

Department of Kinesiology Faculty Performance Criteria

Faculty members at JMU are assessed on their performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. While performance in these areas is assessed independently, these central functions are inextricably linked. A professor's workload typically consists of a reasonable mixture of teaching, scholarship, and service. While teaching is our most important function, we believe that a continuing program of relevant scholarship enhances teaching and teaching motivates scholarly inquiry. Involvement in service similarly motivates teaching and scholarly inquiry. So, again, these three pillars of the professorate are inextricably linked and are interdependent.

Teaching.

The Department of Kinesiology regards teaching as the most important aspect of our professional responsibilities. Teaching involves instructional planning and assessment, in-class and out-of-class activities (e.g., office meetings devoted to course tutoring), and advising and career counseling. (minimum weight of 40%)

Criteria.

- Provide a course syllabus at the beginning of the course.
- State clear and relevant learning goals in the syllabus.
- Establish and include in the syllabus reasonably high expectations that challenge all students.
- Include in each course relevant educational experiences that achieve the stated learning goals.
- Show a command of content in areas of specialization and remain current in the discipline/field.
- Use a variety of instructional approaches appropriate for the class size to enhance learning.
- Use a variety of assessment methods appropriate for the class size to evaluate student mastery of course content.
- Grade fairly and return assignments in a timely manner.
- Maintain a respectful and orderly classroom
- Post and maintain office hours in accordance with departmental policy
- Maintain responsive and professional communication with students.

Sources of evidence. Effective teaching has many sources of evidence, including, but not limited to:

- Course evaluations*
- Course syllabi*
- Self-reflective evaluations * (tied to the Annual Plan & Individual Courses)
- Peer classroom observations
- Examples of student work
- Course materials (e.g., power point presentation, assignments & rubrics, assessments)
- Continued professional development (on & off campus workshops)/ grants (support for continued professional growth)
- Letters of support from professional peer and colleagues
- Letters and comments from former and current students (clarify whether the items were solicited or unsolicited)
- List of theses (honors or graduate)
- Accounting of advisees

* required sources of evidence in the annual dossier

Assessment guidelines. There are a number of quantitative and qualitative criteria that should be considered in forming a judgment about teaching. The criteria noted below focus more on quality, which we consider the more important criteria. However, quantitative criteria, including the number of classes taught during the evaluation period, the number of different preparations, the level of the classes (from 100 to 700) and/or whether any of the classes is a new or revised class, should also be considered.

Exceptional (excellent) - Evidence indicates superlative teaching performance across all courses taught during the evaluation period. Across all courses student evaluations indicate superlative teaching. Exemplars include, but are not limited to:

1. On items 21 and 22, on the Course Evaluation form, 95% of the respondents are within the above average to excellent range.
2. Within the comments section on the Course Evaluation form, students on 75% of their responses list three or more common positive aspects of the course and minimal areas to improve.
3. Across all courses, observations of teaching by colleagues (including unit head) are judged as exceptional.

4. Across all courses, syllabi, materials, assignments and assessment instruments are, up-to-date, well organized, innovative and display evidence of self-reflection and related course refinements
5. Self-reflective evaluations address the teaching performance criteria

Exceeds expectations (excellent) - Evidence indicates very good teaching performance across all courses taught during the evaluation period. Across all courses, student evaluations indicate 'very good' teaching. Exemplars include, but are not limited to:

1. On items 21 and 22 on the Student Evaluation form, 85% of the respondents are within the above average to excellent.
2. Within the comments section on the Course Evaluation form, students on 75% of their responses list one or more common positive aspects of the course and minimal areas to improve.
3. Across all courses, observations of teaching by colleagues (including unit head) are judged as exceeds expectations on colleague assessment form.
4. Across all courses, syllabi, materials, assignments and assessment instruments are, up-to-date, well organized, innovative and display evidence of self-reflection and related course refinements
5. Self-reflective evaluations address the teaching performance criteria

