



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN
MISSISSIPPI.

SCHOOL OF OCEAN SCIENCE & ENGINEERING

ANNUAL EVALUATION
PROMOTION AND TENURE
GUIDELINES



Director

5/14/2021

Date



Dean

8/25/2021

Date



Provost

8/25/21

Date

School Policies and Procedures: Evaluation Processes

This is the first phase of school document creation and addresses annual evaluations, pre-tenure review, promotions, tenure, and post-tenure review.

School: School of Ocean Science and Engineering
Director: Dr. Robert Griffitt
College: Arts and Sciences
College Dean: Dr. Chris Winstead

Mission, Vision, and Values

School Mission

Our mission is to conduct innovative and impactful research on the oceans, atmosphere, geology, biota, and human dimensions in the Gulf of Mexico and beyond. We are a vibrant research enterprise with a focus on delivering exceptional education and mentoring, addressing chronic and episodic problems in the marine environment, and promoting the sustainable use of the habitats and resources to enhance the quality of life for the citizens of the state of Mississippi.

School Vision

SOSE strives to be among the premier organizations conducting research in coastal, marine and hydrographic sciences and ocean engineering and providing exceptional graduate and undergraduate education for the State of Mississippi and the nation.

School Values

SOSE:

- Provides conceptual and integrative foundations for the science-based integration of social, natural, and conservation issues related to coastal and marine human development and ecosystem resilience.
- Diagnoses environmental problems to promote the sustainability of coastal and marine ecosystems and the human communities that depend on them.
- Connects science to action through research that informs policy, trains leaders, creates innovative products, empowers communities, and supports environmental entrepreneurship.
- Emphasizes innovation in teaching, including field involvement, small class environments, modern technological resources, and compelling laboratory instruction.
- Builds collegial environments that support individual growth and creativity. Endpoints are research accomplishments, academic excellence, job placement, and personal well-being.
- Promotes sustainability through our individual, collective, and multi-institutional actions.

FACULTY WORKLOAD AND EVALUATION

General Statement About SOSE Faculty Workload

Course offerings and degree programs differ between the two Divisions of SOSE. Similarly, the baseline effort allocations between the Division of Coastal Sciences (COA) and the Division of Marine Science (DMS) differ slightly, as do the evaluation criteria.

Division- and classification-specific workload rubric for tenure-track faculty in COA and DMS.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Pre-tenure COA</u>	<u>Tenured COA</u>	<u>DMS</u>
Research	70%	65%	40-50%
Teaching	20%	20%	30-40%
Service	10%	15%	20%

SOSE faculty are recognized as having a significant research component in their workload portfolio. The workload policy and evaluation framework must allow for flexibility to pursue research. When a faculty member is hired, modifications to these general percentages may be made depending on the school's current and anticipated needs. These modifications could include relief from teaching and service obligations during their first year of employment so they can focus on developing their research enterprises.

Teaching Track Faculty workload responsibilities are (generally) 80% teaching, 10% service, and 10% research. Evaluation will be provided by the FEC committee within SOSE, following the same procedures as for Tenure-Track Faculty.

Faculty workload responsibilities, and evaluation expectations, can be modified through meetings between the SOSE Director, SOSE Associate Director and the individual faculty member as part of the regular workload expectations meetings at the end of each academic year.

General Statement About SOSE Faculty Evaluation

This section describes proposed updates to the existing FEC rubric (Appendix A) that replaces the current rubric (Appendix B). The updated rubric is intended to satisfy the following:

- 1.) Align with the changes in the USM Faculty Handbook and USM requirements,
- 2.) Respond to feedback from the SOSE Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) after the 2019 to 2020 (18-month) evaluation process,
- 3.) Strive to directly 'map' the required faculty input to Digital Measures to the rubric used by the FEC,
- 4.) Provide guidance to SOSE's FEC committees to increase transparency of the scoring process for faculty, and
- 5.) Highlight future directions for SOSE faculty engagement and evaluation.

1. Alignment to Faculty Handbook and USM Requirements.

The University administration and the Faculty Handbook committee of USM's Faculty Senate have suggested that a rubric entry describing faculty "engagement" be included for categories teaching, research, and service. In response, the Policies and Procedures Committee has included this Rubric Sub-Category and concludes that this is a *qualitative* and *self-reported* entry that should be addressed in the faculty member's annual evaluation narrative. The purpose of the engagement category is to provide context and details about the faculty member's activity that is not reflected in the other reporting categories but instead describes the effort that the faculty

member has made to engage the learning and scientific community and the larger community of stakeholders of the University.

From the Faculty Handbook: “Faculty are expected to be engaged citizens of the University. This [i.e., the new Rubric Sub-Category] provides a method for including engagement in the annual evaluation. This also provides flexibility for how each academic unit will define engagement within their unit documents.”

To satisfy this requirement, new rubric categories (Teaching 05, Research 05, and Service 05) are included that address the engagement requirement for consideration and approval by the faculty.

Following deliberations and vote, the Faculty Senate (Fall, 2020) concluded that it was necessary to recognize an engagement requirement. This rubric criterion will replace the previously included collegiality criteria. This action is part of the process of removing Faculty Engagement from the Employee Handbook and returning it to the Faculty Handbook. Engagement will be evaluated as part of teaching, research and creative activities, and service, much the same way that collegiality was previously assessed.

2. Respond to feedback from the SOSE FEC’s after the 2019 to 2020 (18-month) evaluation process.

Following the 2019 to 2020 evaluation process the SOSE FECs met individually and jointly to discuss ways to improve the evaluation process, address the challenges of using the Digital Measures, and critically evaluate the existing rubric to ensure that the diversity of faculty activity is credited and assessed. Following these deliberations, it was clear that modifications of the rubric were required to improve transparency of the evaluation process. Many of these aspects are described below and include changes to the rubric as well as to the evaluation process.

3. Directly ‘map’ the required faculty input to Digital Measures to the rubric used by the FEC.

One of the primary conclusions of the SOSE FECs deliberations was that the evaluation process was unnecessarily cumbersome because the fields that faculty members complete in Digital Measures were not organized in a coherent way in the evaluation rubric. The updated rubric attempts to make a straightforward and direct representation of each faculty member’s annual activity using Digital Measures.

