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In any organization, universities included, the development of quality personnel to perform work is of paramount importance. Thus, the ability to identify individual employee strengths and weaknesses and provide constructive feedback is vital. In this thesis I discuss the strengths and weaknesses of various performance appraisal formats, before suggesting behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS) as an optimal tool in evaluating the performance of university faculty. I discuss BARS development in depth, as well as highlight BARS strengths as a performance appraisal tool. I further outline the process used and results obtained in updating the BARS used in the performance evaluation of Western Kentucky University Psychological Sciences Faculty, and discuss how it compares to the previous BARS development process.
Introduction

In an effort to produce the highest quality outcomes, universities, as well as all organizations, need high caliber employees to perform the necessary work. One such way that universities can develop employees is through the development and implementation of performance appraisal processes. These appraisal processes can serve universities in two major ways. From an administrative perspective, appraisals enable universities to decide how to award such things as raises and promotions by indicating employee performance levels. More importantly, however, performance appraisal systems allow universities to strengthen their employee base by pinpointing an individual’s unique strengths and weaknesses, allowing universities to provide accurate and constructive feedback for employee development (Tziner, Joanis, & Murphy, 2000). In fact, studies have supported the assertion that properly designed and implemented performance appraisals have a positive effect on overall employee performance (Debnath, Lee, & Tandon, 2015).

In this thesis, I discuss the developmental process utilized in updating the Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS) used in the performance evaluation of Western Kentucky University (WKU) Psychological Sciences (PSYS) department faculty. I begin by describing various performance appraisal formats. Second, I outline the general steps involved in the development of a standard BARS. Third, I discuss the specific benefits inherent in BARS in terms of rater and ratee acceptance, rater and ratee involvement in the development process, and rater bias and error reduction. I also describe several issues inherent in BARS that should be taken into account. Fourth, I
discuss the procedure used in the current BARS development process. Finally, I describe
the outcome of the current BARS development process.

**Performance Appraisal Formats**

The two major types of performance appraisal formats, identified by Tziner and
Kopelman (2002), are graphic rating scales and behavior-based formats. Additionally,
Guion (1998) identified several other formats. Each of these formats has unique
advantages and disadvantages.

**Graphic Rating Scales**

GRSs, in the most basic sense, allow a rater to broadly describe a ratees’ abilities
on a particular set of targeted dimensions (Tziner et al., 2000). The exact format of these
rating scales can vary widely depending on who is designing it and what it is measuring,
though all formats share a few key characteristics (Guion, 1998). The specific dimensions
of performance that an organization wishes to target, such as work ethic, quality and
timeliness, are separated into different scales to be rated individually. Each scale enables
a rater to indicate whether the specific ratee shows high or low performance on that
particular dimension. Generally, the scales are anchored along a continuum by either
numbers, words, or a combination of both to allow raters to make finer distinction in
defining a ratee’s level of performance. For example, anchors that range from one to five
or poor-excellent. The specific number of scale divisions, as well as the specificity in
defining them, is up to the developer of the instrument (Guion, 1998).

GRSs are widely used by many organizations (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002), and
are relatively simple for raters to understand and complete. Additionally, they are less
expensive to develop than behavior-based appraisal formats, and do not necessarily have
to be updated should the content of the job they are designed to evaluate change (Debnath et al., 2015). However, ratings made with a GRSs are often extremely subjective in nature, and fail to sufficiently define the dimensions they are measuring, as well as the scale anchors for those dimensions. All of this leads to a very ambiguous format and, as a result, ambiguous ratings. (Schwab, Heneman & DeCotiis, 1975; Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). Additionally, although GRSs separate performance into multiple dimensions to score, these scores are often recombined into a single overall performance score by administrators, diminishing the value of the original separation (Schwab et al., 1975).

**Behavior-Based Formats**

Behavior-based appraisal formats, as a more elaborate form of GRSs, evaluate performance based on specific behaviors relevant to the various dimensions being measured (Schwab et al., 1975; Tziner et al., 2000). Unlike GRSs where it is the specific dimension itself that is being rated, in behavior-based scales dimensional ratings are informed by the ratings of specific behaviors within those dimensions. Behavior based formats rely less on subjectivity than GRSs when completing appraisals as they are centered on actual behaviors rather than rater impressions, though each type of behavioral scale differs in how much subjectivity is constrained (Tziner et al., 2000). There are three formats that fall under the heading of behavior based: behavioral observation scales (BOSs), BARSs, and behavior summary scales (BSSs; Guion, 1998).

**Behavioral observation scales.** The BOSs format rates performance based on the directly observable behaviors relevant to the dimension that is being rated (Tziner et al., 2000). Raters are presented with a cluster of behaviors, usually developed based on an extensive job-analysis, related to specific job-dimensions, and are asked to rate the
frequency with which the ratee performed these behaviors. Within the dimension
customer service, for example, the behavior “Smiles when interacting with customers,”
would be rated on a frequency of never to always. The scores for each individual
behavior are summed to create a composite score for each dimension.

**Behaviorally anchored rating scales.** With BARSs, originally developed by
Smith and Kendall (1963), specific job-related behavioral statements, known as critical
incidents, or exemplars, are used as anchoring points on a scale to inform raters of the
types of behaviors indicative of an individual with that specific score. Each score on the
scale is designated as being indicative of a certain level of performance by developers in
the beginning of the development process. For example, on a five point scale, a score of
five may be designated as indicating excellent performance, whereas a score of one may
be designated as indicating very poor performance. Each level of the rating scale has at
least one specific illustrative behavior serving as an anchor (Tziner et al., 2000). For
example, within the dimension of customer service the behavior “Answers all customer
questions with a smile” may be anchored to the score of five, whereas the behavior “Is
rude to customers,” may be anchored to the score of one. Raters using this format are
asked to choose the score, based on the anchored behavior(s) that best represents the ratee
for that particular dimension (Tziner et al., 2000). A prescribed development process
utilizing subject matter experts (SMEs) is used to determine both the behaviors
representative of each measured dimension, as well as the scores to which those
behaviors will be anchored (Guion, 1998).

**Behavior summary scales.** Like BARSs, BSSs also have examples of specific
behaviors relevant to a dimension anchored to scale points. Unlike BARSs however,
BSSs do not use the specific behaviors generated by SMEs in the final scale. Instead, developers condense hundreds of behavioral examples developed by SMEs into short paragraphs summarizing similar examples, and use several of those as anchoring points for each scale division (Guion, 1998).

Behavior based scales come with flaws of their own however. For example, it can be difficult for raters to distinguish behavior in the midpoint of the scales, versus the extremes, particularly in scales using exemplars rather than frequencies (Martin-Raugh, Tannenbaum, Tocci & Reese, 2016). Additionally, it is important to note that behavior-based scales are often much more time consuming and costly to develop than GRSs. BOSs generally requires that a job analysis be done beforehand to determine the specific behaviors that need to be included in the scale, and BARSs and BSSs require lengthy consultation with SMEs to develop (Debnath et al., 2015). Given linkage of behavior-based scales to a specific job, it is difficult to generalize the developed scales outside of the job and dimensions for which they were developed (Landy & Farr, 1980).

Furthermore, should the job change the scales may have to be re-developed or updated.

Other Appraisal Formats

A number of other appraisal formats were identified by Guion (1998). These formats consist of forced distributions, where raters assign scores based on a strict bell curve, with a limited number of people allowed in each percentile, as well as employee comparisons, where employees are rated based on their comparison to other employees on specific dimensions. These types of formats output a ranking of employees but, as they are often very subjective, it may be difficult for raters to explain their decisions or give feedback to employees on how exactly to improve.
Utilizing BARS in University Faculty Evaluation

Debnath et al. (2015) and Elliott (2015) provided recommendations to ensure that a performance evaluation program is effective. These recommendations include: (1) Involving ratees in the development process; (2) Creating a common understanding of performance; (3) Reflecting work relevant behaviors and; (4) Eliciting rater and ratee acceptance. Given these guidelines, BARS seem to be an excellent choice in appraisal format to use when evaluating university faculty.

BARS Development

The process of developing BARSs is highly structured, and consists of five main steps, though minor changes in the process are acceptable to accommodate unique organizational circumstances (Guion, 1998; Schwab et al., 1975).

Defining behavioral dimensions. In the first step creating a BARS, developers in cooperation with SMEs such as job incumbents and supervisors produce a number of performance dimensions relevant to the particular job for which the BARS is being developed. The Developers rely on the SMEs extensive knowledge of their field, along with any job-related information provided by the organization such as training material, previous evaluation tools, or job analyses, as available, to generate and define a sufficient number of dimensions needed to encompass the wide range of relevant knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) reflective of actual job practice (Debnath et al., 2015; Martin-Raugh et al., 2016). Once finalized further on in the process, these dimensions will serve as the actual components upon which ratees will be evaluated.

Gathering critical incidents. The next step in the development process is gathering an extensive list of exemplars; that is, examples of job behavior reflective of
actual practice reflect both effective and ineffective performance (Debnath et al., 2015). These exemplars are generally obtained by requesting current job incumbents to provide a number of behaviors that they believe represent both poor and excellent performance in their jobs (Martin-Raugh et al., 2016). The exact number of exemplars that need to be gathered is not set in stone, though developers should endeavor to create a list extensive enough to maintain sufficient coverage of the job should any exemplars have to be discarded at a later point. As such, it is not uncommon for the initial list of behaviors to consist of several hundred exemplars (Martin-Raugh et al., 2016).

