

12.01.99.R0.02 Annual Evaluation of Faculty

Approved September 1, 1996

Revised July 2002

Revised April 18, 2005



Procedure Statement

The annual faculty evaluation process at Texas A&M University-Commerce has two major goals: to provide (1) a system to facilitate the development of teaching, research or other scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), and service to the university, profession and community, and (2) an annual evaluation (review of performance) of teaching, RSCA, and service for the purpose of making decisions regarding the terms and conditions of the employment relationship between the faculty and the university, including merit pay, promotion, tenure, and post tenure review.

Reason for Procedure

Accomplishing these purposes requires the active, joint involvement of the individual faculty member and his/her department head in developing an appropriate evaluation plan suitable to the particular responsibilities and strengths of the faculty member. However, individual faculty members are to take the initiative in promoting their own growth as teachers, scholars, and practitioners.

Procedures and Responsibilities

1. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The evaluation of faculty shall be based on university-wide and departmental criteria.

a. University-wide Criteria

(1) Teaching. Teaching is considered to be the first priority and prime objective of the university. The Texas A&M University System Policy on Post Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness (12.06) lists the following 'techniques' as guidelines for evaluating teaching:

(a) University requirements for faculty including:

1) course syllabi including list of topics to be covered during the semester, specific course objectives, types of activities for the course, student evaluation procedures, and required reading assignments;

2) faculty attendance in class; and

3) adherence to university and departmental policies.

(b) Peer observation of classroom performance.

(c) Departmental, college and university workshops on effective teaching.

(d) Video taping of classroom performance for review and analysis by faculty.

(e) Portfolio assessment by departmental review committee.

(f) On-campus technology centers and other innovative programs designed to educate and support faculty in their efforts to integrate new technology into their teaching.

(g) Departmental in-service training.

(h) Senior faculty to serve as mentors for junior, new faculty.

(i) Quality of instructional outcomes assessment by current and former students, employers of graduates, and faculty in graduate and professional schools attended by graduates.

(2) Research or other Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA). Producing knowledge and performance in professional/creative activities are essential aspects of faculty roles. Examples of RSCA include engagement in writing and publishing through peer reviews, procurement of external funds for research and creativity goals, and participation in professional encounters or activities in one's discipline.

(3) Service. Service to the profession (discipline), the university, and the community is an integral part of a faculty role. Examples of service include engagement in the university, college and departmental committees and/or particular assignments, work on student advisement and in students' extra-curricular activities, and involvement in community exhibiting one's professional expertise. Credit for service shall be based on specific works done, along with its documentation (e.g., a letter from the chair of a committee stating faculty member's performance) rather than providing mere lists of committees and tasks involved in. Certain services (e.g., student advisement or serving as a mentor for students to improve their retention and success) should be given a larger weight during the faculty evaluation process. Service assignments (e.g., memberships of committees) should be based on equity among senior and new faculty members, and should have a balanced representation of academic colleges and departments.

b. Departmental Criteria

Faculty members in each academic department of the university, as a group, shall be responsible for identifying measures and criteria of evaluating (1) teaching, (2) RSCA, and (3) service suitable to their own discipline and professional interests. However, the departmental criteria and measures for evaluating faculty must be comprehensive and consistent with the general framework of the university-wide criteria stated above.

As an example of a particular measure, faculty in each department shall develop a procedure for conducting the process of student evaluation of teaching. The following guidelines must be observed in developing that procedure: (1) student evaluations in classes should be coordinated by the department head; (2) teachers of record should not be present in a class when students evaluate them; (3) all records of students' evaluations should be maintained in the departmental office so they can be used in faculty evaluations for merit, promotions, and tenure

considerations; and (4) faculty members should be provided numeric scores and summaries of all evaluations for formative purposes.

2. EVALUATION PROCEDURE

a. Department Faculty Evaluation Plan in General

All full-time faculty members in each department will participate in developing a departmental plan for measuring and evaluating teaching, RSCA, and service.

A department's plan will identify how evaluations of teaching, RSCA, and service areas will be conducted in terms of various criteria and measures. These shall be published by each department, after having been approved by the department head, college dean and provost, and shall be regularly updated when necessary. They shall be distributed by the department head among current and new faculty.

Additionally, the departmental faculty will develop procedures for determining how the areas of teaching, RSCA, and service will be weighted and used for the purpose of making decisions regarding the terms and conditions of the employment relationship between the individual faculty members and the university. Relative weights for teaching, RSCA and service will be determined on the basis of such criteria as the department's involvement in graduate programs, national disciplinary standards, applicable reassigned time for faculty members for research grant, service and administrative assignments, and so forth. While assigning relative weights for three areas of functioning, department faculty should remember that lower weight for RSCA in the annual evaluation may disadvantage them in the long run when they are evaluated for promotion, tenure, and post tenure review. Each department's plan, including details on measures and instruments, minimums and maximums of percentages allowable in teaching, RSCA, and service will be submitted by the department head to the appropriate college dean for approval and then forwarded to the provost & vice president for academic and student affairs. Changes or annual updates in departmental plans will be submitted when necessary through the same channels. The Office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (VPASA) will maintain a file of departmental plans.

b. Faculty - Department Head Goals for a Given Year

Using the framework of the department's plan, each faculty member and his/her department head will discuss and identify goals related to his/her teaching, RSCA, and service before the beginning of each year. They will then formulate an individual faculty plan for achievement (see Appendix 'B') commensurate with faculty rank and seniority (see Post Tenure Review Procedure A12.22) by January 20, spelling out the following for the forthcoming year:

(1) The proportion of the faculty member's work in teaching, RSCA, and service.

The faculty member and department head, acting together, will determine the percentage of weight for teaching, RSCA, and service, as per the departmental plan.