4. Provide guidance to SOSE’s FEC committees to increase transparency of the scoring process for faculty.

It is intended that the updated rubric will improve transparency in faculty evaluation because it requires detailed sub-category scores as well as the aggregate score to be reported to the faculty. In the proposed reorganization of the rubric, the scoring will proceed as directed by USM: Each of the five subcategories (01 to 05) will be assigned a categorical score of “DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS”, “MEETS EXPECTATIONS”, or “EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS” by the evaluation team.

The proposed rubric and FEC evaluation approach will allow faculty to fully understand how category and sub-category scores are derived. In each category, the sub-category (01 to 05) scores have different impacts to the aggregate category score, the first element in each category is an award, this may not be applicable for all faculty, for all years. Therefore, the weights of each subcategory that contribute to the final category score are not equal. A score in a subcategory is determined by expectation considering the professional trajectory and rank of the faculty. Additional consideration will include evaluating previous years’ evaluations, goals as agreed upon by the faculty member and division leadership, and their narrative letter, including evidence of concerted effort to improve in those areas that needed improvement. In this way, the evaluation of a subcategory score and the full category score is holistic. For example, in the context of teaching, a record of poor student evaluations can be problematic. A faculty member that has documented their efforts to be responsive to this issue would be credited in the subcategory.

The rationale for the scores and any implicit weighting will be in the form of a narrative supplied by the committee to the faculty member. Comments are provided to the faculty by the FEC members for each of the sub-categories as well as the larger rubric categories (e.g., Teaching, Research, Service).

5. Highlight future directions for SOSE faculty evaluation.

We identified needs for SOSE to promote faculty improvement by using the evaluation as a diagnostic tool. We highlight the need for SOSE to:

- a. Derive a peer-mentoring effort for successful grant completion activity, especially those at an early career stage.
- b. For some faculty, there is an expectation for recruitment activity that is disproportionate. It is appropriate that faculty devote some effort to this, however this should not be a primary role of faculty.
- c. Develop protocols and program for peer-review teaching evaluation. We recognize that SOSE resources would need to be directed towards this effort and that there is a need for the peer review to have domain knowledge of the subject's material.

I. TENURED AND TENURE TRACK EXPECTATIONS

Teaching Expectations

For COA and DMS pre-tenured faculty, every effort will be made to release first-year faculty from teaching obligations for their first two semesters, unless there are critical course delivery needs for which they were explicitly hired. Annual DMS teaching expectation is 3 courses (3 hours) per year, distributed as 2 Fall and 1 Spring courses or 1 Fall and 2 Spring courses in each academic year. Generally, Ocean Engineering (OE) faculty are expected to teach 4 (3 hour) courses per year. A laboratory course, or a course with extensive practical exercises, counts as 1 of the 3. Annual COA teaching expectation is typically 3 graduate courses (3 hour) per two years. Mentorship of graduate and undergraduate students is also expected of COA and DMS pre-tenured faculty.

Assistant Professors are expected to show promise as teachers, by teaching established classes effectively or by developing new courses that lie in their area of expertise, and to be effective mentors of graduate students.

Associate Professors are expected to have established an active extramurally funded research program that involves significant participation of graduate and, to the extent possible, undergraduate students. Associate Professors are expected to be good teachers as evidenced by development and contribution to both the graduate, and when possible undergraduate, curricula. Professors (Full) are expected to have sustained an extramurally funded research program that involves participation of graduate students and, to the extent possible, undergraduate students. Professors are expected to be accomplished teachers as evidenced by their contributions to both undergraduate and graduate curricula and students.

Proposed Structure for Evaluation of Teaching

The first column is the proposed organization with five sub-categories for the evaluation category “Teaching.” Each subcategory will be evaluated using the criteria: “DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS,” “MEETS EXPECTATIONS,” or “EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS.”

	Digital Measures Input
Teaching 01	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - A. Awards and Honors Related to Teaching
	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - B. Scheduled Teaching
Teaching 02	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - C. Teaching Innovation and Curriculum Development
Teaching 03	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - D. Directed Student Learning: Master's, Dissertation Committee Chair and Committee Membership, Post-Doctoral Advisement
Teaching 04	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - E. Non-Credit Instruction, includes all teaching and mentoring service outside of USM.
	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - F. Academic Advising (includes undergraduate)
Teaching 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in teaching activity. This will be evidenced by attention to student needs including timely correspondence, availability for meeting, and inclusion of students into professional and research opportunities. This is a <i>qualitative</i> and <i>self-reported</i> entry that should be addressed in the faculty member’s annual evaluation narrative.

Meets Expectations for Teaching:

1. Teaching the full complement of assigned courses, unless previously discussed with the appropriate SOSE Associate Director.
2. Adhering to the teaching expectations outlined in the Faculty Handbook. These expectations include:
 - a. providing classes with detailed syllabi on the first day of class. (At the faculty member's discretion and appropriate to class delivery method, syllabi may be distributed online, in print, or both.)
 - b. holding classes as assigned. (If missing a class is unavoidable, faculty members must attempt to provide students with an appropriate alternative, such as a make-up class or guest instructor.)
 - c. providing students with times of availability for conferral about course matters
 - d. complying with FERPA, adhering to the University's policy on Undergraduate Academic Grades, the Academic Integrity Policy, the Classroom Conduct Policy, and other teaching policies available on the University's Institutional Policies page.
3. Returning student assignments promptly and with constructive feedback.
4. Submitting grades, grade roster reports, and textbook orders on time.
5. Demonstrating effective teaching through:
 - a. Student evaluations with scores reported relative to those of similar course offerings (e.g., graduate level courses, discussion courses, laboratory, and tools courses).
 - b. Teaching portfolios (if required by the division) or other supporting documentation.
6. Demonstration of student mentoring activity.
7. Demonstration of other teaching activities (e.g., Guest Lectures, IVN courses, new course offerings, course improvements and modifications, participation in exchange programs)

Exceeds Expectations for Teaching

Satisfying one or more of the criteria below while also meeting the criteria from the "meets expectations" list. This list is not comprehensive and may include other projects and activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

1. Notably positive student evaluations.
2. Extraordinary individual attention to students through tutoring, conferencing, mentoring, or going to special lengths to enhance students' educational experience.
3. Planning and implementing a full creation or full redesign of a course.
4. Significantly redesigning or introducing new curriculum to advance program goals and enhance student learning. This could include offering special topics and other ad hoc courses to address student needs.
5. Recognition of pedagogical effectiveness/reputation, such as by receiving major awards.
6. Participation in the University's ACUE program, service-learning seminar, leading a teaching forum, or other ways of showing dedication to teaching excellence.
7. Securing internal or external grants to develop new teaching initiatives and methods.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Teaching

Failing to meet more than 1 of the criteria for "Meets Expectations for Teaching", without meeting at least one of the criteria for "Exceeds Expectations for Teaching" may constitute a failure to meet the annual expectations for this evaluation category. The faculty handbook states that faculty do not meet expectations in one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years would trigger a Post-Tenure review (section 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook).