**Retranslation.** After obtaining an extensive list of exemplars, the next phase in BARS development is a process known as retranslation. In retranslation, a group of SMEs, the same as the original group or a different group depending on the circumstances, individually assign each exemplar to the dimension to which they believe it is most indicative (Guion, 1998; Martin-Raugh et al., 2016). Prior to beginning the retranslation process, developers set an agreement standard to judge whether a critical incident will be retained or rejected. The range usually falls within 50-80% group agreement on the dimension of a particular incident (Schwab et al., 1975). Any exemplars that do not meet this standard are rejected, and are not included in the final product. Additionally, any dimension that fails to accumulate a sufficient number of exemplars, as set by the developers, may be rejected (Guion, 1998).

**Dimension scaling.** In this phase of development, a SME group, the same one from the previous phase or a new one, is given the exemplars within each dimensions that made it through the previous phase, along with dimension definitions. SMEs are asked to rate the level of behavior reflected by each behavioral exemplar within its affiliated
dimension (Guion, 1998). The scale SMEs use to rate the exemplars is created by the developers, and usually consists of five to nine anchor points with the lowest number indicating the least effective performance (Martin-Raugh et. al., 2016; Guion, 1998; Landy & Farr, 1980). The exact number of anchor points is up to the developer, though studies have shown a drop-in scale and rater reliability when the number of points is three or fewer, or 11 or more (Landy & Farr, 1980). SMEs are asked to individually assign each behavior to the anchor point that best represents that behavior’s effectiveness within the dimension. Those behaviors showing low rater agreement, usually indicated by a standard deviation of 1.5 or more on a 9-point scale or .75 on a 5-point scale, are discarded (Guion, 1998; Hauenstein, Brown & Sinclair, 2010; Martin-Raugh et al., 2016). Within each dimension, those behaviors showing high agreement on which anchoring point they should be assigned to, are assigned to that point in the final product.

**Final instrument construction.** A unique BARS is developed for each dimension, as each dimension represents a unique component of performance on which ratees will be evaluated. Each dimension is defined and its scale vertically arranged with a single or set of behaviors anchored to each scale point based on the results of the previous development phases (Debnath et al., 2015; Guion, 1998; Martin-Raugh et. al., 2016). The final instrument is both face and content valid due to its basis in actual job content, its language that is consistent with the style and jargon of job incumbents, and its basis in expert opinion (Debnath, et al., 2015; Martin-Raugh et al., 2016; Schwab et al., 1975). This format gives raters a standardized way of conceptualizing poor, average, and excellent performance based on job relevant behaviors, allowing them to evaluate ratees
in a less subjective and/or biased manner than in other rating formats (Debnath et al., 2015; Martin-Raugh et al., 2016).

**Involving Ratees in the Development Process**

As stated earlier, Debnath et al. (2015) and Elliott (2015) suggested that an effective performance evaluation tool involves those who will be evaluated in its development. Through its extensive use of SMEs, BARS is uniquely qualified among rating formats in meeting this recommendation. Those incumbents, university faculty members in this thesis, who will be evaluated using this tool may serve as the SMEs in its development. As these individuals should, in theory, be the most experienced and knowledgeable about the unique requirements of their job, they are in a unique position of being able to identify with accuracy the entire range of behaviors indicative of effective or ineffective performance (Schwab et al., 1975). Additionally, the process by which critical incidents are gathered, assigned, and rated allows incumbents numerous opportunities to voice complaints, concerns, or suggestions regarding specific behaviors and dimensions, ensuring that the final instrument includes only those aspects of development that were meaningful and acceptable to incumbents (Schwab et al., 1975).

**Creating a Common Understanding of Performance**

Another characteristic of an effective performance evaluation tool is its ability to elicit a common understanding of both excellent and poor performance among both raters and ratees. From the perspective of the rater, BARSs provide a guideline for understanding what constitutes varying performance levels in a number of different, unambiguous performance dimensions (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). Specifically, BARS provide raters with a common frame of reference in evaluating an individuals’
performance on the relevant dimensions (Debnath et al., 2015). From the perspective of the ratee, as they were involved throughout the entirety of the process, they know exactly how their performance will be measured, and how the specific evaluation criteria were developed. This, in turn, should result in less confusion, dissatisfaction, or disagreement about their performance evaluations. Additionally, as a result of their participation in the development process of BARSs, faculty may have a clearer understanding of what their job entails (Debnath et al., 2015). SMEs may be primed to think about their own behaviors from a performance context. Thus, they may be more likely to accept outside appraisal, and set effective performance improvement goals as a result of that appraisal.

**Reflecting Work Relevant Behaviors**

Debnath et al. (2015) and Elliott (2015) suggested that an effective performance appraisal tool must reflect those behaviors actually relevant to the job it is appraising. Should the development process of BARSs use current job incumbents as SMEs, the result will be a set of job relevant behaviors linked to specifically defined dimensions that future ratees agreed were reflective and inclusive of their actual job content. Additionally, what constitutes poor, average, and excellent performance among that job content is made clear and unambiguous (Schwab et al., 1975).

**Eliciting Ratee and Rater Acceptance**

One final indicator of an effective performance appraisal system noted by Debnath et al., (2015) and Elliott (2015) is the belief by both rater and ratee that the appraisal tool will be effective in its function. To put it in other words, the tool must be able to elicit acceptance from all parties involved in its use. If raters do not believe that the performance appraisal tool will be an effective rating instrument, then they may not
take the evaluation process seriously or use the resultant evaluations effectively as a foundation to give feedback. Likewise, if ratees do not accept the performance evaluation tool as legitimate then they will likely not accept the resultant evaluations as actually representative of their performance. They will be unlikely to value any feedback derived from it. In both cases the appraisal instrument is far less effective than it could otherwise have been, had sufficient acceptance been achieved (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002).

**Eliciting ratee acceptance.** Ensuring that ratees have a positive reaction to the performance evaluation process and that they are satisfied that the appraisal tool is a legitimate means of evaluating their performance is paramount to the success of the instrument (Keeping & Levy, 2000). This is particularly true in cases where the appraisal tool is used to administer feedback and set performance improvement goals (Tziner et. al., 2000). Fortunately, BARSs have a number of characteristics that lend themselves well to eliciting ratee acceptance.

In BARSs, developers have the option of involving those who will be evaluated using the final instrument as SMEs in the development process. There are several benefits of such an arrangement. First, incumbent ratees are in the unique position of being experts in their exact job. As a result, the dimensions that are developed and their behaviorally anchored scales will be known by ratees to be based on actual job content and agreed upon by a majority of their peers. Even if, due to exigent circumstances, actual incumbents cannot be tapped as SMEs, ratees will still know that SMEs with similar knowledge, education, and/or experience were used in the development of the appraisal. This should result in an evaluation tool that will be more accepted by ratees than
other appraisal formats that do not rely so heavily on expert and incumbent input (Debnath et al., 2015; Martin-Raugh et al., 2016).

Second, it has been suggested that ratees are more willing to accept the results of performance appraisal and any resulting feedback if they are based on actual, objective criteria, rather than subjective standards (Tziner et al., 2000). If a performance appraisal instrument is highly subject to a particular raters’ whims, biases, or misunderstandings, then ratees are more likely to view the instrument as inaccurate or unfair (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). The structure of BARSs, with their behaviorally anchored scales, is designed to guide raters in producing accurate, objective responses based on actual job content, rather than on some other subjective criteria. As the incumbents themselves aided developers in selecting the most appropriate job-based anchors, they should be reassured of the appraisal format objectivity.

Third, ratees are often more accepting of an appraisal instrument when the process by which that instrument was developed was transparent, and when each step in said process was free of ambiguity (Debnath et al., 2015). During the development process of BARSs, it is very easy for developers to maintain total transparency and clarity. As incumbents can serve as SMEs during development, they have ample opportunity to raise questions or concerns regarding the BARS instrument. These concerns can then be addressed immediately by developers to ensure that the final product is as acceptable to ratees as possible.

Finally, allowing ratees to serve as SMEs during development is likely to instill a sense of ownership toward the BARS instrument (Debnath et al., 2015). They were involved throughout the entirety of the development process; they made important
decisions about what should or should not be included as a representative dimension or behavior; and they made the determination of what constituted poor, average and excellent performance. By being so thoroughly involved in its design, BARSs are as much their creation as that of the developers or the raters who will be using it. This process is likely to instill a significant amount of acceptance of the final product (Debnath et al., 2015).

**Eliciting rater acceptance.** As stated earlier, it is not only the ratees whose buy in will help determine if the appraisal tool is successful or not, the acceptance of the raters themselves is also crucial (Debnath et al., 2015; Elliott, 2015). Fortunately, BARSs have several characteristics that elicit rater acceptance as well. First, all of the positive aspects of BARSs development that elicit ratee acceptance can also be applied to raters, should they be included as SMEs. This is especially useful for raters, as being involved in the development process is likely to allow raters to familiarize themselves with the relevant scales and dimensions, reducing even further the training necessary to effectively use this appraisal format in practice.

