3.04 Annual Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members (ADEP)
TAMU-CC College of Education and Human Development
(**Effective 1/1/2026**)

All Faculty in the COEHD will be evaluated annually as part of the Annual Development and Evaluation Planning (ADEP) process. In addition to evaluating a faculty member's annual performance for the year ending, the ADEP provides faculty with the opportunity to establish professional goals (teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activity [RSCA]; and service) for the upcoming calendar year through a formative consultation process with their academic department chair, which maximizes the likelihood of the faculty member receiving a positive end-of-year evaluation. This process allows for specific consideration of their yearly workload assignment when establishing yearly performance expectations.

Annual evaluations will be consistent with the requirements of University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.03 (Responsibilities of Faculty Members) and University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.06 (Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members). Evaluations of non-tenured faculty will be conducted within the requirements of University Procedure 12.07.99.C0.01 (Fixed-Term Faculty Members). If the faculty member undergoes promotion and/or tenure review in an academic year, a separate annual review is not necessary.

The faculty member's department chair completes the annual evaluation each spring for the preceding calendar year (January to December). The review will be provided to the faculty member in writing as part of an end-of-year ADEP meeting on or before **March 31** of each year. The evaluation will detail the department chair's evaluation of performance in each of the respective areas of faculty responsibility (teaching, RSCA, and service). Faculty members will have an opportunity to provide a written (2-page maximum) response to the ADEP evaluation within five (5) working days of the end-of-year ADEP meeting. A copy of the department chair's performance evaluation, as well as any faculty member's response, will be forwarded to the dean for review and placement in the faculty member's college personnel file.

Uses of ADEP Evaluation Results

The faculty member's end-of-year ADEP annual evaluation results will be used as one documentation source for: (a) annual merit pay considerations; (b) applications for tenure; (c) applications for promotion; (d) post-tenure reviews; and (e) annual re-appointments for non-tenured faculty. Two consecutive years of unsatisfactory ratings in any area will automatically trigger a remediation review for faculty at any rank. All ADEPs will be maintained as confidential documentation within the faculty member's personnel file. ADEP evaluations are provided in accordance with the evaluation scale described in University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.06 (Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members).

Criteria in Evaluating Faculty Performance: Academic Preparation and Experience

The faculty evaluation rubrics described in this document are aligned with University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.06 (Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members). University regulations for evaluation of faculty are the primary basis for COEHD and departmental decisions regarding promotion and tenure, merit/equity, and faculty reappointment, when appropriate. TAMU-CC descriptions of Teaching, RSCA, and Service are detailed in University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

Faculty are responsible for documenting RSCA, professional engagement, teaching, and service activities within Interfolio annually. Faculty evaluations are based upon measures of faculty performance in teaching, RSCA, and service. Evaluations shall focus on individual performance relative to assigned responsibilities and contributions consistent with those of a faculty member of comparable rank and workload assignments, as determined in consultation with their department chair and approved by the dean. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to ensure the appropriate documentation of their efforts is included in their Interfolio case prior to the evaluative period.

Instructors, clinical-track faculty, professional-track faculty, assistant professors, and associate professors will be evaluated based on the criteria for their present rank and their progress toward meeting the requirements for the next higher rank. Full professors will be evaluated based on their continued performance, consistent with the requirements for that rank, and in relation to department and college norms.

Evaluation criteria must meet university requirements for the faculty position held, as described in University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.03 (Responsibilities of Faculty Members). Criteria and evidence used in evaluations shall be consistent with written measures of the discipline or department (if applicable), as well as University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

1. Teaching activity criteria for evaluation:

Demonstrates a continuing interest in improving as a teacher and developing a knowledge of university-level pedagogy. Shows evidence of instructional innovation, updating and revising current courses, and new course development. Shows quality in teaching through an Interfolio Faculty Activity Report (FAR) consisting of: (1) teaching assignments by semester, (2) teaching load, (3) student evaluations, and (4) summaries of course revisions and/or innovations implemented in courses. Since academic advisement and career counseling are considered part of the faculty's total teaching responsibility, the faculty member should be familiar with degree requirements and other matters related to academic advisement, career development, and other related training opportunities specific to their assigned program(s) or degrees offered in their department.

2. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) criteria for evaluation:

Demonstrates competence and productivity in scholarship and creative activity (applied scholarship, instructional development, and/or basic scholarship) that are related to the faculty's discipline and to the mission of the college. Demonstrates a record of participation, competence, and productivity in their field through a combination of the following: (1) publication in peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journals, (2) conference papers or presentations including those in proceedings, (3) published case studies, (4) instructor manuals, (5) instructional videos, software and web pages supporting instruction, (6) books or chapters in books, (7) monographs, (8) funded grants and funded research proposals, and (9) significant contributions to funded grants or research proposals. See University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

3. Service activity criteria for evaluation:

Demonstrates servant leadership through active participation in department, college, and university committees. Contributes professional and community services such as consulting, editorial, or peer review activities that serve the mission of the college, the university's purposes, or the faculty member's professional academic discipline. Program development activities, program area advertising and marketing activities, and college and university-level consulting activities are also recognized as part of the faculty's record of service.

COEHD ADEP Procedure and Timeline

Faculty Activity Report. The annual evaluation of faculty is documented in the Faculty Activity Report (FAR), which is generated through Interfolio. Each faculty member will be provided with a case in which they will document and, where appropriate, upload examples of their performance in teaching, scholarship, and service for the previous calendar year (January 1-December 31). While faculty have the freedom to choose what documentation they add to their FAR in most categories, all faculty must upload artifacts of their RSCA as reported in the annual FAR.

The FAR also allows for documentation of faculty annual goals. In preparation for the annual ADEP process, faculty members will be instructed to identify and document individual developmental goals for the upcoming year as a component of their annual FAR. Faculty will be encouraged to consult with their department chair in setting goals consistent with their pending workload for the upcoming year. Mutually agreed-upon goals will be documented in the ADEP. Goals should be selected in light of the requirements for promotion, tenure, and professional development. Written documentation and approval of the ADEP will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Developmental goals must be considered by department promotion and tenure review committees, department chairs, and the college promotion and tenure committee, and mentioned in their written evaluations. While annual evaluations are not based on a faculty member meeting each identified goal, they do serve as guidelines for

how a faculty member should allocate their time and efforts in the upcoming year to maximize the likelihood of receiving a positive evaluation.

The following steps will be completed in the ADEP process:

1. **The faculty member submits the end-of-year ADEP.** Faculty members are expected to make a copy of their FAR for the preceding calendar year available to their department chair in Interfolio by **February 1**. The FAR includes a summarizing narrative of the faculty member's accomplishments in each of the three evaluative areas. These summaries could incorporate a discussion of the faculty member's established goals for the year. It is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure their FAR is updated, accurate, and populated with appropriate supporting documentation.

2. **Establishment of formative goals for the upcoming review cycle.** Faculty members will document their goals for the upcoming year on their annual FAR by **February 1**. Goals should be written to reflect what a faculty member plans to accomplish over the course of the forthcoming calendar year within each area of responsibility, respective to their rank and position as a COEHD faculty member. These goals should also be based on the feedback from the previous end-of-year ADEP, as provided by the department chair in the spring. Goals are intended to serve as a reference point for allocating time and effort in the coming year, rather than a benchmark for any evaluative rating.

3. **The department chair meets with the faculty member to review the end-of-year ADEP.** The department chair will schedule a meeting with the faculty member to review the end-of-year ADEP. This meeting will occur on or before **March 31**. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure the faculty member receives prompt feedback on their ADEP. The department chair's feedback is recorded in writing on the ADEP form and can be used by the faculty member to develop goals for the next academic year. Both the faculty member and the department chair will sign off on the written feedback provided by the department chair, and a copy will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

4. **The department chair forwards the completed evaluation to the Dean's Office.** The department chair will forward the faculty member's case, including their FAR (with annual goals) and the department chair's evaluation letter, to the COEHD Dean's Office by **April 15.**

ADEP Review Calendar

Date	**Task**
February 1	Faculty members submit their Faculty Activity Report documenting their teaching, RSCA, and service activities, accomplishments for the previous year, and goals for the upcoming year. This occurs in the Interfolio system.

