

Annual Evaluation of Faculty

A&M-Commerce Procedure: 12.99.99.R0.13

Approved: February 1, 2016

Most Recent Revision: March 15, 2019

Next Scheduled Review: March 15, 2024

A&M-Commerce Procedure: 12.07.99.R0.01

Approved: September 8, 2016

Most Recent Revision: May 6, 2022

Next Scheduled Review: May 6, 2027

A&M-Commerce Procedure: 31.01.08.R1

Approved: June 20, 2003

Most Recent Revision: July 14, 2023

Next Scheduled Review: July 14, 2028

Responsible University Office:

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Responsible University Administrator:

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

The annual faculty evaluation process at Texas A&M University-Commerce provides a system of feedback and support to (a) increase transparency regarding expectations for faculty performance, and (b) facilitate faculty members' development and long-term success. Results of this annual review are used to make decisions regarding the terms and conditions of the employment relationship between the faculty and the university, including merit pay, promotion, tenure, and post tenure review.

An annual review is conducted for all tenure-track and tenured faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, as well as all non-tenure track faculty members at all ranks.

Criteria for Evaluation

Faculty members are evaluated on their performance in the areas of teaching and contributions to student learning; research or other scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service to the university, profession and community. Evaluation is based on university-wide and departmental criteria. Although collegiality is not considered a separate criterion for annual evaluation of faculty, nevertheless it is implied within each category of teaching/contributions to student learning, RSCA, and service.

At Texas A&M University-Commerce teaching/contributions to student learning is considered to be the first priority and prime objective of the university. Producing knowledge and

performance in professional/creative activities are essential aspects of faculty roles. Service to the profession (discipline), the university, and the community is an integral part of a faculty role. For more information on university-wide criteria for evaluation of teaching/contributions to student learning, RSCA, and service see university Procedure [12.99.99.R0.13](#).

Specific measures and criteria used in annual evaluations will differ depending on academic department. All full-time faculty members in each academic department, as a group, are responsible for identifying comprehensive measures and criteria for evaluating teaching/contributions to student learning, RSCA, and service suitable to their own discipline and professional interests. However, departmental criteria and measures for evaluating faculty must be consistent with the general framework of university-wide criteria.

Procedure for Annual Evaluation

A department's plan, including evaluation criteria and measures, must be approved by the department head or equivalent, academic dean/director of school, and provost, and regularly updated as necessary. The department head or equivalent is responsible for distributing the approved plan among current and new faculty. Additionally, the departmental faculty will develop procedures for determining how the areas of teaching/contributions to student learning, RSCA, and service will be weighted. Relative weights for each area will be based on such criteria as the department's involvement in graduate programs; national disciplinary standards; and applicable reassigned time for faculty members for research grant, service, and administrative assignments.

Faculty members are evaluated on their performance during the calendar year (January through December). Before the beginning of each calendar year, each faculty member and his or her department head or equivalent will discuss and identify goals related to his or her teaching, RSCA, and service, based on the framework of the department's plan. They will then formulate an individual faculty plan for achievement commensurate with faculty rank and seniority. First-year faculty members will file a plan in September and will be evaluated for the fall semester only.

For more information on the process and timeline for the annual evaluation of faculty, please review university Procedure [12.99.99.R0.13](#).

Merit and Professional Development Action

Each faculty member's level of effectiveness is rated in each area of teaching/contribution to student learning, RSCA, and service. These rankings, weighted according to the faculty member's involvement in each area in a given year, are used to calculate merit. For more information on eligibility and the process used to determine whether a faculty member may receive a merit increase, please review university Procedure [31.01.08.R1](#).

Annual Evaluation of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The evaluation process for full-time non-tenure track faculty members follows general principles and guidelines given in the university's *Annual Evaluation of Faculty* procedure ([12.99.99.R0.13](#)), as described above. For non-tenure track faculty of all ranks, the annual review process serves primarily as an evaluation focusing on performance, review of requirements established in the initial letter of appointment, and any additional requirements added during the annual review. The performance evaluation takes into consideration expectations for non-tenure track faculty that may include an increased teaching load and decreased or no requirement to engage in RSCA compared to tenure-track faculty in the same program or department; or in the case of research track faculty members, little or no requirement to teach courses. Overall, the following procedures will be used for evaluating the work of these faculty members at both departmental and college or school levels.

Department Review

Department reviews of non-tenure track faculty take place at least six weeks prior to the notification date for non-reappointments during each year of employment (the notification deadlines are set forth in university Procedure [12.01.99.R1](#) Section 5).

The candidate for reappointment submits to the department head or equivalent a portfolio of teaching, service, and professional activities. The portfolio will contain the candidate's dossier, which consists of: (a) a statement (typically not to exceed three pages) on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his or her professional responsibilities in the areas of assigned responsibility; (b) a current curriculum vitae; and (c) evidence of quality performance in the areas of assigned responsibility.

The department head or equivalent will use the following to evaluate the candidate's performance: (a) student evaluations of courses taught; (b) evaluation of the faculty member's dossier, particularly course syllabi, class assignments, and use of pedagogical techniques; (c) evaluation of any professional assignments other than teaching (e.g., lab work, field-based work, leadership, service, professional or scholarly activities, and credentials as appropriate); (d) feedback from department faculty (including at least one non-tenure track faculty member) on the candidate's work; and (e) other criteria as appropriate for particular departments or programs.

Upon review of all necessary criteria for evaluating the candidate's work each year, as per the academic calendar, the department head or equivalent will make a recommendation to the academic dean/director of school regarding reappointment or non-reappointment.

College Review

The academic dean/director of school will review all recommendations for reappointment of non-tenure track faculty forwarded by department heads or equivalent and will make a recommendation to the provost and vice president for academic affairs. The academic

dean/director of school shall inform the department head or equivalent and the faculty member of approval or denial of the reappointment. When the academic dean/director of school does not concur with the departmental recommendation, he or she will inform the department head or equivalent of the reasons for disapproval.

For more information on the annual review process, the evaluation procedure, evaluation of faculty members who have split appointments, and calculation of merit see [12.99.99.R0.13](#).

Notification Dates for Non-Reappointment of Probationary Faculty:

Written notification of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint a faculty member must be provided by the deadlines set forth in university Procedure [12.01.99.R1](#), *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*, Section 5.