Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures for the Department of Writing and Rhetoric

Overall Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated annually based on the weighted Full-Time Equivalence (FTE) assignment for each category (teaching, service, research/creative activity, and other duties, as applicable). The annual evaluations are guided by Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP).

Faculty are expected to submit a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) summarizing annual activity in each category with an FTE assignment; faculty make assertions of the impact and quality of their work in each category and provide artifacts as evidence to support their claims. The reporting period runs from May 8, 20XX - May 7, 20XX. While FARs are due on May 7 each year, according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) faculty may request in writing a 21-day extension from the chair. Each year, the chair submits an annual report for the department that may include highlights from faculty members' FARs.

Teaching Evaluation

Overview

The department is committed to excellent teaching and maintaining high pedagogical standards across all teaching faculty. Activities described within instructional duties focus on a faculty member's teaching assignment, including work outside of the classroom that supports assigned classes, and the students enrolled in those courses along with other contributions to teaching in the department, university, field, and/or beyond.

All faculty are expected to maintain the benchmark expectations for Satisfactory, regardless of their Instructional Duties assignment. Additionally, the quality of teaching should meet the same standard regardless of FTE. Due to the variation in teaching loads, the expectations beyond Satisfactory are adjusted according to a faculty member's FTE and impact through mentoring of students and faculty beyond one's courses.

Performance Ratings and Standards

Faculty members will be evaluated on the following ratings and standards:

- Unsatisfactory
- Conditional
- Satisfactory
- Above Satisfactory
- Outstanding

Performance Ratings	Standards
Unsatisfactory	The faculty member fails to meet the stated expectation of teaching performance and/or does not provide evidence of expected essential instructional duties.
Conditional	The faculty member does not fully meet the stated expectation of teaching performance and/or provides limited evidence of expected essential instructional duties.
Satisfactory	The faculty member **makes essential contributions to teaching** and **demonstrates instructional effectiveness** in the department. To be eligible to receive the rating of satisfactory, all faculty members must follow university procedures and department requirements through each of the following standards: ● **Adheres to UCF expectations related to instruction**, including those specified by the CBA, UCF Code of Conduct, digital accessibility, FERPA, Office of Student Accessibility Services, and Office Institutional Equity; ● **Attends department orientation and regular meetings** unless previously arranged with the chair; ● **Complies with deadlines** for submitting syllabi, book orders, early warning, and course grades; ● **Develops and/or improves** courses that reflect current disciplinary knowledge, pedagogies, values, and best practices; ● **Maintains programmatic processes**, such as ensuring *course curricula align with program learning outcomes* (as relevant or required by department and university) and submitting assessment data; ● **Teaches** scheduled classes (with exceptions for approved, related professional activities or illness). For online courses, this includes engaging in the learning management system at least every other business days; ● **Holds scheduled office hours**, with a minimum of 45 minutes per 3-credit course, and available by appointment; ● **Design course syllabi that are clear, detailed, and meet university requirements** per UCF Policy 4-403.1 ("Required Elements of the Course Syllabus"); ● **Offers timely feedback on student work** designed to help students meet course goals and **replies to student inquiries** within two business days; ● **Facilitates final exam**, in line with UCF Policy 4-400.3 ("Final Exams"); ● **Receives student evaluations that indicate effective teaching**, as evidenced by SPOIs and/or other student feedback.

Above Satisfactory	The faculty member builds on the expectations for Satisfactory by demonstrating **notable contributions to teaching** through a written explanation and evidence of the following: ● **Continuous improvement in teaching**, including meaningful revisions or development of courses that reflect current disciplinary knowledge, pedagogies, values, and best practices; ● **Mentoring of students** beyond the classroom **and/or supporting colleagues in their teaching efforts** (for tenure-line faculty, this typically includes serving on at least one student committee); ● **Evidence of teaching and learning effectiveness** through and beyond SPOIs.
Outstanding	The faculty member builds on the expectations for Above Satisfactory by demonstrating **extraordinary contributions to teaching** through a written explanation and evidence of typically two or more of the following: ● **Innovative teaching and course development** that reflect current disciplinary knowledge, pedagogies, values, and best practices, effectively preparing students for future professional and academic challenges; ● **Mentoring of students or colleagues that leads to tangible success**, such as presentations or publications, with tenure-line faculty typically chairing or serving on multiple student committees; ● **Leadership roles** in supporting student learning; ● **Formal recognition of teaching quality or impact**, evidenced by awards in the discipline, course designations, or other means.

