

Annual Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members

Texas A&M University-Texarkana

The purpose of the annual faculty performance review is to improve the faculty member's performance in the areas appropriate and applicable to their faculty status as outlined in this document. While informal communication between the dean or designee, department chair, and the faculty continues throughout the year, the annual review serves as the primary checkpoint for assessing a faculty member's performance and, for tenured/tenure-track faculty, progress toward tenure and/or promotion-in-rank (See [UP 12.01.99.H1.03 Faculty Performance Review](#), [UR 12.01.99.H2 Academic Freedom and Responsibility](#), and [UR 12.01.99.H1 Tenure and Promotion](#)). Results of the annual faculty performance review are also used in decision-making regarding the award of merit salary raises or payments (See [UR 31.01.08.H1 Merit Salary Increases](#)).

The annual performance review, individualized for each faculty member, should be conducted in an atmosphere of openness and collegiality and in a spirit of goodwill. The dean or designated reporting authority and faculty member shall engage in discussion and negotiation regarding expectations for each faculty and his/her success in achieving those expectations.

Steps in the Review Process

1. During the annual performance review conference, the dean or designee, department chair, and faculty will review the faculty's performance for the previous year and establish mutual expectations and goals for the forthcoming performance review cycle. For new faculty to the university, the dean and faculty will meet within the first few weeks of the faculty's employment to establish mutual goals and expectations for the first performance review cycle.
2. The dean or designee, department chair, and faculty shall maintain ongoing communication throughout the review cycle regarding progress toward and/or revisions to the expectations and goals.
3. The faculty shall submit evidence in support of their performance in the evaluative areas (as outlined in the guidelines below) to the dean or designee and department chair by a designated date, schedule the annual performance review conference with the dean and department chair, and complete the self-evaluation portions of the performance review.

Timeline

Our evaluation period is from January to December each year. Below are the pieces and timeline of the review process.

Action/Documentation	Submission Deadline (approximate)
New faculty submit percentage, expectations and goals set.	Second Friday in October
Faculty meet with their Department Head/Dean to review percentage, expectations and goals.	Second Friday in November
Faculty submit their supporting documentation and self-evaluation to the Department Chair and Dean.	Last Friday in February

Faculty members meet with their Department Chair/Dean to review their performance evaluation.	Second Friday in April
Submitted to Provost office for review & approval	Last Friday in April

GUIDELINES FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

At the annual performance review conference or initial conference for a faculty member new to the university, each faculty member, in collaboration with the respective dean and department chair, will determine the percentages that teaching, scholarship/program responsibilities, and service will contribute to the annual performance review during the subsequent year. The percentage assignments may be renegotiated by a deadline to be determined and announced by the dean. **The ranges are designated as follows with the total percentages of the three categories totaling 100 percent.** In making these decisions, variables including but not limited to the college needs/requirements for accreditation, academic program expectations, and primary level of the faculty member’s teaching assignment (i.e., lower division, upper division, masters, doctoral) should be considered.

Teaching:	20 – 70 percent
Scholarship/Creative Activities	20 – 70 percent
Service:	10 – 60 percent

The faculty member, department chair, and dean will determine the activities/accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service that will be required for “meets expectations” and/or “exceeds expectations” for the subsequent year, based on the faculty member’s goals and college’s needs.

Rating

Teaching: Each tenured/tenure-track faculty member will be evaluated on teaching performance. As part of their annual review, faculty should submit evidence that provides a robust and accurate representation of their teaching effectiveness (a list of potential supporting documentation appears later in this document).

Scholarship and Creative Activity: Each tenured/tenure-track faculty member will be evaluated on their scholarship and creative activity.

As part of their annual review, faculty should submit evidence that provides a robust and accurate representation of their scholarly achievements (a list of potential supporting documentation appears later in this document).

Service: Each tenured/tenure-track faculty member will be evaluated on their service commitments.

As part of their annual review, faculty should submit evidence that provides a robust and accurate representation of their service contributions (a list of potential supporting documentation appears later in this document).