Second, BARSs have an advantage over other appraisal formats in terms of rater satisfaction by allowing raters flexibility in exercising personal judgment, based on objective guidelines, in their evaluation without having to adhere to the rigid rating options inherent in other appraisal formats (Debnath et al., 2015). For example, in both BOSs and BARSs, an exemplar of excellent performance under the dimension of research activity could be “published three articles in research journals this year,” whereas an exemplar of average performance is “publishes one article in a research journal this year.” A rater could be evaluating a professor who only published one journal
article, but it was one that was widely hailed as an example of excellent research activity, spawned several other research topics, and won a department award for research excellence. In the rigid format of BOSs, that professor would only receive an average evaluation, despite his excellent performance. In BARSs, raters are given the flexibility to exercise their own judgement in ambiguous cases such as these, based on the guidelines provided to them. Debnath et al. (2015) suggested that this will increase the motivation, and satisfaction of raters who use this appraisal format, thus increasing acceptance. In terms of use in practice, in one study comparing BARSs to an already established rating scale for teachers, several raters indicated that BARSs were easier to use, easier to understand, and more resistant to personal bias (Martin-Raugh et al., 2016)

**Bias and Error Reduction**

It is an unfortunate fact of performance measurement that performance ratings are often plagued with bias and error on the part of the rater, whether intentional or unintentional (Guion, 1998) These errors and biases can come in many forms, including intentionally showing favoritism to certain individuals, being uncomfortable with giving negative reviews, or basing ratings on how much an employee is seen working, regardless of their actual performance (Debnath et al., 2015; Guion, 1998; Martin-Raugh et al., 2016; Prendergast & Topel, 1993). Rating errors common to performance evaluation include halo error, where a general impression by a rater of the “goodness” or “badness” of a ratee colors the ratings they give; leniency, where a rater tends to give high ratings regardless of actual performance; and central tendency, where raters who dislike giving extremely high or low ratings settle for the middle (Guion, 1998). Bias and error in performance evaluation can result in little consensus as to which individuals are
actually performing acceptably. This disarray can have a negative impact on ratee morale and/or feelings of discrimination, leading to employee attrition if the problem is serious enough (Prendergast & Topel, 1993). Fortunately, BARs have shown some stalwartness against a variety of these common rating errors.

Several studies have shown that BARs are less affected by halo error than other performance appraisal formats, such as GRSs (Debnath et al., 2015; Kingstrom & Bass, 1981; Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). This assertion holds true for the prevalence of leniency and central tendency errors in BARs, as well (Debnath et al., 2015; Kingstron & Bass, 1981; Landy & Farr, 1980). Additionally, studies have suggested that BARs result in more interrater agreement, and consensus on ratee's actual performance than when using several other forms of appraisal formats (Debnath et al., 2015; Landy & Farr, 1980). It should be noted, however, that varying levels of significance have been found for these effects, and consensus among academia has yet to be reached on the precise effectiveness of BARs in warding off these types of errors (Kingstrom & Bass, 1981).

**Issues**

Unfortunately, BARs are not without their problems, namely the time and resources it takes to develop, and its lack of generalizability outside of the job for which it was developed. In terms of resources, as faculty are able to serve as the SMEs used for development, universities are able to eliminate the need to retain outside SMEs, a substantial savings in monetary resources in an otherwise expensive process. Universities will still have to arrange enough time for faculty to take part in this process; but, provided they do not need the evaluation tool immediately, the process can take as long as they require it to.
Summary

In summary, a number of different performance appraisal processes have been developed, each with their own strengths and weaknesses. BARSs in particular have the ability to create a common understanding of what constitutes effective and ineffective performance, their basis in work-relevant job behaviors, their ability to involve raters and ratees in the development process, and their ability to elicit both rater and ratee acceptance and acceptance of feedback derived from BARSs. Taken together, these characteristics make BARSs an effective appraisal format for many jobs, and particularly desirable for use in a university context.

Current Study

In a university setting, expectations of performance and job behaviors of faculty may change depending on factors such as new university policies, new department head expectations, or program reorganization. It is important, therefore, for performance evaluation standards to remain in line with current faculty circumstances. BARSs are no exception. Unfortunately, as BARSs tend to be ungeneralizable outside of the job for which it was developed (Debnath et al., 2015), it may be necessary to redo the entire development process whenever a shift in job circumstances occurs. In this thesis, a revision of the BARS used in evaluating the performance of Psychological Sciences Faculty at Western Kentucky University was performed. The appraisal instrument used currently, and upon which this development process will be based, was last revised August 2015. However, due to a number of departmental changes, as well as several methodological issues inherent in the previous revision, it was determined that an updated revision was called for.
This revision process will follow the general guidelines of the development process for BARSs outlined by Guion (1998), with a few alterations. As behavioral exemplars and performance dimensions from previous instruments are available for reference, there was no need to attend to the phases of the development process for BARSs wherein these dimensions and exemplars were gathered and/or defined. However, SMEs were given the opportunity to suggest new exemplars, and to correct or recommend the removal of incorrect or outdated exemplars. Accordingly, the proposed BARS revision process consists of the following steps: (1) Retranslation, wherein SMEs, consisting of current PSYS department faculty members, were asked to indicate, for each exemplar, the performance dimension for which it was most indicative. Ten SMEs offered suggested edits; (2) Exemplar scaling and calibration, wherein SMEs were asked to indicate the level of performance illustrated by each exemplar within its particular performance dimension and; (3) Final instrument construction, wherein a unique BARS was created for each performance dimension.

Method

Retranslation

Participants. SMEs used in the retranslation phase consisted of current WKU Psychological Sciences faculty recruited during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. The final sample consisted of two Instructors, three Assistant Professors, six Associate Professors and three Professors (N = 14; Male = 5, Female = 9).

Materials and Apparatus. Materials were provided electronically to each SME and consisted of directions for completing this phase of the development process, (see
Appendix A) definitions of the relevant performance dimensions (see Appendix B), and a randomized list of exemplars.

**Procedure.** Prior to the retranslation process, each exemplar was edited such that all references to specific behavior frequencies or quotas were removed. For example, “Publishes 3 articles in a top journal every year,” was changed to, “Publishes # articles in a top journal every year.” At this point in the development process, it is only necessary for SMEs to focus on the dimension in which each exemplar should be placed, not on how indicative the exemplar was of poor or excellent performance. SMEs were given definitions of each of the 12 initial performance dimensions, a randomized list of the exemplars, and instructions on how to complete the retranslation exercise. They were asked to indicate for each exemplar, the performance dimension for which it was most indicative. All exemplars with at least 70% agreement (i.e., 10 out of 14 participants) were retained and placed within the agreed upon dimension. Any exemplar failing to meet this standard was taken before a SME subcommittee to determine if a) the exemplar should have been included in subsequent development phases, b) if so, whether or not it needed to be edited for content or clarity, and c) into which dimension it should be placed. During this subcommittee meeting, it was determined that the dimension originally labeled as “Professional Conduct/Professional Development” should instead be split into two independent dimensions, “Professional Conduct,” and “Professional Development,” respectively. This change was represented in all future materials given to SMEs.
Scaling and Calibrating Exemplars.

Participants. The same group of SMEs that performed the retranslation phase was asked to serve as SMEs during the scaling and calibration phase, and one additional SME participated; that is, three Instructors, three Assistant Professors, six Associate Professors and three Professors (N = 15, Male = 5, Female = 10).

Materials and Apparatus. Materials were provided electronically to each SME and consisted of directions for scaling and calibrating exemplars (see Appendix C), definitions of the relevant performance dimensions (see Appendix B), scale point definitions (see Appendix D), and 13 exemplar lists corresponding to each of the 13 performance dimensions.

Procedure. Following the retranslation process, exemplars were again edited. Any exemplars indicative of multiple behaviors were split into exemplars indicative of only a single behavior. For example, “Publishes # articles a year in a mid or top tier journal,” was split into, “Publishes # articles a year in a mid-tier journal,” and “Publishes # articles a year in a top-tier journal.” Exemplars phrased such that they made reference to general frequencies, such as regularly, occasionally and rarely, were standardized such that any instance in which the exemplar indicates a behavior is performed regularly was paired with exemplars indicating that it is performed rarely and occasionally, and vice versa. Next, exemplars where references to exact frequencies were previously removed were edited to reflect a number of frequency options. For example, “Publishes # articles a year,” was split into, “Publishes 0 articles a year, Publishes 1 article a year,” and “Publishes 1 article every 2 years.” After the scaling process, exemplars of this nature which have the same anchoring point were combined into a range, for example,
“Publishes 1-3 articles a year.” These changes were necessary to ensure that the entire range of performance within each dimension was fully represented. Once exemplars were edited, they were placed in a list with all other exemplars of their dimension and given to the same group of SMEs as the retranslation phase. These SMES were asked to indicate the level of performance illustrated by each exemplar. These ratings were on a one to five scale with the following labels; 1) Fails to Meet Standard, 2) Below Standard, 3) Meets Standard, 4) Exceeds Standard, and 5) Exceptional. For precise scale definitions see Appendix D. In order to ensure the most accurate calibration of each exemplar, SMEs with no experience in a particular behavior were asked to refrain from rating exemplars based upon that behavior. For example, if an SME did not have any experience writing technical reports, they would not rate any exemplar having to do with writing technical reports. As a result, the precise number of SMEs rating each exemplar varied.

