**Annual Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members (ADEP)**

**Rubric summary & worksheet for Department Chairs**

TAMU-CC College of Education and Human Development

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Teaching** |  |  |
| **Excellent (4): Faculty member demonstrates exceptional performance exceeding expectations**The faculty member submits documentation suggesting effective, rigorous, and innovative teaching. *Excellence* is warranted when the faculty member can document five (5) of the following ten (10) criteria:  | **Faculty/****Self Assess** | **Dept. Chair****Review/Notes** |
| * Achieving a mean rating 4.5 or above on student evaluations

**(must be documented as one of the five criteria)**  |  |  |
| * Receiving positive peer evaluations
 |  |  |
| * Coordinating major course redesigns or proposing new curriculum
 |  |  |
| * Updating syllabi to incorporate contemporary learning and novel research findings
 |  |  |
| * Utilizing Blackboard Grade Center for returning grades and providing students feedback on their assignments and examinations
 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| * Engaging in professional development that supports effective teaching
 |  |  |
| * Meeting all ODELT best practices in online course development and instruction
 |  |  |
| * Incorporating technology and innovation in course delivery
 |  |  |
| * Serving as a thesis, project, or dissertation advisor/chair/methodologist
 |  |  |
| * Other Chair approved teaching related assignments during ADEP Goal setting process
 |  |  |
| **High (3): Faculty member exceeds expectations but does not rise to level of excellent**The faculty member is responsible for meeting the duties associated with teaching (syllabi, class preparation, responsible grading, etc.) and is, overall, a conscientious and effective teacher. Although not at the level of *excellent*, the faculty member receives a rating of *high* by documenting four (4) of the following ten (10) criteria: |  |  |
| * Achieving a mean rating of 4.0 or higher on student evaluations **(must be documented as one of the four criteria)**
 |  |  |
| * Receiving positive peer evaluations
 |  |  |
| * Coordinating major course redesigns or proposing new curriculum
 |  |  |
| * Updating syllabi to incorporate contemporary learning and novel research findings
 |  |  |
| * Utilizing Blackboard Grade Center for returning grades and providing students feedback on their assignments and examinations
 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| * Engaging in professional development that supports effective teaching
 |  |  |
| * Meeting all ODELT best practices in online course development and instruction
 |  |  |
| * Incorporating technology and innovation in course delivery
 |  |  |
| * Serving as a dissertation or thesis advisor/chair/methodologist
 |  |  |
| * Other Chair approved teaching related assignment during ADEP Goal setting process
 |  |  |
| **Meets Expectations (2): Faculty member meets performance expectations**The faculty member is responsibly meeting the duties associated with teaching (syllabi, class preparation, responsible grading, etc.) and is, overall, an effective teacher. Faculty members can *meet expectations* by documenting three (3) of the following ten (10) criteria:  |  |  |
| * Achieving a mean rating of 3.0 or higher on student evaluations **(must be documented as one of the three criteria)**
 |  |  |
| * Receiving positive peer evaluations
 |  |  |
| * Coordinating major course redesigns or proposing new curriculum
 |  |  |
| * Updating syllabi to incorporate contemporary learning and novel research findings
 |  |  |
| * Utilizing Blackboard Grade Center for returning grades and providing students feedback on their assignments and examinations
 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| * Engaging in professional development that supports effective teaching
 |  |  |
| * Meeting all ODELT best practices in online course development and instruction
 |  |  |
| * Incorporating technology and innovation in course delivery
 |  |  |
| * Serving as a dissertation or thesis advisor/chair/methodologist
 |  |  |
| * Other approved teaching related assignment of the Chair during ADEP Goal setting Phase
 |  |  |

**Notes:**

**COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Scholarship and Creative Activity**

All scholarly products must be documented and evidenced in the faculty member’s Interfolio account. For products not yet published or completed, the faculty member should add documentation of their acceptance, submission, or delivery.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quantitative Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Activity**  | **Point Value** | **Faculty** | **DC Notes** |
| Funded federal or national grant (> $100,000) - PI/Co-PI | 15 |  |  |
| Published book (contracted) | 15 |  |  |
| Published (or accepted) article in a peer-reviewed national journal  | 15 |  |  |
| Funded State, foundation or Agency grant (> $50,000) - PI/Co-PI  | 15 |  |  |
| Published (or accepted) chapter in an edited book (contracted)  | 15 |  |  |
| Presentation at an international or national conference (referred)  | 10 |  |  |
| Published (or accepted) article in a peer-reviewed state/regional journal | 10 |  |  |
| Presentation at a peer-reviewed state or regional conference | 10 |  |  |
| Unfunded federal or national grant proposal (fully submitted and scored) PI/Co-PI | 10 |  |  |
| Unfunded State, Foundation or Agency Grant (>$50,000; submitted/scored) PI/Co-PI | 10 |  |  |
| Funded university-level grant (e.g., R&I research enhancement grants) PI/Co-PI | 10 |  |  |
| Unfunded university-level grant (e.g., R&I research enhancement grants) | 5 |  |  |
| Published white paper, technical report, program accreditation report  | 5 |  |  |
| Conference proceeding or published abstract in a peer-reviewed journal | 5 |  |  |
| Published book (self-published) | 5 |  |  |
| Published white paper, technical report, program accreditation report | 5 |  |  |
| Funded college-level grant (e.g., COEHD funds) PI/Co-PI | 5 |  |  |
| Manuscript submitted for publication (in review; Ind. Pub. can only use once for credit)  | 5 |  |  |
| Published instructor manuals or instructional software | 5 |  |  |
| Local presentation or workshop | 3 |  |  |
| Publication in a professional newsletter | 3 |  |  |
| Unfunded college level grant (fully submitted and scored) PI/Co-PI | 3 |  |  |
| **Total Points** |  |  |  |

**Department Chair Summary Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Excellent (4): Faculty member demonstrates exceptional performance exceeding expectations**Faculty member performance will be deemed *Excellent* if they obtain a minimum of 25 points during the specified evaluation period as noted in their Faculty Activity Report. Included in their documented research activity for the specified evaluation period, the faculty member must demonstrate evidence of the following in their submitted Faculty Activity Report: | **DC notes** |
| * A minimum of one (1) **peer-reviewed article in a scholarly journal** or 15 point qualified state or federal external grant.

