## SOC Tenure-System Faculty Annual Review Criteria and Evaluation Rubric

Teaching & Advising/Mentoring (relative to rank, appointment, & workload distribution)

Faculty are evaluated only on their performance and demonstrated impact within the most recent calendar year. This rubric is calibrated to a tenured Associate Professor who is appointed 100% in Sociology with a 40% teaching workload. The criteria (A, B, & C) are arranged vertically in order of descending importance.

Criterion	Doesn't Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceptional
A. Teaching in Undergraduate &/or Graduate Courses <sup>1</sup>	didn't fulfill SOC teaching obligation	fulfilled SOC teaching obligation	fulfilled SOC teaching obligation	fulfilled SOC teaching obligations
	course syllabi lacked specific, measurable learning outcomes	course syllabi had specific, measurable learning outcomes	course syllabi had specific, measurable learning outcomes linked to assessments	course syllabi had specific, measurable learning outcomes linked to assessments
	didn't regularly use scholarly teaching methods <sup>2</sup>	regularly used scholarly teaching methods	regularly used scholarly teaching methods with occasional innovation	regularly used innovative scholarly teaching methods
	didn't provide &/or reflect upon course evaluation data	consistently had "moderate help/gains" SALG scores/comments	consistently had "much help/gains" SALG scores/comments	consistently had at least "much help/gains" SALG scores/comments
	provided no evidence of student learning gains	provided indirect evidence of learning gains	provided direct evidence of student learning gains	provided strong direct evidence of student learning gains
B. Graduate Student Advising &/or Mentoring	served on no SOC guidance committee	served on 1-3 SOC guidance committees	served on 4-6 SOC guidance committees	served on 7+ SOC guidance committees
	chaired no SOC guidance committee	chaired 1 SOC guidance committee	chaired 2-3 SOC guidance committees	chaired 4+ SOC guidance committees
	funded no SOC PhD student	funded a SOC PhD student as 1/4-time GRA or via hourly wage work	externally funded a SOC PhD student as 1/2-time GRA for 1 semester	externally funded a SOC PhD student as 1/2-time GRA for 2 semesters
	didn't co-author any manuscript with any SOC PhD student	co-authored 1 manuscript under review with a SOC PhD student	co-authored 1 peer- reviewed publication with a SOC PhD student	co-authored 2+ peer- reviewed publications with a SOC PhD students
			major advisee earned PhD & secured postdoc or tenure-system position as initial placement	major advisee earned PhD & secured tenure-system position in AAU institution as initial placement
C. Pedagogical or Curricular Development, Contributions, and/or Recognition		delivered no guest lecture in a course	delivered guest lecture in a course	delivered guest lectures in several courses
		oversaw no Honors Options	oversaw 1-2 Honors Options	oversaw 3+ Honors Options
		mentored no student in undergraduate research (SOC 497)	mentored 1 student in undergraduate research (SOC 497)	mentored 2+ students in undergraduate research (SOC 497)
		guided no student in independent study (SOC 496)	guided 1 student in independent study (SOC 496)	guided 2+ students in independent study (SOC 496)
		participated in 1 teaching & learning workshop, institute, or program	participated in 2+ teaching & learning workshops, institutes, or programs	organized &/or led a teaching & learning workshop, institute, or program
		had 1 teaching & learning grant proposal &/or manuscript under review	had 1 teaching & learning funded grant &/or publication	had 2+ teaching & learning funded grants &/or publications
			received departmental or college teaching, advising, or mentoring award or honor	received prestigious university or professional teaching, advising, or mentoring award or honor

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Faculty **meet** their departmental teaching obligation for an academic year by teaching the full number of courses required by their teaching workload percentage OR a lesser number of courses that is reduced due to department-approved releases, buyouts, or leaves. Faculty who teach no courses in and/or for the department during the reporting period (due to department-approved releases, buyouts, or leaves) will not be evaluated on this criterion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> "Scholarly teaching" means that instructional practices are based on and explicitly tied to best practices as described in peerreviewed literatures on pedagogical practices and student learning.

## SOC Tenure-System Faculty Annual Review Criteria and Evaluation Rubric

Research & Grants (relative to rank, appointment, & workload distribution)

Faculty are evaluated on their performance and demonstrated impact within the **three most recent calendar years**. This rubric is calibrated to a tenured Associate Professor who is appointed 100% in Sociology with a 40% research workload. The criteria (A, B, & C) are arranged vertically in order of descending importance.