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity

Assistant Professors are expected to be active researchers in their discipline, develop a strong, externally funded research program, publish in peer-reviewed literature, and present at scientific conferences. Assistant professors are also expected to begin developing a national reputation for expertise in their discipline.

Associate Professors and Professors will be expected to maintain a strong, externally funded research program and publish in peer-reviewed literature and present at scientific conferences. Associate Professors are expected to demonstrate a nationally recognized professional record of scholarship and to have actively participated and contributed to the larger scientific community at the regional, national, and international level.

In general, Professors are expected to have sustained a national and internationally recognized professional record of scholarship, and to have actively participated and contributed to the larger scientific community at the regional, national, and international level.

Proposed Structure for Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity

The first column is the proposed organization with five sub-categories for the evaluation category “Research/Creative Activity”. Each subcategory will be evaluated using the criteria: “DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS”, “MEETS EXPECTATIONS”, or “EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS”.

	Digital Measures Input
Research 01	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - A. Awards and Honors Related to Scholarship / Research
Research 02	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - B. Funded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - C. Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research NOT FUNDED
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - C. Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research Submitted
Research 03	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - D. Peer-Reviewed Publications Journal Article
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - E. Refereed Publications
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - F. Non-Refereed Publications
Research 04	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - H. Presentations
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - I. Media Contributions
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - J. Other Intellectual Contributions
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - K. Research, Creative, Scholarly Activity in Progress
Research 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in research activity as evidenced by the development of original and collaborative research and by supporting colleagues’ research efforts. This is a <i>qualitative</i> and <i>self-reported</i> entry that should be addressed in the faculty member’s annual evaluation narrative.

Meets Expectations for Research/ Creative Activity

1. Securing internal or external grants (or maintaining active grants) to support research efforts.
2. Evidence of active engagement in scholarly and creative projects through publishing scientific work in peer-reviewed journal articles or edited book chapters.
3. Submission of a book draft as part of a contract with a publisher.
4. Development and submission of proposals for external funding.
5. Administration of externally funded grants.
6. Participation in research activity (e.g., cruises, field/laboratory work, foreign research expeditions, etc.)
7. Participation in professional institutes, workshops, courses, and conferences

Exceeds Expectations for Research/Creative Activity

Satisfying one or more of the criteria below while also meeting the criteria from the “meets expectations” list. This list is not comprehensive and may include other projects and activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

1. Evidence of active engagement in scholarly and creative projects through publishing high-impact scientific work in peer-reviewed journal articles or edited book chapters.
2. Delivering keynote addresses and invited presentations at major international conferences.
3. Awarded large research grants that substantively raise the profile or research activity of SOSE and USM.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Research/Creative Activity

Failing to meet more than 1 of the criteria for “Meets Expectations for Research”, without meeting at least one of the criteria for “Exceeds Expectations for Research” may constitute a failure to meet the annual expectations for this evaluation category. The faculty handbook states that faculty do not meet expectations in one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years would trigger a Post-Tenure review (section 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook).

Service

SOSE's tenured faculty are expected to be involved in intra- and extramural service. Associate Professors are expected to play a role in both external and internal (University) service activities and should be seeking external service opportunities that serve to promote their broader professional engagement and recognition. Professors are expected to play a significant role in both internal (University) service activities and external service activities.

As noted above, SOSE's pre-tenure faculty are expected to be involved in intra- and extramural service. It is the expectation that the service requirements of first year faculty will be minimal.

Proposed Structure for Evaluation of Service

The first column is the proposed organization with five sub-categories for the evaluation category "Service". Each subcategory will be evaluated using the criteria: "DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS", "MEETS EXPECTATIONS", or "EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS".

	Digital Measures Input
Service 01	III. SERVICE - A. Awards and Honors Related to Service
Service 02	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service University Service
Service 03	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service College Service
	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service Department Service
Service 04	III. SERVICE - C. Professional and Public Service Professional Service
	III. SERVICE - C. Professional and Public Service Public Service
Service 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in service activity as evidenced by active, substantive participation in service activities. This is a <i>qualitative</i> and <i>self-reported</i> entry that should be addressed in the faculty member's annual evaluation narrative.

Meets Expectations for Service

Standard expectations for service activity may include the following:

1. Attending and actively participating in School and Division meetings.
2. Maintaining an active, engaged, and physical presence on campus for the purpose of supporting the life and goals of the School and University.
3. Actively participating in at least one Division, School, College, or University committee that meets regularly and requires a significant commitment of time or contributing to multiple committees with less onerous responsibilities.
4. Participating in recruitment and retention efforts when requested.
5. Participating in the School's hiring activities.
6. Contributing to respective disciplines through peer reviews, professional committee work, advisory panel work, grant and museum consultations, and other professional activities; or contributing significantly to student and faculty mentorship; or by contributing to academic discourse in the community through public presentations, museum consultations, organizing lecture series, developing

public websites, and other community activities related to scholarly work; or enhancing the campus community by advising clubs, participating in campus training and lecture series, contributing to student conferences and activities, and so forth.

7. Participating in discipline-related service that promotes and supports scientific inquiry. This service includes serving as an editor or reviewer for your discipline's scientific journal(s), serving in an executive capacity in a scientific society, or participating in a scientific society's meeting as an organizer.
8. Participating in public institutions and public policy deliberations as a discipline expert.