Final Instrument Construction

Following the scaling process, a unique BARS scale was developed for each of the 13 identified dimensions of faculty performance. Each scale was vertically arranged, with a number of exemplars indicating each level of performance anchored to each scale point. See Appendix E for the final BARSs for each dimension.

Analyses

Following the dimension scaling step, means and standard deviations (SD) for the ratings of each exemplar were calculated. Within each dimension, exemplars were anchored to the appropriate scale point based on the mean score assigned to it by SMEs. For example, an exemplar which received a mean score of 4 from SMEs would be anchored to the scale point 4 (i.e., Exceeds Standard) in the final BARS for that
dimension. Scale points were based on the following ranges: a mean of 0-1.5 was anchored to the score of one-Fails to Meet Standards; a mean of 1.51-2.75 was matched anchored to the score of 2-Below Standards; a mean of 2.76-3.75 was anchored to the score of 3-Meets Standards; a mean of 3.76-4.5 was anchored to the score of 4-Exceeds Standards and; a mean of 4.51-5 was anchored to the score of 5-Exceptional. These ranges were used to a) follow the natural break-points in the mean scores for the exemplars and b) to eliminate rational inconsistencies and to preempt rater confusion in cases where multiple contradictory levels of frequency based exemplars fell into the same rating category; for example, “Occasionally participates in departmental meetings,” and, “Rarely participates in departmental meetings,” would otherwise be anchored to the same scale point. Any exemplar with a SD of more than .75 was discarded, as, on a five point scale, this would indicate there was insufficient agreement on how well that exemplar represented performance in its dimension (Hauenstein, Brown & Sinclair, 2010).

Results

The final BARS for each of the 13 dimensions of faculty performance may be found in Appendix E, and a detailed look at the precise number of exemplars anchored to each scale point in each dimension may be found in Appendix F. There are several key aspects that should be noted however.

First, although a five point scale was used to create the current BARS, retranslation resulted in some dimensions having no exemplars rated as being representative of those scale points. Dimensions 5, 7, 9, and 10 lacked exemplars anchored to the scale point of one. Dimensions 12 and 13 lacked exemplars anchored to the four scale point, and Dimensions 3, 12, and 13 lacked exemplars anchored to the five
scale point. As such, these scale points were not identified in the final BARS for these dimensions. It should be noted that the lack of exemplars for these scale points does not indicate that faculty cannot/will not perform at these levels in these dimensions. Rather, the lack of exemplars indicates simply that examples of these levels of performance were not generated in the original pool of exemplars.

Second, as it was requested that SMEs with no experience in particular exemplars refrain from rating them, not all exemplars will have a consistent amount of SME input. This is especially apparent in Dimension 4 (60% average response rate) and Dimension 6 (66% average response rate). Possible reasons for this will be discussed in limitations and future development.

Finally, though most dimensions had seven or fewer exemplars that needed to be discarded due to having SDs of over .75, Dimensions 4 and 6 were exceptions. Dimension 4 had 16 exemplars with SDs of over .75 and Dimension 6 had 24 exemplars with SDs of over .75. Possible reasons for this are discussed as limitations and future developments later in this paper.

**Discussion**

The significant differences, namely in dimensions, scale points, exemplars and expertise between the current BARS revision and the 2015 revision on which it was based will be discussed here.

**Dimensions**

Following initial retranslation and consultation with the SME subcommittee, it was determined that it would be appropriate to split Dimension 10-Professional Service/Professional Development, from the 2015 BARS revision into Dimension 10-
Service to the Profession, and Dimension 13-Professional Development in the current revision. It was determined, in consultation with the SME subcommittee, that the second half of the definition of Dimension 10 in the 2015 BARS, “Includes keeping abreast of new developments and activities undertaken to develop and maintain professional credentials,” referred to behaviors that were distinct enough from the behaviors relating to Professional Service as to warrant an entirely new dimension. Enough exemplars were retranslated into Dimension 10 to support this split.

Renaming Dimension 10, from Professional Service to Service to the Profession, was deemed appropriate to make it explicit that the dimension includes both actions and behaviors that draw from professional experience and those that support the needs of the profession as a whole. This brings the dimensions definition more in line with Dimension 8- University Service and Dimension 9-Public Service, which target exemplars of similar nature, albeit in different contexts.

These changes should allow raters to more accurately gauge faculty member performance in these areas by more narrowly tailoring behavioral exemplars to the dimension raters are assessing.

**Scale Points**

The current revision utilizes a five point rating scale; 1-Fails to Meet Standards; 2-Below Standards; 3- Meets Standards; 4- Exceeds Standards and; 5-Exceptional. This is in contrast with the 2015 revision, which utilized a four point rating scale; 1- Fails to Meet Standards; 2-Meets Standards; 3-Exceeds Standards and; 4-Exceptional. The additional scale point in the current revision, 2-Below Standards, was added to allow for more nuanced discrimination on the part of raters when evaluating ratees. Additionally, it
was determined that many low rated exemplars, such as “Serves as the advisor to 1-5 undergraduate students (percentage of transfer students should be considered)” in Dimension 11, while not sufficient to fully meet departmental standards, were not severe enough to warrant a classification of failing to meet standards outright. As such, the scale point of 1-Fails to meet standards, was generally reserved for exemplars that were particularly problematic. It should be noted that several Dimensions (Dimensions 5, 7, 9 and 10) lack any exemplars anchored to the scale point of one, as no SME determined that any exemplar was egregious enough to warrant it.

In the same vein, SMEs determined that several dimensions (Dimensions 3, 12 and 13) lacked exemplars that qualified to be anchored to the five scale point. Additionally, Dimensions 12 and 13 also lack any exemplars anchored to the four scale point, leaving these two dimensions with exemplars for three scale points in total. See Appendix F for the precise layout of exemplars anchored to each scale point in each dimension.

Exemplars

The current BARS revision utilizes a significantly larger number of behavioral exemplars for each dimension than the 2015 revision. This difference was especially apparent in Dimension 4-Publications which has 10 additional exemplars and Dimension 6-Presentations, which has 37 additional exemplars. See Appendices F and G for more examples.

These additional exemplars were primarily created prior to the retranslation phase, when exemplars from the 2015 BARS revision indicative of multiple behaviors were split into individual exemplars indicative of each of those behaviors, or when
exemplars indicating behavior frequency were split into a number of exemplars indicating different levels of frequency. Following retranslation, split exemplars within the same scale range were recombined, leaving only exemplars which represented distinct levels of behavior. For example, within Dimension 2, “Relies on graduate students to teach 5 class periods in the same course in the same semester” and “Relies on graduate students to teach 2-4 class periods in the same course in the same semester” were anchored to points one and two respectively, despite being part of one exemplar originally.

These additional exemplars should provide additional guidance to raters that was not available in the 2015 revision, allowing for a more accurate understanding of what, precisely, is expected of faculty performance at each level in each dimension.

Expertise

The 2015 BARS revision had little input from trained assessment tool developers/I-O psychologists during its development. Due to this, any methodological issues or errors inherent in the 2015 revision process likely went unnoticed and uncorrected, leading to a less valuable tool overall. The current revision process however was conducted in extensive consultation with trained assessment tool developers in the form of I-O faculty at WKU. Because of this, the development process for this instrument strictly followed an appropriate development guidelines, and has been reviewed for error at every step of the development process. This has led to a more professional standard tool than the one used previously.
Limitations and Future Development

There were a number of limitations inherent in the development process that deserve attention. First, Dimension 4-Publications and Dimension 6-Presentations, represented problems in terms of retranslation efforts. There was a comparatively low response rate, and significantly more exemplars that needed to be discarded due to high SD in these dimensions (see Appendix F). In terms of the low response rate, many of the discarded exemplars had to do with writing and/or presenting technical reports. This is an activity that, while common to faculty who are I-O psychologists, is less common in department faculty outside of that specialization. Because of this, even those SMEs that have written technical reports in the past, may not have had as clear and objective opinion as to what level of performance technical report completion should represent, leading to larger standard deviations for these exemplars. This was exacerbated by the fact that two of the three I-O faculty at WKU were directly involved in the BARS development process and, as such, they did not take an active role in calibration. Only one I-O psychologist took part in the calibration phase.

These two dimensions also had the most exemplars to rate because of a large number of split exemplars that were created in an attempt to target all levels of faculty performance. This may have led to two issues: (1) Given the large number of, admittedly very similar exemplars in these dimensions, it is possible that low response rates and high standard deviations were due simply to rater fatigue and/or confusion and; (2) The large number of split exemplars may have been too nuanced and in their differences, leading to less consensus on the part of SMEs as to what scale point they should be anchored. If this
was the case, it may be beneficial in future revisions to ensure that any split exemplars are more explicitly different from one another.

Another major limitation inherent in this development process is that, due to time constraints, we were unable to pilot test the new BARS revision to determine rater reliability. It is highly recommended that, prior to implementation, this BARS be evaluated to assess this and to address any other issues that may or may not come to light.