To support evaluation at a performance rating, the faculty annual report (FAR) should include:

● **A written explanation** of how instructional activities and achievements meet the standards for a particular rating, with an emphasis on the **effectiveness, quality, and impact** of instruction. This explanation could also explain how the faculty member's instructional activities align with disciplinary values, department and university goals, and contribute to teaching beyond their courses (e.g., through programmatic curricula, assessment work, sharing materials, conducting workshops, and/or teaching beyond assignment, etc.).
● **Artifacts** that evidence the explanation of teaching contributions, including course improvement and innovation, mentoring of students in and beyond assigned courses, supporting the teaching of colleagues in and beyond the department, taking on leadership roles related to teaching, and/or earning formal recognition for one's teaching. Key types of teaching activities and evidence are listed below. Faculty may elect to assemble a teaching eportfolio.

Types of Teaching Activities and Evidence

The types of activities and evidence listed below serve as key examples and guidelines; they are not intended to be all-inclusive or exclusionary. In consultation with the chair, the faculty member can determine whether to count activities in Teaching or Service.

Effectiveness of Excellence in Teaching and Learning

- SPOI ratings above the department and/or college means;
- Examples of impressive (de-identified) student work;
- Student presentations or publications that build on work in the faculty member's course;
- HQ and/or HIP course designations;
- University teaching awards.

Course Improvement and Innovation (accompanied by a brief reflection or explanation)

- Revised syllabi, course assignments, rubrics/scoring guides, class agendas, and/or other course elements that draw on disciplinary knowledge and/or recognized teaching best practices (Note: revisions should be identified and can be included in a brief written explanation);
- Course elements that document new or modified uses of technologies and/or approaches that are recognized as innovative teaching practices;
- Student comments from SPOIs.

Mentoring of Students

- Documented guidance for presentation or publication opportunities;
- Supervision of independent studies, internships, or student publication editorships;
- Supervision or assigned mentoring of GTAs;
- Serving on HUT, thesis, and/or dissertation committees where students make demonstrable progress;
- Letters of recommendation or other evidence of help with applications.

Supporting Others' Teaching and Learning (beyond one's own courses)

- Sharing of teaching materials with colleagues via a department or program process;
- Use of a faculty's teaching materials by program (e.g., as exemplary examples);
- Mentoring of colleagues throughout at least one semester;
- Observation of colleagues (per their or program requests) that includes a pre-observation discussion, a formal observation letter, and follow-up discussion;
- Engaging with programmatic assessment, programmatic curricular changes, or other programmatic functions;
- Documented contributions to departmental teaching-related workshops or book clubs;
- Facilitating guest lecturers;
- Teaching for FPEP, LIFE, or other university-affiliated programs.

Pedagogical Leadership Roles (if not counted in Service)
- Chairing HUT, thesis, and/or dissertation committees;
- Presenting at department, university, and/or disciplinary teaching workshops;
- Leading department workshop series or book clubs;
- Chairing or working on KWS planning committee (if this involves substantial student mentoring work);
- Editing student publications;
- Serving in field leadership roles related to teaching.

Other Recognition of Teaching
- For non-tenure-line faculty without research assignments, peer-reviewed or invited teaching-related presentations or publications and/or winning teaching-related grants;
- Field-level teaching awards;
- Written positive feedback from colleagues or chair about teaching support or leadership activities.

Service Evaluation

Overview

All members of the department are expected to share in the work of the department. Additionally, faculty may engage (or be nominated/asked to represent the department) in service work for the college and university, the discipline/profession, and the community. As a faculty member's career progresses, their service is generally expected to increase and include leadership roles and extend beyond the department, where possible. For tenure-line faculty, this category includes service to the discipline or profession.

All faculty are expected to maintain the baseline expectations for a rating of Satisfactory regardless of their Service assignment. Due to the variation in service loads, the expectations beyond Satisfactory are adjusted according to the faculty member's FTE.

