Section III. Faculty Performance, Development and Evaluation

This section of the Handbook covers professional expectations of COS faculty. Because different faculty positions have different expectations, not all sections below apply to all faculty. Faculty and administrators should use this section as a guide to faculty performance, development, and evaluation.

An outline of this section is:

- III.1, Performance Criteria: Lists general college-level guidelines used for evaluation in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service.
- III.2, Promotion (all faculty) and Tenure Timeline
- III.3, Promotion and Tenure (P&T) for Tenured and Tenure-Track (T/TT) Faculty: Includes important definitions, specific college-level expectations for promotions to Associate and full Professor, and the college P&T process. Departments have more detailed expectations; see Appendix XXX for these.
- III.4, Promotion for Fixed-Term Faculty: Lists college-level expectations and process for promotion of Professional, Research, and Clinical faculty. Departments may develop more detailed explanations.
- III.5, Annual Evaluation: Describes the college annual evaluation process, as well as minimal college-level criteria for annual evaluation. Again, departments may have more specific criteria.
- III.6, Pre-Tenure (Midterm) Review: Describes the process for the midterm review of tenure-track faculty.
- III.7, Post-Tenure Review: Describes the process and criteria for post-tenure review.

III.1 Performance Criteria for Faculty

The evaluation of faculty, used for promotion, tenure, and merit pay, is based upon several University Rules and Procedures, including:

- 12.01.99.C0.03, Responsibilities of Faculty Members
- 12.01.99.C0.04, Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service
- 12.01.01.C1, Tenure
- 31.01.08.C1.01, Merit Pay for Faculty
- 33.99.04.C0.02, Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members
- 12.01.99.C0.06, Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members

Procedure 12.01.99.C0.04 includes three major performance criteria: teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity (RSCA), and service. All faculty performance evaluations will be based on documented evidence of faculty contributions and achievements in these areas, commensurate with the effort allocation as stated in the individual offer letter and annual evaluations following the university workload expectations for T, TT and fixed-term faculty.

Teaching, RSCA, and service contributions will be considered in proportion to the workload assignment in determining the outcomes of tenure and promotion reviews. Supporting evidence

in these areas is essential for an affirmative recommendation for merit pay, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

Each department in the college shall develop specific indicators that lend itself to supporting evidence of teaching effectiveness, research achievements, and service accomplishments. Examples of indicators of teaching effectiveness, research and service are given below. In addition to these indicators, faculty should familiarize themselves with the more detailed expectations at the relevant department level.

III.1.a Teaching

Teaching may include delivering course content, developing courses and curriculum, assessing student learning, chairing and serving on graduate student committees, and continuously improving teaching practices based on feedback and educational research. Consult 12.03.99.C1.01 for a complete list of direct teaching activities. Faculty are expected to uphold the highest standards of pedagogical excellence, ensuring that their teaching methods are inclusive and effective in promoting student success across diverse learning environments.

The college uses many avenues to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Each department identifies the techniques most suited to their relevant disciplines and the goals/objectives of the programs.
The following describes criteria that may be considered in evaluating teaching effectiveness and student learning.

Peer evaluation of teaching

Peer evaluation/assessment of faculty teaching is a required component of teaching evaluation. Each department shall have a policy for identifying peer evaluators.

Tenure-track faculty will receive peer evaluation once each academic year prior to mid-term review. Following the mid-term review, tenure-track faculty should receive at least one peer evaluation prior to promotion and tenure review (minimum of either four peer teaching evaluations or one per academic year they have been teaching during the evaluation period, whichever is less). Tenured faculty should have at least one peer evaluation before applying for full professor and before any post-tenure review.

Professional faculty, instructors, and adjuncts should receive peer evaluation once per contract term. Professional faculty and instructors should have minimum of four peer teaching evaluations prior to applying for promotion. Departments may choose to have more frequent informal evaluations.

The peer evaluation will include a written report that contains constructive comments concerning perceived deficiencies if any, and suggested strategies for remediation. A follow-up evaluation may be requested once remediation has occurred. The written reports should be included in the faculty member’s personnel file.

Appendix C provides an example of a peer evaluation instrument. Any evaluation instrument will include assessments of the degree of currency of course content, clarity of presentation, student engagement, inquiry, opportunities for collaboration, and possibly other items such as student surveys conducted by the evaluator(s) to measure teaching effectiveness. Specific departmental peer evaluation forms are included in Appendix C.

Student course evaluations

A second required component of teaching evaluation is student course evaluations. Students participate in a course evaluation process each semester, which is conducted online near the end of the semester. Quantitative student responses are tabulated and analyzed, and their written comments are recorded. The results are available electronically to the dean, the department chair, and the individual instructor for review. Individual faculty members should take responsibility for the preservation of their student evaluations.

