

ITE Annual Review Rubric for Clinical Faculty

(April 7, 2008)

Note: Guidelines used to weigh evidence should be provided by candidates. Committee discussion will resolve issues raised and decisions made through consensus. Bulleted items are among possibilities, not requirements, unless so stated.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (1/2)	Fair (3/4)	Satisfactory (5/6)	Substantive (7/8)	Superior (9/10)
<p>Teaching (must address first two bulleted items for those faculty whose goals include teaching)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teaching rated consistently below 3.0 with no mitigating circumstances. ▪ No peer reviews and/or course evaluations to establish evidence of teaching, or reviews indicate unsatisfactory performance ▪ No evidence to support supervision performance. ▪ Student reviews, alternative evaluation information, or other evidence may not be provided to support higher than an unsatisfactory determination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some teaching is rated at 3.5 or lower, but a large number of items may be rated below the minimum criteria. ▪ Peer review indicates fair teaching performance ▪ Evidence to support a Fair performance in supervision ▪ Contributes somewhat to supervision, or overload needs within college and/or course development. as appropriate ▪ Student reviews, alternative evaluation information, or other evidence may be provided to support fair quality of teaching. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teaching rated often in the 3.0 to 4.0 range. ▪ Peer review indicates satisfactory teaching performance. ▪ Evidence to support a Satisfactory performance in supervision ▪ Contributes actively to course development, supervision, and taking on a heavy teaching load within the program, department, or college as appropriate. ▪ Student reviews, alternative evaluation information, or other evidence may be provided to support satisfactory quality of teaching. ▪ Candidate advises at all levels, participates in exam reviews, and, as appropriate, may serve on doctoral student exams and dissertation committees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teaching consistently at or above 3.5; any ratings below 4.0 relate to mitigating circumstances*. ▪ Peer review is strongly positive teaching performance ▪ Evidence to support a Substantive performance in supervision ▪ Provides some leadership within course development, supervision, or taking on a heavy teaching load within the program, department, or college as appropriate. ▪ Student reviews, alternative evaluation information, or other evidence may be provided to support substantive quality of teaching. <p>Candidate advises at all levels, participates in exam reviews, serves on doctoral student exams and dissertation committees as appropriate. Students progress adequately toward completion of degrees with their guidance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teaching consistently at or above 4.0 and ratings in the 3.0 to 4.0 range relate to mitigating circumstances. ▪ Peer Review indicates excellent teaching performance ▪ Evidence to support a Superior performance in supervision ▪ Active leadership in course/program development in department, college, university, state and national or international academic settings. ▪ Candidate advises at all levels, participates in exam reviews, and, as appropriate, may serve on doctoral exams/dissertation committees. ▪ Student reviews, alternative evaluation information, or other evidence may be provided to support superior quality of teaching.

*Mitigating circumstances include, but are not limited to, large enrollment sections, teaching new or challenging courses, or instructor teaching experience in a higher education environment. The faculty member being reviewed should explain the circumstances and, if possible, provide documentation.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (1/2)	Fair (3/4)	Satisfactory (5/6)	Substantive (7/8)	Superior (9/10)
Administration (for those faculty whose goals include administration)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No evidence offered to support administrative role ▪ Substantial negative evidence related to administrative role. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence indicates marginal performance of administrative duties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence supports competent performance of administrative duties. ▪ No distinctions or above average achievements cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence provided that administrative goals were achieved. ▪ Some evidence of distinction within the administrative capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence provided that administrative goals were achieved. ▪ Clear evidence of distinction and outstanding achievements within the administrative capacity.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (1/2)	Fair (3/4)	Satisfactory (5/6)	Substantive (7/8)	Superior (9/10)
Service (all faculty)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No evidence of service activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least one committee at the program, department, and/or university level. ▪ At least one service activity to community. ▪ Participate in at least 3 college activities Homecoming BBQ Awards Day Graduate School Day USC Showcase Fall Undergrad Reception At least one Commencement Exercise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least two committees (at the program, department and/or university levels. ▪ At least one service activity to community. ▪ Participate in at least 3 college activities Homecoming BBQ Awards Day Graduate School Day USC Showcase Fall Undergrad Reception At least one Commencement Exercise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Active in committee work at the department and college. ▪ Some national service (more than membership) in professional organizations. ▪ State service. ▪ Contributes to the program, department, and college accreditation or program development activities. ▪ Candidate participates actively in orientation programs at program, department, and/or college levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Active in service and leadership to department, university, state, national/international settings so that national/international stature is achieved ▪ Leadership shown through inter-institutional partnerships, state initiatives & projects, national and/or international agencies. ▪ Elected or selected into office in state, national/international organizations or boards. ▪ Candidate takes leadership in advisement activities and he/she participates in orientation programs at program, department, and/or college levels.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (1/2)	Fair (3/4)	Satisfactory (5/6)	Substantive (7/8)	Superior (9/10)
<p>Scholarship (for those faculty who include goals related to scholarship)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No evidence of scholarly activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least one example of scholarly work (e.g. a presentation at a state conference or publication in a newsletter) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least two examples of scholarly work (e.g. a presentation at a state conference or publication in a newsletter.) ▪ At least one national level presentation or at least one scholarly publication at the national level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of scholarly work of national interest in terms of conference presentations or publication. ▪ Activity in at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grants ○ Technical reports ○ Original curriculum products ○ Clinical research site development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of scholarly work of national interest terms of conference presentations and publication. ▪ Exemplary activity in at least one of the following or activity in more than one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grants ○ Technical reports ○ Original curriculum products ○ Clinical research site development