

College of Humanities Annual Evaluation Guidelines (Rev. 1/2010)

The following rubric is not intended to be exhaustively inclusive (or exclusive); it is not an inflexible code or checklist of behaviors against which faculty are to be mechanically judged. Rather, it seeks to give examples of levels of achievement and activity that might be helpful in explaining why work is meritorious or needs improvement.

	TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	CITIZENSHIP
5	Superior teaching as evidenced by exemplary course design and delivery; careful consideration of course learning outcomes, valid and transparent measures, and their articulation with program learning goals; student ratings that are significantly above university, college and department averages. Superior teaching also involves mentoring an unusually high number of students outside of class (especially MA/Honors theses, ORCA projects, etc.)	A banner year, as evidenced by the publication of a major monograph, collection, edition, or a cluster of groundbreaking articles or creative work in prestigious venues.	Exceptionally creative, diligent, or generous service to the department, college, university, or profession. Attends department, college, and university meetings and contributes constructively as appropriate. Contributes actively and visibly to the health of the department. May include consequential leadership in national organizations.
4	Strong teaching as evidenced by creative and rigorous course design and delivery; attention to course learning outcomes and measures in the context of program learning goals; attention to student learning outside of class through some involvement in formal mentoring; and above average student ratings, including narrative comments.	An unusually good year, as evidenced by well-placed articles or creative works and presentations at high-profile conferences. A “4” might also reflect a long-term track record of research productivity with measurable evidence of progress toward a specified date of completion of a new book or scholarly edition/translation., a high level of involvement in the profession (including receiving fellowships or awards, editorial service, book reviews, etc.).	Faithful and innovative performance in major assignments or on significant committees with consistent participation in department, college, and university meetings. May also include activity in the discipline on the national level as evidenced by service on editorial boards, as a scholarly reviewer, an officer in national organizations, etc.
3	Successful teaching, evidenced by efforts to systematically revise and improve courses based on peer and student feedback; description of course improvements should be included in annual Faculty Profile report. Student ratings near or above university averages, buttressed by student comments that describe thoughtful lesson plans, helpful and prompt feedback, and sincere concern for student learning. Course learning goals are consistent with and supportive of program learning outcomes. Some evidence of mentoring students outside of class. Provides timely and thoughtful annual reports with well-considered goals for continuing growth as a teacher.	A year in line with or exceeding college expectations for scholarship, as evidenced by one peer-reviewed academic article or the equivalent of verifiable progress toward a major scholarly project (book, edition, translation, with specified date of completion). Scholar provides timely and thoughtful annual reports with well-considered goals for continuing growth as a researcher/writer.	Competent, dutiful service to the department with a consistent and informed voting record on hiring and rank and status questions, and attendance at most department, college and university meetings. Understands the consecrated source of university resources and uses them judiciously. Provides timely and thoughtful annual reports with well-considered goals for continuing growth as a university citizen.
2	Substandard teaching, as evidenced by some combination of sub-par student ratings, significant student complaints, frequent absences from or late arrival to class, failure to provide students with prompt feedback and minimal mentoring of students outside of class. Superficial attention to course and program learning outcomes and/or active resistance to department work on assessment. Submits annual report, though with little thought or commitment to improvement.	Verifiable work in progress (tangible evidence of work done since the last report), but no publications and a multi-year trend of sub-par activity. Two consecutive years of a “2” rating in scholarship may not meet college standard for 9% salary grant for Sp/Su research. Submits annual report, though with little thought or commitment to improvement.	Inconsistent as a university citizen, as evidenced by frequent absence from department, college and university meetings, irregular or uninformed votes on hiring and CFS questions, or unreliable performance on committees. Visible apathy or other behaviors that impede constructive and civil dialog on key issues. Submits annual report, though with little thought and commitment to needs for improvement
1	Unacceptable teaching, as evidenced by some combination of very low teaching scores (>1.5 points below average) patterns of student complaints that persist over more than two years, failure to provide students with helpful and timely feedback, course content that fails to meet disciplinary standards or is inappropriate for BYU. Does not willingly develop plans for improvement, or shows little or no progress on previous years’ development plans.	Unacceptable scholarly performance, with no verifiable work in progress, no recent submissions and no publications over a multi-year period. Does not meet college standard for 9% salary grant for Sp/Su research. Does not willingly develop plans for improvement, shows little or no progress on previous years’ development plans, or shows no enthusiasm for increasing teaching or service contributions to compensate for lack of scholarly work.	Unacceptable citizenship, as marked by failure to participate in department, college, and university meetings, carry out service assignments, and/or egregious disregard for departmental, college, or university policy, or questionable loyalty to the mission of the university and the church as evidenced by patterns of public comments. Is frequently away from his/her office and is disengaged from the formal and informal life of the department. Does not willingly develop plans for improvement, or shows little or no progress on previous years’ development plans.

A total score of 5 or less, or any single score of 1, may result in the initiation of the post-CFS review process.