



Faculty Forum: College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Performance Evaluation

Thank you for coming!!

We are happy to have you hear and welcome your feedback!



Introductory Remarks

What We Will Cover Today



TEXAS A&M
UNIVERSITY®

- Process of Developing Guidelines
 - Next Steps for Completing Guidelines
 - Proposed Plan for Transitioning to New Guidelines
 - Proposed Procedures
 - Proposed Contents for Promotion (and Midterm) Dossiers
 - Proposed Criteria for College-Level Promotion Reviews
 - Questions and Answers
 - Link to Feedback Survey
-

Objectives of the Faculty Forums



TEXAS A&M
UNIVERSITY®

- 1) We are providing the faculty forums and feedback survey to ensure shared governance.
- 2) We created the draft document as a way to broaden our conversations regarding procedures, policies and criteria for conducting faculty performance evaluations.
- 3) The draft guidelines should be viewed as a “work-in-progress” that has now ready for peer-review.
- 4) Given that it’s easier to do peer review on a good solid draft manuscript, we wanted to provide a complete draft for faculty to review for feedback.
- 5) We fully expect to make multiple edits before finalizing the set of guidelines.



The Task



TEXAS A&M
UNIVERSITY

To create a new set of guidelines that will help unify faculty within the College of Arts and Sciences

- Challenge #1 – The three legacy colleges had different policies, procedures, and criteria.
- Challenge #2 – The departments within the legacy colleges had different policies, procedures, and criteria.
- Challenge #3 – Within each of the legacy colleges there were some practices, policies & procedures were not well codified.
- Challenge #4 – We are developing these guidelines in a context where faculty who have already been coping with lots of change, uncertainty, and anxiety (e.g., F180, changes from MGT, F180, COVID-19, etc.)



The Goals



TEXAS A&M
UNIVERSITY®

- To use **shared governance** throughout the process of developing guidelines.
 - To develop a set of guidelines where policies and procedures, as well as college-level expectations, are **clearly stated** for multiple types of performance evaluations (e.g., annual reviews, midterm reviews, promotion reviews, post-tenure reviews).
 - To develop a set of guidelines that are **fair, equitable, and inclusive** for all faculty tracks, with guiding criteria that are sufficiently **flexible** for the variety of disciplines represented within the college.
 - To develop a set of guidelines that are **in compliance** with university guidelines and policies.
-

The Scope



TEXAS A&M
UNIVERSITY®

University Guidelines & Procedures

University guidelines set university level procedures and policies for a consistent and fair review process.

*** College-Level Guidelines ***

College guidelines set consistent policies & procedures, plus general expectations for promotion

Department Guidelines

Department guidelines will play a key role in setting discipline-specific criteria & expectations

Process of Developing Guidelines



TEXAS A&M
UNIVERSITY®

September:
Setting up Structure for
DAC-TT & DAC-APT

October/November:
Identifying Key
Differences between
College-Level Guidelines

December/January:
Conversations about guidelines with
four committees (DAC-TT, DAC-APT,
FAC-TT, FAC-APT) and the college
leadership team

February
Guidelines – Draft #3
(Posted on College
Website)

Next Steps for Completing Guidelines



TEXAS A&M
UNIVERSITY



- Guidelines will NOT apply to annual reviews and midterm reviews this spring
 - Once approved, the guidelines will apply to performance evaluations going forward (i.e., Starting with promotion cases for Fall 2023).
 - We will work with department heads, as needed, to discuss temporary workarounds for some of the changes.
-



Proposed Rating Scale and Guiding Criteria

We are proposing that all departments adopt a 5-point rating scale for evaluating annual faculty performance:

- Unsatisfactory
- Needs Improvement
- Meets Expectations
- Exceeds Expectations
- Outstanding

Rationale:

To provide consistency across the college.

Department reports should include this rating scale in annual evaluations submitted to the college (even if current department guidelines currently use different labels on their rating scale).