February 1 – March 31	Faculty members meet with their department chair to review their submitted Faculty Activity Report
April 15	Department chairs submit Faculty Activity Reports along with their narrative evaluations of faculty to the COEHD dean.

COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Teaching

The COEHD is committed to fostering excellence in teaching as a core component of its academic mission. The Annual Performance Review of Full-Time Faculty Members (ADEP) assessment policy on teaching provides a structured framework for evaluating instructional effectiveness, promoting continuous professional growth, and ensuring high-quality learning experiences for students. The following criteria, which incorporate student feedback, peer reviews, and self-reflection, are used to assess faculty teaching performance. By engaging in this annual assessment process, faculty members are encouraged to refine their teaching practices, adopt innovative pedagogical approaches, and contribute to a culture of excellence in education. Based on their annual performance, faculty will receive one of the following ratings:

Unsatisfactory (1)
A faculty member may receive a rating of **unsatisfactory** in teaching if they fail to meet basic instructional expectations or demonstrate significant deficiencies in areas such as course delivery, student engagement, and adherence to institutional standards and policies. An **unsatisfactory** rating indicates the need for immediate improvement and may result in the development of a remediation plan or further administrative action if deficiencies persist.

Meets Expectations (2)
A faculty member may receive a rating of **meets expectations** in teaching when they effectively fulfill their instructional responsibilities and demonstrate competency in delivering a quality educational experience to their students. This rating indicates that the faculty member meets COEHD and institutional standards for teaching performance without significant deficiencies or exceptional performance. A **meets expectations** rating signifies that the faculty member is performing at a satisfactory level, contributing to student success, and fulfilling their teaching responsibilities effectively. To achieve this rating, a faculty member must demonstrate meeting ALL six (6) required criteria (highlighted) and one (1) additional supplemental criterion for Fixed-Term (**FT**) and Tenure-Track (**TT**) faculty and two (2) additional supplemental criteria for Tenured (**T**) faculty.

Criteria
Publishing Canvas course shells by the first day of the semester and posting a class syllabus
Adhering to the published class meeting schedule and delivery method
Utilizing Canvas gradebook to return grades and provide timely feedback on student work
Submitting midterm (undergraduate courses only) and final grades (all classes) by due dates

Obtaining an average score of 3.00 to 4.19 on the quantitative portion of student evaluations (in courses where available)
Providing regular availability for student advising and/or consultation in a manner consistent with how courses are taught (e.g., online, in-person).
Updating syllabi to incorporate contemporary learning and novel research findings
Aligning syllabi with course objectives, standards, and/or student learning outcomes
Evidencing pedagogy that appropriately supports all learners
Demonstrating evidence of quality improvement in teaching
Receiving mostly favorable comments for the qualitative questions on the student evaluations (in courses where available)

Exceeds Expectations (3)

A faculty member receives a rating of **exceeds expectations** in teaching when they go beyond basic instructional responsibilities and demonstrate a strong commitment to excellence in education. This rating reflects outstanding performance in course delivery, student engagement, and pedagogical innovation. An **exceeds expectations** rating signifies that the faculty member's teaching significantly enhances student learning, contributes to the overall excellence of the academic program, and helps advance the college's mission. To achieve this rating, a faculty member must demonstrate that they meet **all** (based on academic rank) criteria for 'Meets Expectations' plus additional criteria from the list below. Fixed-term (**FT**) and tenure-track (**TT**) faculty must demonstrate meeting three (3) of the criteria for **exceeds expectations**. Tenured (**T**) faculty must demonstrate meeting five (5) of the criteria for **exceeds expectations**.