Performance Ratings and Standards

Faculty members will be evaluated on the following scale:

- Unsatisfactory
- Conditional
- Satisfactory
- Above Satisfactory
- Outstanding

Performance Ratings	Standards
Unsatisfactory	The faculty member fails to meet the stated expectation of service and/or provides insufficient evidence of expected department service contributions.
Conditional	The faculty member does not fully meet the stated expectation of service and/or provides limited evidence of expected department service contributions.
Satisfactory	The faculty member demonstrates **regular contributions to service activity that supports the department**. If the faculty member has meaningful involvement in service with audiences beyond the department, then the expectations for department service could be lowered accordingly by requesting to chair.
Above Satisfactory	The faculty member demonstrates **relevant contributions, with evidence of output, in service supporting the department and beyond** (e.g., college, university, field, community), including in one or more of the following ways: the **time and effort** involved, the **focus or scope** of the work, the types of work **outputs or deliverables**, **impact of or recognition for** the work, or other aspects that the faculty member identifies. For tenure-line faculty, Above Satisfactory service would typically include actively serving in a **leadership role** in at least one activity.
Outstanding	The faculty member demonstrates **extraordinary contributions– with evidence of leadership, output and/or recognition–of service supporting department and beyond**, including in one or more of the following ways: the **focus or scope** of the work, types of work **outputs or deliverables**, **impact of or recognition for** the work, or other aspects that the faculty member identifies.

To support evaluation at a performance rating, faculty should include in their FAR:

- **A written explanation** of how service activities and achievement meet the standards for a particular rating with an emphasis on the **effectiveness, quality, and impact** of service. Faculty should document how they engaged in service, the specific roles they held (e.g., committee member, chair, organizer), the impact or outcomes of their contributions (e.g., program improvements, community outreach), and any leadership or mentorship roles taken. Faculty should also explain how these service activities align with department and university goals and contribute to the broader professional and academic community.
- **Artifacts** that evidence the explanation of service contributions. These can include promotional materials, event schedules, and other documents indicating participation in service activities; emails, acknowledgment letters, and other documents noting

contributions to and/or leadership of service activities, and reports, proposals, events, and other outputs of service activities. Key types of service activities are listed below.

Types of Service Activities and Evidence
The listed activities and evidence described below serve as key examples and guidelines; they are not intended to be all-inclusive or exclusionary.

Supporting Department
- Actively serving on department committees, task forces, and working groups, with explanation and/or evidence of contributions;
- Evidence of effectively mentoring a colleague (if not counted in Teaching);
- Advising department-affiliated student groups that meet regularly;
- Documented contributions to program marketing upon request of program director or chair, and/or student recruitment;
- Documented contributions to the planning and execution of department events (e.g., KWS, National Day of Writing; Department Graduation Celebration; etc.);
- Other service requested or approved by department chair or program director.

Supporting the College of Arts and Humanities
- Actively serving on college committees, subcommittees, advisory boards, and task forces, with explanation and/or evidence of contributions;
- Documented contributions to the planning and/or enactment of college events (e.g., UCF Celebrates the Arts).

Supporting the University
- Actively serving on university committees, advisory boards, and task forces, with explanation and/or evidence of contributions;
- Documented contributions to the planning and/or enactment of university events (e.g., student orientation advising, fairs, etc.).

Supporting the Discipline
- Actively serving on recognized national committees, executive boards, task forces, or working groups in, or related to, the discipline, with explanation and/or evidence of contributions;
- Reviewing book or journal/chapter manuscripts for publication;
- Reviewing conference proposals;
- Serving on editorial boards;
- Serving as a managing or other supporting editor for a publication (if not counted in other areas, such as research and/or other duties);
- Serving as external reviewer for promotion and/or tenure;
- Serving as external program or accreditation reviewer;
- Documented contributions to the planning and/or enactment of discipline-related conferences or other events.

Supporting Community & Industry Activities Related to Writing & Rhetoric
- Actively serving on community advisory boards as a writing professional and/or other related community committee roles, with explanation and/or evidence of contributions;
- Presenting on a topic related to one's disciplinary expertise at a community event or for a community organization;
- Developing and/or significantly contributing to a community organization or initiative;
- Documented contributions to the planning and/or enactment of community or industry events (e.g., readings, networking events, etc.).

Service-Related Leadership (if not counted in other areas)
- Chairing/co-chairing committees, task forces, working groups, advisory boards, etc.;
- Serving on executive or steering committees;
- Chairing/co-chairing event planning committees;
- Serving as book series or journal editor/co-editor (if not counted in other areas, such as research and/or other duties).