**Conclusion**

As stated earlier, universities, as do all organizations, have an interest in developing their personnel into the highest quality employees possible. In evaluating and developing personnel, BARSs are an excellent performance appraisal format for universities to use in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of their faculty. The current BARS revision has all the hallmarks of an effective performance appraisal system outlined by Debnath et al., (2015) and Elliott (2015). It made extensive use of WKU PSYS faculty as SMEs, making it uniquely suited to rating WKU faculty, as the SMEs were highly qualified experts in their respective field(s). This, in turn, ensured that only highly relevant exemplars made it into the final product, and should increase acceptance for the appraisal process as a whole. Another benefit of the specific SMEs used, from a faculty development perspective, is that individuals have shown more acceptance of feedback derived from BARS, and demonstrated more actual behavioral change, than with feedback derived from other rating formats (Debnath et al., 2015), particularly when they were a part of its development. Ultimately, this BARS development process produced a content and face valid performance appraisal instrument based in actual job content that is expected to elicit rater and ratee acceptance and show resistant to common
rater errors. As a result, it is hoped that this instrument will be an effective tool for assessing the performance of department faculty, allowing WKU to make informed, accurate and justifiable decisions regarding the performance evaluations, annual reviews, promotions, and tenure of department faculty.
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APPENDIX A
Instructions for Competing Retranslation

WKU Psychological Sciences Department Performance Appraisal (PA) System

Revision

STEP 2: ASSIGNING BEHAVIORS TO DIMENSIONS

With existing exemplars and new exemplars submitted by Psych Sciences Department faculty, we have 388 examples of faculty performance/behavior. Step 2 (i.e., this step) will ensure that these examples of performance used on the appraisal instrument are clear examples of a given performance dimension.

Please use the attached Excel file containing the list of behavioral exemplars in random order. The objective of this step is to classify each behavior into one of the 12 dimensions of faculty performance. Each faculty member will sort each behavior into one dimension of performance. We will use the consensus of these faculty classifications to ensure that each behavior is a clear example of a given dimension.

To complete this task, please:

1. First, carefully read the definitions for each of the 12 performance dimensions (please see the next two pages). It is strongly recommended that you PRINT the 12 dimension definitions and keep this in front of you as you complete the sorting task.

2. For each behavior, decide the dimension in which the behavior belongs.

3. Write the “number” for that dimension in the box to the left of the behavior.
4. If you believe a behavior could be classified in more than one dimension, please choose only the ONE dimension for which that behavior is most representative.

5. If needed, you may complete this task in more than one sitting.

6. After you have sorted all the behaviors into dimensions, please save the file and email the file to developers.

You will probably notice that the list of behaviors includes behaviors that would be considered poor performance. Regardless of the level of performance, please assign a dimension to each behavior.

Thank you for your time in completing this important step of the process!

Use the dimension list below as a “quick list.” Be sure you fully understand each dimension by reading the definitions on the following pages.

**Dimensions of Faculty Performance**

1. Teaching Planning
2. Teaching Delivery
3. Teaching Assessment: Student Performance
4. Publications
5. Funding Activities
6. Presentations
7. Research Activity
8. University Service
9. Public Service
10. Service to the Profession
11. Student Engagement
12. Profess Conduct/Profess Dev
### APPENDIX B

**Definitions of Performance Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Performance</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Teaching Planning</td>
<td>Defined in terms of the degree of effectiveness of preparation, planning and organization of course materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Teaching Delivery</td>
<td>Defined in terms of the degree of effectiveness with which one facilitates understanding of course content and other learning endeavors (e.g., independent study, practicum experiences, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Teaching Assessment Student Performance</td>
<td>Defined in terms of the extent to which one is effective in systematically and comprehensively assessing the progress and achievement of students in course content areas and providing timely and meaningful feedback to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Publications</td>
<td>Publications must derive from research activity (basic or applied). Such publications could be: 1) empirical reports of psychological research, 2) theoretical contributions designed to explain/describe empirical findings, 3) literature reviews, 4) empirical reports of studies designed to investigate teaching methodologies used in applied areas of psychology (e.g., case study, single subject design, research to practice applications), and 6) other appropriate scholarly contributions. When the journal or publisher is not known, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the journal tier or the respectability of the publisher. All publications must indicate WKU as the author's current institutional affiliation and must have undergone peer review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Funding Activities</td>
<td>Defined in terms of one's involvement in seeking and obtaining funding to support faculty research, scholarly activities, or other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Presentations</td>
<td>Presentations of scholarly activity. Presentations at academic conferences may be invited by conference or symposia organizer; if the presentations are not invited, then peer-review is required. Conference presentations may be either oral or poster presentations. Presentations must have content similar to that described for publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Research Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>University Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Public Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Service to the Profession</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student Engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professional Conduct</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Dimensions 12 and 13 were initially a single dimension during the retranslation phase. Following this phase, it was determined that it was necessary to split dimension into two distinct dimensions. This split was reflected in all further materials given to SMEs.*
APPENDIX C

Instructions for Completing Scaling and Calibration

WKU Psychological Sciences Faculty Performance Appraisal Development

Step 3: Assigning Ratings to Behaviors

In the second step of the appraisal development process, several hundred examples of Psychological Sciences (PSYS) Faculty behaviors were categorized into 12 dimensions of faculty performance. Step 3 (i.e., this step) will ensure that each behavior is agreed upon as indicative of a particular level of faculty performance within their particular performance dimension.

You will be given a list of just over 660 behaviors, sorted into their appropriate dimensions. The objective of this step is to classify each behavior into one of five levels of performance for that dimension. Fourteen to fifteen PSYS faculty members will be classifying these behaviors. We will use the consensus of these classifications to ensure that each behavior is linked to a clear level of performance for each dimension.

To complete this task, please:

1. Carefully read the definitions for each of the 13 performance dimensions, as well as the definitions for each of the 5 levels of performance.

2. Within each of the 13 dimensions:
   a. For each behavior decide which level of performance that behavior is most representative of.
   b. Input the “number” for that level of performance in the box to the right of the behavior (i.e., 1-5).
Thank you for your time in completing this important step of the process.

Please use the dimension and scale lists below as a “quick list.” Be sure you fully understand each dimension and level of performance by reading the definitions on the following pages.

**Dimensions of Faculty Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Teaching Planning</th>
<th>5-Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching Delivery</td>
<td>4-Exceeds Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teaching Assessment Student Performance</td>
<td>3-Meets Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Publications</td>
<td>2-Below Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Funding Activities</td>
<td>1-Fails to Meet Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Research Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. University Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Service to the Profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Student Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Professional Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scale Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Performance</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Exceptional</td>
<td>This rating reflects a performance level that far exceeds standards for good performance. The faculty member has gone above and beyond what is required for good performance. Performance at this level typically is a rare occurrence and is difficult, if not impossible, to sustain. (This rating should be assigned on a limited basis.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Exceeds Standards</td>
<td>This rating reflects a level of performance that consistently meets and frequently exceeds standards. The faculty member has gone beyond what is typically expected for good performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Meets Standards</td>
<td>This rating reflects good performance and what is expected from a faculty member who consistently meets and occasionally exceeds standards for performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Below Standards</td>
<td>This rating reflects performance of a faculty member who does just enough to get by to meet standards, but at times falls short of what is required for good performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Fails to Meet Standards</td>
<td>This rating reflects performance that is deficient, which clearly falls below standards for good performance or a faculty member who is not fulfilling his/her responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Final BARS

Dimension 1: Teaching Planning
Defined in terms of the degree of effectiveness of preparation, planning and organization of course materials.

5-EXCEPTIONAL
- Teaches 6-7 different courses a year (i.e., multiple preps)

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
- Teaches 4-5 different courses a year (i.e., multiple preps)
- Plays a major role in the initiation and development of a new course
- Has a role in developing new General Education course
- Develops class projects or activities that promote student civic engagement
- Organizes field trips or guest speakers
- Seeks out formative feedback about teaching (peer review, video analysis, student feedback, etc.) and subsequently Uses acquired knowledge to improve course(s)

3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Teaches a course for the first time
- Teaches 2-3 different courses a year (i.e., multiple preps)
- Regularly modifies course content to reflect new developments in the field
- Regularly re-evaluates course delivery methods
- Considers a variety of texts and ancillary materials during text adoption process and upon request can document Rationale for adopted texts and materials
- Structures course in a manner that is appropriate for the population for the course (e.g., freshmen, non-traditional, and graduate students, etc.)
- Develops class projects or activities that promote student engagement in psychology
- Develops projects to apply and demonstrate course principles
- Has specific learning objectives for each section/unit/chapter and plans course content on said learning objectives
- Includes, updates and maintains learning activities other than lectures
- Clearly defines anticipated outcomes for students and selects course activities that reflect the desired outcomes
- Has for each course a syllabus that provides a comprehensive overview of course content, timetable, and Requirements and other information that helps the student succeed in the course
- Has for each course a syllabus with current information and focused, clear expectations
- Has a syllabus prepared and posted on TOPNET prior to start of each class
- Maintains updated resources on a course webpage or on Blackboard
- Invites and encourages student feedback

2-BELOW STANDARDS
- Occasionally modifies course content to reflect new developments in the field
- Occasionally re-evaluates course delivery methods
- Does not seeks out formative feedback about teaching
1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS

- Rarely modifies course content to reflect new developments in the field
- Rarely re-evaluates course delivery methods
Dimension 2: Teaching Delivery
Defined in terms of the degree of effectiveness with which one facilitates understanding of course content and other learning endeavors (e.g., independent study, practicum experiences, etc.)