Exceeds Expectations for Service

Satisfying one or more of the criteria below while also meeting the criteria from the "meets expectations" list. This list is not comprehensive and may include other projects and activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

1. Chairing committees that require more time commitment than is typically expected.
2. Editing journals; conference planning; substantial peer reviews.
3. Sustained community projects related to the University's mission.
4. Considerable contributions to the accreditation process.
5. Engagement with policy makers and decision makers, especially in the context of promoting the blue economy.
6. Winning a major service award.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Service

Failing to meet more than 1 of the criteria for "Meets Expectations for Service", without meeting at least one of the criteria for "Exceeds Expectations for Service" may constitute a failure to meet the annual expectations for this evaluation category. The faculty handbook states that faculty do not meet expectations in one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years would trigger a Post-Tenure review (section 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook).

II. TEACHING TRACK EXPECTATIONS

Teaching

The primary mission of Teaching Faculty members is to provide instruction to graduate and undergraduate students in the classroom and via distance learning. All Teaching Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a pattern of excellence in teaching. Additional demonstration of teaching excellence may include teaching awards, teaching grants submitted or received, evidence of innovations in teaching or curriculum development, etc. It should be noted that “teaching” includes not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising, mentoring, and other forms of student engagement.

Assistant Teaching Professors are expected to show a demonstrated ability in good teaching as evidenced by contribution to the graduate and/or undergraduate curriculum, favorable student evaluations, and effort to improve teaching style and rapport with students and to show a clear interest in a program of scholarship.

Associate Teaching Professors are expected to demonstrate exceptional teaching and student mentorship at the undergraduate level and/or graduate level, as demonstrated by (at a minimum) annual performance reviews, peer evaluations of teaching or evaluation of a teaching portfolio, and student evaluations and to show a clear interest in a program of scholarship.

Teaching Professors are expected to demonstrate a pattern of exceptional teaching, to provide significant contributions at the undergraduate and/or graduate program levels in the design, implementation and evaluation of instructional programs, and to show a clear interest in a program of scholarship.

Instructors are expected to show a demonstrated ability in good teaching as evidenced by contribution to the undergraduate curriculum, favorable student evaluations, and effort to improve teaching style and rapport with students and to show a clear interest in a program of scholarship.

Lecturers are expected to show a demonstrated ability in good teaching as evidenced by contribution to the undergraduate curriculum, favorable student evaluations, and effort to improve teaching style and rapport with students and to show a clear interest in a program of scholarship.

Senior Lecturers are expected to show a pattern of excellence in teaching as evidenced by contribution to the undergraduate curriculum, favorable student evaluations, and effort to improve teaching style and rapport with students and to show a clear interest in a program of scholarship.

Proposed Structure for Evaluation of Teaching

The first column is the proposed organization with five sub-categories for the evaluation category “Teaching”. Each subcategory will be evaluated using the criteria: “DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS”, “MEETS EXPECTATIONS”, or “EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS”.

	Digital Measures Input
Teaching 01	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - A. Awards and Honors Related to Teaching
	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - B. Scheduled Teaching
Teaching 02	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - C. Teaching Innovation and Curriculum Development

Teaching 03	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - D. Directed Student Learning: Master's, Dissertation Committee Chair and Committee Membership, Post-Doctoral Advisement
Teaching 04	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - E. Non-Credit Instruction, includes all teaching and mentoring service outside of USM.
	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - F. Academic Advising (includes undergraduate)
Teaching 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in teaching activity. This will be evidenced by attention to student needs including timely correspondence, availability for meeting, and inclusion of students into professional and research opportunities. This is a <i>qualitative</i> and <i>self-reported</i> entry that should be addressed in the faculty member's annual evaluation narrative.

Meets Expectations for Teaching

1. Teaching the full complement of assigned courses, unless previously discussed with the appropriate SOSE Associate Director.
2. Adhering to the teaching expectations outlined in the Faculty Handbook. These expectations include:
 - a. providing classes with detailed syllabi on the first day of class. (At the faculty member's discretion and appropriate to class delivery method, syllabi may be distributed online, in print, or both.)
 - b. holding classes as assigned. (If missing a class is unavoidable, faculty members must attempt to provide students with an appropriate alternative, such as a make-up class or guest instructor.)
 - c. providing students with times of availability for conferral about course matters.
 - d. complying with FERPA, adhering to the University's policy on Undergraduate Academic Grades, the Academic Integrity Policy, the Classroom Conduct Policy, and other teaching policies available on the University's Institutional Policies page.
3. Documentation of revisions and updates to previously taught courses.
4. Returning student assignments promptly and with constructive feedback.
5. Submitting grades, grade roster reports, and textbook orders on time.
6. Demonstrating effective teaching through:
 - a. Student evaluations with scores reported relative to those of similar course offerings (e.g. graduate level courses, discussion courses, laboratory, and tools courses).
 - b. Teaching portfolios (if required by the division).
7. Demonstration of student mentoring:
 - a. Names of undergraduate students mentored (e.g. interns, supervised research projects, honors' theses) and documentation of the benefits to the student.
8. Demonstration of other teaching activities (e.g. Guest Lectures, IVN courses, new course offerings, course improvements and modifications, participation in exchange programs).

Exceeds Expectations for Teaching

Satisfying one or more of the criteria below while also meeting the criteria from the "meets expectations" list. This list is not comprehensive and may include other projects and activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

1. Notably positive student evaluations.
2. Extraordinary individual attention to students through tutoring, conferencing, mentoring, or going to special lengths to enhance students' educational experience.
3. Planning and implementing a full creation or full redesign of a course.
4. Significantly redesigning or introducing new curriculum to advance program goals and enhance student learning. This could include offering special topics and other ad hoc courses to address student needs.

5. Recognition of pedagogical effectiveness/reputation, such as by receiving major awards.
6. Participation in the University's ACUE program, service-learning seminar, leading a teaching forum, or other ways of showing dedication to teaching excellence.
7. Securing internal or external grants to develop new teaching initiatives and methods.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Teaching

Failing to meet more than 1 of the criteria for "Meets Expectations for Teaching", without meeting at least one of the criteria for "Exceeds Expectations for Teaching" may constitute a failure to meet the annual expectations for this evaluation category. The faculty handbook states that faculty do not meet expectations in one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years would trigger a Post-Tenure review (section 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook).