Meets expectations (satisfactory) - Evidence indicates good teaching performance across all courses taught during the evaluation period. There is no conclusive evidence of poor or inferior teaching. Across all courses, student evaluations indicate satisfactory teaching. Exemplars include, but are not limited to:

1. On items 21 and 22 on the Student Evaluation form, 75% of the respondents are within the above average to excellent.
2. Within the comments section on the Course Evaluation form, students on 50% of their responses list one or more common positive aspects of the course and one or less common areas to improve.
3. Across all courses, observations of teaching by colleagues (including unit head) are judged as meets expectations with regard to teaching using the colleague assessment form.
4. Across all courses, syllabi, materials, assignments and assessment instruments are, up-to-date, well organized, innovative and display evidence of self-reflection and related course refinements
5. Self-reflective evaluations address the teaching performance criteria

Needs improvement* (satisfactory) - Evidence from all sources indicate adequate/satisfactory teaching, but with specific areas of concern, during the evaluation period. There is no conclusive evidence of unsatisfactory teaching, in general, but there is evidence to suggest that improvement is warranted. Across all courses taught within the evaluation period, student evaluations indicate satisfactory teaching. Exemplars include, but are not limited to:

1. On items 21 and 22 on the Student Evaluation form, less than 75% of the respondents are within the above average to excellent.
2. Within the comments section on the Course Evaluation form, students on 50% of their responses list one or more areas to improve.
3. Across all courses, observations of teaching by colleagues (including unit head) are judged as below expectations using the colleague assessment form with regard to teaching, but with reservations. These reservations/concerns must be clearly identified and articulated.
4. There is evidence of need for improvement in some or all courses, syllabi, materials, assignments and assessment instruments
5. Courses and materials may not be up-to-date, well organized, innovative or display evidence of self-reflection and related course refinements
6. Self-reflective evaluations address the teaching performance criteria

Unsatisfactory* (unsatisfactory) - Evidence from all sources indicate unacceptable teaching performance during the evaluation period. If this rating is continued from the previous semester, post-tenure review is required. [Operationally, this category is not employed before an individual has received a "below expectations" rating in the teaching category on a previous annual evaluation within the last three years. An unsatisfactory in teaching automatically triggers the post-tenure review process.]

*See the Faculty Handbook for details regarding post-tenure review.

Scholarly Achievements

In the Department of Kinesiology scholarship is broadly defined as an activity that involves the systematic uncovering of information within an academic discipline. Contributions to the body of knowledge within the discipline may range from theoretical/abstract pursuits to applied/clinical investigations. In evaluating scholarly productivity the quality and quantity of scholarship are considered. While a reasonable level of productivity is expected and encouraged, quality is more heavily weighted in the evaluation. Quality may be substantiated by the reputation of the publication(s) and/or conference(s) in which the scholarship is presented, by the fact that the scholarly contributions were peer reviewed and/or the subsequent impact of the scholarly work as indicated by citations or other recognition of merit.

A longitudinal plan for scholarship must exist. This plan should be congruent with the mission and resources of the institution, the college and the academic unit. It should be reasonable/achievable and updated annually. Scholarly projects and anticipated progress toward dissemination should be specified in the plan. If a project is a collaborative effort, the faculty member's contribution (in percentage) should be estimated. Dissemination of the scholarly information should be the focus of the evaluation, although the normal delays associated with the review process should be taken into consideration. (minimum weight of 15%, with allowances for faculty members with Renewable Term Agreements.)

Criteria.

- Demonstrate a history of continuous involvement in scholarship.
- Create and maintain an organized plan that:
 - identifies the area of scholarly inquiry
 - highlights a systematic approach to answering questions within area of inquiry
 - shows the potential of the scholarship to contribute to the body of knowledge within the faculty member's discipline.
- Provide evidence of dissemination.