GUIDELINES FOR NONTENURE-TRACK FACULTY

At the annual performance review conference or initial conference for a faculty member new to the university, each faculty member, in collaboration with the respective dean and department chair, will determine the percentages that teaching, program responsibilities, and/or service will contribute to the annual performance review during the subsequent year. The percentage assignments may be renegotiated by a deadline to be determined and announced by the dean. The ranges are designated as follows with the total percentages of the three categories totaling 100 percent. In making these decisions, variables including but not limited to the college needs/requirements for accreditation, academic program expectations, and primary level of the faculty member's teaching assignment (i.e., lower division, upper division, masters, doctoral) should be considered.

Teaching:	50 – 100 percent
Service:	0 – 50 percent
Program Responsibilities:	0 – 50 percent

The faculty member, department chair, and dean will determine the activities/accomplishments in each evaluative area required for “meets expectations” and/or “exceeds expectations” for the subsequent year, based on the faculty member's goals and college's needs.

Rating

Teaching: Each nontenure-track faculty member will be evaluated on teaching performance. As part of their annual review, faculty should submit evidence provides a robust and accurate representation of their teaching excellence (a list of potential supporting documentation appears later in this document).

Service: Nontenure-track faculty *may* be evaluated on their service commitments (if applicable). As part of their annual review, faculty should submit evidence provides a robust and accurate representation of their service contributions (a list of potential supporting documentation appears later in this document).

Program Responsibilities: A nontenure-track faculty member *may* be evaluated on their program responsibilities (if applicable). As part of their annual review, faculty should submit evidence provides a robust and accurate representation of their achievements in program responsibilities (a list of potential supporting documentation appears later in this document).

ADDITIONAL EVALUATIVE CRITERIA (WHEN APPLICABLE)

Administrative: Faculty members who hold a paid administrative position or receive reassigned time for such duties will be evaluated by the designated authority overseeing that appointment. The grade on the administrative section will not be included in the overall score and does not impact tenure status. Evaluation of administrative performance solely impacts the continuation of extra pay or reassigned duties.

Examples of specific indicators of administrative effectiveness may include:

- Communicating and building credibility with others
- Effectively partnering with key leaders/organizations

- Painting a vision aligned with strategic priorities of the institution
- Identifying problems and opportunities
- Utilizing effectively internal/external resources toward program accomplishments
- Attaining established programmatic goals
- Recognizing and deleting/revising programs that no longer contribute to organizational priorities
- Ensuring effective planning, conducting, and evaluating of programs resulting in measurable outcomes
- Ensuring college, institutional, regional, and/or national visibility of efforts (as applicable)
- Establishing and responding to priority issues/needs
- Delivering on commitments
- Communicating organizational activities/accomplishments
- Adhering to programmatic, college, and/or institutional deadlines
- Ensuring effective hiring, supervising, and/or evaluating subordinate personnel

Scoring

Overall Faculty Performance is calculated by multiplying the quantitative score in each evaluated section by the assignment percentage for that section (not including any applicable administrative responsibilities evaluations) and then adding those totals together. This sum results in an overall quantitative score. If the quantitative score is under 1.5, the faculty member will receive a Does Not Meet Expectation. A Meets Expectation score is given to those whose quantitative score is between 1.6 and 2.5. Quantitative scores over 2.5 will receive an Exceeds Expectation score.

Example:

Teaching	$2.5 \times 50\% = 1.25$
Scholarship	$3.0 \times 20\% = .60$
Service	$2.5 \times 30\% = .75$

TOTAL: 2.6

Goals

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 direct supervisor, by which he/she will be evaluated the following year. Faculty members should provide evidence to substantiate progress on their stated goals, so performance against these goals can be assessed. At the annual evaluation session with the Dean, Department Chair, or designated reporting authority, these goals may be expanded, amended, or deleted.

Appeal of Evaluation

The Texas A&M University System does not provide for the appeal of faculty performance review results (see System Regulation 32.01.01 [Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members](#)) except on the basis of factual error or discrimination related to a legally protected class: age, gender, color, national origin, race, religion, disability, or veteran status (see System Policy 08.01 [Civil Rights Protection and Compliance](#)). *A faculty who does not agree with the final performance review rating may provide a written response/statement as an attachment to the completed document.*

Suggested Supporting Documentation

Below is a list of suggested support documents that can be submitted with the self-evaluation to demonstrate success in each evaluative category. *The list below, which is not exhaustive in nature, provides examples of documentation and does not constitute required documentation.* Think of these documents as proof of your work for your dean and department chair, who may not be aware or remember everything you accomplished throughout the year in review.