5-EXCEPTIONAL
- Receives the University, College and/or Department Teaching Award

4-EUCEEDS STANDARDS
- Provides outside-class support to students (e.g., tutoring, review sessions)
- Goes beyond material covered in text
- Provides opportunities for students to connect material to larger social systems and issues
- Requires student participation in class beyond class discussion such as participating in class demonstrations or giving presentations
- Brings in speaker(s) with expertise in content area
- Illustrates course principles in class with demonstrations
- Integrates a new technology which facilitates learning
- Offers course in multiple formats (online, face-to-face, etc.)

3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Regularly uses active learning techniques
- Uses projects to give students the opportunity to apply course principles
- Stimulates effective student participation (e.g., by inviting students to identify practical applications or examples of theoretical concepts, or therapy)
- Uses effective methods (e.g., technology, lecture, case studies, demonstrations, activities, debate, videos) to facilitate learning of course objectives
- Uses real-world examples in conveying course material
- Actively constructs class environment where students feel safe and comfortable to voice questions, comments, and ideas, and has a system of doing so
- Uses multiple formats to deliver course content
- Regularly uses current technology in instruction in an appropriate and effective manner
- Rarely uses videos in lieu of other instructional activities
- Lecture coincides with text material
- Understands and accurately conveys major concepts in his/her field
- Conveys information at students' level
- Rarely discusses irrelevant subject matter in class
- Rarely has student complaints concerning disorganized coverage of material
- Rarely begins class late
- Manages disruptive behavior in a professional manner
- Provides adequate supervision of internship and/or practicum experiences
2-BELOW STANDARDS
- Relies on graduate students to teach 2-4 class periods in the same course in the same semester
- Uses only one format or method to deliver content in class
- Primarily reads from lecture notes, PowerPoint slides, or textbook in class
- Rarely uses active learning techniques
- Invites minimal student input and participation
- Regularly uses videos in lieu of other instructional activities
- Occasionally uses current technology in instruction in an appropriate and effective manner
- Rarely uses current technology in instruction in an appropriate and effective manner
- Occasionally begins class late
- Occasionally discusses irrelevant subject matter in class
- Occasionally has student complaints concerning disorganized coverage of material
- Students express concerns about being able to openly voice relevant questions, comments, and ideas
- Provides minimal or inadequate supervision of internship and/or practicum experiences

1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS
- Relies on graduate students to teach 5 or more class periods in the same course in the same semester
- Regularly begins class late
- Regularly discusses irrelevant subject matter in class
- Regularly has student complaints concerning disorganized coverage of material
- Cancels classes without appropriate justification
- Does not understand or inaccurately conveys major concepts in his/her field
Dimension 3: Teaching Assessment: Student Performance
Defined in terms of the extent to which one is effective in systematically and comprehensively assessing the progress and achievement of students in course content areas and providing timely and meaningful feedback to students.

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
• Provides feedback regarding writing style and quality to students on their written reports

3-MEETS STANDARDS
• Provides timely feedback to students
• Sets high but reasonable standards for student performance based on the students ability level
• Uses multiple methods of assessment appropriate to course content and purpose
• At least part of the course assessment requires more than memorization as appropriate to course content and level
• Adheres to identified guidelines for creating good classroom assessment in attempt to maximize reliability and validity of classroom measures
• Appropriately represents course content in assessment instruments and activities
• Develops/assigns tests, papers, projects, and related course/practicum activities that appropriately represent actual course content
• Administers tests/assessments frequently enough to provide students with adequate and timely feedback about their progress in the course and/or practicum
• Assigns projects requiring APA reports from students to assist in the development of technical writing skills
• Requires individual meetings with students who are performing poorly in class
• Provides opportunities for students to receive comprehensive feedback via formal assessment of learning (small group discussion, question-answer sessions, quizzing, etc.)
• Goes over problematic and key exam items with students after exams have been graded
• Creates and uses rubrics for all written assessments (i.e., essay tests, papers, etc.).
• Constructs exam items based on specific learning objectives for each section/unit/chapter (i.e., content validity)
• Regularly evaluates tests/assessments for item quality such as content validity, item difficulty, etc.
• Designs course to have an assessment by the 5th week-assessment deadline to help identify students at risk

2-BELOW STANDARDS
• Uses only one method of assessment
• Occasionally evaluates tests/assessments for item quality such as content validity, item difficulty, etc.
• Fails to provide timely feedback to students on assignments
• Course assessment is primarily based on memorization
• Measures student performance in a manner that deviates from methods stated on the syllabus
• Rarely evaluates tests/assessments for item quality such as content validity, item difficulty
1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS
- Continues to use exams with compromised security
- Course assessment content does not reflect course content
- Fails to provide periodic feedback to students
Dimension 4: Publications
Publications must derive from research activity (basic or applied). Such publications could be: 1) empirical reports of psychological research, 2) theoretical contributions designed to explain/describe empirical findings, 3) literature reviews, 4) empirical reports of studies designed to investigate teaching methodologies used in applied areas of psychology (e.g., case study, single subject design, research to practice applications), and 6) other appropriate scholarly contributions. When the journal or publisher is not known, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the journal tier or the respectability of the publisher. All publications must indicate WKU as the author’s current institutional affiliation and must have undergone peer review.

5-EXCEPTIONAL
• 3 or more refereed article every year in a mid and/or top-tier journal
• Author of a book by a respected publisher.
• 3 or more chapters in an edited book by a respected publisher per year (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc.)
• Writes more than 3 technical reports for a public and/or private organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program every year
• Writes 3 or more technical reports for granting agency documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of a funded grant program every year

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
• Writes more than 3 technical reports for university documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of a university policy or program every year
• Writes 2-3 technical reports for private organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program every year
• Writes 3 technical reports for public organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program every year
• Submits 3 or more manuscripts this year (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)
• More than 3 refereed article every year in a low-tier journal
• 1-2 refereed article every year in a top-tier journal
• 2-3 refereed article every 2-3 years in a top-tier journal
• 2 refereed article every year in a mid-tier journal
• 1-2 chapter in an edited book by a respected publisher per year (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc.)
• 2 chapters in an edited book by a respected publisher every 3 years (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc.)
3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Submits 1-2 manuscripts this year (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)
- Submits 2-3 manuscripts the past 2-3 years (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)
- 1-2 refereed article every 1-3 years in a mid-tier journal
- 1 refereed article every 3 years in a top-tier journal
- 1 chapter in an edited book by a respected publisher every 2-3 years (MIT Press, Cambridge University Press, etc.)
- Writes 1 technical report for university documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of a university policy or program every year
- Writes 1-2 technical report for private or granting organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program every 2 years
- Writes 2 technical reports for public organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program every 3 years

2-BELOW STANDARDS
- Writes 1 technical report for public organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program every 2-3 years
- Writes 1 technical report for private or granting organization documenting the methodology, instrumentation, procedure, data analyses, results, and conclusions for the evaluation of an internal organizational program every 3 years
- 1 refereed article every 1-3 years in a low-tier journal
- Submits 1 manuscripts the past 1-3 years (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)
- Submits 0 manuscripts during the past 1-2 years (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)

1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS
- Fails to submit at least 1 manuscript during the past 3 years (e.g., peer-reviewed journal, book chapter)
**Dimension 5: Funding Activities**
Defined in terms of one’s involvement in seeking and obtaining funding to support faculty research, scholarly activities, or other projects.

---

**5-EXCEPTIONAL**
- Prepares and submits proposal for external funding annually
- Receives external funding annually
- Receives external funding every 2 years
- Regularly receives external funding
- Has multiple external grants
- Administers/coordinates (PI, Co-PI) externally funded project with full F&A

**4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS**
- Administers/coordinates (PI, Co-PI) externally funded project with some F&A
- Prepares and submits proposal for external funding every 2 years
- Regularly applies for external funding.
- Receives external funding every 3-4 years
- Occasionally receives external funding
- Administers/coordinates (PI, co-PI) externally funded project
- Prepares and submits proposal for internal funding annually
- Regularly applies for internal funding.
- Receives faculty-centered internal funding every 1-2 years
- Receives student-centered internal funding (e.g., FUSE) every 2 years

**3-MEETS STANDARDS**
- Occasionally applies for external funding.
- Prepares and submits proposal for external funding every 3-4 years
- Receives external funding every 5 years
- Obtains donations or “in-kind” contributions to support research program (donations of equipment, consumable materials) every 1-3 years
- Prepares and submits proposal for internal funding every 2 years
- Receives internal funding every 3 years
- Receives faculty-centered internal funding every 4-5 years
- Receives student-centered internal funding (e.g., FUSE) every 3 years
- Contributes to proposal development or grant submission, e.g. by helping with writing or serving as consultant.

**2-BELOW STANDARDS**
- Rarely applies for external funding.
- Prepares and submits proposal for internal funding every 4 years
- Rarely applies for internal funding.
- Receives internal funding every 5 years
- Receives student-centered internal funding (e.g., FUSE) every 4-5 years
Dimension 6: Presentations
Presentations of scholarly activity. Presentations at academic conferences may be invited by conference or symposia organizer; if the presentations are not invited, then peer-review is required. Conference presentations may be either oral or poster presentations. Presentations must have content similar to that described for publications.

5-EXCEPTIONAL
- Primary and/or presenting author of more than 3 presentations per year at national and/or international meetings.
- Coauthors more than 3 presentations per year at national and/or international meetings.
- Serves as discussant/chair of more than 3 symposiums at national and/or international meetings every year.
- Serves as a panel member at more than 3 symposiums at international meetings every year.