Scholarship/Professional Development

Research, particularly related to teaching, pedagogy, and student success is encouraged. USM has a variety of teaching development and engagement opportunities. Participation in these (e.g., ACUE, online teaching skill development) is strongly encouraged.

Proposed Structure for Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity

The first column is the proposed organization with five sub-categories for the evaluation category “Research/Creative Activity”. Each subcategory will be evaluated using the criteria: “DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS”, “MEETS EXPECTATIONS”, or “EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS”.

	Digital Measures Input
Research 01	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - A. Awards and Honors Related to Scholarship / Research
Research 02	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - B. Funded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - C. Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research NOT FUNDED
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - C. Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research Submitted
Research 03	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - D. Peer-Reviewed Publications Journal Article
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - E. Refereed Publications
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - F. Non-Refereed Publications
Research 04	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - H. Presentations
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - I. Media Contributions
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - J. Other Intellectual Contributions
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - K. Research, Creative, Scholarly Activity in Progress
Research 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in research activity as evidenced by the development of original and collaborative research and by supporting colleagues’ research efforts. This is a <i>qualitative</i> and <i>self-reported</i> entry that should be addressed in the faculty member’s annual evaluation narrative.

Meets Expectations for Scholarship/Professional Development

1. Participation in professional development opportunities (pedagogical training and seminars) offered at USM that enhances their ability to teach courses at the University.
2. Evidence of active engagement in scholarly and creative projects that focus on scientific pedagogy in peer-reviewed journal articles or edited book chapters.
3. Participation in professional institutes, workshops, courses, and conferences.

Exceeds Expectations for Scholarship/Professional Development

Satisfying one or more of the criteria below while also meeting the criteria from the “meets expectations” list. This list is not comprehensive and may include other projects and activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

1. Evidence of active engagement in scholarly and creative projects that focus on scientific pedagogy through publishing in peer-reviewed journal articles or edited book chapters.
2. Delivering keynote addresses and invited presentations at major international conferences.
3. Awarded large research grants that substantively raise the profile or educational activity of SOSE and USM.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Scholarship/Professional Development

Not satisfying expectations of category-specific performance will constitute a failure to meet the annual expectations for this evaluation category. The faculty handbook states that faculty do not meet expectations in one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years would trigger a Post-Tenure review (section 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook).

Service

Teaching faculty are expected to participate in service activities in support of the School, the College, the University, and their profession. Although not an exhaustive list, examples of service activities include serving on School or University committees, community education/outreach activities, leadership roles in professional societies, etc.

Proposed Structure for Evaluation of Service

The first column is the proposed organization with five sub-categories for the evaluation category “Service”. subcategory will be evaluated using the criteria: “DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS”, “MEETS EXPECTATIONS”, or “EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS”.

	Digital Measures Input
Service 01	III. SERVICE - A. Awards and Honors Related to Service
Service 02	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service University Service
Service 03	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service College Service
	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service Department Service
Service 04	III. SERVICE - C. Professional and Public Service Professional Service
	III. SERVICE - C. Professional and Public Service Public Service
Service 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in service activity as evidenced by active, substantive participation in service activities. This is a <i>qualitative</i> and <i>self-reported</i> entry that should be addressed in the faculty member’s annual evaluation narrative.

Expectations for Service

Standard expectations for service activity may include the following:

1. Attending and actively participating in School and Division meetings.
2. Maintaining an active, engaged, and physical presence on campus for the purpose of supporting the life and goals of the School and University.
3. Actively participating in at least one Division, School, College, or University committee that meets regularly and requires a significant commitment of time or contributing to multiple committees with less onerous responsibilities.
4. Participating in recruitment and retention efforts when requested.
5. Participating in the School’s hiring activities.
6. Contributing to respective disciplines through peer reviews, professional committee work, advisory panel work, grant and museum consultations, and other professional activities; or contributing significantly to student and faculty mentorship; or by contributing to academic discourse in the community through public presentations, museum consultations, organizing lecture series, developing public websites, and other community activities related to scholarly work; or enhancing the campus community by advising clubs, participating in campus training and lecture series, contributing to student conferences and activities, and so forth.
7. Participating in discipline-related service that promotes and supports scientific inquiry. This service includes serving as an editor or reviewer for your discipline’s scientific journal(s), serving in an

executive capacity in a scientific society, or participating in a scientific society's meeting as an organizer.

8. Participating in public institutions and public policy deliberations as a discipline expert.

Exceeds Expectations for Service

Satisfying one or more of the criteria below while also meeting the criteria from the "meets expectations" list. This list is not comprehensive and may include other projects and activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

1. Chairing committees that require more time commitment than is typically expected.
2. Editing journals; conference planning; substantial peer reviews.
3. Sustained community projects related to the University's mission.
4. Considerable contributions to the accreditation process.
5. Engagement with policy makers and decision makers, especially in the context of promoting the blue economy.
6. Winning a major service award.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Service

Not satisfying expectations of category-specific performance will constitute a failure to meet the annual expectations for this evaluation category. The faculty handbook states that faculty do not meet expectations in one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years would trigger a Post-Tenure review (section 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook).

RESEARCH FACULTY EXPECTATIONS

Research Faculty play an important role in the research, service, and teaching mission of SOSE. Research Faculty will be evaluated using the same evaluation procedure as that used for tenure-track faculty of equivalent rank. It is understood that the primary role of Research Faculty is to be heavily engaged in scholarly activities. Because Research Faculty are usually funded through external sources, and because they are not allowed to serve as Major Advisor for graduate students, their expectation for Teaching is proportionally less. When Research Faculty are also engaged in Teaching, either as members of graduate student committees, or as instructor of record for classes, they will be evaluated using the same metrics as tenured/tenure-track faculty, adjusted for effort allocation weighting.