Research Evaluation

Overview

Given the varied nature of writing-based scholarship, the department values both **research and creative works** as scholarship, also noting that such work may undergo different types of rigorous review processes. In keeping with disciplinary norms and values (see, for example, https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/scholarshipincomp), the department values the **scholarship of teaching and learning**, **writing program administration** (including program design, curricular, pedagogical, and assessment), **interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary** scholarship (including forums outside of our field), **digital and multimedia** scholarship (including web-based publications, video installations, podcasts, and exhibits), and **public-facing** scholarship (including research-based policy, advocacy, or news media pieces that are typically evaluated by publics beyond our field).

Neither our field nor department distinguish between single-authored and **collaborative works** (including both publications and grants) in terms of impact, though faculty should be able to articulate the nature and extent of their contributions to such work. Cases where a faculty member demonstrates a primary responsibility during the entire project will be valued higher than those where their roles were more limited.

In keeping with the values of our field, the department recognizes different types of **editorial work** as scholarship, and we note that such work creates opportunities for the broader impact of the editors and contributors. Such scholarship includes edited book collections, managing editors, journal special issues, and proceedings as well as the ongoing work of editing a nationally recognized journal or other venue that is published regularly.

Regarding research or creative output, the department encourages faculty work on **large-scale, long-term projects** (i.e., books, grants) if they so wish, as such work often leads to considerable impact and recognition. Accordingly, the standards below include demonstrating **progress on such work while explaining its quality and promise of impact**, as well as recognizing the **multi-year impact** of larger-scale publications and grants. For book-length publications and major external grants (i.e., grants of $50K or more where faculty member is PI/Co-PI with substantial responsibility), the faculty member may request, in consultation with the chair, to receive credit in two review cycles that could include either a contract and publication or publication and reception.

In addition, because the timing of publication is largely out of faculty control, smaller-scale publications might appear in bunches, and therefore the Research standards give faculty some flexibility, in consultation with the chair, about which years to credit such work. For example, a faculty member could request credit for a forthcoming publication in the year that they receive the acceptance *or* in the year that the work is published. (Faculty cannot receive credit for both the review period when the work is forthcoming and credit in the review period when work publishes.)

The evaluation of research performance should be consistent with the annual assignment; faculty members with a higher research assignment will be expected to produce proportionally more in research than those with a lower assignment.

Performance Ratings and Standards

Faculty members will be evaluated on the following scale:

- Unsatisfactory
- Conditional
- Satisfactory
- Above Satisfactory
- Outstanding

Performance Ratings	Standards
Unsatisfactory	The faculty member fails to meet the basic expectations for research and/or creative works, showing substantial limitations in quality, impact, or progress. The faculty member provides little to no evidence of meaningful contributions to the discipline or beyond. Previous deficiencies identified in a Conditional evaluation have not been addressed, or the faculty member's performance has deteriorated further. There is a lack of scholarly engagement, with no documentation of achievement.

Conditional	The faculty member falls short of meeting the expectations for a Satisfactory rating. The faculty member's research and/or creative works demonstrates significant limitations in quality, impact, or progress, with limited evidence of meaningful contributions to the discipline. Documentation of scholarly engagement and achievement is incomplete, and there is minimal to no recognition of the work. Efforts toward meeting the expected standards are insufficient or inconsistent.
Satisfactory	The faculty member demonstrates a **degree of achievement in research and/or creative work**. The faculty member provides evidence of their work's **quality and potential to contribute to scholarly conversations.**
Above Satisfactory	Exceeding the expectation for a Satisfactory rating, the faculty member demonstrates a **substantial degree of achievement in research and/or creative work.** The faculty member provides **evidence of how their work has appeared** or is set to appear **in well-regarded venues** that **promise to significantly advance scholarly conversations** in the field or beyond.
Outstanding	Exceeding the expectation for an Above Satisfactory rating, the faculty member demonstrates an **exceptional rating of achievement in research and/or creative work**. The faculty member provides **clear, compelling evidence of how their publications or other scholarly products have appeared in well-regarded venues** (based on the indicators of quality and impact outlined below) and have **advanced scholarly conversations** in the field or beyond in **important or innovative ways**.

