NTID Faculty Annual Review
Rating Guidelines (April, 2016)

According to RIT Policy E.07 (“Annual Review of Faculty”):

“A faculty member receives a performance evaluation for each area as appropriate and according to one's plan of work, and an overall evaluation. The performance categories for evaluating all faculty members with respect to their annual plans of work shall be: Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, and Unsatisfactory.

- **Outstanding** reflects performance that represents a truly exceptional level of accomplishment.
- **Exceeds Expectations** reflects performance that exceeds the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member.
- **Meets Expectations** reflects the performance that meets the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member.
- **Does Not Meet Expectations** reflects performance that does not meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member. This rating indicates a deficiency beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.
- **Unsatisfactory** reflects performance that repeatedly fails to meet the level of accomplishment in relation to the expectations for a given faculty member in a way that reflects disregard of previous reviews or other documented efforts to provide correction or assistance.”

The following matrix provides a guideline for assignment of performance ratings to NTID faculty in the annual review process in the teaching/tutoring, communication, scholarship and service categories. The examples given in each cell are intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Teaching/Tutoring</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Demonstrated excellence in teaching/tutoring effectiveness and accomplishments as evidenced by student ratings, chairperson observations, peer testimonials, awards, and/or other evidence</td>
<td>Exhibited outstanding effort to improve communication ability and/or awareness of Deaf culture, documented by course/workshop attendance, student evaluations, SLPI rating, or peer feedback.</td>
<td>Disseminated peer-reviewed scholarship of exceptional quality and/or quantity, such as: major publication, patents, grants, catalogues, screenings, online publishing, exhibition at nationally or internationally-recognized venue, major commissioned work, consulting, jurying, etc.</td>
<td>Service contributions with demonstrated leadership at the university or national level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Taught/tutored according to Plan of Work</th>
<th>Established and implemented a communication plan with a clearly stated goal for improvement.</th>
<th>Engaged in scholarship activity through research, publication, presentation, innovative pedagogy and/or creative activity leading to the dissemination of peer-reviewed contribution.</th>
<th>Service contributions with demonstrated leadership. Active participation in professional organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Demonstrates good teaching/tutoring effectiveness as evidenced by student ratings, chairperson observations, peer testimonials, and/or other evidence.</td>
<td>Little or no attempt to develop and/or implement a communication plan</td>
<td>Little or no scholarship through research, publications, presentations, innovative pedagogy and/or new creative activity.</td>
<td>Average level of service contributions as outlined in POW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet Expectations</td>
<td>Demonstrated poor teaching and/or tutoring effectiveness</td>
<td>Repeated deficiency in implementation of a communication development plan</td>
<td>Repeated deficiency in scholarship as noted in previous reviews without any plan or strategy for action</td>
<td>Minimal service contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Repeated deficiency in teaching and/or tutoring effectiveness as noted in previous reviews</td>
<td>Repeated deficiency in implementation of a communication development plan</td>
<td>Repeated deficiency in service membership and contributions</td>
<td>Repeated deficiency in service membership and contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No demonstrable plan or strategy for improvement</td>
<td>Disregarded previous reviews concerning a communication plan</td>
<td>Disregarded previous reviews concerning service contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to assign overall ratings to faculty in each of the three portfolios, teaching/tutoring, balanced & lecturer, chairpersons should apply the following criteria. Please note, however, that:

• These are generic guidelines, not hard and fast rules.
• They do not cover all possible combinations of individual category ratings (where the mix of individual ratings is different from the combinations set out below, chairs should exercise careful judgment)
• They do not cover every possible combination
• While the immediate point of an appraisal is to appraise past performance, the underlying goal is to improve future performance. A punitive approach is unlikely to achieve that goal.
• The basis for appraisal must always be the POW. Therefore, it is very important that POWs be written carefully and, if necessary, updated during the course of the academic year.
• Appraisals are individual. It is generally not a good idea to rate one individual largely on the basis of how he or she compares to his or her peers in the department.
• An overall rating of “Needs Improvement” requires that the chair and the faculty member agree upon an improvement plan for the following year.

**Faculty on the Teaching/Tutoring portfolio**

The faculty member who:
• Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring
• Exceeds Expectations in at least two other categories
• Meets Expectations in remaining categories

has earned an overall rating of **Outstanding**.

The faculty member who:
• Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring
• Meets Expectations in all other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations**.

The faculty member who:
• Exceeds Expectations in teaching/tutoring
• Meets Expectations in at least two other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Meets Expectations**.

The faculty member who:
• Does Not Meet Expectations teaching/tutoring
• Does no better than Meets Expectations in all other categories

has earned an overall rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations**.
Faculty on the Balanced portfolio

The faculty member who:
• Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring OR scholarship
• Exceeds Expectations in at least two other categories
• Meet Expectations in remaining categories
has earned an overall rating of **Outstanding**.

The faculty member who:
• Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring OR scholarship
• Meets Expectations in all other categories
has earned an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations**.

The faculty member who:
• Exceeds Expectations in teaching/tutoring OR scholarship
• Meets Expectations in at least two other categories
has earned an overall rating of **Meets Expectations**.

The faculty member who:
• Does Not Meet Expectations teaching/tutoring OR scholarship
• Does no better than Meets Expectations in all other categories
has earned an overall rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations**.

Faculty on the Lecturer portfolio

The lecturer who:
• Is Outstanding in teaching/tutoring
• Exceeds Expectations in all other categories in the POW
has earned an overall rating of **Outstanding**.

The lecturer who:
• Exceeds Expectations in teaching/tutoring
• Meets Expectations in all other categories in the POW
has earned an overall rating of **Exceeds Expectations**.

The lecturer who:
• Meets Expectations in teaching/tutoring
has earned an overall rating of **Meets Expectations**.