

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

TAMU-CC College of Education and Human Development

(Last Revised November 25, 2024)

All Faculty in the COEHD will be evaluated annually as part of the Annual Development and Evaluation Planning (ADEP) process. The ADEP provides faculty the opportunity to establish professional goals (teaching, research/scholarship and service) for the upcoming academic year in a formative consultation process with their academic department chair. 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 Rule 12.01.99.C0.03](#) (Responsibilities of Faculty Members) and [University Rule 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 Rule 12.07.99.C0.01](#) (Fixed-Term Faculty Members). If the faculty member undergoes promotion or tenure review in an academic year, a separate annual review is not necessary.

Annual evaluations are completed by the appropriate department chair . The evaluation will be provided to the faculty member in writing as part of an end-of-year ADEP meeting on or before **April 15** of each academic year. The evaluation will detail the department chair 's evaluation of performance in each of the three areas of faculty responsibility. 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 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) application for tenure; (c) application for promotion; (d) post-tenure review; and (e) annual re-appointment 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 remain as confidential documentation within the faculty member's personnel file. ADEP evaluations are provided in accordance with the evaluation scale described in [University Rule 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 Rule 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.

TAMUCC descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service are detailed in [University Policy 12.01.99.CO.04](#) (Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

Faculty evaluations are based upon measures of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Evaluations shall focus on individual performance relative to assigned responsibilities and contributions consistent with that of a faculty member of comparable rank and workload assignments as determined in consultation with his/her department chair and approved by the dean.

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 criteria for the next higher rank. Full professors will be evaluated based on their continued performance consistent with the criteria for that rank.

Evaluation criteria must meet university requirements for the faculty position held, as described in [University Rule 12.01.99.CO.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 Policy 12.01.99.CO.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 a developing knowledge of university level pedagogy. Shows evidence of instructional innovation, updating and revising current courses, and new course development. Shows quality in teaching through a teaching portfolio 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 opportunities.

2. Scholarship and creative activity criteria for evaluation:

Demonstrates competence and productivity in scholarship and creative activity (applied scholarship, instructional development and/or basic scholarship) which 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 Policy 12.01.99.CO.04](#) (Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

3. Service activity criteria for evaluation:

Serves in leadership positions on college and university committees. Participates in 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. Annual evaluation of faculty is documented in the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) in Interfolio. The FAR is a product of the TAMU-CC supported Interfolio platform where faculty members will document and, where appropriate, upload examples of their performance in teaching, scholarship and service. All faculty must upload artifacts of their scholarship reported in the annual FAR.

Each year, faculty are required to complete a FAR in Interfolio where they document their performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service for the previous calendar year (January 1-December 31).

The FAR also allows for documentation of faculty annual goals. In preparation of 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 are to be selected in the light of 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.

The following steps will be completed in the ADEP process:

1. **Establishment of formative goals for the upcoming review cycle.** Faculty members will document their yearly goals 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 upcoming 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 on the previous end-of-year ADEP provided by the department chair in the spring.

2. **The faculty member reviews goals with the Department chair.** Between **February 1 and March 1**, the faculty member will schedule a time to meet with their department chair to review their goals for the upcoming year. The department chair's role is to provide initial feedback on the faculty member's goals and offer recommendations if needed for refining goals or including additional goals that reflect departmental assignments and corresponding expectations. Consideration will be made of the faculty member's previous year's ADEP to facilitate any goal revision for the new academic year. By noting their agreement with the faculty member's stated goals, the department chair commits to providing as much support as possible to help the faculty member attain their goals.

3. **The faculty member submits end-of-year ADEP.** Faculty members are expected to make available to their department chair a copy of their FAR for the preceding calendar year in Interfolio by **February 1**. The FAR includes the faculty member's original goals for the year being reviewed along with a narrative update for each goal explaining the extent to which that goal was accomplished and plans moving forward.

4. **The Department chair meets with the faculty member to review 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 **May 1**. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure the faculty member receives prompt feedback on their ADEP. The department chair's feedback is made in writing on the ADEP form and can be used by the faculty member for the development of 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.

ADEP Review Calendar

Date	Task
February 1	Faculty member submits annual goals on the Faculty Activity Report in Interfolio
February 1 – March 1	Faculty members meet with their department chair to review goals and receive feedback
February 1	Faculty members submit their Faculty Activity Report documenting their teaching, research, and service activities and accomplishments for the previous year.
March 1 – May 1	Faculty members meet with their department chair to review their submitted Faculty Activity Report
May 15	Department chairs submit Faculty Activity Reports and their narrative evaluations to the COEHD dean.

COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Teaching

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 knowledge in one or more specific parts of the field. The member should demonstrate a continuing interest in improving as a teacher and in developing knowledge of university-level pedagogy. Evidence of quality in teaching may be demonstrated by instructional innovation, new course development, or other similar activities compiled in a teaching portfolio.

The college recognizes that not all teaching loads require equal effort because of differences in class size, number of preparations, and course level (graduate or undergraduate). As an important element 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 in the beginning of the review period ADEP process on the FAR within Interfolio.

As part of this planning process, the faculty member, in coordination with their department chair, should articulate how teaching efforts and expected performance will be addressed in the context of their teaching workload assignments. As part of the ADEP process, the department chair should review student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluation, and both the number and magnitude of student advising activities. Consideration should be given to teaching load, average number of students taught, average number of classroom preparations, and undergraduate versus graduate courses. The COEHD considers participation and involvement in the mentoring of graduate (master's and doctoral level) students as either a thesis or dissertation advisor/ methodologist as a teaching activity for which a faculty may be eligible to receive an appropriate workload reassignment.

Exceeds Expectations (3):

Faculty member demonstrates exceptional performance exceeding expectations

The faculty member submits documentation suggesting effective, rigorous, and innovative teaching. *Exceeds Expectations* is warranted when the faculty member can document five (5) 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 five criteria)**
- Receiving positive peer evaluations or professional awards from peer/professional Organizations
- Coordinating major course redesigns or proposing new curriculum
- Updating syllabi to incorporate contemporary learning and novel research findings
- Utilizing Canvas Gradebook for returning grades and providing students feedback on their assignments and examinations
- Submitting midterm and final grades in a timely manner
- Engaging in professional development that supports effective teaching

- Meeting all DLAI 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 indicators, with department chair approval, raised during the goal setting phase

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 nine (9) 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 or professional Awards from peer/professional Organizations
- Updating syllabi to incorporate contemporary learning and novel research findings
- Utilizing Canvas Gradebook for returning grades and providing students feedback on their assignments and examinations
- Submitting midterm and final grades in a timely manner
- Engaging in professional development that supports effective teaching
- Meeting all DLAI 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 indicators, with department chair approval, raised during the goal setting phase

Unsatisfactory (1):

Faculty member is below performance expectations

A clear pattern of ineffective teaching is noted. The faculty member does not attend and hold scheduled class sessions except for extenuating circumstances, fails to respond to student inquiries, does not maintain scheduled office hours, does not return grades and other feedback on exams and assignments to students in a timely manner, and fails to utilize appropriate technology or maintain currency in both course content and delivery method.

COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Scholarship and Creative Activity

The chief objective of the Scholarly and Creative Activity evaluation is to encourage faculty to contribute positively to the mission of the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD). The primary responsibility of meeting the COEHD's goals lies with the faculty. As such, all faculty members are expected to demonstrate competence and productivity in scholarship and creative activity, as defined by [University Policy 12.01.99.CO.04](#) (Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service), On an annual basis. Faculty members should consult with their department chair to identify appropriate goals in this area to work on each year. If no agreement is reached between the parties, the final

decision will be made by the COEHD dean. Recognizing the unique and valued contributions of faculty members across disciplines, the COEHD supports an inclusive view of scholarship where the evaluation of a faculty member's scholarly and creative activity performance is made *relative to the assigned responsibilities and workload assignments of the individual*.

Points Earned for Each Scholarly Product. Each scholarly product a faculty member produces will result in the earning of a specified point value (see table below). All points accrued during the specified reporting interval will be summed with the total point value used to evaluate the faculty member's performance in terms of Scholarly and Creative Activity.

Adjustment of point allocation based on order of authorship. Recognizing the importance of faculty member responsibility for developing an independent research agenda as well as the value of collaboration, sole or primary authors (Authors 1 and 2) will receive the full (equal) points specified in table below. Tertiary (3rd authors or below) will receive one half (50%) of the point values. All authors independent of the order in which they appear will receive credit for the product.

Examples of Intellectual contributions are detailed in [University Policy 12.01.99.CO.04](#) (Descriptions of Teaching, Librarianship, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service). The COEHD views the following as intellectual contributions: books or chapters in books; publication in peer-reviewed journals (scholarly and/or professional); conference presentations (international, national, state, and/or local); published abstracts and conference proceedings; grants (funded or unfunded); and published instructor manuals and software.

In the ADEP evaluation process, the department chair should consider the merits of the intellectual contributions, with consideration given to the number and quality and relative contribution of effort to the documented product as well as the general impact of the contributions to the profession within and beyond the university. In accordance with TAMUS policy ([12.01.01](#)), intellectual contributions that have been subjected to some level of peer review must be present in the portfolio and will be accordingly given more evaluative weight.