STATEMENT OF GOALS FOR EVALUATION PERIOD

Prior to the annual review process, and included in the evaluation material, the faculty member will prepare a short (1 page narrative) addressing: 1.) how their activity in the preceding evaluation period met or exceeded teaching, service and research requirements, and 2.) how they will in the upcoming evaluation period meet or exceed teaching, service, and research requirements for the next evaluation period. This narrative will be reviewed by the respective FEC of the SOSE. For those faculty that fail to meet expectations in one or more evaluation categories the “Goals for next evaluation period” narrative will be used to provide guidance and targets for the faculty. The “Goals for next evaluation period” narrative will outline specific goals that will be consistent with the stated expectations of SOSE. The faculty member will prepare a short narrative describing how their actions in the previous year met or exceeded standards in teaching service and research, and specific actions they will take to meet or exceed teaching, service, and research requirements for the next evaluation period.

Pre-Tenure Review

Criteria for pre-tenure review are the same as for tenure but consider that candidates have not had the full probationary period to develop a record of achievements. The responsibility of the school promotion and tenure committee is to identify areas in which the candidate needs to improve in order to eventually merit tenure and to help the candidate identify strategies. The faculty member’s progress should be monitored in subsequent annual reviews.

Each non-tenured faculty member holding a tenure-track appointment will undergo a comprehensive review of progress toward tenure ordinarily during the third year of full-time employment. However, there are exceptions, and these are addressed in the Faculty Handbook. This review will involve the School’s tenured faculty, Director, College Advisory Committee (CAC), College Dean, and USM Provost. A positive review will signify that the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure; a negative review may result in a terminal contract for the fourth year.

Tenure

By granting tenure, the University exercises its belief in academic freedom and recognizes that a faculty member has the knowledge, skills, and professionalism required to make continuing, positive contributions to the discipline, school, and academic community.

The criteria for tenure are determined in the typical areas of assessment (teaching, service, research/creative scholarship) with additional considerations of collegiality within the University. Because they aim to become part of the cadre of faculty that will shape the long-term future of the institution, candidates for tenure must exhibit a clear sense of shared responsibility for the excellence of the University; this includes collegiality.

Promotion

Research Faculty

After service at the Assistant Research Professor level, research faculty may apply for promotion to Associate Research Professor. The evaluation will follow the standard and timeline for tenure-track evaluation, consisting of preparation of a dossier demonstrating research productivity and grantsmanship, evaluation by the tenured faculty of SOSE and SOSE Director, and by CAS Personnel Committee and Dean. Promotion to Associate Research Professor requires the candidate to demonstrate excellence in research as evidenced by success in obtaining funding, publishing papers, and mentoring graduate students. Successful promotion will result in an approved pay increase commensurate with that given to newly tenured faculty, although this is again contingent on the research faculty’s ability to cover this increase from their extramural funding. After service at the Associate Research Professor level, the candidate may elect to apply for promotion to Research Professor.

Doing so will entail following the University's procedures for promotion to Professor, including preparation of a dossier demonstrating research productivity and grantsmanship, evaluation by the tenured faculty of SOSE and SOSE Director, by CAS Personnel Committee and Dean, and the University Personnel Committee and Provost. Candidates for promotion to Research Professor are required to demonstrate a national reputation in his or her field, as demonstrated by participation in national or international conferences, leadership roles in journals or societies, and/or the attestation of their peers through external letters of evaluation.

Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty may apply for promotion. The evaluation will follow the standard and timeline for tenure-track evaluation, consisting of preparation of a dossier demonstrating teaching productivity and grantsmanship, evaluation by the tenured faculty of SOSE and SOSE Director, and by CAS Personnel Committee and Dean. Promotion requires candidates to demonstrate excellence in teaching as evidenced by success in pedagogical activity.

Tenure-track Faculty

Promotion through successive academic ranks implies an increasing measure of academic and scholarly maturity as evidenced by sustained quality performance in each of the three areas that constitute the mission of the University. Promotion and tenure recommendations to the College from the SOSE will originate from the SOSE Director, upon appropriate recommendation from the faculty. Promotion (and tenure) Committees are formed from eligible faculty of the SOSE. A 'grandfather' exception exists for faculty hired prior to the implementation of the SOSE, or its previous iteration, the School of Ocean Science and Technology. These faculty will undergo promotion and tenure by a Promotion Committee consisting of only the degree program (COA or MAR) under which they were originally hired.

Faculty members prepare and submit promotion dossiers to the SOSE Director on or before the date specified in the College's annual Academic Calendar. Candidates for promotion may supplement their dossiers with additional relevant information at any level of the promotion process.

SOSE Promotion and Tenure Committee: This committee consists of members of the faculty holding academic rank equal to, or higher than, that being sought by the candidate. The SOSE Director sits as a nonvoting ex officio member. The Committee is chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of other members. The Promotion and Tenure Committee prepares and submits to the School Director a written document, signed by committee members, recommending or declining to recommend promotion in rank. The written document includes (a) narrative detailing the rationale for the recommendation and results of a secret-ballot vote of the Committee and (b) the Promotion Evaluation Form (see Provost's website Forms).

Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion is official institutional recognition of meritorious achievement in research/creative scholarship, service, and teaching (tenure-track faculty) or service and teaching (non-tenure track faculty). Promotion recognizes talented faculty for their records of achievement within their respective disciplines or interdisciplinary settings.

Identify school or unit criteria for promotion to associate professor in addition to the expectation that annual evaluations have shown that the faculty member has met or exceeded expectations.

The promotion and tenure process is administered in the School by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee is composed of all faculty eligible to vote on a particular candidate who is employed with > 0.50 FTE in the school. If a school does not have three eligible faculty to serve on such a committee, the school, in consultation with the Dean, must invite faculty from a discipline related to that of the faculty under review to serve on the School Promotion and Tenure Committee.

All candidates are to be voted on by faculty with academic rank equal to or greater than the rank being sought by the candidate. Only tenured faculty vote on tenure decisions or promotion of tenure track faculty. For promotion of non-tenure track faculty, the Promotion and Tenure Committee must be composed of promotable non-tenure track faculty ranked higher than the candidate, and the associate professors and professors of the candidate's School. In the case of large schools or very disparate disciplinary cultures, committees are free to defer the bulk of deliberations to sub-committees.

Promotion to Full Professor

Candidates for the rank of professor are teacher-scholars and have a well-established national/international standing in their discipline and a strong record of contribution to the university and science community. Successful candidates will have a record of sustained high-level performance in each of the three areas of the university mission (i.e., research, teaching, and service). Candidates will ordinarily have spent at least five years at the associate professor rank and exhibit a successful record in graduating masters and PhD students. The candidate must also be recognized by peers as having made a major contribution to his or her specific field of expertise, as indicated in explicit evaluation by external reviewers.

