

APPENDIX I

CONSTITUTION OF THE GENERAL FACULTY OF TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE

Article I. THE GENERAL FACULTY

The General Faculty, subject to the laws of the State of Texas and the general policies of the Board of Regents of the Texas A&M University System, shall have the responsibility for the overall educational policies of the University.

Section 1. The General Faculty shall consist of all full-time tenured or tenure-track personnel of the academic rank of Instructor and above, full-time tenured or tenure-track professional library personnel, Lecturers and Visiting Professors who receive full-time salaries from teaching or library funds and Texas A&M University-Kingsville retired faculty who teach for Texas A&M University-Kingsville. In the case of questioned status under this provision, the decision of the Faculty Senate shall be final.^{6,17}

Section 2. All General Faculty members at Texas A&M University-Kingsville,²⁵ shall be eligible to vote in

- (a) elections of members of the Faculty Senate
- (b) referendums, and
- (c) General Faculty meetings.

Full-time faculty members and professional library personnel not meeting the criteria for membership in the General Faculty given in Section 1, Article I, shall have the privilege of participation in faculty deliberations exclusive of the voting rights herein specified.⁸

Section 3. There shall be at least one General Faculty meeting per year.

Section 4. Additional General Faculty meetings may be called by

- (a) the President or the Provost of the University,
- (b) the Faculty Senate, either on its own initiative or upon Faculty Senate³ approval of a written petition of fifteen members of the General Faculty.

- Section 5. The President of the University²⁴ shall preside at General Faculty meetings, or, in his or her absence, the Provost, the President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate, or the Senior Dean of a College, in that order. Seniority among the Deans of the Colleges shall be determined by date of appointment to the A&M University-Kingsville faculty.⁶ The Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall serve as Secretary of the General Faculty.
- Section 6. Recognized parliamentary procedure shall govern the conduct of General Faculty meetings. However, failure to follow such procedure shall not be grounds for contesting any decision made at such meetings unless the breach of procedure was challenged at the time of occurrence.
- Section 7. Voting in any General Faculty meeting shall be by show of hands or, if called for by a faculty member and favorably voted by the members present, a roll-call vote or secret written ballot.
- Section 8. (Deleted)⁶
- Section 9. (Deleted)³
- Section 10. The President of the University²⁴ shall be requested to report to the General³ Faculty regarding his or her²⁴ implementation of Faculty Senate recommendations at the September meeting of the Faculty Senate.¹

Article II.

THE FACULTY SENATE

To facilitate the exercise of the responsibilities outlined in Article I, those powers are hereby delegated by the General Faculty to a representative body to be called the Faculty Senate. The delegation of authority by the General Faculty is subject to revision by that faculty.⁶

Membership

- Section 1. (a) The Faculty Senate shall consist of thirty-three^{19,22,26} members: three representatives from the five undergraduate Colleges elected from and by their respective Colleges and serving staggered terms, one representative from Texas A&M University-Kingsville System Center-San Antonio elected from and by System Center faculty,²⁶ one representative from the Library elected from and by Library faculty,²² and fifteen representatives elected at-large serving staggered terms, and the Senate President.^{12,13,19,24}
- (b) The Faculty Senate shall have an Executive Committee.¹⁷
- Section 2. (a) All full-time tenured or tenure track members of the General

Faculty who have completed at least one full academic year²⁵ of service at Texas A&M University-Kingsville⁴ are eligible to serve as members of the Faculty Senate.^{2,13,17}

- (b) Representatives from the several Colleges to the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the eligible voters of each College. The rules defining the qualifications outlined in (a) above shall apply to representatives from the several Colleges.

Election of Members

Section 3.

(a) Representatives-at-large shall be elected by the eligible voters of the General Faculty. Procedure for the election of representatives shall be as follows: The President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate⁴ shall have ballots prepared and distributed to all eligible voters. Ballots shall be signed in a manner which makes possible the²⁴ removal of signatures without damaging the portion of the ballot on which the vote is cast.⁹ The ballots shall be sent to the person designated by the President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate to receive them. The designated person shall check the ballots to determine the eligibility of the voters, and then shall remove and dispose of the signatures and count the ballots, all in the presence of at least three witnesses.⁹ It shall be the right of any qualified voter to witness the ballot counting, and the time and place of the vote count shall be publicized so this may be possible. In each election of faculty members of the Faculty Senate there shall be a primary election and a run-off election if needed. A candidate shall be declared elected if he or she receives a majority of votes cast in the primary election; if not, a run-off election shall be held.² The number of candidates in each run-off election shall be twice the number of vacancies to be filled, the candidates in the run-off being those candidates securing the largest number of votes in the primary election. In case of ties in the last place eligible for the run-off election, all names tied for the last eligible place shall be submitted as candidates in the run-off election. In case of a tie for the last place or places for Faculty Senate membership in the run-off election, the position or positions shall be determined from among those candidates by lot.

It is the responsibility of those counting ballots to record all votes. The tally of votes for each candidate shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate office and remain on file for a period of one year. This voting record shall become the basis for determining those eligible to fill Senate vacancies.¹⁹

- (b) The procedure for the election of representatives from the several Colleges shall be the same as that followed in Section 3 (a) above, except that eligible voters shall be limited to members of the respective Colleges.

Section 4. (a) Election of College representatives shall take place during early February.¹⁹

- (b) Election of at-large representatives shall take place during early March.¹⁹ Those elected shall take office on the day of the regular May meeting even if the so-called May meeting is held in April after the completion of all elections for representatives.¹² Terms of members being replaced by newly elected members shall expire at the conclusion of Old Business.^{11,13,23,24}

Section 5. A vacancy among representatives-at-large and representatives from the several Colleges shall be filled by appointment of the candidate receiving the next greatest vote in the immediately preceding election.^{6,17} Senators filling unexpired terms shall serve only the balance of the unexpired term.¹⁹

Membership Terms

Section 6. (a) The members of the Faculty Senate shall serve for three years.¹³

- (b) The terms of Senators shall be staggered.^{11,13}

- (c) Having served for one three-year term, or having failed to complete a term, a member of the Faculty Senate shall be ineligible for membership for a period of one year.¹³

- (d) If a Senator has completed more than three academic semesters of the predecessor's term, then the Senator will be ineligible for membership for a period of one year.¹⁷

Officers

Section 7. Officers of the Faculty Senate shall be:

1. President²⁴,
2. Vice-President²⁴ and President-Elect²⁴ (who will serve as the following year's President²⁴),
3. Secretary (who will serve as Secretary to the General Faculty),

4. Parliamentarian.

- (a) All officers of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the Faculty Senate by secret ballot from among its own members, except the Parliamentarian, who shall be appointed by the President of the Senate.^{6,11,24} The Parliamentarian need not be a member of the Faculty Senate.¹⁷
- (b) Upon the Senate President's²⁴ assuming office, the Senate seat the President²⁴ held shall be declared vacant and shall be filled for the duration of the President's term²⁴ by the procedures set forth in Article II, Section 5. The President²⁴ shall be ineligible for re-election to the Senate until a year after leaving office as President.^{19,24} The President shall be ineligible to serve two consecutive terms as President.²⁴

The Senate President shall be granted three hours released time per semester so that the total teaching load is no more than nine hours per semester during the time of service as Senate President. In addition, the Senate President may choose to assign a weight of zero percent to both Categories II (Research and Scholarly Activity) and III (Professional Growth and Activities) of the Annual Evaluation of Faculty for those portions of the evaluation years which overlap the year of service as President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate.²⁴

Meetings

- Section 8.
- (a) The Faculty Senate shall hold a regular meeting each month of the academic year, the time and place subject to the provisions in the By-Laws of the body.¹² The General Faculty shall be notified of the hour of meeting, place of meeting, and agenda at least forty-eight hours in advance of each monthly meeting.
 - (b) Special meetings of the Faculty Senate may be called by the President of the University²⁴, by decision of the Faculty Senate at a previous meeting, by the President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate, or by petition signed by five members of the Faculty Senate and presented to the President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate.¹¹

Parliamentarian Authority

- (c) The rules contained in the most recent edition of "Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised" shall govern the Faculty Senate in all cases to which they are not inconsistent with By-Laws and any special rules of order the Faculty Senate may adopt.¹⁷
- (d) An interpretation of the Constitution and its By-Laws by a simple majority

of the Faculty Senate supersedes an interpretation by the Senate President²⁴ and the Parliamentarian.¹⁷

Quorum

Section 9. A quorum shall consist of 3/5 of Faculty Senate members,¹⁰ not counting the Past President (who is ex officio and does not vote), and truncating fractions to the nearest whole number.²⁴

Voting

Section 10. Each member of Faculty Senate shall have one vote.¹²

Section 11. The Faculty Senate shall make any by-laws it deems necessary to facilitate transactions of its business as long as such by-laws are consistent with the provisions of the Constitution and approved by a majority of those present at two successive meetings.^{11,17}

Membership Vacancies

Section 12. A Faculty Senate seat shall be declared vacant upon three successive absences at regular meetings by a given member of the Faculty Senate.¹³

Committees

- Section 13.
- (a) The Faculty Senate shall have the power to create standing and special committees. The memberships shall be appointed by the President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate unless otherwise provided by the Faculty Senate. Membership may be appointive or elective. The notices of appointment shall include definitions of the duties and powers of the respective committees. Annual and/or special reports from such committees shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate.¹⁷
 - (b) The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall serve as a committee on committees for all campus-wide committees.¹⁷

Minutes

Section 14. (a) Minutes taken by the Faculty Senate must be sent to each member of the General Faculty and such action shall be considered as approved by the General Faculty unless letters from twenty members of the General Faculty stating reasons for objection to a given action of the Faculty

Senate are received by the Secretary of the Faculty Senate within ten days of the publication of the minutes. Any item of action by the Faculty Senate which receives the objection in writing by twenty members of the General Faculty shall be submitted to the General Faculty for action by that body.¹⁹

- (b) A report of action by the Faculty Senate shall be forwarded by the President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate to the President of the University²⁴ and to the Provost,¹⁹ on a regular and systematic basis.¹⁹
- (c) Any action of the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate shall be approved or vetoed by the President of the University²⁴ within sixty days of receipt of formal notification of the action by the Office of the President. The President of the Senate²⁴ shall then notify the Provost.¹⁹ If the action of the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate is such that the President of the University²⁴ requires more than sixty days to approve or veto, the President of the University²⁴ shall so inform the General Faculty through the President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate. In case of a veto the President of the University²⁴ shall give his or her²⁴ reasons for the veto. Any matter to which the President of the University²⁴ has not responded within sixty days of receipt of formal notification of the action by the Office of the President shall be included on the agenda of the next Faculty Senate meeting.^{17,19}
- (d) At the last official meeting of the current Faculty Senate, the Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall compile and distribute to the Faculty Senate members a list of resolutions passed, committee reports adopted and/or accepted, and the status of each with regard to the University²⁴ President's action on such matters as of that date.^{6,19}

Annual Report

- Section 15. The Faculty Senate shall give an annual report to the General Faculty and members of the Board of Regents by the first week of the Fall semester of each year. The report shall cover the period of the previous Faculty Senate year, which begins and ends with the adjournments of consecutive May meetings²⁴, and its preparation shall be the responsibility of the previous year's Faculty Senate President²⁴, or, if he or she is unable or unwilling to do so, the previous year's Secretary, with the help of the previous year's Executive Committee, shall assume this responsibility.^{6, 17}

Senate Powers

- Section 16. The Faculty Senate is authorized to consider any subject pertaining to the interest of the University and to make recommendations to the President of the University²⁴ in regard thereto.
- Section 17. (a) The Faculty Senate shall consider any matter of University interest which the President of the University²⁴ places before it.
- (b) The Faculty Senate may request information from any members of the Administration and Faculty, and may invite any such person to sit with it for consultation and advice.
- (c) The Faculty Senate shall give consideration to any written recommendation put to it by fifteen voting members of the General Faculty.
- Section 18. The Faculty Senate is authorized to participate in establishing curricula, setting standards of instruction, determining requirements for degrees, and in general determining the educational policies of the University.¹⁷
- Section 19. The Faculty Senate is authorized to share in the formulation of principles which shall govern faculty salaries, faculty salary raises, tenure, promotions, appointments, dismissals of faculty members, leaves, work loads, retirement, and concern itself with all matters affecting the welfare of the faculty.¹⁷
- Section 20. (a) The Faculty Senate is authorized to share in the formulation of policy governing such student affairs as orientation and guidance, financial aids and scholarships, extracurricular activities, standards of behavior, student housing, and student rights.
- (b) The Faculty Senate is authorized to participate in the formulation of policies governing official University publications.
- (c) The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall serve as an advisory body to the President of the University²⁴ in the formulation of policies concerning the University.¹⁷

Section 21. The Faculty Senate recognizes the special competencies of the several departments and Colleges of the University in matters pertaining to their respective disciplines; however, the Faculty Senate reserves the right to review any actions of these administrative units which affect the University as a whole and to make recommendations concerning them to the President of the University²⁴.

Article III. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, RATIFICATION AND REVIEWS

Section 1. Amendments may be proposed by

- (a) The Faculty Senate by a majority of those present at two successive meetings.^{11,17}
- (b) Petition of fifteen members of the Faculty to the Faculty Senate subject to a favorable vote of a majority of those present at two successive meetings.¹⁷

Section 2. Ratification procedure is as follows: Within fourteen days of the date of Faculty Senate approval of successful faculty petition,¹¹ copies of the proposed amendments must be distributed to the members of the General Faculty together with a ballot. This ballot must be returned to the President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate within seven days. If a majority of the eligible members voting approve the amendments, they shall be ratified.^{11,17}

Section 3. The Constitution of the General Faculty of Texas A&M University-Kingsville shall be reviewed every ten (10) years effective 1990.¹⁷

By Laws

Executive Committee

I. Commencement of May Meeting²⁴: The President-Elect²⁴ shall arrange a time and place for the May²⁴ meeting of the new membership of the²⁴ Faculty Senate and shall notify all Senators of said meeting. In the event that the President-Elect²⁴ is unable to perform any of these duties, the outgoing President²⁴ shall assume the responsibility of their execution.¹⁶

II. Section 1. At its first meeting, the new Faculty Senate membership²⁴ shall select an Executive Committee. This committee shall consist of the outgoing Senate President, the Senate President²⁴, the Vice-President and President-Elect²⁴, and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, and of three additional Senators who shall be elected by secret ballot. If the President-Elect²⁴ is unable to preside at this first meeting, the outgoing

President²⁴ or outgoing Secretary, or an outgoing Executive committee member shall be elected to preside.

