Faculty Performance Evaluations Task Force

Clint Allred, Michael Benedik, Fred Bonner, Antonio Cepeda-Benito (Chair),
Joseph Cerami, Gary Ellis, (coChair), Marcel Erminy, Joe Golsan (coChair), Jean-Luc Guermond,
Johnny Hurtado, Yvonna Lincoln, Annie McGowan, Kate Miller, Allen Roussel, Roger Schultz,
Simon Sheather (coChair), Elizabeth Tebeaux, Ben Wu, Debra Zoran

June 2010

The task force was charged with providing a set of guidelines and recommendations to better align faculty performance evaluations with the Vision, espoused values and strategic initiatives of the University. The three charged tasks were,

1. Identify and recommend examples of best-practice approaches to faculty performance evaluation in research-extensive, land-grant universities;

2. Develop a flexible set of university-wide guidelines or rules to steer the colleges and departments in the development of their own annual faculty performance evaluation guidelines;

3. Make recommendations on how the proposed changes should be addressed in college and departmental guidelines (timeline and processes), and guidance on any concerns for 'phasing in' changes in evaluation processes so that all faculty are treated fairly, especially those on tenure track or nearing some other significant evaluation juncture.

After an initial meeting on December 8, 2010, the task-force was divided into three topic-specific subcommittees to provide independent recommendations with regard to 1) teaching, 2) engagement, and 3) research and other creative activities. Each of the subcommittees (or sub-task forces) provided a report with recommendations regarding the principles that department and college guidelines should follow. The three subcommittees met monthly to discuss each other's progress and seek consensus. The subtask force on teaching evaluation provided also specific recommendations for how best address the proposed changes at the college and departmental level.

Executive Summary

1. By-and-large other universities engage in faculty evaluation practices similar to what's done at Texas A&M University.

2. Principles of performance evaluations include:

   a. The evaluation system should be congruent with the overall mission, goals, and priorities of the university, college and departments.
   b. The evaluation system should be flexible to accommodate different unit needs.
   c. Deans, department heads and faculty should contribute to the development of guidelines.
   d. The primary responsibility and privilege of selecting faculty performance indicators resides with the faculty.
   e. Evaluations should be constructive and provide guidance for the future—i.e., it should not be merely descriptive.
   f. Multiple sources and indicators should be used in performance evaluations.

3. Modifications to the university rules were suggested to achieve the following goals:

   a. Allow flexibility in the assignment of faculty loads across teaching, service and research/creative activities, as long as such flexibility helps the department, college and university advance their mission and goals.
   b. Reassert that tenure-track faculty positions have three essential job functions, teaching, service, and research/creative activities. The rule recognizes engagement as an activity that can be considered teaching, service and/or research depending on the context or circumstances. The rule allows departments to have flexibility on how engagement is valued.
   c. Incorporate the TAMU administration's mandate to:
      i. recognize and reward products from interdisciplinary collaborations, as well as from globalization and diversity efforts,
      ii. include as part of the performance evaluation an assessment of compliance with safety practices,
      iii. require compliance with all mandated training as a necessary condition for a satisfactory faculty evaluation.

4. To select and then implement the changes, initiate discussions with the council of deans and with the faculty senate to seek reactions to the proposed changes:

   a. Fall semester 2010—presentation of the task force recommendation to the deans and the faculty through college-wide forums and through the faculty senate.
   b. Spring 2011— finalize and put to a vote final draft of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, and incorporate rule changes into college and department guidelines
   c. Summer 2011—approve all changes to college and departmental guidelines

<div align="center">

Recommendations

Committee on Faculty Teaching Performance Evaluation
Faculty Performance Evaluations Task Force
Joseph Cerami, Annie McGowan, Kate Miller, Roger Schultz, Simon Sheather (Chair), Ben Wu

</div>

Teaching and Learning Roadmap Committee

In 2009, the Teaching and Learning Roadmap Committee recommended the following teaching and learning goal for the university: "Students at Texas A&M University will achieve a set of university student learning outcomes through high-impact experiences that position them for a lifetime of success"[1]. Clearly, the faculty evaluation should encourage activities that lead to achieving this goal.

Governing Principles of Good Metrics to Assess Teaching[2]

- The evaluation system should be compatible with the overall mission, goals, and structure of the institution.

- The proper loci for developing the overall guidelines for an effective evaluation system should be the deans, department heads and the faculty senate.

- To ensure the acceptance of the evaluation system, faculty members should be integrally involved in choosing the performance indicators used to assess teaching (i.e., faculty must believe in the fairness and utility of the evaluation process).

- The evaluation system should reflect the complexity of teaching, which must include the course design element, implementation and delivery of the course, assessment, mentoring, the scholarship of teaching and mechanisms for continuous improvement, and recognition of different learning styles and levels of student abilities.

- An evaluation of teaching should include separate formative feedback to assist/help individual improvement and summative evaluation to measure progress toward institutional goals. In particular, separate meetings should be held with each faculty member to discuss their formative feedback.

- The formative feedback should include a discussion of future performance goals and strategies for meeting these goals.

- The evaluation system must be flexible enough to encompass various disciplines, audiences, goals, teaching methodologies, etc.

- Multiple sources should be used in the evaluation of teaching. These sources should include student evaluations, peer evaluation, evaluation by department head/supervisor and self evaluation.