To support evaluation at a performance rating, faculty should include in their FAR:

- **A written explanation** of how research and creative activities and/or achievements meet the standards for a particular rating, with an emphasis on the (potential) quality and impact of the work. This explanation could also explain how the faculty member's research and creative activities align with **disciplinary values and university goals**. Faculty may articulate the noteworthy nature of any research/creative activity or achievement, including in any of the following ways: the **scope** of the work and time and effort involved (e.g., for extensive empirical research), the **quality** of the work, the **reach and impact** of the work, the **focus** of the work (as aligned with disciplinary values), and

the faculty member's **role** (e.g., type of editorship or presentation, role in grant). For work in progress, the faculty should detail the progress on the work from the previous submission.

- ○ **Indicators of scholarly quality and impact** that the chair may consider include but are not limited to the following:
  - ■ venue **competitiveness** (through acceptance rates, rigor of peer/editorial review processes, etc.);
  - ■ venue **reputation and prestige** (through organizational affiliation, venue awards, etc.);
  - ■ venue **reach** (through readership/participation size, regional/national/ international orientation, etc.).

- **Artifacts** that evidence the explanation of quality and impact, include but are not limited to the following:
  - ○ amount of grant credit split;
  - ○ type of presentation (keynote, plenary/featured, invited);
  - ○ post-publication reviews (by academics or other types of experts);
  - ○ citations;
  - ○ public mentions/review/articles;
  - ○ re-publication;
  - ○ awards and nominations (disciplinary, UCF, public etc.);
  - ○ fellowship and society inductions;
  - ○ inclusion of work in scholarly frameworks for program design/administration or policy.

The department recognizes the growing importance of alternative metrics of quality and impact in the humanities. The chair may consider indicators that show longer-term impact or highly prestigious recognition over multiple evaluation periods. The faculty member should provide evidence of quality and impact indicators.

- Other **artifacts** demonstrating **substantial progress** on larger- and smaller-scale scholarly projects may include the following:
  - ○ examples of data collection or analysis of data;
  - ○ manuscript drafts or submissions;
  - ○ proposal (in-draft);
  - ○ statements from editors/reviewers about submission/status, promise, etc.;
  - ○ pre-publication editorial or peer reviews;
  - ○ advanced or final (e.g., board approved) contracts.

Drafts of data collection, analysis, or write-ups should be accompanied by brief explanations of what they show and how this constitutes substantial progress.

Key types of research/creative activities are listed below, followed by an explanation of what combinations of activities could position faculty to make a case for a specific performance rating.

Types of Research/Creative Activities and Evidence

The types of activities and evidence listed below serve as key examples and guidelines; they are not intended to be all-inclusive or exclusionary.

Peer-Reviewed Publications
- Journal article
- Book chapter
- Monograph
- Textbook
- Creative work (e.g., poem, short story, essay, flash fiction)
- Edited volume
- Edited journal special issue
- Edited column
- Interview (local, national)
- Proceedings volume or paper
- Encyclopedia or handbook entry
- Web article, video, audio recording, podcast, comic, or other non-print or multimodal publications
- Digital/multimedia scholarly resource

Other Publications
- Interview
- Research-based report or policy document
- Re-publication
- New edition of textbook or monograph

Other Relevant Editorial Work *(if not counted in Other Duties or Service)*
- Editor/co-editor of journal
- Editor/co-editor of column
- Editor/co-editor of podcast
- Editor/co-editor of book series
- Leader/co-leader of research group or seminar/workshop

Grants and Contracts
- Major external grant (faculty member as PI/Co-PI typically of $50K or more)
- Substantial, competitive external grant (faculty member as PI/Co-PI typically of $10K or more)
- Substantial internal grant (e.g., institutional seed grant; faculty member as PI/Co-PI typically of $5K or more)
- Smaller external grants (e.g., travel grant)
- Smaller internal grant (e.g., professional development grant)
- Renewed grants

Scholarly and Public Presentations
- Keynote presentation
- Plenary or featured presentation
- Peer-reviewed conference presentation
- Invited presentation at conference or at another institution
- Response to panel
- Community-based or public presentation
- Exhibit

Research Output Guidelines

The following are general guidelines for the baseline **research outputs** that are typically expected to make a faculty member eligible for the different performance ratings of Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, and Outstanding–considered alongside the **performance standards and indicators of quality, recognition, and impact** above.

There is no single formula for achieving each rating but instead a menu of options, and the examples of combinations below are not exhaustive. In addition, these guidelines assume a typical research assignment of 30-35%, with higher assignments requiring more output and lower assignments requiring less. "Publication" can refer to a publication in any medium or modality.