Criteria
Participating in professional development activities supporting effective teaching
Serving on graduate projects, theses, or dissertation committees
Participating in accreditation-related curricular alignment and assessment activities
Nominated for teaching/mentoring awards or recognition (college, university, or professional group) in the past year
Developing/proposing new courses or programs
Documenting positive peer evaluations from department/COEHD colleagues or a TAMU-CC certified peer observer (see CFE website for peer observation resources)
Coordinating major course redesigns or proposing new curriculum
Developing, innovating, and disseminating innovative uses of learning technologies
Applying for instructional grants (internal and external) to support teaching
Average score of 4.20 to 5.00 on the quantitative portion of student evaluations
Contributing to student accolades, awards, or achievements through instruction, advising, or mentorship
Incorporating or managing service learning components in assigned courses (either new or existing opportunities)
Mentoring peer faculty (observer or observed)
Leadership in curricular development and teaching improvement in the discipline

In the ADEP evaluation process, the department chair should consider the extent to which the faculty member demonstrates both a broad knowledge of the discipline and an in-depth understanding of one or more specific areas within the field. The member should document a continuing interest in improving as a teacher and in developing a sense of university-level pedagogy. Evidence of quality in teaching may be demonstrated by instructional innovation, new course development, or other similar activities compiled in the FAR. Additionally, as part of the ADEP process, the department chair should review student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluations, and both the number and magnitude of student advising activities.

The college recognizes that not all teaching loads require equal effort because of differences in class size, number of preparations, course type (in-person or online), and course level (graduate or undergraduate). Consideration should be given to the teaching load, including the average number of students taught and the average number of classroom preparations, as well as the distinction between undergraduate and graduate courses. The COEHD considers participation and involvement in mentoring graduate students (at the master's and doctoral levels) as either a thesis or dissertation advisor/methodologist to be a teaching activity for which a faculty member may be eligible to receive an appropriate workload reassignment. As an essential component of the ADEP process, the department chair is required to meet with faculty to discuss teaching and administrative responsibilities for the academic year. These discussions are documented at the beginning of the review period on the FAR within Interfolio.

COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA)

The COEHD promotes a holistic view of RSCA that recognizes the unique and valued contributions of faculty members across disciplines and at various developmental stages of their professional careers. As such, intellectual contributions accrued in the areas of applied scholarship, instructional development, and basic scholarship are considered in the annual evaluation of a COEHD faculty member's RSCA. For the review, a point system is used with point values assigned to various research-related activities (see table below). The total points accrued during the review period are used to evaluate annual performance in RSCA. While point value benchmarks are included for clinical faculty, RSCA may not be a part of the yearly workload of these individuals. Evaluation of research productivity typically occurs when clinical faculty incorporate an RSCA component into their annual workload.

Additionally, the COEHD recognizes that the roles of all faculty members are not alike; therefore, evaluations are made relative to the assigned responsibilities and workload of the individual faculty member for the year in review. For tenure-track and tenured faculty, these point values are based on the standard 40-40-20 workload split, where RSCA comprises 40% of the faculty member's workload (with Teaching 40% and Service 20% comprising the other percentages). In cases where an increased research workload allocation is negotiated, the corresponding point values are adjusted accordingly (e.g., for each 10% increase/decrease in research workload, the minimum point value increases/decreases by 5). For example, a tenure-track faculty member with a negotiated research workload allocation of 50% would need to accumulate 26 or more points (rather than 21) to meet expectations.

Unsatisfactory (1)

A faculty member may receive a rating of **unsatisfactory** in RSCA if their cumulative point total for the evaluation period falls below the established standard for their academic rank. An **unsatisfactory** rating indicates the need for immediate improvement and may result in the development of a remediation plan or further administrative action should the noted deficiencies persist.

Clinical Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	Tenured Faculty
≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 25

Meets Expectations (2)

A faculty member may receive a rating of **meets expectations** in RSCA if their cumulative point total for the evaluation period falls within the point range established for their academic rank. This rating indicates that the faculty member meets COEHD and institutional standards for RSCA performance without significant deficiencies or exceptional performance. A **meets expectations** rating signifies that the faculty member is performing at a satisfactory level, demonstrating competency and productivity in RSCA, and contributing to the institution and their academic discipline.