Criterion	Doesn't Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expe	ctations	Exceptional			
A. Publications <sup>3</sup>								
A1. Productivity	<6 journal article equivalents (<2 per year)	6 journal article equivalents (2 per year)  9-12 journal a equivalents (3-4 per year)		cle	15+ journal article equivalents (5+ per year)			
	Conversion Rates for Different Types of Peer-Reviewed Publications							
	1 peer-re 1 sole-au 1 co-autl 1 sole-ec 1 co-edit 1 book c	<ul> <li>1.0 journal article equivalent</li> <li>4-8 journal article equivalents</li> <li>2-4 journal article equivalents</li> <li>2-3 journal article equivalents</li> <li>1-2 journal article equivalents</li> <li>0.5 journal article equivalents</li> </ul>						
	The next two sub-criteria (Que publications counted in the Padditional clarifying details.	roductivity sub-criterion abo While it is hard to assess, w	ove. See the Publi e believe quality i	cations Cr s more im	iterion Appendix for portant than sheer quantity.			
A2. Quality	Since scholarship quality may not be accurately assessed until several years after publication, we evaluate newly published works by their <i>placement quality</i> .							
	we use two criteria (listed in peer-reviewed journal articles  • whether or not the artic o a prestigious journal o a leading journal with o a leading journal acros the journal's 1-year Jou	ine or field, or journals, leading sociological sub-disciplinar						
	We judge the <i>placement quality</i> of newly published authored or edited books based upon the publisher (in order of descending quality):  • a prestigious university press,  • a highly regarded trade press,  • a respectable (but not prestigious) university press, and  • all other presses.							
A3. Authorship	We expect a mix of sole-, lead-, and co-authored publications over the reporting period. We judge the value of authorship patterns (in order of descending value) as such:  • sole-authored publication,  • lead-authored publication,  • co-authored publication with current MSU PhD student as lead-author,  • co-authored publication with recently graduated (within 3 years) MSU PhD student as lead-author, and  • all other co-authored publications.							
B. Grants	submitted (as PI, Co-PI/I, or Other Senior Personnel) 0 proposals to an external or internal grant competition	submitted (as PI, Co-PI/I, or Other Senior Personnel) 1+ proposal to external grant competition OR						
		managed (as PI, Co-PI/I, or Other Senior Personnel) 1 already funded competitive external grant	managed (as PI, or Other Senior Personnel) 2+ al- funded competiti external grants	ready				
		OR	OR		OR			
		received (as PI, Co-PI/I, or Other Senior Personnel) 1+ newly funded competitive internal grant(s)	received (as Co- Other Senior Per 1+ newly funded competitive exte grant(s)	rsonnel) I	received (as PI) 1+ newly funded competitive external grant(s)			
C. Awards			received a composite internal research		received a competitive national or international research award			

<sup>3</sup> The number of publications expected for each performance level is multiplied by 1.25 for faculty with a 50% research workload and is multiplied by 0.625 for faculty with a 25% research workload. Publication date is based on DOI. In the case of unavailable DOI, publication date is based on the date in print.

## SOC Tenure-System Faculty Annual Review Criteria and Evaluation Rubric

Service, Outreach, & Engagement (relative to rank, appointment, & workload distribution)

Faculty are evaluated only on their performance and demonstrated impact within the **most recent calendar year**. This rubric is calibrated to a tenured Associate Professor who is appointed 100% in Sociology with a 20% service workload. The criteria (A, B, & C)—and sub-criteria (A1, A2, & A3)—are arranged vertically in order of descending importance.

Criterion	Doesn't Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceptional
A. Service within MSU	didn't attend all departmental meetings <sup>5</sup>	attended all departmental meetings	actively participated in all departmental meetings	actively participated in all departmental meetings
A1. Department <sup>4</sup> A2. College A3. University	didn't fully engage with members of assigned departmental committee(s)	fully engaged with members of assigned departmental committee(s)	exhibited leadership via engaging with members of assigned departmental committee(s)	provided evidence of leadership when engaging with members of assigned departmental committee(s)
	didn't consistently participate in tasks of assigned departmental committee(s)	consistently participated in tasks of assigned departmental committee(s)	demonstrated initiative via participating in tasks of assigned committee(s)	provided evidence of personal contribution to completed tasks of assigned committee(s)
			served on a departmental faculty search committee	chaired a departmental faculty search committee
	performed no service that directly engaged with students <sup>6</sup>	performed some service that directly engaged with students	performed much service that directly engaged with students	provided evidence of positive impact of service that directly engaged with students
			actively served on college &/or university committees, councils, boards, or task forces	provided evidence of leadership via service on college &/or university committees, councils, boards, or task forces
B. Service within Profession	reviewed <5 total journal manuscripts, book proposals or manuscripts, & external agency grant proposals	reviewed 5-8 total journal manuscripts, book proposals or manuscripts, & external agency grant proposals	reviewed 9-12 total journal manuscripts, book proposals or manuscripts, & external agency grant proposals	reviewed 13+ total journal manuscripts, book proposals or manuscripts, & external agency grant proposals
	served on 0 journal editorial boards	served on 1 journal editorial board	served on 2-3 journal editorial boards	served on 4+ journal editorial boards
	didn't serve as a session organizer, presider, or discussant at any professional conference	served as a session organizer, presider, or discussant at 1 state or regional professional conference	served as a session organizer, presider, or discussant at 1 national or international professional conference	served as a session organizer, presider, or discussant at 2+ national or international professional conferences
			organized a state or regional conference, symposia, or workshop	organized a national or international conference, symposia, or workshop
			elected/nominated member of professional association's section, division, or committee	elected leader of a professional association's section, division, or committee
			member of 1-2 prestigious task forces, advisory boards, or councils	leader of 1-2 prestigious task forces, advisory boards, or councils
			received state or regional professional association service award	received national or international professional association service award
C. Service to & Engagement with Publics	didn't engage with publics or stakeholder groups	engaged at least some with publics or stakeholder groups	engaged regularly & deeply with publics or stakeholder groups	demonstrated leadership when engaging with publics or stakeholder groups

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Faculty **meet** their departmental service obligation for an academic year by performing the following:

- Assistant Professors should serve on at least 1 departmental standing committee, though aren't expected to chair the committee;
- Associate Professors should serve on (and *possibly* chair) at least 1 departmental standing committee and *possibly* represent the department on at least 1 college or university committee;
- Professors should serve on (and *likely* chair) 1 or 2 departmental standing committees and *likely* represent the department on at least 1 college or university committee.

Faculty with no—or a greatly reduced—departmental service obligation during the reporting period (due to department-approved leaves or modified duties) will not be evaluated on this criterion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> We expect that all tenure-system faculty will attend the entirety of all departmental meetings. Exceptions include, but are not limited to, a time conflict with an MSU course, a department-approved leave, and a department-approved trip on university business.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Such service includes, but is not limited to, being a faculty advisor to a registered student organization (RSO); participating in RSO events; & organizing &/or participating in events with/for students (e.g., workshops, panel discussions, debates).