---

[1] Source: http://provost.tamu.edu/documents/TLRCReport2009Jun19.pdf

[2] Based on "*Developing Metrics for Assessing Engineering Instruction – What Gets Measured is What Gets Improved*"- Report from the Steering Committee for Evaluating Instructional Scholarship in Engineering; National Academy of Engineering, 2009, C. Judson King, Chair, University of California, Berkeley; Susan A. Ambrose, Carnegie Mellon University; Raoul A. Arreola, University of Tennessee Health Science Center; Karan Watson, Texas A&M University

Summary of the Telephone Interviews of Peer Institutions

Telephone interviews were conducted with 14 public Research I institutions about their practice of faculty teaching performance evaluation, including the components of teaching performance evaluated, the types of data collected and the methods, the approach to categorize and integrate the measurements, and the approaches to implement their guidelines/practices. Although the practices are diverse, there are common trends among the institutions with regards to centralized vs. decentralized approaches, components of teaching evaluated, structure of student evaluation, the use of peer and self evaluation, instruments for the evaluation, and effective practices for implementation of the faculty teaching performance evaluation. Following is a brief summary of the main findings from the interviews; a more detailed summary is provided in Appendix A.

Centralized vs. decentralized:

- Most universities have decentralized processes… with some centralized requirements (e.g., students' ratings but they are typically open to some degree of tailoring)

- P&T process requires comprehensive teaching information in the dossier. Typically, each department is responsible for deciding what specific information needs to be in the dossier

- Merit/annual evaluations typically involve having the faculty's supervisor/department-head doing a less formal evaluation

- Most universities provide online or PDF copies of their guidelines

Components of teaching evaluation:

- Most universities don't evaluate each of these components separately- they are embedded into the student's rating or peer review processes…

- Some universities explicitly stated they don't evaluate these components

Data source and processes:

- All universities use some form of student's rating. Typically, they include global items and a department section (where each department has a quota of extra items they can add- some universities provide a bank of items and the department has to choose from within this bank). One university charged a fee to each department if the department wanted to add more questions to the student's rating form.

- Peer evaluations, self- evaluations, and portfolios: Typically, each department chooses if they want to use alternative methods.

- Rarely do they use external evaluators

- They typically don't use rubrics- and if they do, they were designed/required by the department

- Peer evaluations usually mean classroom observations (in some cases- peer evaluation refers to evaluating the course materials)…

Quantification:

- How the information is quantified varies greatly. While most universities use means and standard deviations, the data based on which they obtain these statistics can differ considerably. For example, while one university obtains the mean score from 2 global items, other obtain it by averaging every single question in the questionnaire, and still others obtain the mean based on the response of one given item across classes for a given faculty…

- NORMS: Each university has their own idea of what a norm is and how they are calculated (very controversial issue-which prompted fascinating conversations!)

General advice:

- Include your faculty early on and throughout the process (Faculty Senate)

- Ideally teaching portfolios will be used as part of the evaluation process

- There is no way that one-size will fit all—You need to allow each department to tailor the evaluation to their culture/field… but do provide some centralized guidelines

- You need a committee/Task force that is willing to put in the time and effort that it takes to get this done.

- Have global items as part of your students' rating form- and align those global items to your university-wide teaching mission/vision statements

- Do not use students' ratings and/or evaluations as a way to penalize faculty. Use them as a way to identify faculty who are in need of more support

- A number of individuals said that they will be willing to come here and meet with us and some of them strongly recommended that we consult with Peter Seldin

A Framework for Teaching Performance Evaluation

A general framework (in the form of a matrix) for faculty teaching performance evaluation was developed based on the literature, experiences of peer institutions, and our own experience. The design of the framework is based on and expanded from the approaches presented in the National Academy of Engineering report on developing metrics for assessing engineering instruction[1]. The matrix identified components of teaching to be evaluated and recommended indicators associated with each component, as well as recommended sources of data including student, peer, administrator, and self evaluations.

This framework is to be customized for use by individual departments and colleges. In customizing the framework, all components of teaching evaluation must be represented. Each of the components of teaching evaluation contains several suggested indicators and associated data source. Individual units can select a subset or all of the indicators, and can add additional ones, for each component based on their appropriateness to the disciplines; a small set of indicators is marked (last column) for use by all disciplines. Justifications need to be provided for the selection of the indicators. All components must be represented and individual units will determine, with justification based on disciplinary characteristics and needs, the weights for individual components when calculating overall scores.

Process to finalize the framework

Feedback for the framework and associated recommendations will be sought from Deans, Department Heads, and the Faculty Senate. In addition, faculty forums should be held to seek direct feedback from the faculty. The weights for different source of data, student, peer, administrator, and self evaluations, should be determined through this process by consensus. The following ranges are recommended as a starting point for the consideration: 25-45%, 25-45%, 15-25% and 5-15% for student, peer, administrator, and self evaluations, respectively. An example of the weights used in the National Academy of Engineering report on developing metrics for assessing engineering instruction[1] was 25%, 45%, 20% and 15% for student, peer, administrator, and self evaluations, respectively.

Implementation Process

We recommend development of supporting instruments and pilot testing of the framework for faculty teaching performance evaluation before full-scale implementation.

- Templates of appropriate instruments (e.g., classroom evaluation worksheet for peer evaluation) and evaluation rubrics should be developed by the university and assistance should be provided for individual departments or colleges to customize the templates based on their disciplinary needs.

- Faculty training programs should be conducted for appropriate use of the instruments and rubrics to facilitate effective peer evaluation processes.

- Pilot tests should be conducted with four departments in four different colleges to evaluate and fine-tune the framework and adoption process.

