

Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Review of Faculty

Adopted May 2008

The following policies and procedures apply to all faculty members of the

College of Education and Social Sciences (COESS) At West Texas A&M University

In addition, the following COESS Departments have adopted these policies for their departmental standards:

***Department of Psychology, Sociology, and Social Work (PSSW)
Department of Education (DOE)
Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice (PSCJ)***

Results of the annual review will be used for the determination of salary increases based on merit, qualification for promotion and tenure, reappointment of non-tenured faculty, assessment of post-tenure performance, faculty awards, and appointments to endowed professorial positions. *The policies within this document are in alignment with the following WTAMU University documents: Annual Review of Faculty Performance Standards (12.99.99.WA/AA) and Promotion and Tenure (12.02.01.WI/AA). Addendums to the University documents (12.99.99.WA/AA and 12.02.01.WI/AA) are noted in red and highlighted.*

PREAMBLE

The annual faculty evaluation process provides each faculty member with a clear understanding of what is necessary to be regarded as a productive faculty member. The data resulting from the annual review process is used as the basis for considering annual merit increases in salary, tenure, promotion, reappointment of non-tenured faculty, post-tenure review, faculty awards, and professorships. During the annual evaluation process, each faculty member has an opportunity to review strengths, weakness and expectations based upon his/her accomplishments during the preceding year. The annual review process also allows a faculty member to work with the department head to establish goals and evaluation standards for the next year.

To ensure an equitable and balanced University-wide approach to the annual evaluation of faculty performance, all academic departments and colleges must have a written policy statement that describes the standards for annual performance. Each department and college will establish its own criteria, but all performance standards must be consistent with university standards and must be approved by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. As a part of the annual review process, each faculty member will have an opportunity to establish

individual performance goals, subject to the approval of the faculty member's department head, by which he/she will be evaluated the following year.

West Texas A&M University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution. In accordance with federal and state law, Texas A&M University System policy, and University rules, no decision in the annual evaluation of faculty performance will be influenced by bias on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, religion, age, veteran status or disability.

1. ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT

- 1.1 By February 1 of each year, each faculty member must provide his/her department head with a complete Annual Activity Report that accurately lists the faculty members accomplishments during the preceding calendar year (January 1 to December 31).
- 1.2 The Annual Activity Report is a summary of all professional activities and accomplishments for the preceding calendar year (January 1 to December 31) and must be submitted in the form prescribed by the University.
- 1.3 The Annual Activity Report will be used with other evaluative sources (e.g., student evaluations, peer and/or alumni reviews, reviews by external evaluators, etc.) by the Department Head, College Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the University President as a basis for the Annual Review of Faculty Performance.
- 1.4 The annual review of faculty performance will be used in the determination of salary increases based on merit and in reviews associated with the promotion, tenure, or post-tenure processes. Merit salary increases will be granted only in the event that funds are allocated for such salary increases.
- 1.5 It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide the information required on the Annual Activity Report. The faculty member must be able to document each entry made on the Annual Activity Report. In each major category of the Annual Activity Report, faculty members may add additional information so that the department head and reviewers at other administrative levels may obtain a full and accurate evaluation of an individual's accomplishments during the year under review.
- 1.6 The Annual Activity Report consists of three parts:
 - 1.6.1 The Annual Professional Summary document, prepared using Sedona© software, that lists individual faculty activities and accomplishments during the review period;

- 1.6.2 A self-assessment (two pages maximum) of individual accomplishments during the review period relative to the goals set at the beginning of the year in any or all of the three major evaluation categories; and
- 1.6.3 A description of goals for the upcoming year in each of the three evaluation categories. The goals should include an evaluation weight for each evaluation category (within the limits prescribed below). The goals and weights may be adjusted by the department head. Both parties must sign the goals and weights statement for the evaluation period. These goals and weights will be used as the basis for the next faculty performance evaluation. The goals and weights statement may be amended by agreement of the faculty member and department head if situations arise during the year that impact the faculty member's ability to fulfill the agreed upon goals. The amended statement must be signed by both parties and included with the faculty member's Annual Activity Report for the following year.

2. ANNUAL DEADLINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

- 2.1 The typical annual deadlines for the reviews of faculty performance are listed below. In some years, the deadlines listed below fall on weekend days rather than work days. When this occurs, the deadlines will be moved forward to the next business day.