Section 2. The Executive Committee shall

(a) act for the Faculty Senate in emergencies and during the summer months when the Faculty Senate does not normally²⁴ convene.

(b) make the agenda for regular Faculty Senate meetings,

(c) serve as a nominating committee for all committee appointments, and

(d) serve as an election committee.

Duties of Officers

Section 3. Executive Committee actions shall be reported to the Faculty Senate at its next regular meeting.

Section 4. The Executive Committee shall read, correct, and approve the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting held in May, within thirty²⁴ days of the date of the meeting.⁶

III. Duties of the Officers of the Faculty Senate include:

1. The President²⁴

(a) presides at Faculty Senate meetings,

(b) presides at Executive Committee meetings,

(c) is a non-voting member of all Faculty Senate committees,

(d) attends Texas Council of Faculty Senates (formerly CoFGO) meetings,²⁰

(e) represents the Faculty Senate to the administration,

(f) is responsible for the annual Faculty Senate Report,¹⁶

(g) is a non-voting member of the University President's Executive Council²⁴,

- (h) attends Board of Regents' meetings at the invitation of the President of the University²⁴,
 - (i) attends the Chancellor's Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) at his/her invitation.,¹⁹
 - (j) requests the President of the University²⁴ to report on implementation of Senate recommendations at the September meeting²⁴,
 - (k) reports on actions of the Executive Committee at the next regular Senate meeting²⁴,
 - (l) presides at General Faculty meetings in the absence of the President of the University²⁴ and Provost²⁴,
 - (m) notifies the President of the University²⁴ and Provost regarding Senate resolutions²⁴,
 - (n) notifies the Provost regarding the University President's action on Senate resolutions²⁴,
 - (o) attends Academic Deans' Council or appoints a designee²⁴,
 - (p) conducts election of at-large representatives in March.²⁴
2. The Vice-President and President-Elect²⁴
- (a) presides at Faculty Senate or Executive Committee meetings in the absence of the Senate President²⁴,
 - (b) is responsible for the monthly newsletter,
 - (c) attends Texas Council of Faculty Senates (formerly CoFGO) meetings,²⁰
 - (d) serves as requested by Senate President,^{16,19,20,24}
 - (e) reports on Executive Committee meetings with the President of the University²⁴ and Provost²⁴,

- (f) arranges and publicizes the May meeting of the Senate and assumes the office of President of the Senate as the last item of business at that meeting.²⁴
3. The Secretary²⁴
- (a) keeps minutes of all Faculty Senate meetings,
 - (b) keeps all committee reports,
 - (c) keeps accurate membership and attendance reports,
 - (d) assists the Senate President²⁴ in preparation of annual Faculty Senate report,
 - (e) maintains the currency of the Faculty Handbook by reporting needed changes (relevant resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President of the University²⁴) to the Office of the Provost as they occur,²⁰
 - (f) distributes and transmits minutes and other electronic records to the University Community,²⁰
 - (g) serves as Secretary to the general faculty if needed,
 - (h) serves as requested by the Senate President,^{16,20}
 - (i) compiles a list of resolutions and committee reports accepted and a list of the University President's actions²⁴,
 - (j) keeps lists of faculty eligible to be Senators and eligible to vote as General Faculty.²⁴
4. The Parliamentarian
- (a) maintains the authoritative text of the Constitution of the General Faculty of Texas A&M University-Kingsville²⁴ and the By-Laws for conducting business in the Texas A&M University-Kingsville Faculty Senate,
 - (b) interprets provisions of the Constitution and its By-Laws when called upon to do so,
 - (c) maintains a record of interpretations of the Constitution and its By-Laws,¹⁶
 - (d) interprets Parliamentary procedure when called upon to do so.²⁴

- IV. Calendar of Recommendations and Committee Reports:
1. Matters placed before the Faculty Senate by the President of the University²⁴ or recommended to it by members of the General Faculty, reports from Faculty Senate committees, and other matters of Faculty Senate business are to be placed on the Calendar of Recommendations and Committee Reports until the Faculty Senate disposes of such items.
 2. Any item taken from the Calendar may be returned to the Calendar.
 3. (Deleted)^{14,18}
- V. The President²⁴ of the Faculty Senate shall attend meetings of the Academic Dean's Council²⁴ or appoint observers from among the members of the Faculty Senate serving second or third year terms and from the membership of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to attend the meetings. Observers shall serve on a rotating basis. Observers are to report back to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate on a regular basis concerning all proposals and changes discussed at the Council of Deans meetings. The Executive Committee will then report significant proposals and changes to the Faculty Senate during Regular Senate Meetings.¹⁹
- VI. Executive Sessions: The Faculty Senate may at any time place itself in executive session by a simple majority vote of all members in attendance. The executive session shall serve to exclude all in attendance at the meeting except regular Faculty Senate members or persons specifically invited by the Senate President²⁴ with the approval of the Faculty Senate.
- VII. During years when no member of the Faculty of the Citrus Center at Weslaco is serving as an elected member of the Faculty Senate, that Faculty may elect one of their number to serve as a non-voting delegate to the Faculty Senate, such delegate to be granted all the privileges of any member of the Faculty Senate except voting.^{7,16}

Standing Rules

- I. Committee reports to be considered by the Faculty Senate shall be mailed to Faculty Senate members no later than five calendar days prior to the Faculty Senate meeting at which the matter on which the committee is reporting is to be considered by the Faculty Senate (Adopted April 1992).

¹As amended February 1969

²As amended April 1970

³As amended October 1973

⁴As amended April 1974

⁵As amended February 1978

⁶As amended October 1978

⁷As amended March 1979

⁸As amended October 1979

⁹As amended November 1981

¹⁰As amended January 1982

¹¹As amended February 1982

¹²As amended March 1982

¹³As amended October 1983

¹⁴As amended March 1986

¹⁵As amended April 1986

¹⁶As amended February 1991

¹⁷As amended March 1991

¹⁸As amended April 1992

¹⁹As amended February 1996

²⁰As amended April 1997

²¹As amended November 1998

²²As amended January 1999

²³As amended December 2001

²⁴As amended April 2002

²⁵As amended May 2003

²⁶As amended October 2003

APPENDIX II

TAMUK Student Rating of Instruction

rev. Feb. 10, 2000

Instructor _____

Course _____

Term _____

Academic Year _____

Thoughtful student appraisal of the instruction in this class is very important. Your assistance in filling out this form is appreciated. Please do not sign your name. Scantron machine scoring requires bubbles filled in completely with a number two pencil.

| | Not Applicable | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. The instructor is considerate of the students during class. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. The instructor presents the subject matter in a clear and organized manner. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Tests and other requirements cover the course description in the syllabus. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. The instructor sets high academic standards. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. The instructor follows the grading system outlined in the syllabus. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. The instructor is available during office hours. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. Lectures, discussions, and/or demonstrations focus on the material outlined in the syllabus. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. The results of tests and assignments are returned in a reasonable amount of time. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. The textbook(s) and/or other required materials support the course objectives. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. The instructor takes time to answer questions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11. The instructor attempts to involve students in class discussions/activities. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12. The instructor did not require high quality work. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. The instructor communicates the importance of the subject matter. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 14. The instructor can not be reached during posted office hours. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 15. The instructor uses examples to help students understand. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 16. Compared to other college courses I have taken, the amount of effort required to succeed in this course is: | NA <input type="radio"/> | Higher <input type="radio"/> | | Average <input type="radio"/> | | Lower <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. Students made comments about the instructor while I was filling out this evaluation. | | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> | |
| 18. The instructions for completing this evaluation form were read out loud to the class. | | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 19. The grade that I expect in this class is: | NA <input type="radio"/> | A <input type="radio"/> | B <input type="radio"/> | C <input type="radio"/> | D <input type="radio"/> | F <input type="radio"/> |
| 20. My reason for taking this course: | Required <input type="radio"/> | Elective <input type="radio"/> | | | | |

Please give your views on the quality of the instruction in this course. In your comments, please include both strengths and weaknesses. Use the back of this sheet if you need more space.

Implementation Guide for Interpretation and Use of Student Ratings of Instruction

Revised February 23, 2000

Background.

In accordance with the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) policy passed by the Board of Regents, the primary purpose of Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) is formative, to aid the instructor in developing as a teacher. The secondary purpose of SRIs is summative, to assist supervisors in making personnel decisions. The PTR policy also specifies that SRIs are to be used in a criterion-referenced fashion (i.e., establishing objective performance criteria that one must meet), not in a norm-referenced manner (e.g., comparing one's scores to a departmental mean).

The currently proposed SRI instrument was developed in accordance with current research findings, but in some instances the experts are in disagreement as to what the findings mean. In all instances, however, the SRI instrument was developed (1) to protect the rights of faculty and (2) to protect the integrity of the university. For example, all researchers agree that grades are correlated positively with SRIs. But some researchers side with experimental evidence showing that high grades cause high SRI ratings (and low grades cause low SRI ratings). Other researchers provide correlational evidence suggesting that good teaching causes both higher grades and higher SRI ratings (and they argue that high grades do not directly cause high SRI ratings). Whereas it is true that both explanations might account for part of the observed relation between grades and SRIs, we sided with the first group of researchers because to do otherwise would (1) ignore the potential plight of instructors who give low grades when low grades are justified and (2) ignore the possibility of a vicious cycle of higher grades, higher SRIs, and lower standards that threatens to destroy the academic integrity of our universities.

Administrators must interpret Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) with careful attention to what each item is supposed to be measuring, with equal attention to potentially biasing factors, problems of interpretation, and considerations as to how SRI data should be used. Following is an explication of these factors, problems, and considerations.

I. Reliability

No summative conclusions are to be based on data averaged over fewer than 50 students, because low ratings might be attributable to unreliability of the small sample (see Appendix A for further explanation and research references). It is possible to average SRIs over courses for a given professor, *if the professor agrees* (an exception appears to be that undergraduate and graduate courses should never be averaged together), but averaging across courses may lead to spurious conclusions. For example, suppose that a professor had low ratings in one course that is required and has a rigorous Departmental final, and s/he has high ratings in an elective course that is graded easily. Both sets of ratings might need to be interpreted in their respective contexts in order to get a truer picture of the instructor's strengths and weaknesses; it may be necessary to collect data over several semesters in order to obtain data that are reliable enough to be analyzed. For new faculty, then, reliable SRI data may not be available for the first semester (or even a few semesters); in the meantime, SRIs may nevertheless be used for formative purposes, and other assessments of teaching (peer review, videotapes of lectures, course syllabi and materials, etc.) may be used.

II. Validity

Even when adequate samples of students are averaged together to obtain reliable data, the evaluator must keep in mind that validity is, at best, only moderate: the best obtainable correlation between SRI scores and student achievement is about .40, meaning that, under the best circumstances (multi-section courses with a common final) with the best SRI instruments, only 16% of the variance in student achievement is accounted for by the SRI (see Appendix A for further explanation and references). In most real-world cases, it is to be expected that substantially less variance will be accounted for by SRIs.

Moreover, SRIs have what has been called discriminant invalidity. That is, SRIs are correlated more highly with grades (and probably other factors) than other methods of assessing teaching are correlated with these factors (see Appendix A for further explanation and references).

Therefore, there will be many “false positives” (i.e., poor teachers - - meaning those whose students learn very little - - who receive good SRIs, perhaps because of grade inflation or due to one of the other biasing factors listed below) and many “false negatives” (i.e., good teachers - - those whose students achieve a lot - - who receive bad SRIs, perhaps due to a strict grading policy or due to one of the other biasing factors). In theory, these false positive and false negative errors can be avoided by using additional measures of teaching effectiveness, as enumerated below.

III. Dimensions measured by SRIs.

The items and dimensions upon which SRIs are based must be analyzed separately, never averaging across dimensions to create a composite score such as “overall instructor rating” or “overall rating of course” because such items are most prone to biasing factors and are most likely to reflect a positive or negative halo effect. Marsh and Roche (1997, *American Psychologist*, 52, p. 1188), two enthusiastic defenders of student ratings of instruction, state that “Global or overall ratings ... may be more susceptible to context, mood, and other potential biases than are specific items that are more closely tied to actual teaching behaviors...” The one exception to this rule might be to use such items only to estimate such halo effects in order to remove them statistically from the data.

In most cases, it is acceptable to average across items within a dimension, but only when all of the items are appropriate for the particular course and instructor. It is important to keep in mind that not all items and all dimensions will apply to all courses and professors. For example, the dimension “group interaction” might not be applicable to certain large-lecture-hall, TTVN, or web-based courses. Similarly, the item referring to “lectures, discussions, and demonstrations” might not be applicable to every course or professor. When the SRI ratings are used formatively, this poses no problem—the instructor and Chair can simply ignore the irrelevant items or dimensions. However, when an item or dimension is to be used summatively, it is up to the Chair to be able to justify why the item or dimension is being used in this way.

According to one influential model, there are nine dimensions of SRIs, as determined by statistical factor analysis (H. W. Marsh, 1984, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 707-754). Again, it is important to keep in mind that these nine dimensions collectively are only moderately correlated with student achievement, $r = .40$, so that only 16% of the total variance in SRIs is accounted for by student achievement; the individual dimensions would be expected to correlate even less well with student achievement (reflecting a general property of tests and their subtests).

| Dimension | Items |
|--|--------------|
| 1. value (the degree to which course was challenging/something was learned) | 4, 12 |
| 2. enthusiasm (this factor is most weakly correlated with student achievement) | 13 |
| 3. organization (this factor is most highly correlated with student achievement) | 2, 7 |
| 4. group interaction (ratings on this dimension suffer in large class sections) | 1, 11 |
| 5. individual rapport (also suffers in large class sections) | 1, 6, 10, 14 |
| 6. breadth of coverage (e.g., effectively using examples to clarify concepts) | 15 |
| 7. examinations/grading (higher grades are associated with higher SRIs) | 3, 5, 8 |
| 8. assignments (value of textbook and other assignments) | 3, 9 |
| 9. workload/difficulty (heavier workload is associated with lower SRIs) | 16, 17 |

IV. Biasing factors.

Biasing factors must be taken into account in interpreting SRI scores. These biasing factors collectively account for more of the variation in SRI scores than does student achievement. One of these factors, namely, class size, would be expected to influence only certain items or dimensions. For example, class size affects ratings on instructor rapport and class interaction, as it would be expected to do (H. W. Marsh & L. A. Roche, 1997, *American Psychologist*, 52, 1187-1197.).

However, most biasing factors would be expected to influence ratings on all items, resulting in positive or negative halo effects (for example, a negative bias in answering all questions). The direction and size of this halo effect can be estimated by documenting evidence relevant to concrete items. For example, suppose that an instructor documented that all exams and other graded materials were returned by the next class period, which should have resulted in a rating of 5.0 on item 8 (“The results of tests and assignments are returned in a reasonable amount of time”). If the average response on this item is 4.0, then a negative bias of 1.0 exists; all items could be adjusted upward by 1.0 points to remove this negative halo.

The following list of factors known to bias SRI ratings is by no means exhaustive, but these are some of the more salient ones:

- a. personality of instructor (as students understand it - - for example, “warm” vs. “cold”).
- b. expected grade in the class (this factor alone is as strongly correlated with SRI scores as is student achievement)
- c. difficulty or size of workload assigned by instructor (probably most important when course is not elective)
- d. small or large class sections
- e. whether course was required or elective
- f. level of students (freshman, senior, graduate student)
- g. the instructor may make the case that other biasing factors exist in his/her instance.

V. Interpretation of individual items.

In attempting to protect faculty rights, protect institutional integrity, and serve formative and summative purposes with SRIs, the basic approach is to first try to explain a low rating in terms of reliability, validity, misadministration, and/or biasing factors. If a low rating cannot be explained in terms of biasing factors, then alternate measures for evaluating teaching must be examined (see section VIII below); if the low rating still seems valid in light of the additional measures, then the instructor should attempt to satisfy a greater proportion of students (of course, without sacrificing academic integrity).

Following are the items on the proposed SRI along with corresponding dimensions, biasing factors, and problems of interpretation affecting each item:

(For items 1-15, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree)

1. The instructor is considerate of the students during class.
 - Dimension 4, group interaction (ratings on this dimension suffer in large class sections)
 - Dimension 5, individual rapport (also suffers in large class sections)
 - This item may be irrelevant in some Internet-based courses.
 - Should not be used to assess teaching effectiveness in large classes. Ratings on this item suffer in such classes because it taps Dimension 4, group interaction, and Dimension 5, individual rapport.
 - If needed, an instructor can document considerateness through videotape lectures.
2. The instructor presents the subject matter in a clear and organized manner.
 - Dimension 3, organization. Of all of the dimensions, the one tapped by this item, organization, is most highly correlated with student achievement. It should perhaps be

- weighted more highly than other dimensions.
 - If an instructor is downgraded on this item, evidence to the contrary can be provided through videotape of classroom presentation. Also, the instructor can require students to pass in notes taken during the videotaped lecture. To the extent that the content in the videotape is understandable to a reasonably intelligent and attentive person, any discrepancy between the students' notes and the content in the videotape would reveal that the problem is not in the instructor's clarity of presentation but in the preparedness of the students for college-level work.
- 3. Tests and other requirements cover the course description in the syllabus.
 - Dimension 7, examinations/grading (more generous grades are correlated with higher SRIs)
 - Dimension 8, assignments (value of textbook and other assignments)
 - Some instructors may not give "tests," but all should have some requirements stated in the syllabus. If downgraded on this item, an instructor can provide evidence to the contrary.
- 4. The instructor sets high academic standards.
 - Dimension 1, value (the degree to which course was challenging/something was learned)
 - May be irrelevant in physical activity courses.
 - If an instructor is rated low on this item, the low rating can be refuted by the professor by documenting actual grade distributions.
 - This item and item number 12 require opposite responses so function as catch items. The data from any student who gives an illogical combination of responses should be excluded from further analyses. (See Note for item 6 below.)
- 5. The instructor follows the grading system outlined in the syllabus.
 - Dimension 7, examinations/grading (more generous grades are correlated with higher SRIs)
 - Some instructors may be more lenient than stated in their syllabi; if so, it is unlikely that the students would downgrade the instructor.
 - The truthfulness of answers to this item was designed to be especially easy to verify or disconfirm. If an instructor is downgraded on this item, the instructor can provide hard-copies of graded work along with actual grade distributions that prove that the grading policies were followed.
- 6. The Instructor is available during office hours.
 - Dimension 5, individual rapport (suffers in large class sections)
 - This item may not be relevant in some departments in which instructors are already available during long to-be-arranged laboratory periods whose times have been established for the convenience of the students.
 - This item and item number 14 require opposite responses so function as catch items. If the student gives an illogical combination of responses, all of that student's data will be excluded from further analyses.
 - Items 4 and 12 also serve as a pair of catch items. If responses to either pair of items, 4-12 or 6-14, are illogical, then all of that student's responses for that section will be rejected. It is not necessary to generate illogical combinations for both pairs of questions to trigger this contingency.
- 7. Lectures, discussions, and/or demonstrations focus on the material outlined in the syllabus.
 - Dimension 3, organization (this factor is most highly correlated with student achievement)
 - Some classes may not use these techniques, e.g., jogging activity class, so this item should be ignored.
- 8. The results of tests and assignments are returned in a reasonable amount of time.
 - Dimension 7, examinations/grading (more generous grades are correlated with higher SRIs)

- In those cases where the instructor is downgraded, the truthfulness of answers to this item was designed to be especially easy to verify or disconfirm. The instructor can have students sign dated attendance sheets that state prominently that the tests were returned that day.
9. The textbook(s) and/or other required materials support the course objectives.
- Dimension 8, assignments (value of textbook and other assignments)
 - In certain courses this item may be irrelevant, if neither textbook nor materials are required.
 - It is hard to imagine that an instructor would ever require a textbook or materials that did not support the course objectives, so in virtually every case in which an instructor is downgraded on this item, it should be easy to obtain letters from colleagues in the discipline attesting that the items were indeed supportive of course objectives.
10. The instructor takes time to answer questions.
- Dimension 5, individual rapport (suffers in large class sections)
 - This item may not be relevant in certain types of distance learning courses (e.g., Internet-based or those using non-interactive televised lectures).
 - If the course is small and non-distance learning and the instructor is still downgraded, an instructor can potentially provide a sample of videotaped class time showing that time was taken to answer questions.
11. The instructor attempts to involve students in class discussions/activities.
- Dimension 1, value (the degree to which course was challenging/something was learned)
 - This item may not be relevant in certain types of distance-learning courses (e.g., Internet-based or those using non-interactive televised lectures).
 - If the course is small and non-distance learning and the instructor is still downgraded, an instructor can potentially provide a sample of videotaped class time showing that attempts were made to involve the students.
12. The instructor did not require high quality work.
- Dimension 1, value (the degree to which course was challenging/something was learned)
 - This is a catch item when its response is compared to that of item 4. If the student gives an illogical combination of responses, all of that student's data will be excluded from further analyses. If the student gives a logical combination of responses, CIS will "reverse score" this item in order that a response of "5" will signify a positive opinion of the instructor. (See Note for item 6.)
 - If downgraded on this item, an instructor can refute the low rating by documenting actual grade distributions.
13. The instructor communicates the importance of the subject matter.
- Dimension 2 enthusiasm (this factor is most weakly correlated with student achievement)
14. The instructor can not be reached during posted office hours.
- Dimension 5, individual rapport (suffers in large class sections)
 - This is a catch item when its response is compared to that of item 6. If the student gives an illogical combination of responses, all of that student's data will be excluded from further analyses. If the student gives a logical combination of responses, CIS will "reverse score" this item in order that a response of "5" will signify a positive opinion of the instructor.
 - See note on item 6 regarding relevance for some faculty members.
15. The instructor uses examples to help students understand.
- Dimension 6, breadth of coverage (e.g., effectively using examples to clarify concepts)
 - If downgraded unfairly on this item, the instructor can supply videotape of class sessions or

copies of handouts that illustrate concepts by example.

16. Compared to other college courses I have taken, the amount of effort required to succeed in this course is: NA, Higher = 3, Average = 2, Lower = 1

- Dimension 9 workload/difficulty (heavier workload is correlated with lower SRIs)
- If a larger-than-average amount of work is required of students, a negative halo effect can be created; an amount smaller than average might create a positive halo effect.

17. Students made comments about the instructor while I was filling out this evaluation. Yes No

- This item was designed to assess the validity of SRI results vis-à-vis the administration of the SRI. To the extent that this item and item 18 are answered affirmatively, the SRI results for this entire section may be discarded for summative purposes at the instructor's discretion (the chair does NOT have the right to exclude data from a course section). Alternatively, halo effects can be estimated and removed by adjusting the data as described above.

18. The instructions for completing this evaluation form were read out loud to the class. Yes No

- This item was designed to assess the validity of SRI results vis-à-vis the administration of the SRI. To the extent that this item and item 17 are answered affirmatively, the SRI results for this entire section may be discarded for summative purposes at the instructor's discretion (the chair does NOT have the right to exclude data from a course section). Alternatively, halo effects can be estimated and removed by adjusting the data as described above.

19. The grade that I expect in this class is: NA A B C D F

- It has been experimentally demonstrated that giving higher grades causes higher SRI ratings to result and lower grades causes lower SRI ratings. If the instructor's grade distribution is significantly higher or lower than those of other instructors to which the students would be expected to have been exposed, then consideration should be given to adjusting the SRI scores up or down or otherwise taking this factor into account when making formative or summative recommendations.

20. My reason for taking this course. Required Elective

- It has been demonstrated that instructors of elective courses receive higher grades than those of required courses. Consideration should be given to adjusting the SRI scores up or down or otherwise taking this factor into account when making formative or summative recommendations.

VI. Criterion referenced evaluation.

In line with the Post-Tenure Review policy, a method of criterion referenced evaluation must be used. A criterion is a minimum level of performance that is regarded as acceptable without question. It is suggested that the following ratings criteria be used:

- 3.0 or above This score on the current 5-point scale for a given dimension (items averaged together within the dimension) is acceptable and requires no action (at 3.0, approximately half of the students are satisfied, half are not); there is no need, other than the instructor's own formative/developmental need, to try to "explain" such ratings. If criterion is not reached for one of the nine SRI dimensions, then one-ninth of the potential points are deducted from the contribution of SRI scores to the final Teacher Performance rating (see Implementation Guide for Annual Evaluation of Faculty).
- 2.50 - 3.00 The faculty member is possibly deficient, but the chair should evaluate whether the low ratings on that dimension can be attributed to other biasing factors; the instructor may supply evidence that refutes the low ratings and makes the case that biasing

factors account for the low ratings; if not, professional teacher training or other efforts to address that dimension might be considered, but should remain optional.

below 2.50 Professional teacher training or other efforts should be automatically considered if for no other reason than maintaining good student-faculty relations, but with the realization that much or even all of the low ratings might be attributable to biasing factors; if biasing factors appear to account for the low ratings, then teacher training or other efforts should remain optional.

VII. Teaching in the overall assessment of faculty

It has been established that in overall annual evaluation of faculty members, the Teaching Performance component may count as 25%-65% of the overall evaluation (with research 15-55%; growth 5-45%; service 15-55%).

VIII. SRIs in the Overall Assessment of Teaching.

SRIs must never be used alone in the assessment of teaching.

Computerized summaries (means) of SRIs may count 25%-50% toward the Teaching Performance Component of Annual Evaluations.

The other 25-75% of the Teaching Performance component may be determined by the following sources of evidence.

Texas A&M System Policy 12.06.2 lists the following sources of evidence:

- (1)(a) course syllabi including list of topics to be covered during the semester, specific course objectives, types of activities for the course, student rating procedures, and required reading assignments;
- (1)(b) faculty attendance in class; and
- (1)(c) adherence to university and departmental policies.
- (2) Peer observation of classroom performance.
- (3) Departmental, college and university workshops on effective teaching.
- (4) Video taping of classroom performance for review and analysis by faculty.
- (5) Portfolio assessment by departmental review committee.
- (6) On-campus technology centers and other innovative programs designed to educate and support faculty in their efforts to integrate new technology into their teaching.
- (7) Departmental in-service training.
- (8) Senior faculty to serve as mentors for junior, new faculty.
- (9) Quality of instructional outcomes assessment by ... former students, employers of graduates, and faculty in graduate and professional schools attended by graduates.

System Policy 12.06.1 lists the following sources of evidence:

- (10) course content, complexity, level of expertise
- (11) performance of students in subsequent courses
- (12) student evaluations of the instructor
- (13) teaching innovations
- (14) peer evaluations
- (15) direction of dissertations and theses
- (16) awards, honors and other recognitions

Finally, evidence of teaching effectiveness at TAMUK may include the following additional sources:

- (17) written student comments on SRI (only if the instructor submits them)
- (18) other factors mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and supervisor

- (19) individual teaching portfolio
- (20) reflective self-review
- (21) trained observers
- (22) feedback from former students
- (23) results from conduct of recognized assessments of teaching effectiveness
- (24) use of instructional consultant
- (25) student enrollment in elective courses taught by the faculty member
- (26) student performance on standardized exams (e.g. ExCET, certification exams)

Appendix A
for
Implementation Guide for Interpretation and Use of
Student Ratings of Instruction
©James M. Puckett
[modified from TACT Quarterly Bulletin, Jan.-Mar., 1998]

The recent January 16, 1998 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* ran an article titled "New Research Casts Doubt on Value of Student Evaluations of Professors: Studies find that faculty members dumb down material and inflate grades to get good reviews." Although the overall tone of the article was negative with regard to student ratings of instruction, some positive points were made. Some of those positive points were valid, but it is hard to let some of them stand unchallenged. For example, the article quoted Herbert W. Marsh as saying "Research on peer review shows that if you have three or four different people go in and sit in on lectures by the same teacher, there will be relatively little agreement among them ... With student ratings, you've got someone who's sat through 40 hours of a course." In the context in which it was made, this statement implies that students give accurate assessments of teaching simply because they have had lengthy exposure to the teaching. This kind of speculation has turned up elsewhere, and it is time to put it to rest. The following empirical demonstration is provided by L. E. Stanfel (1995, *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 22, pp. 117-125):

For Questions 1 ["The instructor's objectives for the course have been made clear."] and 4 ["The instructor explains clearly to students how they are evaluated."] the vehicle of [documentation] was an open-book, multiple-choice quiz ... every student answered both quiz parts correctly and thereby proved that they knew both the course objectives and the procedure by which they would be evaluated. ... For Question 5 ["Tests and written assignments are graded and returned in a reasonable period of time."] a dated sign-up sheet was circulated at each occasion when graded documents were returned ... The original documents' being dated, the student signatures proved the graded documents had been returned to class at the earliest possible opportunity.

For the first course reported by Stanfel (1995), Question 1 received: 1 strongly agree; 6 agree; 7 uncertain; 19 disagree; and 6 strongly disagree. The data reported allow the following calculations: on a 5-point scale, if 5 were the best score, the average response to Question 1 should have been 5.00; instead, the average response to Question 1 was 2.41; the averages for Questions 4 and 5, respectively, were 2.64 and 3.79; for the second course, the averages for Questions 1, 4, and 5 were 1.88, 2.00, and 3.75, respectively. As Stanfel notes, "since [responses to three questions] have been proven patently incorrect, it is impossible to suppose the remainder [of responses to the questionnaire] is any less erroneous" (Stanfel, 1995).

Potentially making matters worse, Marsh and Roche (1997, *American Psychologist*, 52, p. 1188), two enthusiastic defenders of student ratings of instruction, speculate that "Global or overall ratings ... may be more susceptible to context, mood, and other potential biases than are specific items that are more closely tied to actual teaching behaviors..." If that is the case, then student responses to any global items on Stanfel's (1995) questionnaire would have been even more untruthful than those to the specific items described above. This and other evidence amply document the fallibility of student ratings. What follows is a brief summary of the psychometric properties of well-developed student ratings of instruction (SRIs); for in-house instruments that have not been revised and fine-tuned in light of validity considerations, reliability and validity data are probably worse than the figures reported here.

Reliability. To be used for making decisions that affect individuals' careers, tests should generally have reliability coefficients of $r = .95$ (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1993, *Psychological Testing*

(3rd ed.), Brooks/Cole, p. 126). SRIs are generally reliable in this range if about 50 students' responses are averaged together (Marsh & Roche, 1997, *American Psychologist*, 52, p. 1188). Making administrative judgments about teaching based on substantially fewer than about 50 students would probably amount to ratings malpractice, because the low score might be attributable to unreliability of the small sample.

Convergent Validity. Convergent validity exists when two or more methods of assessment correlate significantly with each other (e.g., SRIs and expert ratings). Convergent validity for SRIs is said to be moderate (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997, *American Psychologist*, 52, p. 1214), in the range of $r = .50$. (This correlation may sound high, but it means that only about 25% of the variance in SRI scores is accounted for in terms of convergent validity.)

Criterion Validity. Criterion validity is a direct correlation between, in this case, SRIs and an objective measure of job performance. The Supreme Court has determined that this is the type of validity that is pertinent in discrimination cases and has determined that the employer must define the measure of job performance and define the relationship between the test and the measure of job performance (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1993, *Psychological Testing* (3rd ed.), Brooks/Cole, p. 615). Using student performance on exams as the criterion, criterion validity is about .40 for SRIs overall (as cited by Haskell, 1997, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 5, No. 6, <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n6.html>), accounting for only about 16% of the variance.

Discriminant Invalidity SRIs would be said to have discriminant validity as compared to another method of assessing teaching effectiveness (such as experts' ratings) if SRIs were to be well correlated only with a criterion such as student performance and not with grading leniency and if experts' ratings were to correlate well with both student performance and grading leniency. However, good evidence supports the position that SRIs correlate with both student performance and grading leniency (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997, *American Psychologist*, 52, p. 1214). Hence, SRIs are said to have discriminant INvalidity (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997). This conclusion is supported by several actual classroom experiments such as that of Chacko (1983, *Educational Research Quarterly*, 8 (2), 19-25):

... Pre- and posttreatment measures of Ss' perceptions of instruction were obtained from an experimental and a control group of Ss using a Likert-type scale consisting of items describing commonly shown teaching traits and behaviors. The 2 groups did not vary in their premeasure scores. A midterm examination was administered, then evaluated in such a way that Ss in the experimental group were more harshly graded than Ss in the control group. Results show that the ratings of Ss in the experimental group changed to reflect more negative perceptions of instruction. These shifts were statistically significant in 7 of the 10 rating items. Such changes were not seen in the control group. ...

Meanwhile, some researchers have supplied observational/correlational data and interpretations suggesting that contamination by grades is not a problem, but such conclusions are drawn on observational/correlational data and are thus highly debatable; because the careers of faculty and the integrity of our universities are at stake, the burden of proof should be on these researchers. In the meantime, there is ample evidence to support the view that SRIs are substantially influenced by grading leniency.

Besides grading leniency, other sources of discriminant invalidity are also likely. For example, the more work the professor assigns, the lower the SRI scores (request preprint from agg@u.washington.edu), and certain personality characteristics as perceived by the students are correlated with ratings (Feldman, 1986, *Research in Higher Education*, 24, 139-213).

If our jury system generally produces verdicts that are correct (analogous to good criterion validity), but statistics prove that, given the same evidence, black defendants are more likely to receive guilty verdicts than white (analogous to discriminant invalidity), then that situation is not acceptable and is a reason for outrage.

Should SRIs Be Used, and If So, How?

Until just a decade or two ago, SRIs were used by very few universities. Over the last two centuries or so, students who were the products of the traditional university system produced our system of democracy, medical breakthroughs, computer technology, and much more, all without the benefit of teaching influenced by SRIs. (Note: The students are the products, not the customers; employers and society at large are the customers.)

Given the problems with SRIs, why should we use them? No law requires them to be used for untenured faculty in Texas, nor does the post-tenure review bill (S.B. 149, <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlo/75r/billtext/SB00149F.htm>) require them for tenured faculty. Senate Bill 149 does, however, require performance review of tenured faculty. What are some of the choices for performance review of teaching?

Use Signed Student Statements. Even some critics of SRIs such as Stanfel (1995) reason that there is a need for some form of student feedback for faculty, citing such examples as an instructor arriving for class inebriated. In such cases of unprofessional behavior or bad teaching, a student can write a letter to the Chair or Dean and sign his or her name and let the Chair and Dean do their job in following up on the complaint by determining its accuracy and, if appropriate, taking proper action. Following up such signed letters could be made official policy and described in the university's student handbook. This would be highly preferable to the inaccurate SRI responses given by many students documented by Stanfel (1995) and highly preferable to a few cowardly students' unsigned, untrue written accusations that often derail faculty careers (for example and documentation, see the *Chronicle* article on SRIs cited above and an excellent article by Robert E. Haskell, 1997, Education Policy Analysis Archives, <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n6.html>).

Use Peer Reviews. In the same issue of the *Chronicle* as cited for SRIs, an article appears on a program run by the American Association of Higher Education that trains faculty in the proper use of peer reviews ("Project Seeks to Help Colleges Use Peer Review to Evaluate Teaching," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 16, 1998). However, Marsh and Roche (1997) cite data that peer reviews are unreliable and invalid.

Use Teaching Portfolios. In contrast to the quantitative SRI approach, faculty can qualitatively document their teaching philosophy, course preparation, grading methods, and so forth (Seldin, P., 1991, *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing).

Use SRIs. If it is decided that SRIs are to be used, what do the experts say about how they should be used? Marsh & Roche (1997, *American Psychologist*, 52, p. 1189) provide evidence that as many as nine dimensions of teaching effectiveness contribute to construct validity of SRIs, and they strongly make the case that the items on an SRI should never be averaged together to report an overall mean SRI score. To do so would probably constitute ratings malpractice. For example, Marsh and Roche review data that large class sizes lead to lower scores on SRIs, and of the nine dimensions identified by Marsh and Roche, this effect is exerted only on the Group Interaction and Individual Rapport dimensions. When large classes are sampled, lumping together scores on these two dimensions with those on all other dimensions would pull down the overall mean SRI average, whereas the proper procedure would be to evaluate all dimensions separately and to acknowledge that the Rapport and Group dimensions were low due to large class sizes.