Framework of Faculty Teaching Performance Evaluation

Component	Indicators	Source of data				All disciplines
		Students 25-45%	Peers 25-45%	DH 15-25%	Self 5-15%	
Content expertise __%	Demonstrate sufficient disciplinary knowledge and skills		√		√	√
	Bring relevant and current research, especially one's own, to support the contents of the course		√		√	
	Relate relevant current issues to course contents	√	√	√	√	
Instructional design __%	Construct a syllabus, with A&M required elements, that clearly communicates expectations and all necessary information and motivates students	√	√		√	√
	Develop course objectives and learning outcomes that align with program learning outcomes		√	√	√	√
	Select appropriate content based on learning outcomes		√	√	√	
	Design well-paced, well-presented, and appropriately sequenced instructions		√		√	
	Plan and schedule a variety of learning, assessment and teaching activities to achieve the learning outcomes		√		√	
	Create effective learning activities/assignments		√	√	√	
	Help students learn how to learn		√		√	
Instructional delivery __%	Be well organized and well prepared	√	√		√	√
	Communicate effectively and demonstrate enthusiasm	√	√		√	
	Respect students and care about their learning	√	√		√	
	Respond effectively to student questions and provide timely feedback on student work	√	√		√	
	Engage students and facilitate discussion in class	√	√		√	
	Effectively use active and cooperative learning techniques (including group work or teams)	√	√		√	
	Use technology effectively to enhance student learning	√	√		√	
	Make self available to help students in and outside of class (office hours, etc.)	√	√		√	
	Is an effective clinical/professional role model	√	√		√	
Instructional assessment __%	Articulate a philosophy of assessment that provides a rationale for and links assessment to learning outcomes		√	√	√	
	Implement assessments (exams, etc.) that correspond to and evaluate achievement of learning outcomes		√		√	√
	Set and communicate clear expectations/criteria for assessing student work	√	√		√	
	Implement grading schemes that are fair and comprehensible	√	√		√	

	Gather formative feedback on teaching periodically	√	√		√	
	Gather formative feedback on learning periodically and give feedback to students	√	√		√	
	Assist students in developing ability to self-regulate and self-assess their own behavior and learning	√			√	
Course & classroom management __%	Provide sufficient information about course management and logistics in the syllabus	√	√	√	√	√
	Effectively manage course and classroom logistics	√	√		√	
	Provide efficient student access to class materials (notes, readings, assignments, quizzes, etc.)	√	√		√	
	Effectively use on-line course management systems and communication tools to facilitate student learning	√	√		√	
	Create learning environments that welcome, challenge, and support all students	√	√		√	√
	Be aware of and practice effective teaching strategies that help acknowledge issues that emanate from differences among students, including differences in opinion	√	√		√	
	Recognize and appropriately manage incivility	√	√		√	
Scholarly teaching and SoTL __%	Practice "scholarly teaching" – the process of reflection, experimentation, and evaluation to improve one's teaching and enhance student learning		√		√	
	Collaborate with other faculty members for mutual improvement of teaching		√		√	
	Participate in/lead professional development activities in teaching (workshops, conferences, etc.)		√	√	√	
	Engage in scholarship of teaching and learning (research, presentations, publications, etc.)		√	√	√	
Mentoring __%	Mentor graduate students (# of PhD and Masters students chaired/served as committee member)		√	√	√	
	Demonstrate effectiveness of graduate mentoring (# graduated, retention, student publications, student awards and grants, Time to completion, employment, etc.)		√	√	√	
	Participate in other graduate student mentoring activities		√	√	√	
	Mentor undergraduate students (# of undergraduate research students mentored)		√	√	√	
	Demonstrate effectiveness of undergraduate mentoring (% go to graduate school, presentations/publications, awards, etc.)		√	√	√	
	Student/alumni comments	√				
Recognition __%	Teaching awards, fellowships, invited talks, etc.			√	√	

Selected Literature

Arreola, R. A. (2007*). Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cashin, W. E. (January, 1996). Developing an effective faculty evaluation system. *IDEA PAPER #33*. Retrieved April 7, 2010, from http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Idea_Paper_33.pdf

Chism, N. V. N. (2007). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hoyt, D. P., & Pallett, W. H. (1999). Appraising teaching effectiveness: Beyond student ratings. *IDEA PAPER #36.* Retrieved April 7, 2010, from http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Idea_Paper_36.pdf

Seldin, P. (2006). *Evaluating faculty performance: A practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Seldin, P., & Miller J. E. (2009). *The academic portfolio: A practical guide to documenting teaching, research, and service.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zubizarreta, J. (2008). The learning portfolio: A powerful idea for significant learning. *IDEA PAPER #44*. Retrieved April, 7, 2010, from http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/IDEA_Paper_44.pdf

<center>**Recommendations**</center>

<center>Committee on Engagement Performance Evaluation
Faculty Performance Evaluations Task Force
Fred Bonner, Gary Ellis, (Chair), Marcel Erminy, Jean-Luc Guermond,
Allen Roussel, Elizabeth Tebeaux</center>

Summary of Process Used by Engagement Subcommittee

Engagement subcommittee members included Fred Bonner (Higher Education Administration), Gary Ellis (Subcommittee Chair; Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences), Marcel Erminy (Architecture), Jean-Luc Guermond (Mathematics), Allen Roussel (Large Animal Medicine), and Elizabeth Tebeaux (English). Each committee member reviewed either two or three peer institutions, in terms of how those institutions were addressing engagement. Institutions reviewed included the following:

- The University of North Carolina
- Ohio State University
- Penn State University
- Purdue University
- University of Florida
- University of Illinois
- University of Michigan
- University of Minnesota
- University of Wisconsin

Brief summaries were crafted for engagement policy and practice at each of these peer institutions, and select key documents were downloaded. These materials were reviewed and discussed in two meetings of the subcommittee. These meetings yielded a set of recommended revisions to University Rule 12.01.99.M2. These revisions to that rule are based on consensus of the subcommittee on the following:

1. We endorse a "three leg stool" as the foundation for evaluating faculty performance: teaching, research and creative contributions, and service.