February 1	Annual Activity Report is submitted by each faculty member to the appropriate Department Head.
March 15	Department Head submits all Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance forms to the appropriate College Dean. Instructions for completing this form are contained in the <i>Faculty Handbook</i> and must be followed as outlined.
April 1	Dean submits all Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance forms to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with his/her evaluation and comments. The Dean also submits the Annual Report of Tenured Faculty for Post-tenure Review.
April 15	Vice President submits Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance forms to the President. Vice President also submits the Annual Report of Tenured Faculty for Post-tenure Review.
May 1	President submits Post-tenure Review Report to the Chancellor of the Texas A&M University System.
August 15	By this time, the President will have approved merit salary increases for the next fiscal year

3. AREAS OF FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

- 3.1** The major areas of faculty responsibility that will be considered in the Annual Review process are related to activities in four arenas: Instructional Responsibilities; Intellectual Contributions; Professional Service; and Collegiality and Professionalism. *The Instructional Responsibilities, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Service are broken into categories, identified by the indicators A, B, C, etc. (see sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3). Faculty members are evaluated using a ranking of 0 – 4 on each of these categories, with the totals of these categories resulting in the overall scores of the four main areas of faculty responsibility (see Annual Activity Evaluation Form). The weight of each category within the four areas of faculty responsibility is determined by each department and will be consistent for every faculty member in the department.*

In each of the following sections: 3.2.1 Instructional Responsibilities; Intellectual Contributions; 3.2.3 Professional Service; and, 3.2.4 Collegiality and Professionalism are a series of bulleted items that provide faculty with performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process. It is essential that faculty members provide correct and complete information so the department head and others who evaluate the Annual Review can draw accurate conclusions and scoring of faculty members. If faculty members do not address these points, it will be assumed that they have failed to meet the objectives (see 1.5).

- 3.2** The evaluation of a faculty member's performance in each major area may consider, but is not limited to, the following factors:

3.2.1 Instructional Responsibilities

In the College of Education and Social Sciences, teaching is a high priority for faculty and will be weighted more in evaluating faculty than Intellectual Contributions and Professional Service. Faculty are responsible for providing students a quality educational experience by keeping up-to-date in their fields, engaging the students in and out of the classroom, continuously striving to improve as teachers, teaching classes and changing the curriculum, including new classes and new programs, to meet the needs of the students and department, college, and university.

Faculty members will be evaluated on the following five categories of Instructional Responsibilities: A) Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness, B) Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance, C) Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, D) Quality of Communication with Students, and E) Academic Development. The weight of each of the five categories to the overall score for Instructional Responsibilities is determined by

each department and will be consistent for every faculty member in the department.

A. Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (*CIEQs*);
- Peer, department head, and/or alumni evaluations of teaching effectiveness;
- *Instructor developed evaluations of teaching effectiveness – (formative and summative) - in addition to the CIEQ;*
- Effective participation in Core Curriculum courses based on incorporation of innovative teaching techniques and use of technology-based teaching strategies;
- Honors or other recognition for teaching effectiveness.

B. Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- *Implements specific strategies and designs plans to achieve stated course goals, objectives, and assessment of learning outcomes;*
- *Establishes classroom environment of mutual respect and helpfulness;*
- *Tests and assignments are well-planned, well-prepared and indicate student learning toward course goals;*
- *Challenges students to critically apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information; activities reflect higher-level thinking, demonstrate communication skills, and stimulate intellectual growth;*
- *Uses technology innovations in courses;*
- Development or revision of courses with emphasis on the preparation and use of innovative instructional materials, the incorporation of technology-based teaching strategies, classroom interactions, community-based learning, participatory learning opportunities such as service learning, learning communities and/or other student-engaging teaching techniques;
- Active role in developing new academic programs, *niche programs*, majors and/or minors;
- Stimulation of student discussion and critical thinking;
- Incorporation and evaluation of student writing and research assignments in course requirements;
- Leadership in the development and successful accomplishment of a faculty-led Study Abroad course;

- Integration of theory with practice in course materials.
- *Serves on committee for masters' theses and doctoral dissertation; (credit limited to two years for master's thesis and dissertation; one year for senior honors);*

C. Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- *Assists in updates of the courses and program in the department or college; takes leadership roles in curricular changes, course preparation, and program evaluation;*
- *Makes effective contribution by teaching courses needed in the department, college, and university (i.e., core curriculum, distance learning, Honors courses, graduate courses, overloads, etc.);*
- *Develops new courses when appropriate;*
- Comparative assessment (to other departmental faculty) of course load responsibilities taught during the review period based upon the class size, number of courses, number of class/lab preparations, and the total classroom, lab and/or clinical contact hours per week;
- Direction of internships, *field placements*, independent studies, student research, major student projects, theses, dissertations, and/or capstone courses;
- Director, coach or mentor of student achievement in research or creativity.

D. Quality of Communication with Students

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- *Encourages student questions, participation, and discussion, both in and outside of the classroom;*
- *Responds to students in a student-oriented, helpful and friendly manner;*
- *Responds to student contact (email, phone, other) in a timely manner;*
- Quality of course syllabi that communicate high academic expectations, assessment of student learning outcomes, timely return of graded materials, grading policy, and other course materials;
- Involvement with and effectiveness of student advising;
- Professional interactions with students that promote student learning and the mission of the University outside of the classroom;

- To receive a score of 3.0 to 3.5, a faculty member must significantly exceed the normal expectations for this factor.

Satisfactory/Excellent 2.5. to 3.0 Points

- *Above expectations for full-time faculty in the department or college when considering the totality of the faculty member's instructional responsibilities as measured across the following five categories: Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurances, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and Academic Development.*
- The level of achievement for the factor under consideration is above expectations for full-time faculty in the department or college.

Marginally Satisfactory 2.0 to 2.4 Points

- *Faculty member does the minimum required but usually does not exceed expectations when considering the totality of the faculty member's instructional responsibilities as measured across the following five categories: Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurances, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and Academic Development.*
- The faculty member does what is required with effectiveness, but usually does not exceed expectations in all areas.

Unsatisfactory 1.0 to 1.9 Points

- *Faculty member's performance ranks below expectations when considering the totality of the faculty member's instructional responsibilities as measured across the following five categories: Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurances, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and Academic Development.*
- The faculty member's performance ranks below expectations in most categories.
- The faculty member must improve performance in this area and should be given a written set of expectations for improvement.

Unacceptable 0 Points

- *The faculty member's performance ranks significantly below the expected level when considering the totality of the faculty member's instructional responsibilities as measured across the following five categories: Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurances, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and Academic Development.*
- The faculty member's performance ranks significantly below the expected level.
- The faculty member did not engage in the activity called for by the factor even though such activity is an expectation based on the faculty member's position and academic rank.

- The faculty member must demonstrate tangible evidence of engagement in the activity called for by this factor during the next review period and must provide a written plan that includes goals for improvement.

Not Applicable N/A

- Based upon the faculty member's job description and/or academic rank, there is no expectation of performance in the area described by this factor.
- This designation shall not be used as a substitute when "Unacceptable" or "Unsatisfactory" are appropriate evaluations.
- The N/A rating carries no point value and is not used in calculating an average rank score.

3.2.2 Intellectual Contributions

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to engage in quality Intellectual Contributions. Although there are many avenues in which Intellectual Contributions take place, priority will be given to peer-reviewed products. Both the quantity and quality of the Intellectual Contributions will be determined at the department level.

There are three categories in which faculty will be evaluated: A) Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performances, B) Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions, and C) Honors for Research or Creative Expressions. The weight of each of the three categories to the overall score for Intellectual Contributions is determined by each department and will be consistent for every faculty member in the department.

A. Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performances

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- Publication (or acceptance of publication) in refereed professional and academic journals of the results of research, analysis of cases, interpretations of knowledge, creative writing, instructional developments (including software), and/or pedagogical methodology;
- Publication of scholarly monographs, books, *textbooks, workbooks, lab manuals*, and/or chapters in books;
- *Publication of articles in the faculty member's discipline;*

- Publication of technical reports having primary relevance to agencies or businesses at the local, state, or national level;
- *Publishes comprehensive online deliverable courseware;*
- *Commitment to sustained participation in scholarly activity;*
- *Directs masters' theses and doctoral dissertation committees (credit limited to two years for master's thesis and dissertation; one year for senior honors);*
- Performances or exhibits of creative expressions that are performed or exhibited in a regional, national or international professional venue and/or are reviewed by documented professional authorities not associated with the University (guidelines for compensated performances or exhibits will be established by departments);
- Funded *research* grant proposals from any external public or private source with special emphasis on external funding by state and national agencies;
- Patents or the commercialization of research;
- Professional consulting and/or commissions of creative work.

B. Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- Presentations of knowledge or creative expressions at professional conferences or exhibitions;
- Performances, exhibits of creative expressions, or presentations of knowledge at University-sponsored events;
- Invited lectures or presentations based on research, creativity, or professional expertise;
- Translation of research into practice by development or improvement of clinical practice guidelines, protocols or best practices.
- *Discussant at professional meetings or conferences;*

C. Honors for Research or Creative Expressions

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- External awards, honors or other recognition for intellectual contributions and/or creative contributions;

- University awards or honors for intellectual contributions and/or creative contributions.

Evaluation Criteria for Intellectual Contributions

Outstanding 3.6 to 4 Points

- *Truly exceptional when considering the totality of the faculty member's intellectual contributions as measured across the following three categories of intellectual contributions: Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performance, Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions, and Honors for Research or Creative Expressions.*
- Truly exceptional level of achievement matched by few in the University.
- Level of achievement is considered significant when compared nationally.
- This ranking should be used judiciously and will likely call for justification if the evidence for such a ranking is not evident to the dean, provost, or president.

Excellent 3.0 to 3.5 Points

- *Well above normal expectations for full time faculty in the department or college but is not considered exceptional when considering the totality of the faculty member as measured across the following three categories of intellection contributions: Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performance, Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions, and Honors for Research or Creative Expressions.*
- The level of achievement for the factor under consideration is well above normal expectations for full-time faculty in the department of college, but is not considered exceptional.
- To receive a score of 3.0 to 3.5, a faculty member must significantly exceed the normal expectations for this factor.

Satisfactory/Excellent 2.5. to 3.0 Points

- *Above expectations for full-time faculty in the department or college when considering the totality of the faculty member measured across the following three categories of intellectual contributions: Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performance, Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions, and Honors for Research or Creative Expressions.*
- The level of achievement for the factor under consideration is above expectations for full-time faculty in the department or college.

Marginally Satisfactory 2.0 to 2.4 Points

- *Faculty member does the minimum required but usually does not exceed expectations when considering the totality of the faculty member*

measured across the following three categories of intellectual contributions: Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performance, Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions, and Honors for Research or Creative Expressions.

- The faculty member does what is required with effectiveness, but usually does not exceed expectations in all areas.

Unsatisfactory 1.0 to 1.9 Points

- *Faculty member's performance ranks below expectations when considering the totality of the faculty member measured across the following three categories of intellectual contributions: Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performance, Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions, and Honors for Research or Creative Expressions.*
- The faculty member's performance ranks below expectations in most categories.
- The faculty member must improve performance in this area and should be given a written set of expectations for improvement.

Unacceptable 0 Points

- *The faculty member's performance ranks significantly below the expected level when considering the totality of the faculty member measured across the following three categories of intellectual contributions: Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performance, Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions, and Honors for Research or Creative Expressions.*
- The faculty member's performance ranks significantly below the expected level.
- The faculty member did not engage in the activity called for by the factor even though such activity is an expectation based on the faculty member's position and academic rank.
- The faculty member must demonstrate tangible evidence of engagement in the activity called for by this factor during the next review period and must provide a written plan that includes goals for improvement.

Not Applicable N/A

- Based upon the faculty member's job description and/or academic rank, there is no expectation of performance in the area described by this factor.
- This designation shall not be used as a substitute when "Unacceptable" or "Unsatisfactory" are appropriate evaluations.
- The N/A rating carries no point value and is not used in calculating an average rank score.

3.2.3 Professional Service

The faculty of COESS plays an important role in serving the many constituents of West Texas A&M University, including students,

department, the college, the university, the community, the Panhandle, the state, and their academic profession. Because faculty members have different interests and strengths to which they can contribute to these constituencies, varied ways of serving will be recognized as Professional Service. Regardless of what form this service takes, faculty members are expected to be active in serving these constituents.

Faculty will be evaluated in three categories of Professional Service: A) Service to the University, B) Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World, and C) Service to the Profession. The weight of each of three categories to the overall score for Professional Service is determined by each department and will be consistent for every faculty member in the department.