Clinical Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	Tenured Faculty
11-24	21-39	26-49

In addition to the specified point values, tenure-track and tenured faculty must evidence publication of at least one (1) peer-reviewed journal article during the evaluation period. For manuscripts that have not yet been published, correspondence (e.g., letter or email) from the journal editor stating that the manuscript has been accepted, is not in need of revision, and is considered “in press” can be submitted as part of the annual review case in Interfolio.

Exceeds Expectations (3)

A faculty member receives a rating of **exceeds expectations** in RSCA if their cumulative point total for the evaluation period exceeds the established standard for their academic rank. This rating reflects outstanding performance in scholarship, advancement of knowledge in one’s academic discipline, and intellectual creativity. An **exceeds expectations** rating signifies that the faculty member’s RSCA significantly enhances their department, institution, academic discipline, and community.

Clinical Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	Tenured Faculty
≥ 25	≥ 40	≥ 50

In addition to the specified point values, tenure-track and tenured faculty must evidence publication of at least one (1) peer-reviewed journal article during the evaluation period. For manuscripts that have not yet been published, correspondence (e.g., letter or email) from the journal editor stating that the manuscript has been accepted, is not in need of revision, and is considered "in press" can be submitted as part of the annual review case in Interfolio.

Recognized Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Products	**Point Value**
Funded federal or national grant (PI/primary author)	20
Published or contracted book (authored, solo, or collaboration)	20
Published article in a peer-reviewed journal (lead/senior author)	20
Published or contracted book (edited, solo, or collaboration)	15
Funded federal or national grant (Co-PI or team member with ≥ 10% effort[1])	15
Funded state, foundation, or agency grant (PI/primary author)	15
Published article in a peer-reviewed journal (coauthor)	15
Presentation (refereed) at an international/national conference (lead presenter)	15
Funded university-level grant (e.g., R&I research enhancement grants)	10
Unfunded federal or national grant proposal (fully submitted and scored)	10
Unfunded state, foundation, or agency grant (fully submitted and scored)	10
Presentation (refereed) at a state/regional conference (lead presenter)	10
Presentation (refereed) at an international/national conference (co-presenter)	10
Published chapter in an edited book (contracted)	10
Published article in a peer-reviewed local journal (e.g., CEDER)	10
Ongoing management and coordination of a federal or national grant	10
Unfunded university-level grant (e.g., R&I research enhancement grants)	5
Presentation (refereed) at a state/regional conference (co-presenter)	5
Ongoing management and coordination of a state, foundation, or agency grant	5
Published technical report or annual program accreditation report	5
Conference proceedings or published abstracts in a peer-reviewed journal	5
Contracted revisions (updated editions) of a book	5
Published book (self-published)	5
Funded college-level grant (e.g., COEHD funds)	5
Manuscript submitted for publication (in review)	5
Published instructor manuals, instructional software, or course OER	5
Local presentation or workshop	5
Publication in a professional newsletter	5
Research-based blogs, podcasts, webinars, and op-ed webpages	5
Research mentorship (junior faculty, graduate/undergraduate students)	5
Total Points	

[1]*As denoted in Interfolio and Maestro*

In accordance with TAMUS policy (12.01.01), intellectual contributions that have undergone

some level of peer review must be included in the FAR and will be given more evaluative weight accordingly.

COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Service

The COEHD recognizes service as a core responsibility of all faculty as it strengthens the college, supports our students, and advances our academic disciplines. Faculty are encouraged to engage in a variety of service contributions at multiple levels (department, college, university, and professional organizations) during their careers at TAMU-CC. The following criteria, which include participation (as a member or leader) in standing committees, ad hoc committees, task forces, or special projects (at the department, college, or university levels), program coordination, curriculum development, event coordination, and institutional assessment management, are service components that faculty may choose to include in their FAR. Department chairs, in coordination with the appropriate representative from the COEHD Dean's Office, will ensure that faculty members within their departments have ample opportunities to fulfill institutional service commitments that are appropriate for their level of development. In addition to institutional activities, service provided at the community and professional levels will be considered if they relate to the faculty member's academic discipline, support department, college, and/or university goals and initiatives, or strengthen relationships between the university and the broader community.