Articles with documented designating them as ‘accepted or in-press’ will be considered evidence for peer-reviewed contribution minimum for only one ADEP cycle. If counted as such in one year, the completed article will not be considered for the subsequent(nt ADEP cycle. AND● A minimum of one (1) **peer-reviewed presentation at a state, regional, or national****professional conference** in the faculty member’s discipline |  |
| **High (3): Faculty member exceeds performance expectations but does not rise to level of excellent**Faculty member performance will be deemed *High* if they obtain between 20 and 24 points during the specified evaluation period as noted in their Faculty Activity Report. Included in their documented research activity for the specified evaluation period, the faculty member must demonstrate evidence of the following in their submitted Faculty Activity Report: |  |
| A minimum of one (1) **peer-reviewed presentation at a state, regional, or national professional conference** in the faculty member’s discipline or 10 point qualified state or federal grant And A minimum of one (1) Manuscript submitted & designated as ‘(Under Review)’ in a **peer-reviewed scholarly journal** |  |
| **Meets Expectations (2): Faculty member meets performance expectations**Faculty member performance will be deemed *Meets Expectations* if they obtain between 15 and 19 points during the specified evaluation period as noted in their Faculty Activity Report. |  |
| **Unsatisfactory (1): Faculty member is below performance expectations**Faculty member performance will be deemed *Unsatisfactory* if they obtain less than 15 points during the specified evaluation period as noted in their Faculty Activity Report. |  |

**Notes:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Service** | Faculty  | DC Notes |
| **Excellent (4): Faculty member demonstrates exceptional performance exceeding expectations**The faculty member contributes significant quality-level service time at the institutional and professional levels as documented by participation in three (3) of the following four (4) areas:  |  |  |
| * Membership on standing department committees
 |  |  |
| * Collaboration with department colleagues on curriculum development/revision
 |  |  |
| * Student advisement
 |  |  |
| * Volunteer work in the community that supports the University’s mission
 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **And TWO (2) of the following:**  |  |  |
| * Leadership on university-level committees
 |  |  |
| * Leadership on standing college committees
 |  |  |
| * Leadership on standing department level committees
 |  |  |
| * Leadership on a professional organization committee (elected/appointed) at the state, regional, or national level
 |  |  |
| * Editorial Review Board membership (excludes service as an *ad hoc* reviewer)
 |  |  |
| * Acknowledgement by receipt of an service related Award (COEHD, University, Professional organization)
 |  |  |
| * Service related to Work on implementation of a university, college or departmental grant initiative
 |  |  |
| **High (3): Faculty member exceeds expectations but does not rise to level of excellent** The faculty member contributes substantial and significant service time at the institutional and professional levels as documented by participation in three (3) of the following four (4) areas:  |  |  |
| * Membership on standing department committees
 |  |  |
| * Collaboration with department colleagues on curriculum development /revision
 |  |  |
| * Student advisement
 |  |  |
| * Volunteer work in the community that supports the University’s mission
 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **And ONE (1) of the following:**  |  |  |
| * Membership on university-level committees
 |  |  |
| * Membership on standing college committees
 |  |  |
| * Leadership on standing department level committees
 |  |  |
| * Membership on a professional organization committee (elected or appointed) at the state, regional, or national level
 |  |  |
| * Editorial Review Board membership (includes service as an *ad hoc* reviewer)
 |  |  |
| * Acknowledgement by receipt of a service related Award (COEHD, University, Professional organization)
 |  |  |
| * Service related to work on implementation of a university, college or departmental grant initiative
 |  |  |
| **Meets Expectation (2): Faculty member meets performance expectations** |  |  |
| The faculty member contributes appropriate service time at the institutional level as documented by participation in three (3) of the following four (4) areas:  |  |  |
| * Membership on standing department committees
 |  |  |
| * Collaboration with department colleagues on curriculum development
 |  |  |
| * Student advisement
 |  |  |
| * Volunteer work in the community that supports the University’s mission
 |  |  |

Notes:

**Overall Summary Rubric for Annual Evaluation**

A composite score of faculty performance will be computed for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Then, based upon the weighting agreed upon by the faculty member and Department Chair for each of the three areas (i.e., Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will multiply the average score by the assigned weight. For example, a candidate who negotiated a 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% Service would have each multiplied by the average faculty rating for that area arriving at a total average faculty rating.

 **Example**

The faculty evaluative structure including 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% service. The evaluative ratings for this faculty member were 3.2, 3.0, and 3.2 respectively. Evaluative ratings are multiplied by the evaluative percentage and summed.

* Teaching 3.2 x .4 = 1.28
* Scholarship 3.0 x .4 = 1.20
* Service 3.2 x .2 = 0.64

Total composite average faculty rating = 3.12

Faculty members are generally expected to meet or exceed expectations (i.e., receive at least a 2 rating) in each area of responsibility for teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty receiving a score of less than 2 in any area will be subject to additional review according to COEHD and University policies. The results of all annual reviews must be submitted as part of the promotion and tenure application portfolio.