Ex. “Meritorious/Exceeds expectations”

- **Areas of Responsibility** – vary depending on job title, appointment letter, etc.
 - **Guiding Criteria** - general, college level criteria for evaluating performance
 - **Specific Criteria** - department-specific criteria for evaluating performance
-



Teaching

- Quality of Teaching
- Professional Development
- Curricular Development
- Impact Beyond the Classroom



Research\Creative Work

- Productivity
- Independence and Intellectual Leadership
- Scholarly Impact
- Positive Trajectory



Service

- Institutional Engagement
- Academic Leadership
- Professional Mentoring
- Commitment to the Discipline
- Public Engagement and Outreach

Section 8 has tables outlining possible accomplishments to meet each of the guiding criteria for the three areas of responsibility.

- Possible accomplishments vary by job title and track.
 - The list of possible accomplishments is not exhaustive and should not be viewed as a checklist.
 - Department guidelines are key to identifying required accomplishments to meet these guiding criteria.
-

- **Productivity** and **Positive Trajectory** are considered in all promotion cases (where research is an area of responsibility)
 - **Independence** from early career mentors is key for early career scholars, while **Intellectual Leadership** is essential for promotion to full professor.
 - **Scholarly Impact** is important for promotions in all disciplines, BUT what it means will vary from one discipline to the next (and expectations should be clearly stated in department guidelines)
-

- Not all of the “guiding criteria” apply equally to all job titles and ranks.
 - Ex. To achieve promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure), a faculty member’s service record will focus on 2 of the 5 guiding criteria for service: **Institutional Engagement** and **Commitment to the Discipline**. A faculty member may have some achievements in the other categories, however.
 - To achieve promotion to Professor, there will be a greater expectation that a faculty member’s service record includes achievements that align with at least 2 of the other 3 guiding criteria: **Academic Leadership** and **Professional Mentoring**. A faculty member may substitute service related to **Public Engagement and Outreach** for one of the other guiding criteria.
-



Items of Note

(New to some legacy colleges and/or new to
come departments)

Tenure Track

- Guidelines follow the university requirement for a minimum of 5 “arm’s length” external letters.

Academic Professional Track

- Proposed college requirement is 2 external review letters for the highest rank in any of the 5 sets of APT titles.

Rationale:

1) Gives additional review from outside expert in the same discipline/subject.

2) University allows it and some departments have required them at all levels.

3) Elevates and showcases the work of our APT faculty.

- Minimum of **two** for all promotion cases (*starting with promotion cases in Fall 2023*).
- Minimum of **one** for midterm reviews (*starting w/ midterms in Spring 2024*).
- Appendix B has a sample teaching observation instrument.

Rationale:

Allows for a more holistic review of teaching that goes beyond student evaluations of teaching.

- All faculty who have opportunity for promotion may request a promotion progress review at the time they submit their annual review materials.
- Provides constructive feedback on how the faculty member can strengthen their overall record.
- A positive promotion progress review does not guarantee a successful promotion case.

Rationale

Having a series of positive annual reviews is not the best indicator of whether somebody is ready to come up for promotion.

This option provides a candid assessment of how a faculty member's record of performance aligns with promotion criteria.

The Dean's Advisory Committee –
Tenure-Track will vote on two
questions:

- Is the faculty member making satisfactory progress towards tenure and promotion?
- Should the faculty member be reappointed?

Rationale

Provides candidates with clear feedback on whether they are making progress toward tenure.

In current draft the language for 1st promotion is:

“Candidates must have demonstrated impact of accomplishments within the university.”

2nd promotion language is:

“Candidates must have demonstrated impact of accomplishments within and beyond the university.”

Feedback has been considered and this will be edited to be more inclusive. Suggested new language for 2nd promotion is:

“Candidates must have demonstrated significant impact in leadership within the university or some impact beyond the university in any of the areas of responsibility.”

What questions and comments
would you like to share as we
continue to revise
these guidelines?



Please use our
feedback survey to
provided additional
comments.