Unsatisfactory (1)

A faculty member may receive a rating of **unsatisfactory** in service if they fail to fulfill assigned service responsibilities or demonstrate a lack of engagement in academic unit initiatives and/or student-support activities. An **unsatisfactory** rating indicates the need for immediate improvement and may result in the development of a remediation plan or further administrative action if deficiencies persist.

Meets Expectations (2)

A faculty member may receive a rating of **meets expectations** in service when they effectively engage in both internal and external service activities. This rating indicates that the faculty member meets the COEHD and institutional standards for service performance, without significant deficiencies or exceptional performance. A **meets expectations** rating signifies that the faculty member is performing at a satisfactory level, contributing to the institution and their academic discipline, and fulfilling their service obligations effectively. To achieve this rating, a faculty member must demonstrate that they meet **all** required criteria (highlighted) and two (2) additional supplemental criteria for Fixed-Term (**FT**) and Tenure-Track (**TT**) faculty and three (3) additional supplemental criteria for Tenured (**T**) faculty.

Criteria
Regularly attends departmental, college, and university events (e.g., general faculty meetings, hooding ceremonies, induction ceremonies, graduation)

Serves as an academic advisor for students majoring in the faculty member's discipline
Attends and actively engages in meetings and the business of the department
Participates in the work of a standing department committee (e.g., curriculum, admissions, textbook review)
Holds membership in professional associations within the faculty member's academic discipline
Serves on an ad hoc department committee (e.g., faculty search) or task force (e.g., curriculum/handbook revisions)
Participates in outreach on behalf of the department, college, or university that contributes to student recruiting and retention (e.g., Islander Days, accepted student/family days, open houses, new student orientations)
Provides informal or formal mentoring of new faculty engaging in professional organizations or associations
Completes annual reports or enters assessment data into university databases (i.e., WEAVE)
Provides professional consultation related to the faculty member's area of expertise or academic discipline
Engages in community service supporting the college and university mission

Exceeds Expectations (3)

A faculty member receives a rating of **exceeds expectations** in service when they go beyond basic engagement and demonstrate a strong commitment to service excellence at both the institutional and professional levels. This rating reflects outstanding performance in institutional service, professional engagement, and community outreach. An **exceeds expectations** rating signifies that the faculty member's service significantly enhances their department, institution, academic discipline, and community. To achieve this rating, a faculty member must demonstrate that they meet **all** required criteria (based on academic rank) for **meets expectations** plus additional criteria from the list below. Fixed-term (**FT**) and tenure-track (**TT**) faculty must demonstrate meeting three (3) of the criteria for **exceeds expectations**. Tenured (**T**) faculty must demonstrate meeting five (5) of the criteria for **exceeds expectations**.

Criteria
Serves as an advisor for a student club or organization
Accompanies students at external venues for professional growth opportunities (e.g., conferences, advocacy events)
Participates in peer review of faculty teaching (e.g., live observations or review of course materials)
Chairs a committee tasked with developing a new academic program in the department
Serves as program coordinator in the department
Coordinates major outreach events at the department, college, or university level
Chairs a department faculty search committee
Coordinates the field experience component of a degree plan
Serves on a college-wide committee, council, or task force (elected or appointed)
Serves on a university-wide committee, council, or task force (elected or appointed)

Serves as an elected member of the Faculty Advisory Council (FAC Speaker)
Holds an administrative leadership role at TAMU-CC (e.g., FAC Speaker, IRB chair, CPIRA chair)
Serves as a full member of an editorial review board (includes editor, associate editor, and assistant editor roles)
Conference program proposal review committee member
Leadership and committee activities in academic or professional organizations
Officer in a professional association (state, regional, national)
Serves on a grant review panel for a federal agency
Serve as an evaluator for a professional accrediting body