2. We endorse a definition of engagement that is fully consistent with the definition proposed by the Texas A&M University Scholarly Engagement Roadmap Committee:

> Engagement is a "collaborative and reciprocal relationship between Texas A&M University and key constituencies that involves discovery, integration, translation, and application of knowledge. "

We note that the definition establishes that engagement refers to the **context** of faculty contributions rather than the nature of the contribution. As such, teaching, research and creative contributions, and service may all occur within a context of engagement.

3. We endorse the perspective that the percent of effort of faculty members should be permitted to vary across teaching, research and creative scholarly contributions, and service as careers evolve and faculty advance in rank.

4. We endorse the position that engagement should be valued no more and no less than contributions to teaching, research and creative scholarly contributions, and service that occur in contexts other than engagement.

5. We recommend that the mandate with respect to affording opportunity for faculty to be recognized for contributions to diversity, internationalization/globalization, multidisciplinary collaboration, and interdisciplinary collaboration and safety compliance also be addressed through specific revisions to University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (see Appendix B).

The Engagement Subcommittee presented suggested wording of Rule revisions associated with each of these to the full task force. Finally, the subcommittee prepared a draft of a guideline for departments to use in crafting annual performance review standards and promotion and tenure standards for evaluating scholarly engagement. A copy is attached.

Guidelines for Developing Department Criteria for Evaluating Engagement

This document provides a guideline for departments in developing annual performance evaluation criteria and promotion and tenure criteria for scholarly engagement. The foundation for the guideline is University Rule 12.01.99.M2. That rule establishes that some faculty members may choose to contribute to teaching, research and creative scholarly contributions, and service in the context of scholarly engagement. The Rule asserts that faculty contributions through the context of scholarly engagement are to be valued equally with contributions that do not occur within the context of scholarly engagement.

Scholarly engagement is defined as, **"a collaborative and reciprocal relationship between Texas A&M University and key constituencies that involves discovery, integration, translation, and application of knowledge**." Departments are expected to develop their own guidelines for evaluating scholarly engagement of faculty members. Those guidelines should be appropriate to the discipline of the department, and should be

consistent with the meaning of engagement, as defined above, and as described by the Engagement Roadmap Committee (Report of the Scholarly Engagement Roadmap Committee, Texas A&M University, May 21, 2009). The following paragraphs from the Engagement Roadmap Committee report define scholarly engagement and distinguish between that concept and "service."

> *Scholarly engagement [involves] the discovery, integration, translation, and application of knowledge through (these) engagement activities. The engagement process could consist of (1) teaching, research/creative works, or service activities within the academy being shared with audiences outside academe for implementation, refinement, or consideration (moving activities within the academy to those outside the academy) or (2) engagement activities providing faculty members with new ideas and thoughts to inform their teaching or research/creative works (moving activities from outside the academy to those within the academy).*

The following may be useful in distinguishing between service, engagement, and scholarly engagement:

1. If a faculty member provides information about careers in the sciences to high school students, our report would classify this activity as service (because of the lack of a reciprocal relationship).

2. If the activity in (1) is part of a program that recruits targeted students for enrollment in majors within the sciences at TAMU, our report would classify this activity as engagement (because of the recruiting element and the reciprocal relationship that is created with that high school.

3. If the activity in (1) provides faculty members with information or perspectives that inform their teaching or research/creative works, our report would classify this activity as scholarly engagement (because of the creation of knowledge in the faculty member's teaching or research/creative works that would occur through the reciprocal relationship).

Again, it is important to note that activities (1), (2), and (3) are all important and should be encouraged and recognized as being expected of faculty. The sole purpose of our differentiation is to provide the basis upon which we focus our recommendations.

Engagement is defined as a collaborative and reciprocal relationship between Texas A&M University (TAMU) and key constituencies. This definition of engagement extends the traditional land grant role of "service" which connotes a unidirectional relationship characterized by TAMU disseminating knowledge and expertise to others. Whereas service focuses on providing assistance to public audiences, engagement embraces collaboration with audiences in the production of new knowledge.

A second difference between the concept of scholarly engagement and that of service is the scholarly nature of efforts related to the former. Instead of seeing constituencies as passive recipients of expert knowledge (which is characteristic of service), a scholarship-based approach to engagement recognizes that constituencies contribute to and participate in the creation of academic knowledge. (Report of the Scholarly Engagement Roadmap Committee, Texas A&M University, May 21, 2009, p. 4-5).

<center>**Recommendations**</center>

<center>Committee on Research Performance Evaluation
Faculty Performance Evaluations Task Force
Clint Allred, Michael Benedik, Joe Golsan (Chair), Johnny Hurtado, Yvonna Lincoln, Debra Zoran</center>

Background: At our initial meeting of the Task Force, members of the Research Subcommittee met to discuss what were the most appropriate peer institutions with which we should compare ourselves for the purposes of annual reviews in research. Noting that TAMU is a hybrid institution in terms of the range of disciplines we include, the Committee chose to look at other institutions not based solely on their national ranking or their inclusion on the list of Peer Institutions for the 20/20 Plan. As a result we came up with the following Institutions to consider: Michigan State, Minnesota, Ohio State, Penn State, Illinois, Florida, Wisconsin, Texas, UC San Diego, UC Davis, and Georgia. We then divided up the institutions so that each member of the Subcommittee would research three of four institutions. We then met to discuss our findings, one member of the Subcommittee did not attend our meetings, and some reports on specific institutions were not provided. The Subcommittee was able to determine that procedures in most institutions are similar to our own. However, there were some interesting divergences and innovations in terms of annual reviews that are worth noting here. We leave it to the Annual Review Task Force or the Dean of Faculties to determine whether these divergent policies and practices at other institutions are worth implementing at TAMU

- At Michigan State, the Annual review process provides a more detailed and formal response process from the individual who is being reviewed. Specifically, the individual has the right not only to meet with the supervisor if they do not agree with the evaluation (which we do here) but also to provide "additional documentation" in support of their case. All this information must be included in the individual's permanent file.

