|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Teaching/Pedagogy:**  Plan of Work combined with student evaluations.  Per E7 policy: "Student ratings shall not be the sole source of  data used to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Response rates  should be taken into consideration when reviewing student  ratings. Other possible teaching effectiveness data may include  alumni ratings; peer ratings; self-assessment statements; syllabi  and other course documents; examples of student work; and  teaching portfolios.” | **Service:**  Plan of Work |
| Examples of **Unsatisfactory** | Teaches required workload as outlined in Plan of Work  Repeated deficiencies in teaching effectiveness as noted in previous reviews  No demonstrable plan or demonstrable strategy for improvement | Repeated deficiencies in service membership and contributions to School, College or University committees.  Disregard to previous reviews concerning service and contributions. |
| Examples of **Does Not Meet Expecations** | Teaches required workload as outlined in Plan of Work  Demonstrate poor teaching effectiveness  “Deficiency beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.” | Membership on School and/or College committees with no or little identifiable contributions  “Deficiency beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.” |
| Examples of **Meets Expectations** | Teaches required workload as outlined in Plan of Work  Demonstrate good teaching effectiveness | Membership on School, College or University committees. |
| Examples of **Exceeds Expectation**  (Meets expectations plus at least one additional distinguishing  example within the category. | Meets Expectations and:  Demonstrate very good teaching effectiveness  Introduces new pedagogical practices in course(s) by way of subjects, assignments, classroom participation, projects, student initiatives, technology, interdisciplinary, study abroad, flipped classroom, mycourses, use of Wallace Center in course development, etc.  Contributes to curriculum improvements:  Writes and/or teaches a new course, co-teaches a new course; collaborative pedagogical practice across program, school, college or university, and etc. | Exceeds Expectations:  School and/or College committee with participation and leadership  Active participation in professional or service organization in field  Service to community or service organizations with identifiable contributions |
| Examples of **Outstanding**  (Exceeds expectations plus at least two additional distinguishing examples within the category. | Exceeds Expectations and:  Demonstrate excellent teaching effectiveness and accomplishments  Class product, innovation and/or achievement disseminated, awarded, etc.  Award: teaching, grant, etc | Exceeds Expectations and:  University Committee participation and leadership  Introduces and leads new School initiative via committee work  Lead position in professional or service organization in their field  Directs community service initiatives  Service award(s) |

In AY2014, RIT’s E7 policy was revised to include new performance categories for faculty, lecturer, program chair and graduate director (see [www.rit.edu/~w-policy/sectionE/E7.html](http://www.rit.edu/~w-policy/sectionE/E7.html). The college’s E7 policy has been revised in compliance with the university’s policy (see inside.cias.rit.edu).

The above matrix is a guideline for faculty in the School of Design and direct reports of general recognition of kinds and types of examples in the three areas of evaluation that meet the approved performance categories. The matrix provides faculty, lecturer, program chairs and graduate directors with potential examples to describe performance with evidence that is specific to self, school, program, and discipline/field.

The following are performance categories as written in RIT’s E7 policy:

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