

## Yearly Evaluation Criteria (Department of Philosophy)

Yearly Evaluation	Teaching	Scholarship and Professional activity	Advisement and Service
Superior (2.8-3)	Excellent student evaluations And Classes are planned well, dynamic, and engaging And Syllabi complete and clear And Performs yearly analysis of pedagogy	Demonstrated progress on a book or textbook And/or Peer-reviewed article accepted for print And/or Awarded funded external grant And/or Elected officer in national professional organization	Any two of: Important committee chair Department chair Program chair Gives students help with job, graduate school and law school placement Arrangement and execution of student activities related to the discipline
Very Good (2.5-2.7)	Strong student evaluations And Classes are well taught And Performs yearly analysis of current pedagogy	Peer-reviewed paper delivered at a national or regional conference And/or Invited presentation And/or Elected officer in regional professional organization And/or Served as peer reviewer for journals or granting organizations	Actively serves on key university committees And either Gives students help with job, graduate school and law school placement Or Arrangement and execution of student activities related to the discipline
Good (2.2-2.4)	Good student evaluations And Classes in line with course syllabus And For courses with multiple sections, common syllabus elements followed And Performs yearly analysis of current pedagogy	Book review And/or Non-peer-reviewed paper delivered at national or regional conference And/or Awarded Martine or Keenan grant And/or Private publication of in-house textbook And/or Professional Memberships	Actively serves on school committees And Actively serves on departmental committees
Needs improvement (1.9-2.1)	Student evaluations show some dissatisfaction with the instructor And	Only occasionally involved in professional activity or scholarship	Only occasionally serves on committees or engages in student advisement

Conference with chair necessary to set goals for next evaluation	Course syllabi remain unchanged for years; Or No yearly examination of pedagogy		
Poor (below 1.9)	No yearly examination of pedagogy Or Missed classes not made up Or Instructor routinely late for class Or Assignments not returned in a timely fashion Or Incomplete syllabus or syllabus not followed	Little or no scholarly or professional activity	Reluctant to serve on university, school, or departmental committees And advises no students
Category Multiplier	5	3	2

Quantitative Ranking Scale

28-30	Superior
26-27.9	Very Good
24-25.9	Good
22-23.9	Average
0-21.9	Poor