- At Minnesota, the criteria for the review are quite explicit and spell out issues that are, to my experience at TAMU at least, not stressed in the same way. These include promotion of diversity, and also "responsible leadership, management, and use of the university's human, physical, and financial resources."

- Post tenure review procedures are obviously much more rigorous at UNC and at Texas than they are here. Moreover, the policies and procedures are spelled out carefully, and obviously "have teeth."

- The University of Florida also has a very interesting procedure in place. Their faculty are required to input accomplishments (e.g. citation for a published paper) into web based system. Basically, they are inputting all of the same information that we put in our annual reports. They have set deadlines for this to be done. The beauty of the system is that then administrators or others can simply use the interface to generate the necessary report on that faculty member (or a collection of faculty members). The reports are also uniform across faculty members, departments, and schools. Also, you do it once and you are done. Some faculty are required to prepare multiple reports.

  Following our initial report to the full task Force, we met again to discuss how uniform (or not) annual review procedures for research were across Texas A&M, in different Colleges and Departments. For the most part, these procedures are similar, taking into account a three year window of activity, and stressing quality of research over quantity. Most members of the

<center>13</center>

Subcommittee members were comfortable with the three year window but all noted that filling out Annual Review forms was a time-consuming process. It should be noted, however, that some Departments and Colleges count publications accepted, whereas others insist that these publications be in print before they are counted.

The Subcommittee also discussed the issue of fairness in teaching load in comparison to the research productivity of the faculty member in question. It seems clear that, especially in difficult budgetary times, when raise monies are scarce, that those faculty that publish less should teach more. At our meeting with the Full Task Force, this issue was raised, and the Dean of Faculties pointed out that this can be addressed on an ad hoc basis between the faculty member and the Department Head.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

- The members of the Research Subcommittee concluded that, overall, the procedures for annual review at Texas A&M are generally functional, and more or less in conformity with procedures at other peer institutions, with the notable exception of divergent (and innovative) procedures noted above. Therefore, as a group we make no major recommendations for changes in the rules. It should be pointed out, however, that the actual annual review procedures in force at Texas A&M are frequently not entirely in conformity with University rules. For example, the three year window in practice in most Departments and Colleges does not jive with rule 2.5.5.1, which stresses that the review should focus primarily on the immediately previous academic or calendar year. Also, it is not clear to what extent the annual reviews for tenured Associate Professors emphasize progress toward Full Professor, as stipulated in Rule 2.5.2.

- In his role as Department Head, the Chair of our Subcommittee does wish to make a few recommendations by way of conclusion:

  1. The assigning of larger teaching loads to less research-productive faculty *should not* be left up to individual Department Heads to impose alone, as this opens the door for perceptions of unfairness or prejudice. Colleges and the University need to make explicit that this is a University policy. To make that point effectively might require obligatory revisions in Department By-laws, etc.

  2. In the annual reviews of all faculty, it should be stressed that research productivity is directly linked to research support in terms of travel and research funds, eligibility for Development leaves, etc. It is the impression of at least the Chair of this Subcommittee that this is not always the case.

- A final issue discussed but without resolution was the matter of post-tenure review. Some express a need for "giving more teeth" to the process, whereas others thought our current rules and guidelines address the issue appropriately.

UNIVERSITY RULE

12.01.99.M2 **University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion**
Approved June 20, 1997
Revised July 27, 2001
Supplements System Policy 12.01

1. GENERAL

The policies for academic freedom, ethics, responsibility, tenure, and promotion at Texas A&M University apply equally to current faculty members and to subsequent appointees. These policies seek to establish a spirit of cooperation, good faith, and responsibility and to provide useful guidelines for situations not specifically described in this document.

2. FACULTY AND EMPLOYMENT

  2.1 Definition of Faculty:

   2.1.1 In general, a faculty member, to whom the academic freedoms and responsibilities described in this document pertain, is any full-time or part-time employee of Texas A&M University with an appointment as a Professor at any rank, an Instructor, or a Lecturer at any rank, or a Librarian (I, II, III, or IV).

   2.1.2 A faculty member is not automatically eligible for tenure.   See Section 4.1.1.

  2.2 Employment Contract:

   2.2.1 All new faculty members shall be provided with an appointment letter stating the initial terms and conditions of employment. Any subsequent modifications or special understandings in regard to the appointment, which may be made on an annual basis, will be stated in writing and a copy will be given to the faculty member. All tenure-track faculty members, unless the terms and conditions of their appointment letter state otherwise, are expected to engage in teaching, scholarship, and service, and research or other creative contributions. Essential job functions for a position may vary depending upon the nature of the department in which the faculty member is employed, the nature of the discipline in which the faculty member holds expertise, external funding requirements attached to the position, licensing or accreditation requirements, and other circumstances. It is therefore important that essential job functions for each faculty position be listed in the initial appointment letter. For example, all of the following that are applicable should be listed: teaching responsibilities, responsibilities for advising students, independent and/or collaborative research responsibilities, engaging in patient care, committee assignments, conditions imposed by external accrediting agencies, conditions for holding a named professorship or a position that combines academic and administrative duties, and any other specific essential functions for the position in question. All appointment

15

letters must indicate whether the appointment being offered is with tenure, tenure-accruing, or non-tenure-accruing.

2.2.2 If the appointment is tenure-accruing, the appointment letter will indicate the length of the period of probationary service at Texas A&M University and state the credit agreed upon for appropriate service at other institutions. The specific probationary period does not, however, constitute the term of the initial appointment. All appointments during the probationary period are for a fixed term of one year or less and are subject to renewal or non-renewal each year of the probationary period.