Sources of evidence. Effective scholarship has many sources of evidence, including, but not limited to:

- Publication of original scholarship in quality peer-reviewed journals and other professional media (books, professional internet sites, etc.).
- Presentation of original scholarship at professional conferences, workshops, etc.
- Professional recognition of scholarly work (citations, awards, etc.).
- External funding to support scholarship.
- Internal grant funding
- Editorial contributions to peer-reviewed journals and other professional media
- Reports of progress. These reports indicate the progress made on a scholarly project during the assessment period. A report should be completed for each project still under progress.

Assessment guidelines.

Exceptional (excellent) - In addition to exceeding expectations, the faculty member has

1. a published peer-reviewed manuscript that is of exceptional quality, or
2. published multiple peer-reviewed manuscripts within the current academic year, or
3. secured external funding to support scholarship that can be broadly disseminated

Exceeds expectations (excellent) - In addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member has

1. worked as a primary contributor to a manuscript published in a peer-reviewed journal within the current academic year, or
2. made significant progress, as judged by PAC, toward fulfilling the annual goals for disseminating peer-reviewed scholarship and/or securing external funding (e.g. the faculty member may have submitted two or more manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals)

Meets expectations (satisfactory) - The faculty member has:

1. a demonstrated history of continuous involvement in scholarship,
2. an organized plan for scholarship
3. presented evidence of disseminating scholarly work and/or securing funding for scholarship within current academic year.
4. In order to meet expectations, presentations and publications must be disseminated through professional media, but do not need to be peer-reviewed.

Needs Improvement (satisfactory) - The faculty member has:

1. an organized plan for scholarship, but
2. not provided a history of continuous involvement in scholarship, or
3. not presented evidence of disseminating scholarly work.

Unsatisfactory (unsatisfactory) - The faculty member fails to:

1. provided an organized plan for scholarship, and
2. contributed to scholarship during the evaluation period

Service.

The Department of Kinesiology requires that all faculty members make service contributions within the university and values service to the community and professional organizations. Service includes, but is not limited to, departmental program coordination and serving on search committees, as well as other committees within the university and community/educational/professional organizations. Committee and organizational leadership responsibilities are valued by the department. (minimum weight of 15%)

Criteria.

- Assume leadership responsibility for departmental service in accordance with departmental needs.
- Serve on at least one additional committee at the department level, if needed to equitably distribute the overall departmental service load..
- Assist with at least one service need at the college or university level, within community or for a professional organization.

Sources of evidence. Effective service has many sources of evidence, including, but not limited to:

- Committee minutes.
- Reports.
- Letters from chairs and/or colleagues.
- Other documented evidence of community, educational or professional service.

Assessment guidelines.

Exceptional (excellent) - Multiple sources of evidence suggest a consistent pattern of service contributions. In addition to exceeding expectations, the faculty member will:

1. Provide executive leadership to a community program or professional organization, or
2. Provide leadership to a college or university committee, although it is not necessary to be the committee chair

Exceed expectations (excellent) - Multiple sources of evidence suggest a consistent pattern of service contributions. In addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member will:

1. Assist with one additional service need at the college or university level, or
2. Provide committee leadership to a community program or professional organization, or,
3. Write a major report required for accreditation or academic program review

Meets expectations (satisfactory) - Multiple sources of evidence suggest a consistent pattern of service contributions in order to meet expectations the faculty member will:

1. Provide service leadership within the department.
2. Serve on at least one additional committee at the department level, if needed to equitably distribute the overall departmental service load.
3. Assist with at least one service need at the college or university level, within the community or for a professional organization.

Needs Improvement (satisfactory) - Multiple sources of evidence suggest a consistent pattern of service that falls below the minimum criteria required to meet expectations.

1. Assisting with, but not providing leadership to, at least one service need at the department level
2. Assisting with at least one service need at the college or university level, within the community or for a professional organization

Unsatisfactory (unsatisfactory) - Multiple sources of evidence suggest a consistent pattern of service that falls below the minimum criteria listed in the Needs Improvement category.