Post-tenure Review (PTR)

Provided there are no substantially mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness), PTR is initiated when, in the annual review process, faculty do not meet expectations in any one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years. There are no SOSE-specific processes for PTR. SOSE follows the PTR process outlined in the Faculty Handbook (section 4.7).

PROPOSED EVALUATION STRUCTURE (APPENDIX A)

The first column is the proposed organization with five sub-categories in each main category. Following FEC deliberations, the category “Professional Consulting” is omitted from the rubric. Each subcategory will be evaluated using the criteria: “DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS”, “MEETS EXPECTATIONS”, or “EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS”.

Research Rubric:

Rubric Category	Digital Measures Input	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Research 01	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - A. Awards and Honors Related to Scholarship / Research	Awards and Honors Related to Scholarship / Research does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Awards and Honors Related to Scholarship / Research reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Awards and Honors Related to Scholarship / Research exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
Research 02	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - B. Funded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research	Activity in Funded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research, Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research, and unfunded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research Submitted does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity in Funded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research, Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research, and unfunded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research Submitted reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity in Funded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research, Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research, and unfunded Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research Submitted exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - C. Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research NOT FUNDED			
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - C. Other Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research Submitted			
Research 03	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - D. Peer-Reviewed Publications Journal Article	Activity to produce Peer-Reviewed Publications, Journal Article, Refereed Publications, and Non-Refereed Publications does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity to produce Peer-Reviewed Publications, Journal Article, Refereed Publications, and Non-Refereed Publications reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity to produce Peer-Reviewed Publications, Journal Article, Refereed Publications, and Non-Refereed Publications exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - E. Refereed Publications			
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - F. Non-Refereed Publications			
Research 04	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - H. Presentations	Presentations, Media Contributions, Other Intellectual Contributions, and Research, Creative, Scholarly Activity in Progress does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Presentations, Media Contributions, Other Intellectual Contributions, and Research, Creative, Scholarly Activity in Progress reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Presentations, Media Contributions, Other Intellectual Contributions, and Research, Creative, Scholarly Activity in Progress exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.

	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - I. Media Contributions			
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - J. Other Intellectual Contributions			
	II. SCHOLARSHIP / RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITIES - K. Research, Creative, Scholarly Activity in Progress			
Research 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in research activity as evidenced by the development of original and collaborative research and by supporting colleagues' research efforts.	Your narrative documenting your engagement in research activity as evidenced by the development of original and collaborative research and by supporting colleagues' research efforts does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Your narrative documenting your engagement in research activity as evidenced by the development of original and collaborative research and by supporting colleagues' research efforts reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Your narrative documenting your engagement in research activity as evidenced by the development of original and collaborative research and by supporting colleagues' research efforts exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.

Service Rubric:

Rubric Category	Digital Measures Input	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service 01	III. SERVICE - A. Awards and Honors Related to Service	Activity of Awards and Honors Related to Service does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity of Awards and Honors Related to Service reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity of Awards and Honors Related to Service exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
Service 02	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service University Service	Activity and participaiton in Institutional Service University Service does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity and participaiton in Institutional Service University Service reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity and participaiton in Institutional Service University Service exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
Service 03	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service College Service	Activity and participaiton in College and Division-level Service does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity and participaiton in College, Division, and Professional and Public Service reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Activity and participaiton in College, Division, and Professional and Public Service exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
	III. SERVICE - B. Institutional Service Division Service			
Service 04	III. SERVICE - C. Professional and Public Service Professional Service			
	III. SERVICE - C. Professional and Public Service Public Service			
Service 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in service activity as evidenced by active, substantive participation in service activities.	Your narrative documenting your engagement in service activity as evidenced by active, substantive participation in service activities does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Your narrative documenting your engagement in service activity as evidenced by active, substantive participation in service activities reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Your narrative documenting your engagement in service activity as evidenced by active, substantive participation in service activities exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.

Teaching Rubric:

Rubric Category	Digital Measures Input	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Teaching 01	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - A. Awards and Honors Related to Teaching	Awards and Honors Related to Teaching and level of Scheduled Teaching does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Awards and Honors Related to Teaching and level of Scheduled Teaching reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Awards and Honors Related to Teaching and level of Scheduled Teaching exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - B. Scheduled Teaching			
Teaching 02	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - C. Teaching Innovation and Curriculum Development	Teaching Innovation and Curriculum Development does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Teaching Innovation and Curriculum Development reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Teaching Innovation and Curriculum Development exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
Teaching 03	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - D. Directed Student Learning: Master's, Dissertation Committee Chair and Committee Membership, Post-Doctoral Advisement	Master's, Dissertation Committee Chair, Committee Membership, and Post-Doctoral Advisement does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Master's, Dissertation Committee Chair, Committee Membership, and Post-Doctoral Advisement reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Master's, Dissertation Committee Chair, Committee Membership, and Post-Doctoral Advisement exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
Teaching 04	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - E. Non-Credit Instruction, includes all teaching and mentoring service outside of USM.	Non-Credit Instruction (all teaching and mentoring service outside of USM) and Academic Advising (includes undergraduate) does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Non-Credit Instruction (all teaching and mentoring service outside of USM) and Academic Advising (includes undergraduate) reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Non-Credit Instruction (all teaching and mentoring service outside of USM) and Academic Advising (includes undergraduate) exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.
	I. TEACHING AND ADVISING - F. Academic Advising (includes undergraduate)			
Teaching 05	Your narrative will document your engagement in teaching activity. This will be evidenced by attention to student needs including timely correspondence, availability for meeting, and inclusion of students into professional and research opportunities.	Your narrative, that addresses teaching by providing evidence of attention to student needs including timely correspondence, availability for meeting, and inclusion of students into professional and research opportunities, does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Your narrative, that addresses teaching by providing evidence of attention to student needs including timely correspondence, availability for meeting, and inclusion of students into professional and research opportunities, reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.	Your narrative, that addresses teaching by providing evidence of attention to student needs including timely correspondence, availability for meeting, and inclusion of students into professional and research opportunities, exceeds the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups.