2.2.3 Unless otherwise specified in the initial or annual appointment letter, or mutually agreed upon revision thereof, tenure-accruing appointments and appointments with tenure guarantee employment for nine months or the equivalent.

2.2.4 All faculty members will receive an annual notification of the terms and conditions of appointment for the next fiscal year within two weeks after the Texas A&M University budget has been approved by the Board of Regents. This notice shall contain the rank of appointment, tenure status, inclusive dates of employment, salary, and any special conditions. Any changes or additions to either essential job functions or conditions of employment noted in the original letter of appointment also should be included, but only after appropriate consultation with the faculty member. Any changes to the terms and conditions of appointment may be appealed through Rule 12.01.99.M4 (Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights). Faculty members are obligated to fulfill the terms of employment for the following year, unless they resign prior to 30 days after receiving notification of these terms.

2.3 Termination of Employment: Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint a faculty member, shall be given in writing in accord with the following standards:

2.3.1 Tenure Track

2.3.1.1 Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of probationary service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination;

2.3.1.2 Not later than December 15 of the second year of probationary service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination; and

2.3.1.3 At least twelve months before the expiration of a probationary appointment after two or more years in the institution.

1. Proposed changes to Section 2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2; (draft)

   2.3.2 ~~Lecturers and Senior Lecturers~~Non-tenure Track Faculty Titles

      2.3.2.1 A ~~Lecturer~~ non-tenure track faculty who has held any faculty appointment other than Assistant Lecturer for the equivalent of 5 or more academic years of full service within a 7 year period shall be provided a one-year notice if it is the University's intent not to renew the appointment.

      2.3.2.2 A faculty member promoted to or hired at the rank of Senior Lecturer, qualified Associate or Full Professor rank shall be provided a one year notice if it is the University's intent not to renew the appointment.

      2.3.2.3 Any request for an exemption to either of these provisions must be based on a major programmatic revision or budgetary cutback. Such a request with appropriate documentation must be submitted by a college dean through the Provost to the President for approval.

2.4 Right of Access to Personnel Files

   2.4.1 All faculty members are entitled under Texas law to see their personnel files and to obtain, at their own expense, a copy of the information in these files.

2.5 Annual Review.

   2.5.1 An annual review will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members regardless of their title~~at the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Distinguished Lecturer, Instructor, Librarian (I, II, III, or IV), Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor~~. The purpose of the annual review is to provide a mechanism to facilitate dialogue between the administration and faculty. The ~~A~~annual review provides ~~valuable information to the department head about~~ the venue to evaluate the faculty members' accomplishments ~~and to the faculty members with regard to the department head's assessment of their progress in the discipline and~~ in the context of department goals. Annual reviews are to be conducted in an environment of openness and collegiality, with an emphasis on constructive development of the individual faculty member and the institution.

   2.5.2 The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank. For ~~lecturers and librarians of all ranks,~~non-tenure track faculty the annual review process will serve primarily as an evaluation focusing on performance and potential for reappointment and promotion. For ~~tenured or~~ tenure-track faculty, the annual review must take into account the fact that progress in a scholarly career is a long-term venture; therefore, a three to five year horizon may be necessary for the accurate evaluation of scholarly progress. Furthermore, an annual review process should be conducted differently depending upon the different stages of a faculty member's career. For non-tenured, tenure-track assistant professors and instructors, the annual review process must also provide indication as to progress toward tenure and

promotion (see 4.3.5). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward the requisite stature for promotion to professor. For professors, annual review should be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

2.5.3   Annual reviews must embrace the position that faculty members' relative degrees of focus on teaching, service, and research or other creative contributions may change as their careers evolve. At times, it is appropriate for faculty members to contribute in a balanced way to all three facets of faculty contribution. At other times, it may be appropriate for a given faculty member to focus on research/creative contribution, and at still other times it may be appropriate for that faculty member to focus on teaching or service

2.5.43   To ensure consistency over time, each department shall publish its annual review procedure on paper or by electronic means.   Annual review procedures for the department shall be approved by the respective college dean before publication and shall be reviewed by the Dean of Faculties for consistency with this section.   The creation and modification of this document should be a product of joint deliberation by faculty members and the department head. If there is no need for department specific guidelines, a college-wide document, developed jointly by faculty and administrators and reviewed by the Dean of Faculties, is sufficient.   The annual review procedure document must include the following elements:

2.5.3.1 Purpose of annual review. These include the purposes set forth in (2.5.1) and (2.5.2) as well as any department specific purposes.

2.5.3.2 Period of evaluation (may be longer than one year; see 2.5.2) and aspects of performance to be evaluated, as appropriate for each job title.

2.5.3.3 Annual Activity Report format and content. Examples of possible content include (a) a statement of assigned duties, consistent with (or consisting of) the appointment letter or current position description (2.2.1); (b) a list of activities, accomplishments, and awards; (c) documentation, including such items as course syllabi, evidence of student learning, published papers or books, evidence of effectiveness in service, teaching portfolio, etc.; (d) self-evaluation in the context of the assigned duties of the faculty member and the missions of the department and University; and (e) a statement of goals (see 2.5.5.1).

2.5.3.4 Timeline and procedures for evaluation must be consistent with sections 2.2.1, 2.5.5.2, 2.5.5.3, and 2.5.5.4.

1. Proposed changes to Section 2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2; (draft)

>> 2.5.3.5 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines (generally, letter to dean with copy to Dean of Faculties).

> 2.5.53.4 Basis for eEvaluation.

>> 2.5.5.1 All sources of information to be used for the evaluation must be specified. The following are examples of possible sources of information: (a) Annual activity report (required as a source); (b) personal observation by evaluator; (c) discussions with colleagues, students, and/or others; (d) student evaluations of teaching; (e) peer evaluations of teaching. Note that the standard end-of-semester student evaluations of teaching must not be the only instrument used in determining teaching quality and effectiveness.

>> 2.5.5.2 Evaluation Criteria. Regardless of the sources used, all annual evaluations must address faculty members' contributions through teaching, research, service, and creative contribution. Reports to faculty must include evaluations for each category (teaching, service, and research or other creative contribution). It is understood that teaching, service, and research or other creative contributions may be directed at discovery, integration, translation, and/or application of knowledge.

>> 2.5.5.3 As part of the annual review process, an explicit, written statement must be established with each faculty member indicating expectations with respect to degree of focus on teaching, service, and research or other creative contribution. Within departments, the overall mix of faculty contributions should be established in ways that optimize the probability of success of the individual faculty member, while also advancing the goals of the department, college, and Texas A&M University.

>> 2.5.5.4 Department and college guidelines must thus allow the teaching, service, and research or creative contribution loads to vary across faculty members. The teaching component shall not be less than those mandated by the Texas A&M System policy, and service contributions shall be no less than 10% of the total effort of any faculty member. Service contributions shall normally include service to the department, college or university in addition to, or in lieu of, service to the profession.

>> 2.5.5.5 Department and college guidelines may define the extent to which different teaching, service, and research or creative activities load distributions are weighed for merit-raise considerations. That is, departments and colleges shall have flexibility in determining what type of contributions and the weight that each type of contribution has in the overall merit evaluation.

1. Proposed changes to Section 2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2; (draft)

2.5.5.6 Department and college guidelines must define what types of activities qualify as measures of performance within each of the three activities, teaching, service, and research or creative contributions.. Indicators of performance need not be exclusively assigned to one category. For example, membership on an editorial board could be both an indicator of scholarly achievement as well as of service to the profession.

2.5.5.7 Contributions of faculty members through scholarly engagement (defined in 2.2.1) must be acknowledged in the review process, but are to be valued no more and no less than scholarship that is conducted in other contexts and directed at other outcomes. Annual reviews must also afford faculty member opportunity to be recognized for contributions to diversity, internationalization/globalization, interdisciplinary collaboration, and multidisciplinary collaboration. Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary contributions must be valued no more and no less than disciplinary contributions. Faculty member who do not make significant contributions to diversity or internationalization/globalization should not be disadvantaged in the review, but those faculty members who do not make significant contributions in these areas must be recognized through the evaluation results.

2.5.5.8 Annual reviews must include an informed judgment by the administrator of the extent to which the faculty member complies with rules, policies, and procedures related to safety and all mandatory trainings. No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if she or he is out of compliance with Texas A&M University's Regulation 33.05.02, which addresses required training.

2.5.3.5 Timeline and procedures for evaluation. These must be consistent with sections 2.2.1, 2.5.5.2, 2.5.5.3, and 2.5.5.4.

2.5.3.6 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines (generally, letter to dean with copy to Dean of Faculties).

Comment [acb1]: Incorporated above under 2.5.4

Comment [acb2]: Incorporated above under 2.5.4

2.5.64 Department heads with faculty who have budgeted joint appointments will collaborate with the heads of the appropriate units to develop accurate annual reports. In all cases there should be one department where more than 50% of the appointment is located; the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation. Input will be sought from heads of departments in which a faculty member holds non-budgeted appointments.

2.5.75 The exact form of the annual review may differ from college to college, or even from department to department within a college, but must include the following components.

2.5.57.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities. The report should be focused on the immediately previous academic or calendar year, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred. The report must incorporate teaching, service, and research or other creative activities as appropriateteaching, research, and service. Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals.

2.5.57.2 A written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations. The department head will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual report document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member indicates receipt by signing a copy of the document. This memorandum, and/or the annual report and any related documents, will be entered into the faculty member's departmental personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual report shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research and service.

2.5.58.3 Meeting between the department head and the faculty member. There will be an annual opportunity for a personal meeting to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year if either party believes it is needed. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.

2.5.59.4 Performance Assessment. In assessing performance and determining salary increases, the weights given to teaching, service, and research or other creative activities as appropriateteaching, research, and service shall be consistent with the expectations as determined in 2.5.5.5, 2.5.75.2 and 2.5.75.3 above and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department and University. For example, persons with solely teaching responsibilities who attain excellence in all aspects of teaching should receive comparable merit to persons with multiple responsibilities who attain excellence.

A Guide to Develop Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines

The present guide does not attempt to represent the only pathway to the development of performance evaluation guidelines. There can be other more or less granular ways to evaluate faculty performance. However, the present guide can walk you through the most relevant considerations departments will have to follow in the development of their own guidelines.

Mission, Goals and Priorities

- The goals and priorities of the department should be present as performance evaluation guidelines are developed or modified. In the end, the guidelines will be useful and valid to the extent they help the department to reach its vision.

Process and Procedures

- Timeline and process to revise edit and publicize the guidelines (changes to guidelines cannot be forced retrospectively in the upcoming evaluation period).

- Timeline for other important steps in the process, for example:

    o Completion of annual activity report

    o Written review by the department head.

    o Meeting with department head to discuss faculty performance evaluation.

- If a faculty committee participates in the review:

    o Process to select individuals

    o Length of terms and rotation schedule

    o Role and purpose of the committee (e.g., does the committee comments on the department head's reviews, or do they conduct independent reviews? Does the committee contribute to merit allocations?)