While student evaluations often contain valuable information about faculty teaching, they should not be the only element of evaluation of teaching. In addition, evaluators should recall the peer-reviewed literature documenting biases in student evaluations.

Other criteria

Documented efforts in the following broad areas will also be considered in evaluating teaching. Departments may add additional examples as appropriate.

Preparation for effective teaching: examples include Completing DELA "Best Practices in Online Instruction Course" within the last three years; teaching a stacked undergraduate/graduate course; developing a new course or program; teaching four or more preparations in the calendar year; teaching vertically (1xxx-6xxx level courses); participate in specific and significant professional development activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness; generating curricular material for multi-section classes.
Performance of effective teaching: examples include: Receive at least one satisfactory peer evaluation for a course as assigned by the department chair within the last two years; meeting department-defined expectations for student learning in key courses for the major.
Significant course modifications: examples include Developing and
deliver a High Impact Practice (as described in a college or university document) new to the course; revising courses based on an assessment of student learning outcomes; significant modification of course format (e.g., converting a face-to-face course to either a hybrid or fully online course); teaching in a learning community, honors, or innovative course (as designated by the department chair and/or Dean).
Recognition of effective teaching: examples include Developing and delivering a teaching-related conference presentation or workshop (if not counted as a research activity); being nominated by a committee for a college, university, or external agency award (e.g., TAMU System, CASE, Minnie Piper); and receiving within the last three years a university or an external agency award.
Teaching activities outside the classroom: examples include supervising internships or DIS courses; Engaging in additional activities outside of normal class periods and office hours to ensure

students master the subject matter (e.g., tutorials, labs, review sessions, case consultation, problem-solving sessions); Supervising Teaching Assistants/Supplementary Instructors without Service Reassignment; Participating in departmental activities focused on teaching—e.g., writing a common final exam for a multi-section, multi-instructor course.
Mentoring Graduate Students: serving as the chair co-chair or member of non-thesis, thesis and dissertation committees. Excellence can be demonstrated by timely progression of students in their programs, student-authored publications and/or attainment of student grants and scholarships.

III.1.b Research, Scholarship, & Creative Activities (RSCA)

Research and scholarly activity enhances the college's and university's academic reputation. Faculty are encouraged to engage in original research that contributes to the advancement of their field, pursue external funding through grants, and disseminate their findings through peer-reviewed publications and presentations at professional conferences while maintaining ethical standards and compliance with institutional and federal regulations. Collaboration across disciplines is encouraged to foster innovative and interdisciplinary projects.

Scholarship is a component of the workload for all tenure-line faculty in the college, but the resources and time allocated to support faculty research varies with faculty program assignment and terms of appointment. The college tenure-line faculty comprises a spectrum, ranging from those strictly engaged with undergraduate programs to faculty supporting Ph.D. programs. Quantitative measures can assist in evaluating faculty scholarship for the different tenure-line faculty categories, but the quality, impact, and significance of the accomplishments are the primary indicators of whether the faculty member has been able to establish a viable and competitive research program. Some key factors for consideration are: visible products of work done by the faculty member and students, notably peer-reviewed research publications and presentations in peer-reviewed professional off-campus venues; external funding directly supporting the research program; and financial support of undergraduate and, where applicable, graduate student research.

III.1.c Service

Service can generally be defined as "work performed for another or a group." A faculty member may contribute service at more than one level including: the department, the university, the city, the nation, and the international levels. We recognize three broad categories of Service:

- Activities that contribute to the management and growth of a department and/or program. Examples include, but are not limited to, participation in departmental committees, program coordination, recruiting efforts, related student organizations, and program development.
- Activities that contribute to the management and growth of the college and university. Examples include, but are not limited to, participation in college/university committees, sponsorship of college/university student organizations, and promotion of the university.
- Activities that use the specialized training and expertise to contribute to the profession. Examples include but are not limited to participation and/pr providing leadership in the following: professional and governmental organizations, journal reviewing and editing grant review panels...

- Activities that use the specialized training and expertise to contribute to the community. Examples include but are not limited to professionally related service in community (local, state or national) or communication of science to the general public.

Indicators of service performance of each recognizable faculty groups shall be defined by each department in the college.

As shown in the nominal effort allocation (Table 1 in Section II.D.), a faculty service contribution of approximately 10% is typically considered for promotion and tenure reviews, but this value may change to consider the average negotiated effort allocation approved by the dean.

Citizenship

It is also understood that tenure confers a class of departmental citizenship upon a faculty member. As a departmental citizen, a faculty member is expected to act in the best interests of the department and the university. Personal qualities such as commitment to the department and its mission, constructive honesty in dealings with fellow faculty, and impartiality towards students are important to the integrity and growth of the department. Failure to exhibit such personal qualities will be considered as evidence of "non-collegiality" and may contribute to a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion.