the same **type** of item from a list can count multiple times in a year in many sections.
5. An additional artifact type was added in each section that reads “other professional artifacts demonstrating appropriate section/subsection title.” The purpose is to allow for flexibility between departments which have different needs/expectations of the faculty.
6. Many items reworded to create consistency between sections and among items.
7. Notes about Teacher Education Faculty were moved under the tables of the rubric.
8. Level 4. Unprofessional Performance: All sections now simply indicate, “Faculty member does not meet the conditions for evaluation score “3 Improvement Needed.”

The following specific large changes were made to the rubric.

1. Section 1.5: Determined a set of 2 minimal requirements of all faculty to constitute “Improvement Needed” and then rearranged the list of remaining items into an “In Addition” sections to be consistent with sections 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4.
2. Section 4: for consistency with other sections, the committee identified a baseline requirement, separated the remainder of the list into an “In addition” list with required numbers consistent with previous rubric. As the baseline is serving on a university committee, the caveat that first-year faculty can instead participate in a major recruitment event was added. Additional elected committees that are not standing university committees were added to the list in addition to Faculty Senate, and additional institutional activities were explicitly included.
3. Section 2: Professional Development: combined into a single rubric item and will be evaluated holistically as Sections 3-5 have always been. This involved combining the two lists, dividing the 2.2 paragraph into several items in the list, and determining the number of items required for each level of performance.
4. Section 3: identified 2 scholarly activities (publishing a book and completing a terminal degree) that the committee feels should count for multiple years. As this section will primarily apply for tenure review process, this section of the rubric is written to specifically address the 3-year portfolio and notes regarding the application to the one- and five-year portfolio have been added in a separate document that is posted on the FEAD website.