Purpose, Scope and Expectations

- Time

    o Period of evaluation: Departments have flexibility in defining the period included in the activity report. For example, departments may choose to evaluate faculty annually on a three-year window and weigh each of the years equally (or, for example, weight more the most recent year but still consider what was done in previous years).

- Load distributions across teaching, service, and research/creative activities

    o Taking into account the mission, goals and priorities of the department, what are the *optimal* parameters (ranges) for load distributions across the different faculty tasks (i.e., what % effort or weight should be attached to teaching, service, and research and other creative activities)?

    o Are there different load-distribution expectations for different ranks? For instance, should senior faculty have more flexibility than junior faculty in defining their load

distributions (e.g., reducing their research effort to increase their time dedication to teaching and service)?

- o Can individuals request exceptions to optimal load distributions? If granted, what are the implications for merit allocations? For example, Professor Brightbrain wants to avoid committee service and is seeking a substantial reduction on his teaching load so that he can finish his new book, "I'm Smarter than You'all." Will he be able to aspire to an overall qualification of "Extraordinary" or "Outstanding", or will he have to settle for a maximum possible of "Satisfactory" or "Average"?

- Defining Excellence

  - o Are there different (quantity/quality/impact) expectations for different ranks? For instance, for tenure-track faculty, are there higher expectations for senior than junior faculty on specific areas or activities (e.g., funding, national service, quality of publication outlets, teaching and mentoring effectiveness).

  - o In addition to quantify productivity, guidelines should list (identify) indicators of quality and impact for each teaching, service, and research or other creative activities. A direct assessment of quality involves a direct assessment of the work produced (i.e., reading and analyzing a publication) or can be inferred or assumed (e.g., a work published in a very prestigious peer reviewed publication). Although evidence of impact might be difficult to assess for recent works, guidelines may include markers or indicators of actual and potential impact (e.g., an invitation to speak at a prestigious conference to illustrate a new teaching technique can be an indicator of both actual and potential impact).

  - o Can there be overlap between areas of performance? For example, being the editor of a prestigious journal can be considered a service to the profession but also is an indicator of the individual's status in the field.

  - o Quantity and indicators of quality and impact can be categorized into levels of excellence (e.g., merit, high merit, extraordinary merit).

  - o Performance within each, teaching, service and research or other creative activities should define what constitutes unsatisfactory, satisfactory, very satisfactory and outstanding performance (or other set of qualifying categories).

  - o Guidelines should define how overall performance is qualified (e.g., can an overall satisfactory be given in the presence of an unsatisfactory in teaching?). For example, a department may judge a faculty member who contributes to all three areas in a balanced manner as a better performer than an individual with a high level of contribution to one area but insufficient amount of contribution to another area.

  - o Specify the weight that each performance area contributes to the overall performance evaluation (e.g., weight equals the percent effort allocated to each area of contribution).

- Multidisciplinary Contributions, Engagement, Contributions to Diversity and Globalization

- - There can be products of multidisciplinary work, engagement, diversity and globalization within each service, teaching, and research and other creative activities.

  - Guidelines can identify quantity, quality, and impact of these products within each of the areas of faculty performance.

  - Multidisciplinary work cannot be valued less or more than disciplinary work.

  - The guidelines should define the criteria to follow to classify engagement work into the teaching, service, and research or other creative activities areas of performance.

- Safety

  - Guidelines must incorporate an assessment of individuals' compliance with minimum safety standards. Neglect or noncompliance with safety automatically leads to an unsatisfactory evaluation.

- Compliance with mandatory training

  - Noncompliance with mandatory trainings automatically leads to an unsatisfactory evaluation.

- Activity Report

  - Consider what goes in the activity report (e.g., *CV*, teaching portfolio).

  - Instrument developed specifically to record accomplishments within the various categories of performance (teaching, service, research/creativity) and of excellence (merit, high merit, extraordinary merit).

  - Consider including self-expectations for each area of contribution (teaching, etc).

  - Evidence or statement of compliance safety and mandatory training requirements.

Annual Review and Allocation of Merit

- Annual Appointment Checklist

  - Period of appointment and salary.

  - Are there any changes in (or a need to re-emphasize) expectations for teaching, service and research and other creative activities.

  - Are there any new (or a need to re-emphasize) specific expectations related to the individual (e.g., obtaining external funding).

- Annual Review and Merit

  - Description of the individual's performance overall and across the various areas of contribution.

  - Relate performance to expectations for the individual.

- Put performance into context by indicating how performance ranks against appropriate comparison cohort.

- Explain how evaluations were used to assign merit salary allocations. Describe the available merit pool and how merit was allocated.

  - How does performance ranking relate to merit allocation?

  - Are merit allocations based on the individual's base salary, a percentage of the available pool (i.e., an absolute dollar amount), or a hybrid of these two methods?

  - What % of the available pool was used cover salary increases due to promotions, equity adjustments, retention efforts?

- Qualify progress towards achievement of higher rank (for full and distinguished professors, qualify progress in maintaining or elevating already achieved levels of excellence).

- Include expectations for future performance.

Meeting with Department Head

- There must be an annual opportunity for a personal meeting to discuss the written review and expectations for the upcoming year(s).

- Discuss strategies for achieve expectations.

- In case of an unsatisfactory evaluation in any of the areas of performance,

  - The meeting with the department head must lead to a written plan or contract with a timeline and description of how such deficiencies will be resolved.

  - A solution may include a redistribution of expectations to compensate for the deficiencies (e.g., reassign effort from an area of low performance to an area of outstanding performance).

  - Redistribution of expectations could enhance the individual's actual contribution to the department, but could also limit the potential of individual's overall contribution. For example, a department may judge a faculty member who contributes to all three areas in a balanced manner as a better performer than an individual with a high level of contribution to one area but insufficient amount of contribution to another area.