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
- Primary and/or presenting author of 2-3 presentations per year at international meetings.
- Primary and/or presenting author of 3 presentations per year at regional and/or national meetings.
- Serves as discussant/chair of 2 symposiums at national and/or international meetings every 1-3 years.
- Coauthors 2-3 presentations per year at international meetings.
- Coauthors 3 presentations per year at national meetings.
- Coauthors more than 3 presentations per year at regional meetings.
- Serves as a panel member at more than 3 symposiums at regional and/or national meetings every year.

3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Primary and/or presenting author of 1 presentation per year at international meetings.
- Primary and/or presenting author of 1-2 presentations per year at national meetings.
- Primary and/or presenting author of 1-2 presentations in the past 2-3 years at national meetings.
- Primary and/or presenting author of 2 presentations per year at regional meetings.
- Primary and/or presenting author of 2-3 presentations in the past 2-3 years at regional meetings.
- Serves as discussant/chair of 1 symposium at international meetings every 2-3 years.
- Serves as discussant/chair of 1 symposium at national meetings every year.
- Serves as discussant/chair of 1 symposium at national meetings every 2-3 years.
- Serves as a panel member at 1-2 symposiums at international meetings every 1-3 years.
- Serves as a panel member at 1-2 symposiums at regional meetings every year.
- Serves as a panel member at 2 symposiums at national meetings every year.
- Serves as a panel member at 1-2 symposiums at regional and/or national meetings every 1-3 years.
- Coauthors 1 presentation per year at international meetings.
- Coauthors 1-2 presentations per year at national meetings.
- Coauthors 2 presentations in the past 3 years at national meetings.
- Coauthors 2-3 presentations per year at regional meetings.
2-BELOW STANDARDS
- Primary and/or presenting author of 0 presentations per year at national and/or international meetings.
- Primary and/or presenting author of 0-1 presentations in the past 2 years at international meetings.
- Primary and/or presenting author of 0-1 presentation in the past 2-3 years at regional and/or national meetings.
- Primary and/or presenting author of 0-1 presentation per year at regional meetings.
- Serves as discussant/chair of 0 symposiums at regional meetings every year.
- Serves as a panel member at 0 symposiums at regional, national and/or international meetings every year.
- Coauthors 0 presentations per year at national and/or international meetings.
- Coauthors 0 presentations in the past 2 years at international meetings.
- Coauthors 1 presentation in the past 2-3 years at national meetings.
- Coauthors 0-2 presentations in the past 2-3 years at regional meetings.
- Coauthors 0-1 presentations per year at regional meetings.

1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS
- Primary and/or presenting author of 0 presentations in the past 3 years at regional, national and/or international meetings.
- Coauthors 0 presentations in the past 3 years at regional and/or international meetings.
- Coauthors 0 presentations in the past 2-3 years at national meetings.
 Dimension 7: Research Activity
 Defined in terms of the amount and nature of investigative research activities conducted or supervised at WKU. Faculty are expected to engage in research activity on an ongoing basis in their respective areas of expertise.

5-EXCEPTIONAL
- Receives the University, College and/or Department Research/Creative Activity Award
- Directs 4 or more masters theses to completion every year

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
- Directs 1-3 master’s theses to completion every year
- Directs 4 masters theses to completion every 3 years
- Directs 2-3 master's theses per year for psych science grad students that are unrelated to personal research program

3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Directs 1-3 masters theses to completion every 2-3 years
- Directs 1 master's theses per year for students outside of the department that are unrelated to personal research program
- Directs 1 master's thesis per year for psych science grad students that are unrelated to personal research program
- Conducts program evaluation (i.e., develops instrumentation; collects, analyzes, and interprets data to address hypotheses concerning program effectiveness) for the University and/or a public organization/private organization/funded grant program
- Is regularly actively involved in data collection in a research program
- Collaborates with colleagues in research program development within and outside the department

2-BELOW STANDARDS
- Directs 0 master's theses per year for psych science grad students that are unrelated to personal research program
- Directs 0 master's theses per year for students outside of the department that are unrelated to personal research program
- Directs 0-1 master’s thesis to completion every 1-3 years
- Is rarely actively involved in data collection in a research program
Dimension 8: University Service
Defined in terms of the extent of one’s involvement and responsibility in departmental, college, and university activities that support and maintain the effective functioning of the departmental, college, and university. Includes the applied practice of one’s professional skills within the university.

5-EXCEPTIONAL
- Participates in 4 or more college and/or university committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Participates in 5 or more departmental committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Member of 5 or more master's thesis committees annually
- Receives Department, College and/or University award for service

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
- Member of 4 master's thesis committees annually
- Participates in 3 college and/or university committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Participates in 4 departmental committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Regularly represents faculty or departmental interests in university affairs
- Creates or revitalizes a professional university organization
- Provides leadership for university initiatives that promote public engagement
- Provides leadership for the committees of the department, college and/or university
- Actively supports and provides leadership for valued university initiatives (e.g., chairs committee, workgroup, taskforce; chairs subcommittee, etc.)
- Regularly helps office of research with presentation and info sessions for faculty interested in grant writing and submission
- Assumes administrative responsibilities in the department in a meritorious manner (e.g., promotes significant program development, completes reports that bring recognition to the department, etc.)
- Administers/coordinates academic program within the department (e.g., writes reports, coordinates graduate program, etc.)
- Regularly reviews FUSE and/or RCAP grants
- Regularly provides developmental workshops for the university
- Regularly presents workshops for campus based on area of professional expertise
- Regularly presents workshops within university based on area of professional expertise
- Has a role in developing new academic program
- Conducts technical and professional evaluation of website for the university
- Conducts program review for academic programs outside the department
- Has a role in getting course approved as General Education offering
- Has a role in revising academic program
3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Mentors new faculty
- Member of 2-3 master's thesis committees annually
- Participates in 1-2 university committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Participates in 2 college committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Participates in 2-3 departmental committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Regularly participates in department meetings
- Occasionally represents faculty or departmental interest in university affairs
- Actively supports valued university initiatives (e.g., committee membership, promotes activities, etc.)
- Supports university initiatives (e.g., attends presentations, promotes university programs, etc.)
- Occasionally helps office of research with presentation and info sessions for faculty interested in grant writing and submission
- Occasionally provides developmental workshops for the university
- Occasionally presents workshops within university based on area of professional expertise
- Occasionally presents workshops for campus based on area of professional expertise
- Occasionally reviews FUSE and/or RCAP grants

2-BELOW STANDARDS
- Member of 0-1 master's thesis committee annually
- Participates in 0 university committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Participates in 0-1 college committee annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Participates in 1 departmental committee annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Does not participate in college and/or university committees
- Occasionally participates in department meetings
- Rarely represents faculty or departmental interests in university affairs
- Rarely helps office of research with presentation and info sessions for faculty interested in grant writing and submission
- Rarely presents workshops within university based on area of professional expertise
- Rarely presents workshops for campus based on area of professional expertise
- Rarely provides developmental workshops for the university
- Rarely reviews FUSE and/or RCAP grants

1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS
- Participates in 0 departmental committees annually (regular or ad hoc)
- Rarely participates in department meetings
- Does not participate in departmental committees
Dimension 9: Public Service
Defined in terms of the extent of one's involvement in activities that support the needs of the public and that draw on professional expertise. Includes the applied practice of one’s professional skills outside of the university.

5-EXCEPTIONAL
- Regularly provides developmental workshops for the community
- Presents a colloquium or seminar outside the university 3 times per year
- Creates or revitalizes a community organization

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
- Regularly involved in community at large in ways that support community needs
- Seeks out or creates ways to be involved in the community at large in ways that support community needs
- Is interviewed by media on topics related to professional expertise
- Regularly provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government
- Serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 3 times per year
- Regularly serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent
- Conducts technical and professional evaluation of website for the community
- Regularly engages in the applied practice of the profession (e.g., provides direct services, including assessments and interventions)
- Regularly supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one's profession
- Provides leadership for non-university boards, committees, and organizations
- Regularly presents workshops for community based on area of professional expertise
- Regularly provides professional development workshops for fellow professionals
- Presents a colloquium or seminar outside the university 2 times per year
- Serves on the board of a non-university organization

3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Served as a judge for a science fair this year
- Occasionally involved in community at large in ways that support community needs
- Occasionally provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government
- Serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 1-2 time per year
- Occasionally serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent
- Occasionally provides developmental workshops for the community
- Occasionally presents workshops for community based on area of professional expertise
- Occasionally provides professional development workshops for fellow professionals
- Occasionally supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one's profession
- Occasionally engages in the applied practice of the profession (e.g., provides direct services, including assessments and interventions)
- Presents a colloquium or seminar outside the university 1 time per year
2-BELOW STANDARDS

- Serves as a consultant to a non-university constituent 0 times per year
- Rarely provides organizational consulting to organizations in education, business, industry, military or government
- Rarely engages in the applied practice of the profession (e.g., provides direct services, including assessments and interventions)
- Rarely supervises clinical services, organizational consulting, school consultation, or other activities related to one's profession.
- Rarely provides professional development workshops for fellow professionals
- Rarely presents workshops for community based on area of professional expertise
- Presents a colloquium or seminar outside the university 0 times per year
Dimension 10: Service to the Profession
Defined in terms of the extent of one’s involvement in activities that support the needs of the profession and that draw on professional experience.