A. Service to the University

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- Service to the University through effective participation in administrative assignments, committees or governance processes of the department, college and/or university;
- Service to the University through assisting student organizations or activities;
- Service to the University through non-credit or uncompensated teaching;
- Service to the University through active participation in the recruitment of students;
- *Participates with recruitment and retention activities;*
- *Participates in summer orientation of students;*
- *Participates in "Discover WT";*
- *Participates in mentoring of students and faculty;*
- *Provides leadership in promoting teaching effectiveness, incorporation of appropriate technology, and curriculum improvement;*
- *Participates in external development activities for the department, college, and/or university;*
- *Participates in alumni relation activities;*
- *Attends department, college, and university meetings;*
- *Attends graduation, freshman convocation, and other events;*
- Service to the University through leadership in the development of academic programs, curricula, or other special projects assigned by the department head, dean or provost;

- Service to the University as an effective elected member of the Faculty Senate, including Senate offices and committee assignments;
- Service to the University through uncompensated performances or exhibits of creative expressions not directly associated with class assignments.

B. *Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World*

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- Application of professional knowledge in (uncompensated) service to the community, state, nation, or world (reimbursements or modest honoraria that cover travel or other incidental expenses are not considered “compensation”);
- Public service activities for governmental or non-governmental units at local, state, national, or international levels.
- *Demonstrates a sustained record of active service and leadership by serving on community committees;*
- *Serves as a consultant in area of professional expertise (Note prior approval required. See TAMUS Policy 31.05, 31.05.01);*
- *Represents the Department, College, or University in print or electronic media.*
- *Provides written reviews for journals and other publications.*

C. *Service to the Profession*

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- Service to professional organizations through elected or appointed offices, committees, or conference assignments;
- Service to professional organizations through editorial assignments;
- Service to the profession through the publication of book *or article* reviews in professional outlets.
- *Serves on boards and/or committees in areas of professional expertise;*
- *Receives funding for a service grant;*
- *Serves as a manuscript referee, adjudicator, reviewer, or editor;*
- *Serves as a reviewer for professional publications and/or presentations;*

- *Maintains membership in national, regional, or state professional associations;*
- *Sustained record of attendance and participation in discipline related professional conferences;*
- *Serves as commentator, panelist, or discussant at professional meetings;*
- *Service to the profession as a member of an accreditation review team or professional association;*
- *Other service not included in the departmental faculty evaluation document.*

D. Honors for Service

Performance tools and criteria that will be considered in the evaluation process:

- Honors for service to the University, community, state, nation, or the profession (*not related to Intellectual Contributions*).

Evaluation Criteria for Professional Service

Outstanding 3.6 to 4 Points

- *Truly exceptional when considering the totality of the faculty member's professional service as measured across the following four categories of professional service: Service to the University, Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World, Service to the Profession, and Honors for Services.*
- Truly exceptional level of achievement matched by few in the University.
- Level of achievement is considered significant when compared nationally.
- This ranking should be used judiciously and will likely call for justification if the evidence for such a ranking is not evident to the dean, provost, or president.

Excellent 3.0 to 3.5 Points

- *Well above normal expectations for full time faculty in the department or college but is not considered exceptional when considering the totality of the faculty member as measured across the following four categories of professional service: Service to the University, Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World, Service to the Profession, and Honors for Services.*
- The level of achievement for the factor under consideration is well above normal expectations for full-time faculty in the department of college, but is not considered exceptional.
- To receive a score of 3.0 to 3.5, a faculty member must significantly exceed the normal expectations for this factor.

Satisfactory/Excellent 2.5. to 3.0 Points

- *Above expectations for full-time faculty in the department or college when considering the totality of the faculty member as measured across the following four categories of professional service: Service to the University, Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World, Service to the Profession, and Honors for Services.*
- The level of achievement for the factor under consideration is above expectations for full-time faculty in the department or college.

Marginally Satisfactory 2.0 to 2.4 Points

- *Faculty member does the minimum required but usually does not exceed expectations when considering the totality of the faculty member measured across the following four categories of professional service: Service to the University, Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World, Service to the Profession, and Honors for Services.*
- The faculty member does what is required with effectiveness, but usually does not exceed expectations in all areas.

Unsatisfactory 1.0 to 1.9 Points

- *Faculty member's performance ranks below expectations when considering the totality of the faculty member measured across the following four categories of professional service: Service to the University, Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World, Service to the Profession, and Honors for Services.*
- The faculty member's performance ranks below expectations in most categories.
- The faculty member must improve performance in this area and should be given a written set of expectations for improvement.

Unacceptable 0 Points

- *The faculty member's performance ranks significantly below the expected level when considering the totality of the faculty member measured across the following four categories of professional service: Service to the University, Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World, Service to the Profession, and Honors for Services.*
- The faculty member's performance ranks significantly below the expected level.
- The faculty member did not engage in the activity called for by the factor even though such activity is an expectation based on the faculty member's position and academic rank.
- The faculty member must demonstrate tangible evidence of engagement in the activity called for by this factor during the next review period and must provide a written plan that includes goals for improvement.

Not Applicable N/A

- Based upon the faculty member's job description and/or academic rank, there is no expectation of performance in the area described by this factor
- This designation shall not be used as a substitute when "Unacceptable" or "Unsatisfactory" are appropriate evaluations.

- This ranking should be used judiciously and will likely call for justification if the evidence for such a ranking is not evident to the dean, provost, or president.

Excellent 3.0 to 3.5 Points

- The level of achievement for the factor under consideration is well above normal expectations for full-time faculty in the department of college, but is not considered exceptional
- To receive a score of 3.0 to 3.5, a faculty member must significantly exceed the normal expectations for this factor.

Satisfactory/Excellent 2.5. to 3.0 Points

- The level of achievement for the factor under consideration is above expectations for full-time faculty in the department or college.

Marginally Satisfactory 2.0 to 2.4 Points

- The faculty member does what is required with effectiveness, but usually does not exceed expectations in all areas.

Unsatisfactory 1.0 to 1.9 Points

- The faculty member's performance ranks below expectations in most categories
- The faculty member must improve performance in this area and should be given a written set of expectations for improvement.

Unacceptable 0 Points

- The faculty member's performance ranks significantly below the expected level.
- The faculty member did not engage in the activity called for by the factor even though such activity is an expectation based on the faculty member's position and academic rank.
- The faculty member must demonstrate tangible evidence of engagement in the activity called for by this factor during the next review period and must provide a written plan that includes goals for improvement.

Not Applicable N/A

- Based upon the faculty member's job description and/or academic rank, there is no expectation of performance in the area described by this factor
- This designation shall not be used as a substitute when "Unacceptable" or "Unsatisfactory" are appropriate evaluations.
- The N/A rating carries no point value and is not used in calculating an average rank score.

- 4.2 In determining an overall performance rating for each faculty member, the following procedure will be followed:

- 4.2.1 For each factor itemized under each of the three major areas of performance responsibility (i.e., Instructional Responsibilities, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Service), the department head will provide a point value based on the qualitative rating of Outstanding, Excellent, Satisfactory/Excellent, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Unacceptable, or Not Applicable.
- 4.2.2 In the area of Collegiality and Professionalism a rating of either “Acceptable” or “Not Acceptable” will be given.
- 4.2.3 Some factors in the itemized lists are considered more important than others and will carry a greater weight. The greater weight will be expressed by repeating the point value for the item multiple times in the calculation of the average score for the major area of performance responsibility.
- 4.2.4 In determining the overall evaluation of performance within each of the three major categories, an average of all performance scores for the factors within a major area of performance will be calculated.
- 4.2.5 Consistent with the position description and the agreed-upon goals that were established for the faculty member during the preceding annual review, the weights assigned to each of the three major areas of responsibility may be assigned within the following ranges of weights:

Normal Ranges for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Instructional Responsibilities	50% -- 65%
Intellectual Contributions	20% -- 40%
Service	5% -- 20%

Normal Ranges for Faculty not in Tenure Lines

Instructional Responsibilities	60% -- 75%
Intellectual Contributions	5% -- 20%
Service	10% -- 30%

The ranges established for each faculty member must total, but not exceed, 100%.

- 4.2.6 Normally, the following ranges of weights are suggested for major area of responsibility based on academic rank, years of service and/or job description:

For Tenure-track Faculty in First Two Years of Service:

Instructional Responsibility	65%
------------------------------	-----

Intellectual Contributions	30%
Service	5%

For Tenure-track Faculty in Years 3 to 6:

Instructional Responsibility	60%
Intellectual Contributions	35%
Service	5%

For Tenured Associate and (Full) Professors

Instructional Responsibilities	From 50% to 65%
Intellectual Contributions	From 20% to 40%
Service	From 10% to 20%

For Non-tenured Faculty with Teaching-only Contracts

Instructional Responsibilities	75%
Intellectual Contributions	10%
Service	15%

For Non-tenured Faculty with Research Obligations

Instructional Responsibilities	60%
Intellectual Contributions	30%
Service	10%

- 4.2.7 Using the appropriate weights described above, multiply the average point value calculated for each major factor by the weight assigned for the major area to calculate the weighted average for each major performance area.
- 4.2.8 Add the weighted averages for the three major performance areas to compute the overall performance score.
- 4.2.9 Rank all of the faculty members in the department based on their overall performance scores and make recommendations for merit increases based on the rankings.

Example of Calculation: Overall Evaluation Rating

<u>Major Area</u>	<u>Average Score</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>Weighted Score</u>
Instructional Responsibility	3.6		0.6 (60%)		2.16
Intellectual Contributions	3.0		0.3 (30%)		0.90
Service	2.5		0.1 (10%)		0.25
Overall Evaluation Rating					3.31

5. It is expected that every faculty member will perform all assigned duties and meet all expected responsibilities. However, meeting the minimum standard of acceptable

6.9.08

performance, such as a rating of “Marginally Satisfactory,” is not sufficient to justify a salary increase based upon merit.

- 5.1 The Texas A&M University System regulations require that merit raises be provided to faculty only for “meritorious job performance” (System Regulation 31.01.01, Item 2.4.2) or “superior performance” (System Regulation 31.01.08, Item 2.0).
- 5.2 West Texas A&M University interprets the terms “superior performance” and “meritorious job performance” as they relate to merit increases in salary as follows:
 - 5.2.1 When funds are available for merit-based increases, merit-based salary increases will be granted only to those faculty members whose Overall Evaluation Rating is 2.50 or higher.
 - 5.2.2 Available funds for merit increases will be distributed using a formula that correlates the monetary amount of the merit increase to the Overall Evaluation Rating so that the faculty member with the highest overall evaluation rating receives the most financial reward.
 - 5.2.3 Any of the following conditions will render a faculty member ineligible for merit advances in salary for the evaluation period under consideration:
 - 5.2.3.1 Less than a 2.5 evaluation in the category of Instructional Responsibilities during the evaluation period; and/or
 - 5.2.3.2 Less than a 2.5 evaluation in Intellectual Contributions during the evaluation period *or* having not produced a peer-reviewed publication or off campus, peer-reviewed creative activity in any of the three previous evaluation periods; and/or
 - 5.2.3.3 Less than a 2.5 evaluation in the category of Professional Services in any two of the three most recent evaluation periods; and/or
 - 5.2.3.4 An evaluation rating of “Not Acceptable” in the category of Collegiality and Professionalism during the evaluation period.
6. The department head’s recommendation for awards of salary increases based on performance evaluation will be calculated based on two basic factors: (1) the total amount of money allocated to the department for merit raises (Departmental Merit

Pool), and (2) the number of faculty members in the department who received an Overall Evaluation Rating of 2.50 or higher and who meet the eligibility requirements specified in 5.2.3. The amount of a faculty members merit award will be calculated as follows:

- 6.1 The department head will determine how many faculty members in the department are eligible to receive a salary adjustment based on merit.
 - 6.1.1 Only those faculty members with an Overall Evaluation Rating of 2.50 or higher are eligible to receive a salary adjustment based on merit.
 - 6.1.2 Only those faculty members who meet the eligibility requirements specified in 5.2.3 are eligible to receive a salary adjustment based on merit.
 - 6.1.3 Factors such as longevity, current salary level, comparisons to “market” salary levels, or average salary levels for academic rank, etc., may not be considered in the determination of merit recommendations.
- 6.2 The department head will divide the total dollar amount of funds allocated to the department for merit increases by the total number of faculty members who are eligible (see 6.1, above) to receive a merit increase. This calculated amount is the *Merit Unit*.
- 6.3 The department head will subtract 2.49 from the Final Faculty Rank of each faculty member who is eligible for a merit increase to determine the *Merit Factor* for each faculty member.
- 6.4 The department head will multiply the *Merit Unit* by the *Merit Factor* to determine the recommended merit salary increase for each faculty member.