Exceeds Expectations (3):

Faculty member demonstrates exceptional performance exceeding expectations

When benchmarked with others of comparable rank and workload in the department, the faculty member will be deemed *Exceeds Expectations* 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 either of the following in their submitted Faculty Activity Report:

- A minimum of one (1) **peer-reviewed article in a scholarly journal**
- A minimum of one (1) **peer-reviewed presentation at a state, regional, or national professional conference** in the faculty member's discipline

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 ADEP cycle.

Meets Expectations (2):

Faculty member meets performance expectations

When benchmarked with others of comparable rank and workload in the department, the faculty member 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

When benchmarked with others of comparable rank and workload in the department, the faculty member will be deemed *Unsatisfactory* if they obtain less than 15 points during the specified evaluation period as noted in their Faculty Activity Report.

Evaluation of 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. At the end of the evaluation period, faculty members will be required to submit a Faculty Activity Report highlighting their scholarly activity over the past year. The COEHD evaluation period runs between January 1 and December 31 of the previous calendar year.

Quantitative Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Activity

Scholarly and Creative Activity or Product¹	Value
Funded federal or national grant (> \$100,000) - PI/Co-PI	15
Published book (contracted)	15
Published (or accepted) article in a peer-reviewed national/International	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 (refereed)	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)	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

¹Point values are adjusted for collaborative product. Primary authors (Authors 1 and 2) will receive the full (equal) points specified in table below. Tertiary (3rd authors or below) will receive one half (50%) of the point values. All authors independent of the order in which they appear will receive credit for authoring the product.

COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Service

Service is an essential part of faculty member responsibility and as such is important for annual evaluation. Faculty should endeavor to engage in a diversity of service contributions at multiple levels (departmental, institutional, national and professional) during their career as a faculty member at TAMU-CC. Department chairs, in coordination with the appropriate Dean's Office representative, should ensure faculty members within their departments have ample opportunities to fulfill service commitments appropriate for their level of development as a faculty member. Specific and deliberate dialog at the beginning of each ADEP review period should focus on each faculty member's proposed service commitments for the year and their appropriateness given tenure and/or promotion considerations.

A variety of service activities can be included in the faculty member's FAR. Participation (as a member or leader) in standing committees, ad hoc committees, task forces, or special projects at the department, college, or university level all are examples of institutional service. Additionally, active participation in program coordination, curriculum development, event coordination, and institutional assessment management are service components the faculty member should record in the FAR. Service provided at the community and professional levels will be considered if it is related to the faculty member's academic discipline and supports department, college, and/or university goals and initiatives.

In ADEP evaluations, the department chair must evaluate the extent to which the faculty member has documented how they have taken an active role in service opportunities at the department, college, university, community, and professional level. The evaluation of service effort also varies depending on level of effort, type of committees, and visibility of 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 coordination of

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 in 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.

A faculty members' service commitment may include a substantial (documented) administrative responsibility for coordination of department or college program/initiative (program coordinator/Task force leader). Examples might include administrative positions, labor-intensive service involving the reading of many files, chairing a substantial department committee, or contributing to significant college, university, and/or professional service or outreach efforts

Positive peer and professional evaluations in the form of awards or other professional acknowledgements for service activities should be included and considered positively in addition to specific indicators.

Exceeds Expectations (3):

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
- Student advisement
- Volunteer work in the community that supports the university's mission

And TWO (2) of the following:

- Membership on university-level committees
- Membership on college-level committees
- Leadership or significant stewardship on university-level committees, organizational Events, initiatives or projects
- Leadership or significant stewardship on standing college committees, organizational, Events, initiatives or projects
- Leadership or significant stewardship on standing department level committees, organizational Events, initiatives or projects

- Leadership or significant stewardship on a professional organization committee (elected or appointed) at the state, regional, or national level or organizational level
- Editorial Review Board membership (excludes service as an *ad hoc* reviewer)

Meets Expectations (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

Unsatisfactory (1):

Faculty member is below performance expectations

The faculty member offers minimal contributions to departmental committees or provides cursory, time-limited service at other appropriate levels (college, university, local community, or professional organization).

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 (e.g., Teaching, Scholarship, 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

The 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 $3 \times .4 = 1.20$
- Scholarship $2 \times .4 = 0.80$
- Service $3 \times .2 = 0.60$

Total composite average faculty rating = 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, 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.

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. Normally, 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 at the completion of the development plan at or before the next 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:

1. 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 .
2. 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 from the time the department chair receives the faculty member's formal written response or within two weeks of the beginning 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.
3. 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 for a meeting to the COEHD dean to present an appeal. This meeting must take place within two weeks from the time the dean receives 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 her/his decision 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.