Teaching

- Tools of instruction such as syllabi, assignments, examinations, grading methods, should also be assessed and may be included in the evaluation.
- Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness may be considered in the period of review.
- Awards from organizations from within and outside the department, TAMUT, and TAMUS might be used to substantiate excellence in teaching.
- Undergraduate and/or graduate students supervised: documents undergraduate or graduate student committee assignments.
- Other courses taught; recognizes the development of, or participation in, recognized programs for continuing education, short courses, or special workshops. Written assessments by participants.
- Teaching innovations such as the development of innovative teaching methods and materials (textbooks, software, new curricula, etc.).
- Invited Lectures: include invitations to teach at outside academic institutions.
- Student comments and testimonials.
- Evidence of attendance at teaching workshops and conferences on pedagogy.
- Students' work showing evidence of learning which would include, but are not limited to, such items as workbooks, class logs, portfolios, essays, creative works, and projects.
- Documentary evidence of assistance to students outside of class with course-related problems, advisement, securing employment, letters of recommendation, workshops and tutorial sessions.
- Copies of corrected students work showing suggestions for improvement and encouragement.
- Evidence of special preparations or modifications made to accommodate students with special needs.

Scholarship & Creative Activity

- Publications include: publications in refereed journals, conferences, and/or leading professional journals; the publication of scholarly books, conference proceedings, and/or chapters in scholarly books; monographs, publication of professional projects; technical reports, including those to a granting agency; patents; publications of open-source material will bear more weight if peer-reviewed and from leading open-source publishers; acknowledgment of creative work through selection as a subject for a published article, inclusion in an exhibition catalogue, or descriptions in a curator's statement; and creative work included in a public or private collection, invited exhibition, traveling exhibition, screening, or broadcast.
- Evidence of external or internal grants awarded or submitted for funding (but not awarded).

- Showings of creative work in design development or visual and performing arts includes engineering design development.
- Funded research includes recognition of the receipt of external resources for scholarly and creative activities and/or evidence of completed, peer reviewed research activities. External resources might include, but would not be limited to, fellowships, contracts, or research grants.
- Pre-publication activities: Data collection and analysis; Field and lab research activities; Drafts of papers in progress; Preliminary work for an exhibit or performance.
- Nominations for awards and/or awards received for scholarly contributions or creative works.

Service

- Advising students at the undergraduate level at or beyond the expectations of regular academic advising of faculty to students is noteworthy.
- Demonstrated supervisory responsibilities in official departmental or university leadership position.
- Participation in the following activities would be considered a contribution: (1) serving on discipline appropriate editorial boards, (2) judge or critic for national/international competitions, and/or (3) ad hoc reviewer for competitions, grants, journals, or contract funding agencies.
- Moderator or session chair at a national, state, or regional conference.
- Participation in the planning of a national, state, or regional conference.
- Officer of a professional organization.
- Member of a committee of a professional organization.
- Proof of student service (sponsorship of a club or honor society; supervision of a field trip; service on University committees relating to Student Affairs).
- Program responsibilities (see below)

Program Responsibilities

- Metrics demonstrating program growth.
- Program strategic planning documents (e.g., vision, mission, goals, measures of achievement).
- Student advising data (including metrics of degree completion/retention, advising load).
- Program/degree updates/redesign.

Administrative

- Strategic planning documents (e.g., vision, mission, goals, measures of achievement).
- Evidence of administrative oversight or supervision, including (but not limited to) budgeting documents, performance reviews/observations of personnel, resource management, internal/external funding/resource procurement.
- Evidence of effective communication with stakeholders, constituents, and/or personnel.
- Evidence of effective leadership (letters/notes from subordinates or collaborative partners, internal/external recognition, etc.).
- Evidence of programs, initiatives, events, or other outputs (and internal/external measures of achievement, satisfaction, impact, etc.).

- Evidence of engagement/visibility (webpage, promotional items, collaborations, sponsorships/partnerships, social media, etc.).
- Letters/notes of support, thanks, acknowledgement related to the position/initiative.
- Honors, awards, recognitions for efforts related to the position/initiative.
- Evidence of wider campus, community, national, or international engagement, involvement, or presence related to the position/initiative.
- Other items that speak directly to any appropriate evaluative criteria as determined between the faculty and designated reporting authority.