7. APPEAL OF EVALUATION

- 7.1 A faculty member may appeal the evaluation of the department head. Within five (5) working days of the faculty member’s evaluation meeting, the faculty member may present the department head with a written description of what the faculty member considers to be inaccurate interpretation or evaluation of the faculty member’s achievements as presented in the Annual Activity Report. This written description may not exceed two pages (12-point font).
- 7.2 The department head will re-review the faculty member’s Annual Activity Report in light of the material presented in the two-page appeal. The

department head will inform the faculty member in writing of the decision regarding the appeal before sending the faculty member's Annual Activity Report to the college dean. If changes are made to the evaluation form, the changes will be discussed with the faculty member and the faculty member will initial all changes made on the Evaluation Form.

- 7.3 The two-page appeal document, the department head's letter regarding the appeal, and the faculty member's Evaluation Form will be stapled together and forwarded to the college dean.
- 7.4 If a faculty member is not satisfied with the response of the department head to the appeal, the faculty member may request via a one (1) page letter (within 3 working days of receiving the department head's response) that the dean re-evaluate the faculty member's Annual Activity Report. The faculty member may not provide additional information beyond what is provided in the original two-page appeal.
- 7.5 The dean will respond to this appeal via letter before sending the Annual Activity Report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The college dean may request that the department head re-evaluate the faculty member's Annual Activity Report or deny the appeal.
- 7.6 Generally, the process of appeal should cease when the college dean renders a decision on the matter. However, the faculty member may continue to appeal the annual evaluation by requesting the Vice President of Academic Affairs (after the appeal to the college dean) and the President (after the appeal to the Vice President) evaluate the faculty member's performance.

ANNUAL ACTIVITY EVALUATION FORM

Name: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____ Evaluation Year: _____

Weighted Average Score: _____

I. Instructional Responsibilities

Weight (%): _____

- _____ A. *Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness*
- _____ B. *Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance*
- _____ C. *Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions*
- _____ D. *Quality of Communication with Students*
- _____ E. *Academic Development*

Calculation of Mean for Instructional Responsibilities:

_____ Score for A
+ _____ Score for A (repeated)
+ _____ Score for A (repeated)
+ _____ Score for B
+ _____ Score for B (repeated)
+ _____ Score for C
+ _____ Score for D
+ _____ Score for E
= _____ **Total for I.R.**

Total for I.R. _____ \div N = _____ **Average Score for I.R.**

II. Intellectual Contributions

Weight (%): _____

_____ F. *Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performances*_____ G. *Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions*_____ H. *Honors for Research or Creative Expressions***Calculation of Mean for Intellectual Contributions**

_____ Score for F
 + _____ Score for F (repeated)
 + _____ Score for F (repeated)
 + _____ Score for G
 + _____ Score for H
 = _____ **Total for I.C.**

Total for I.C. _____ \div N = _____ **Average Score for I.C.**

III. Professional Service

Weight (%): _____

_____ I. *Service to the University*_____ J. *Professional Service to the Community, State or Nation*_____ K. *Service to Professional Organizations*_____ L. *Honors for Service***Calculation of Mean for Professional Service**

_____ Score for I
 + _____ Score for J
 + _____ Score for K
 + _____ Score for L
 = _____ **Total for P.S.**

Total for P.S. _____ \div N = _____ **Average Score for P.S.**

IV. Collegiality and Professionalism (A = Acceptable; N = Not Acceptable)**_____ Overall Rating for Collegiality and Professionalism****EVALUATION SUMMARY**

Major Area	Average Score	x	Weight	=	Weighted Score
Instructional Responsibility	_____	x	_____	=	_____
Intellectual Contributions	_____	x	_____	=	_____
Professional Service	_____	x	_____	=	_____
Collegiality & Professionalism	_____				
Final Faculty Rank (=Total of Weighted Scores)				=	_____

Department Head's Signature

Date

I have read the above evaluation of my performance. I may submit comments (limited to 2 pages) that will be attached to this form and will be forwarded with this form.

Faculty Member's Signature

Date

A copy of this form must be provided to the faculty member once it has been signed by the department head and the faculty member.