5-EXCEPTIONAL
• Serves on multiple review boards
• Serves as editor, or on the editorial board, for a professional journal
• Regularly serves in professional organizations as an officer

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
• Maintains a professional or organizational website (other than one’s own homepage)
• Regularly serves in professional organizations as a committee chair
• Occasionally serves in professional organizations as a committee chair
• Occasionally serves in professional organizations as an officer
• Regularly provides professional development programs
• Regularly reviews grant proposals for a granting agency
• Regularly reviews grant proposals or submissions for professional journals, book chapters or professional conferences

3-MEETS STANDARDS
• Is regularly involved in professional societies
• Occasionally serves in professional organizations as a committee member
• Rarely serves in professional organizations as a committee chair
• Rarely serves in professional organizations as an officer
• Occasionally reviews grant proposals for a granting agency
• Occasionally provides professional development programs
• Occasionally reviews grant proposals or submissions for professional conferences, professional journals, books or book chapters

2-BELOW STANDARDS
• Rarely serves in professional organizations as a committee member
• Has limited involvement in professional societies
• Rarely provides professional development programs
• Rarely reviews grant proposals for a granting agency
• Rarely reviews grant proposals or submissions for professional conferences, professional journals, books or book chapters
Dimension 11: Student Engagement
Defined in terms of meaningful activities that inspire students to become active contributors to their own learning, and to take responsibility for their own education and personal and professional growth. May include activities conducted within the context of a course either during or outside of class time, activities related to research, and/or activities related to university, public, or professional service.

5-EXCEPTIONAL
- Receives University award for advising
- Serves as the advisor to more than 16 graduate students
- Serves as the advisor to more than 20 undergraduate students (percentage of transfer students should be considered)
- Supervises more than 5 independent studies per year
- Sponsors (not coauthor) more than 4 student presentations per year

4-EXCEEDS STANDARDS
- Serves as a faculty advisor to a university student club/organization
- Does JUMP program advising
- Sponsors (not coauthor) 3-4 student presentations per year
- Serves as the advisor to 11-15 graduate students
- Supervises 4 independent studies per year
- Serves as the advisor to 16-20 undergraduate students (percentage of transfer students should be considered)
- Regularly involves students in research
- Supports student engagement in research funding activities by mentoring students to obtain funding for their research projects.
- Routinely provides support for student involvement in activities of the profession (Faculty sponsor to professional group; encourages students to become "engaged" with professional activities)
- Regularly includes students as coauthors on published articles and/or book chapters
- Provides workshops to students to assist graduate school acceptance
- Provides funding for students for assistance on paid consulting projects
3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Serves as the advisor to 6-15 undergraduate students (percentage of transfer students should be considered)
- Serves as the advisor to 1-5 graduate students
- Sponsors (not coauthor) 1-2 student presentations per year
- Supervises 1-3 independent studies per year
- Provides adequate supervision of independent study experiences
- Provides supervision of practicum experiences, internship experiences and/or independent study which enhances learning, and prevents problems and/or effectively handles problems that may arise
- Occasionally involves students in research
- Occasionally includes students as coauthors on published articles and/or book chapters
- Includes students in departmental, college and/or university projects
- Involves graduate students in activities of the program (recruitment activities, student groups, etc.)
- Encourages individual meetings with students
- Regularly meets with students to provide guidance on educational and career paths related to faculty member’s discipline
- Occasionally meets with students to provide guidance on educational and career paths related to faculty member’s discipline
- Routinely or actively supports or promotes activities to engage students in the community
- Routinely encourages students to attend campus and community events related to course material
- Provides periodic support for activities to engage students in the community

2-BELOW STANDARDS
- Serves as the advisor to 1-5 undergraduate students (percentage of transfer students should be considered)
- Supervises 0 independent studies per year
- Sponsors (not coauthor) 0 student presentations per year
- Provides minimal or inadequate supervision of independent study experience
- Provides minimal independent study feedback
- Does not support or promote student involvement in activities in the community
- Rarely includes students as coauthors on published articles and/or book chapters
- Rarely involves students in research

1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS
- Serves as the advisor to 0 undergraduate students (percentage of transfer students should be considered)
Dimension 12: Professional Conduct
Defined in terms of adherence to the APA Code of Ethics and university policies; demonstration of good citizenship in relations with students, peers, and staff, and when representing the university; demonstrating collegiality; valuing diversity; and meeting professional responsibilities and obligations.

3-MEETS STANDARDS
• Is regularly proactively helpful to colleagues
• Is occasionally proactively helpful to colleagues
• Is always on time in fulfilling obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth functioning of the department
• Is conscientious in meeting obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth functioning of the department
• Displays sensitivity to ethical issues and university policies in the conduct of university and personal activities
• Is respected by colleagues (e.g., serves as a source of professional expertise)
• Demonstrates respect for colleagues, staff, and students
• Consistently follows University Exam Policy
• Consistently maintains office hours
• Consistently submits textbook requests in a timely manner
• Complies with state licensing law requirements
• Is knowledgeable about and adheres to APA Code of Ethics
• Adheres to ethical research procedures
• Consistently treats students and colleagues fairly, irrespective of ethnicity, religion, gender, culture, age or disabilities
• Is regularly available to students
• Maintains office hours

2-BELOW STANDARDS
• Is usually on time in fulfilling obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth functioning of the department
• Is often careless about fulfilling obligations and deadlines that are important for the smooth function of the department
• Rarely is proactively helpful to colleagues
• Is occasionally available to students
• Does not submit textbook requests in a timely manner
• Does not meet University expectation that all course syllabi will be posted to TopNet
• Does not follow university final exam policy
1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS

- Does not maintain office hours
- Is rarely available to students
- Habitually unavailable to students
- Reacts in an emotionally inappropriate manner to unruly, disruptive students
- Is overly and frequently critical in non-constructive ways of other faculty members
- Seldom treats students and colleagues fairly based on ethnicity, religion, gender, culture, age or disabilities
- Makes derogatory remarks about or engages in discriminatory behavior toward people of differing ethnicities, religions, genders, cultures, ages or disabilities
Dimension 13: Professional Development
Defined in terms of the extent to which one keeps abreast of new developments, and participates in activities undertaken to develop and maintain professional credentials.

3-MEETS STANDARDS
- Participates in a professional development seminar or workshop to improve research skills
- Regularly attends professional development workshops in his/her field
- Occasionally attends professional development workshops in his/her field
- Occasionally attends professional development workshops
- Regularly attends workshops, seminars, etc. on teaching
- Occasionally attends workshops, seminars, etc. on teaching
- Regularly attends professional conferences
- Is regularly involved in professional societies
- Is occasionally involved in professional societies
- Functions as a competent resource both inside and outside the department
- Regularly reads professional periodicals in his/her field
- Reads and is conversant about major professional periodicals in his/her field
- Sufficiently conversant with most major content areas in his/her field, so as to serve as a resource to other departmental faculty members
- Provides accurate information regarding additional sources of information in his/her field
- Provides accurate and contemporary information within the scope of his/her competency
- Completes Continuing Education requirements to maintain professional credentials (e.g., license, certification; if applicable)
- Maintains professional license (if practicing or appropriate)

2-BELOW STANDARDS
- Occasionally attends professional conferences
- Occasionally reads professional periodicals in his/her field
- Rarely attends professional development workshops in his/her field
- Rarely attends workshops, seminars, etc. on teaching
- Rarely attends professional development workshops
- Is rarely involved in professional societies
- Is unfamiliar with major recent theoretical and empirical developments in his/her specialty area

1-FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS
- Rarely reads professional periodicals in his/her field
## APPENDIX F

### 2020 Exemplar Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Total Exemplars</th>
<th>1-Fails to meet standards</th>
<th>2-Below Standards</th>
<th>3-Meets Standards</th>
<th>4-Exceeds Standards</th>
<th>5-Exceptional</th>
<th>Mean N**</th>
<th>Discarded Exemplars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Teaching Planning</td>
<td>28 (31)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Teaching Delivery</td>
<td>45 (58)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Teaching Assessment</td>
<td>26 (28)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performance</td>
<td>29 (75)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Funding Activities</td>
<td>30 (46)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Presentations</td>
<td>41 (114)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 (66%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Research Activities</td>
<td>15 (32)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-University Service</td>
<td>53 (75)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Public Service</td>
<td>35 (40)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Service to the Profession</td>
<td>22 (50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13 (86%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Student Engagement</td>
<td>42 (58)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13 (86%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Professional Conduct</td>
<td>30 (31)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>25 (28)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* After recombining similar exemplars. Parentheses indicate the initial exemplar count, prior to exemplar recombination or the removal of exemplars of SD=.75

** Rounded down to the nearest whole number.
# APPENDIX G

2015 BARS Exemplar Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Total Exemplars</th>
<th>1-Fails to meet standards</th>
<th>2-Meets Standards</th>
<th>3-Exceeds Standards</th>
<th>4-Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Teaching Planning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Teaching Delivery</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Teaching Assessment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Publications</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Funding Activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Presentations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Research Activities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-University Service</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Public Service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Service to the Profession/</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Student Engagement</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Professional Conduct</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>