PREVIOUS (2019-2020) SOSE EVALUATION RUBRIC (APPENDIX B)

This rubric is included for continuity and internal evaluation. In future iterations of this document, we recommend that this be omitted.

TEACHING				
	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	COMMENTS
Coursework	Coursework (development, materials, and assessments) does not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups, (e.g. online steering committee).	Coursework (development, materials, and assessments) reflects the standard performance level identified within the unit or identified by appropriate university groups, (e.g. online steering committee).	Coursework reflects innovative development which may include service learning, active learning, honors theses, SPUR projects, etc. consistent with school directives and exceeding the unit expectations.	
Course delivery	Course delivery (attendance, course load, syllabi, grading deadlines, etc.) is not performed according to the university calendar and guidelines.	Course delivery (attendance, course load, syllabi, grading deadlines, etc.) is performed according to the university calendar and guidelines.	Course delivery exceeds unit and university guidelines by the addition of independent studies, thesis or dissertation coursework, etc. added to existing load.	
Student mentorship	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and dissertations as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student committees to include graduate examinations and dissertations as well as undergraduate honors theses, delivery of independent study courses, etc. as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Facilitates growth in their field of study through formalized mentorship of students and/or other faculty, service on student to committees to include graduate examinations and dissertations master's theses, and undergraduate honors theses, etc. exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Graduate student progression in the program	Completion to degree and achievement of student's milestones (from the Graduate School) do not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Completion to degree and achievement of student's milestones (from the Graduate School) reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Completion to degree and achievement of student's milestones (from the Graduate School) exceed the standard level of performance level identified within the unit.	
Student teaching evaluations	Teaching evaluations conducted by students do not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Teaching evaluations conducted by students reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Teaching evaluations conducted by students exceed the standard level of performance level identified within the unit.	
Peer teaching evaluations	Teaching evaluations conducted by peers do not reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit	Teaching evaluations conducted by peers reflect the standard performance level identified within the unit	Teaching evaluations conducted by peers exceed the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Innovative teaching	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews reflect a lack of change or inclusion of relevant material in the course experience	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews reflect the use of new materials, new approaches to engage students	Teaching evaluations and/or peer reviews show engaged learning based on innovative teaching methods	
TOTAL SCORE:				

3/5 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations
3/5 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations
Collegiality in Teaching Statement: All faculty are expected to demonstrate collegiality through being willing to help their fellow faculty engage their students and improve instructional skills when asked.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	COMMENTS
Participation in research/creative activities	Participates or demonstrates continuous effort in research/creative activities at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Participates in research/creative activities by initiating new activity and/or demonstrating continuous effort on existing activity as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Participates in research/creative activities by initiating new collaborative interdisciplinary activity and/or demonstrating continuous effort on existing interdisciplinary activity exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Dissemination of research/creative activities	Disseminates work through unit identified channels (e.g., peer-reviewed journals, books, performance, etc.) at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Disseminates work through unit identified channels (e.g., peer-reviewed journals, books, performance, etc.) as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Disseminates work through unit identified channels (e.g., peer-reviewed journals, books, etc.) at a level that exceeds the standard performance expectation identified within the unit.	
Applications for internal/external funding	Submits application for internal/external funding of research/creative activities at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Submits application for internal/external funding of research/creative activities as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit. (e.g., unit may define expectations as annual, bi-annual, tri-annual submissions, etc.)	Procures internal/external funding of research/creative activities exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	

TOTAL SCORE:

2/3 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations

2/3 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations

Collegiality in Research/Creative Activity Statement: All faculty are expected to be open to the possibility of collaborating with their colleagues in the school and university, and to treat all faculty, staff, and students with professionalism and courtesy.

SERVICE

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	COMMENTS
Institutional committees	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the school, college, and university level at a rate lower than the standard	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the school, college, and university level as reflected within the standard	Serves on appointed/elected committees at the school, college, and university level at a rate exceeding the standard	

	performance level identified within the unit or does not attend committee meetings to represent the unit.	performance level identified within the unit; attends meetings and contributes to the needs of the committee.	performance level within the unit; attends meetings, completes a leadership role for the committee or sub-committee.	
Professional organization and service to science	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation (e.g. grant, manuscript review, and editorship of a scientific journal) in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, and/or statewide at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership and participation (e.g. grant, manuscript review, and editorship of a scientific journal) in professional organizations within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, or statewide as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Contributes to their identified field of study through membership, participation (e.g. grant, manuscript review, and editorship of a scientific journal) in, and committee service on professional organizations, publications, activities within their field internationally, nationally, regionally, or statewide exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Campus intramural service	Facilitates growth of the University/college/school through active participation in University campus activities (i.e., Eagles Spur, recruitment, retention, etc.) related to their profession at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Facilitates growth of the University/college/school through active participation in University campus activities (i.e., Eagles Spur, recruitment, retention, etc.) related to their profession as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Facilitates growth of the University/college/school through active participation in University campus activities (i.e., Eagles Spur, recruitment, retention, etc.) related to their profession exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
Service to the community	Participating in public institutions and public policy deliberations to support the maintenance of the blue economy as a discipline expert at a rate lower than the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Participating in public institutions and public policy deliberations to support the maintenance of the blue economy as a discipline expert as reflected within the standard performance level identified within the unit.	Participating in public institutions and public policy deliberations to support the maintenance of the blue economy as a discipline expert exceeding the standard performance level identified within the unit.	
TOTAL SCORE:				
3/4 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations				
3/4 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations				
Collegiality in Service Statement: All faculty are expected to show collegiality through a willingness to participate in reasonable requests for chairing or serving on school, university, and external.				

To be completed by evaluator:

NOTEWORTHY ACTIVITIES AND REMARKS	
Evaluator may list any activities they identify as noteworthy or include other remarks for the academic year	
Teaching	
Research/ Creative Activities	
Service	

Name of Preparer: Robert Leaf, Xiaodong Zhang, Christopher Hayes, Zachary Darnell, Stephan Howden, Chet Rakocinski

Email Address of Preparer: robert.leaf@usm.edu

Date of Submission: 2/25/2021

I certify that the information provided above has been approved by the school director.