Satisfactory

Combinations that will typically qualify for a Satisfactory rating includes any of the following:
- One scholarly presentation and demonstrated progress toward an article-length reviewed publication;
- One scholarly presentation and submission of an external grant proposal;
- One scholarly presentation and one non-reviewed publication;
- One scholarly presentation and one awarded smaller internal grant;
- Two scholarly presentations (one can be for a public audience);
- Continuing editorial output in journal or book series (if not counted under Service or Other Duties) and demonstrated progress toward an article-length reviewed publication.

Note: A faculty member cannot achieve a Satisfactory rating more than one year in a row without documentation of progress toward a peer- or editorially- reviewed publication.

Above Satisfactory

Combinations that will typically qualify for an Above Satisfactory rating, beyond meeting the criteria for Satisfactory, include any of the following:
- One article-length reviewed publication (in print);
- One scholarly presentation and securing one substantial grant (external or internal);
- One scholarly presentation and a re-publication;
- Two or more scholarly presentations and submission of either an article-length reviewed publication or external grant proposal;

- A keynote, plenary, or featured presentation and submission of either an article-length reviewed publication or external grant proposal;
- A scholarly presentation, and either demonstrable progress toward a book-length reviewed publication or submission of a major external grant proposal;
- Continuing editorial output in journal or book series (if not counted under Service or Other Duties) and either demonstrable progress toward a book-length publication or submission of a major external grant proposal.

Note: A faculty member cannot earn Above Satisfactory two years in a row without some type of peer- or editorially-reviewed publication or award of an external grant. Progress toward a book-length publication typically moves from research and draft segments, to submission, to a contract, to post-review revision.

Outstanding

Combinations that will typically qualify for an Outstanding rating, beyond meeting the criteria for Above Satisfactory, include any of the following:

- A book-length reviewed publication (including edited collection with a substantial introduction or other content written by the faculty member);
- An awarded major external grant;
- Two or more article-length reviewed publications;
- An article-length publication and a re-publication;
- An article-length publication and an awarded substantial external grant;
- Two or more scholarly presentations, an article-length reviewed publication, and demonstrable progress toward another reviewed publication;
- A keynote, plenary, or featured presentation, article-length reviewed publication, and demonstrated progress toward another reviewed publication;
- A major research award, at least one scholarly presentation, and demonstrated progress toward another reviewed publication.

Note: Depending on its proven quality and continuing impact, the publication of a book-length publication could earn a faculty member an Outstanding rating over two review cycles (e.g., for a final contract and publication or for publication and reviews/recognition). In addition, a faculty member cannot earn an Outstanding rating two years in a row without a peer- or editorially-reviewed publication or external grant.

Other Duties Evaluation

By their nature "other" assignments are individual and cannot be evaluated by a single set of criteria. To aid in the definition and evaluations of these assignments, a job description will be prepared for each assignment specifying both regular duties (those that recur each semester or year) and special initiatives. The job description and expectations should be articulated and updated each annual period in a Memo of Understanding (MOU). For those with "other" assignments outside of the department, the chair will arrange for an evaluation on tasks completed in the "other duties" section from the immediate supervisor.

Note: These procedures do not apply to any percentage of a faculty member's assigned FTE that is designated as "unevaluated" under the collective bargaining agreement.

Evaluation Standards

Because of the individual nature of "other" assignment, no single set of specific criteria can be developed. However, the following principles guide such evaluations:

1. Expectations for performance will vary according to the percentage of FTE assigned for "other" duties; that is, those with higher FTE percentages assigned to "other" duties will be expected to perform more work than those with lower FTE percentages assigned to "other" duties.

2. For a satisfactory evaluation of an "other duties" assignment, the faculty members must meet the basic obligations listed in the job description. As much as possible, the threshold for satisfactory performance should be similar to that for teaching or service duties, including such things as meeting deadlines, following university policies, timely response to student and other inquiries, and the timely completion of tasks assigned by one's immediate supervisor.

3. Evaluations above satisfactory require performance beyond the threshold for satisfactory performance such as innovation regarding regular duties and completion of special initiatives important to the assignment.

As with all other sections, the faculty member should provide a **written explanation** with **artifacts** that evidence the explanation to account for contributions made in response to the "other duties" assignment.