(2) Specific measures to be employed for evaluating the faculty member's teaching, RSCA, and service.

Unresolved disagreements in sections 3.b.(1) and /or 3.b.(2) will be forwarded to the appropriate college dean's office for resolution.

Copies of the faculty - department head yearly goals for each faculty member will be signed by both with copies retained by both. Changes in a faculty member's plan may be negotiated between the faculty member and the department head during a given year only when the faculty member's assignments change significantly for that year, and such changes will be recorded and signed by both parties and copies of new document retained by both parties.

3. SCHEDULE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS (ANNUAL REVIEWS OF PERFORMANCE)

The following schedule will be used for annual evaluations:

a. The calendar year (January through December) will be utilized for annual evaluations.

b. From January 5 to January 30, the department head will consult with faculty as they establish annual goals, supported by a plan of activities, for January through December of that year. A copy of each faculty member's plan, describing the activities to be pursued during the period of evaluation, will be submitted by the department head to the dean of the college for review and approval by January 25.

c. The annual evaluation conference between the faculty member and the department head will take place from January 5 through January 30 of each year. A first year faculty member will be evaluated for the fall semester only (plan will be filed in September).

d. The annual evaluation process will include the following steps:

(1) Each faculty member will prepare for the department head, by January 5, an annual report on accomplishments in teaching effectiveness, RSCA, and service as per the plan which the faculty member signed at the year's beginning.

(2) For each faculty member the department head will draft an assessment of the degree to which the faculty member fulfilled the plan formulated the previous January. The departmental plan for evaluation will be the foundation for the assessment; depth, breadth, and quality of the achievements should be considered. The assessment will include a numerical rating for each of the three categories of teaching, RSCA, and service, and an overall numerical merit rating which is calculated by weighting the teaching, RSCA, and service numbers according to the plan formulated for that year (see Faculty Evaluation Format in Appendix 'A' at the end of this procedure). The department head will then have a conference with each faculty member to explain and discuss the assessment, and the faculty member will receive a copy. The faculty member will sign to acknowledge receiving a copy of the evaluation. If a faculty member disagrees with the department head's evaluation, he/she will have a right to write a rebuttal by stating specific reasons for the disagreement. The rebuttal, if any, shall become a part of the evaluation report of that faculty member for the year.

(3) The department head will forward a copy of faculty reports and department head

recommendations (in the faculty evaluation format) to the dean of the college by January 30. The dean will review the materials, and where the dean wishes to revise any faculty member's overall merit rating, the dean will have a conference with the department head and faculty member involved.

(4) The dean will forward faculty reports, department head recommendations and dean's recommendations to the vice president for academic affairs by February 15.

(5) The vice president for academic affairs will review the recommendations. In instances of disagreement with the dean's recommendations, the vice president will consult with the dean. Any changes made in ratings at whatever level will be shared with the department head and faculty member. The vice president will make faculty merit recommendations to the president by March 1.

4. MERIT

The following example demonstrates the process. However, this example is not meant to imply any particular norm or standard for the faculty in general.

A faculty member and his/her department determine the following allocation of involvement that would be appropriate for him/her in the upcoming year.

Areas of Faculty Involvement Weight of Effort (%)

Teaching .60

RSCA .20

Service .20

Following the academic year, the department head shall determine the appropriate ordinal rating which best describes the level of effectiveness that the faculty member achieved in each of the planned areas. The following levels of effectiveness will be used.

Ordinal Rating Level of Effectiveness

1 The highest level of performance

2 A high level of performance

3 A moderate level of performance

4 A minimal level of performance

5 An unsatisfactory performance

Using the previously agreed upon proportions of involvement, the overall rating will be determined as the weighted average of the ratings and these proportions. The overall merit rating stated to one decimal would be determined as the sum of each rating multiplied by the appropriate proportion. The spreadsheet below demonstrates the result.

Areas of Faculty Involvement Weight of Effort (%) Annual Rating Merit Rating Calculated

Teaching .60 1 .60 X (1) = 0.60

RSCA .20 1 +.20 X (1) = 0.20

Service .20 3 +.20 X (3) = 0.60

Overall Rating 1.40

5. SPLIT APPOINTMENTS

Faculty members who have split appointments (where work load credit is granted for responsibilities outside the home department) will consult with the appropriate administrator to establish goals supported by a plan of activities. They will be evaluated by each administrator to whom they are responsible. The merit rating shall be determined by using each evaluation in proportion to the percent of time the individual is assigned to each entity. For example, if a faculty member has a one-half time administrative assignment during a given year, he/she will have 50% of total expectations of performance in teaching, RSCA, and service as compared to a full-time teaching faculty.

6. APPEALS

Appeals beyond the departmental level regarding adverse decisions are to follow regular administrative channels. TAMUS policies and regular A&M-Commerce university grievance procedures (A12.01) are available for use by individual faculty members.

7. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTION

If a faculty member receives an overall rating of 4 or 5, the department head and the faculty member will develop formative recommendations in the following year's plan to help the faculty member overcome deficiencies or shortcomings in teaching, RSCA, or service.

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

System Policy [12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure](#)

System Policy [12.02 Institutional Procedures for Implementing Tenure](#)

System Policy [12.03 Faculty Academic Workload and Reporting Requirements](#)

System Policy [12.06 Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness](#)

System Policy [12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty](#)

University Procedure [12.01.99.R0.02 Annual Evaluation of Faculty](#)

University Procedure [12.01.99.R0.06 Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty](#)

University Procedure [12.02.99.R0.01 Convert Non-Tenure Track Appointments to Tenure-Track Appointments](#)

University Procedure [12.02.99.R0.02 Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Departments](#)

Appendix

[Faculty Evaluation Forms](#) are located on the Provost's website.

Contact Office

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
903-886-5439