In ADEP evaluations, the department chair must assess the extent to which the faculty member has documented their active participation in service opportunities at the department, college, university, community, and professional levels. The evaluation of service effort also varies depending on the level of effort, the type of committees, and the visibility of the effort. Department chairs should consider the overall time commitment involved in specified service commitments when making their evaluations. A faculty member's service commitment may include a substantial (documented) administrative responsibility for the coordination of a department or college program/initiative (program coordinator/task force leader). Recognizing the importance of these administrative assignments to the program, faculty members serving in this capacity may be granted a course reassignment to adjust their overall workload.

In addition to the service activities listed above, all faculty members are expected to be productive citizens in their respective departments and the COEHD. Attending assigned commencement ceremonies, regularly attending department and college faculty meetings (unless excused), submitting syllabi each semester on time, and completing all required University and Texas A&M System training as specified through TrainTraq are examples of how faculty members can demonstrate their citizenship.

Overall Summary Rubric for Annual Evaluation

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

Example:
A faculty member negotiated an evaluative structure including 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% service. The evaluative ratings for this faculty member were 3, 2, and 3, respectively. Evaluative ratings are multiplied by the evaluative percentage and summed.

Teaching 3 x .4 = 1.20

RSCA 2 x .4 = 0.80
Service 3 x .2 = 0.60
Total: 1.20 + 0.80 + 0.60 = 2.60

Professional Development Plan

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, RSCA, and service. Faculty members receiving a score of less than 2 in any area will be subject to additional review, as per the COEHD and university policies. The results of all annual reviews must be submitted as part of the promotion and tenure application (i.e., Interfolio case).

The faculty member, in collaboration with the department chair, shall establish a short-term professional development plan addressing any/all unsatisfactory areas (individual categories or overall rating) within 30 days of the performance review. This plan must include performance improvement benchmarks. The original written evaluation and development plan shall be submitted to the dean. Usually, the development plan period will be for one (1) academic year. The department chair/supervisor will assess evidence of improvement midway through the plan and discuss progress with the faculty member.

The successful completion of the professional development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The department chair will assess evidence of improvement upon completion of the development plan, at or before the following performance review of the faculty member. If the faculty member is deemed to have made insufficient progress by the end of the plan period, the department chair, in conjunction with the dean, will take appropriate administrative action up to and including recommendation for dismissal.

Faculty Appeal Process for ADEP

A faculty member may make a formal appeal of the feedback received on the ADEP. The appeal process is as follows:

If, upon review, the faculty member is dissatisfied with the department chair's feedback, they may submit a formal written response addressing areas of disagreement. This formal written response must be submitted to the department chair within five (5) days of the meeting with the department chair.

The department chair is required to review the faculty member's formal written response and meet again with the faculty member to attempt reconciliation. This meeting must take place within two weeks of the department chair receiving the faculty member's formal written response or within two weeks of the start of the next academic year. The proceedings of this meeting must be formally documented and signed off by both the faculty member and the department chair. If the faculty member is unwilling to sign, it will be so noted.

If disagreements persist after the department chair and faculty member meet to discuss the faculty member's formal written response, the faculty member may submit a written request to the COEHD dean to present an appeal. This meeting must take place within two weeks of the dean receiving the faculty member's written request. The department chair must be present at this meeting. Upon request for a meeting with the dean, the faculty member must submit to the dean any and all written documentation in support of their appeal, including the ADEP under appeal, department chair's written feedback, faculty member's written response, documentation of faculty member's reconciliation meeting with the department chair, and any other material the faculty member wishes to use in support of the appeal.

After the faculty member has met with the dean and the department chair, the dean will submit in writing to the faculty member their decision, along with justification, concerning the faculty member's appeal. This written decision must be submitted to the faculty member within two weeks after the meeting with the dean and the department chair. This decision will be considered the final step in the College of Education and Human Development appeal process for the faculty member concerning their ADEP feedback. All written documentation on the appeal will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.