Taken together with the implications of the reliability data reviewed above, Marsh and Roche's (1997) construct validity data would suggest that the proper procedure would be to evaluate SRI items (or dimensions) separately and to average over at least 50 students. Yet just the opposite is common practice, that is, averaging over all SRI items/dimensions; and sometimes, making matters worse, this averaging is based on input from relatively few students. Further, SRIs are often used in this manner without any other corroborating measure. Even the advocates of SRIs state repeatedly that SRIs should never be used alone but should be supplemented with other measures that have been assessed for their reliability and validity. Finally, should SRIs be adjusted in terms of expected grades? There is controversy over adjustments based on grading leniency. Perhaps less controversial would be an adjustment in terms of an overall halo effect as might be assessed by falsifiable items such as those used by Stanfel (1995). That is, if the correct average response to a question such as "were the tests returned as soon as possible?" should have been 5.00, and the actual response was 3.00, then 2.00 could be added to all responses.

APPENDIX III

Cover Sheet

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION/TENURE

_____ **Promotion Only**

_____ **Tenure Only**

_____ **Promotion and Tenure**

Name

Date

College _____

Present Rank _____ **Date of**

Rank _____

Education:

Degree (Major Field)

University

Dates

Professional Employment (list most recent employment first):

Employer

Position or Title

Date

APPENDIX III - Cont.

ORGANIZATION OF TENURE/PROMOTION PORTFOLIO

NOTE: Faculty members hired on or after September 1, 1995, are required to assemble their tenure/promotion portfolios using the following guidelines. The following format is recommended for faculty members hired prior to this date. Materials should be assembled in a three-ring, loose-leaf notebook.

Cover Sheet

Routing Sheet

Complete Vitae (See suggested organizational format. Give all information in chronological order beginning with most recent.) (NOTE: For Tenure Only: Please include your vitae on a diskette using MS Word. An electronic version is needed for submission to The Texas A&M University System Board of Regents.)

Copy of appointment letter indicating academic rank and tenure status.

Annual Evaluations by Department Chair (in chronological order beginning with most recent; include all since last promotion).

Annual Reports. (Include all annual reports since last promotion, organized by sections beginning with the most recent report. A one page summary written by the candidate should introduce each section.)

Section A. Teaching Performance

1. One page summary of teaching accomplishments
2. "Teaching Performance" section of each Annual Report

Section B. Research, Creative and Scholarly Activity (Please refer to Appendix XIII regarding definition)

1. One page summary of research, scholarly, or creative activities
2. "Research and Scholarly Activity" section of each Annual Report

Section C. Professional Growth

One page summary of professional growth activities
"Professional Growth" section of each Annual Report

Section D. Service (non-teaching activities in support of the university)

One page summary of service to university, college, department,
and the community at large
“Service” section of each Annual Report

APPENDIX III - Continued

(g) Appendices (Supporting Documentation)

(NOTE: Selected examples are appropriate. A bullet [•] indicates that an item is required. Quality of materials is more important than quantity.)

Appendix A. Teaching Performance

- A semester-by-semester listing of courses taught with numbers of students in each section
- Examples of course syllabi
- Numerical scores on student evaluations (Include computer print-out for each course evaluated, not just summary scores.)
- Documentation of honors/awards for teaching excellence (if listed in vitae)
Examples of unsolicited letters from students and others in support of teaching effectiveness
Examples of other work related to teaching
Documentation of success of students, as related to teaching effectiveness
Typed comments from student evaluations

Appendix B. Research and Scholarly Activities (Please refer to Appendix XIII regarding definition)

Selected examples or evidence of the following

- Refereed journal articles or (if appropriate) other juried activities, such as exhibits, performances, or competitions (if listed in vitae)
- Nonrefereed articles (if listed in vitae)
- Letters from editors indicating acceptance of manuscripts for publication, etc. (if listed in vitae)
- Documentation of honors and/or awards for scholarly or creative activities (if listed in vitae)
Refereed abstracts

Nonrefereed abstracts

Funded grants
Proposals submitted but not funded
Other publications, such as proceedings, books, chapters, monographs, etc.
Refereed presentations to learned societies, grouped by international, national, state, regional, local
Reprints of articles
Unsolicited letters related to research, creative or scholarly activities
Technical assistance

Policy analysis
Program evaluation
Participation in workshops and seminars resulting in an action plan for
improving teaching skills
Development of outcomes assessment tools
Participation in curricular innovation
Conducting interdisciplinary seminars

APPENDIX III - Continued

Appendix C. Professional Growth

- Documentation related to election to office or appointment to committees in learned societies (if listed in vitae)
- Documentation of honors and/or awards related to professional service (if listed in vitae)
Unsolicited letters related to professional activities
Copies of programs of meetings where name appears (cover page and page where name appears are adequate)
Published articles about the candidate's professional contributions

Appendix D. Service

- List of committees and years served, with amount of time spent on committee responsibilities; identify candidate's actual responsibilities on each committee (if listed in vitae)
- Documentation of honors and/or awards for university service (if listed in vitae)
Committee appointment letters
Unsolicited letters related to service activities.

(h) Letters of Recommendation

APPENDIX III - Cont.

FORMAT FOR CURRICULUM VITAE

Education (degrees, years granted, granting institutions)

Employment history (if tenured, indicate year and institution)

List of courses taught; identify by institution where taught

Bibliography of publications

Include all authors in order of authorship; include number of pages in each citation; divide into sections.

- Refereed journal articles
- Nonrefereed articles
- Refereed abstracts
- Nonrefereed abstracts
- Refereed proceedings
- Nonrefereed proceedings
- Books, chapters, monographs, etc.

List of presentations to learned societies, grouped by international, national, state, regional, local.

Include all presenters in order to authorship; divide into refereed and nonrefereed presentations.

Research and Creative Activities

- Funded grants; include role/title and other project staff by title, funding source, dates of project, and amount of funding
- Proposals submitted but not funded; include role/title and other project staff by title, funding source to which grant was submitted and amount requested
- Other juried activities, such as exhibits, performances, or competitions

Professional Growth Activities

- Membership in professional societies
- Leadership roles in professional societies (service on committees, chairing committees, service as an officer or on board of directors)
- Attendance at meetings of professional societies
- Professional service activities (consulting; reviewer or editor for journals; service on editorial boards, task forces, etc.)

Service Activities

- Membership on university, college, and/or department committees
- Leadership roles on committees (chair or other office)
- Briefly specify candidate's responsibilities on the committee(s)
- Service activities outside the university (community service organizations, presentations, etc.)

Honors and Awards

Other Professional Activities Not Covered Above

APPENDIX IV

ROUTING SHEET FOR PROMOTION

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Applicant | |
| Department Committee (optional in small departments): | For _____ Against _____ |
| Signature of Committee Chair | Date |
| Department Chair: | |
| | For _____ Against _____ |
| Signature of Chair | Date |
| College Committee: | |
| | For _____ Against _____ |
| Signature of Committee Chair | Date |
| College Appeals Committee (if applicable): | |
| | For _____ Against _____ |
| Signature of Committee Chair | |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| | Date |
| Dean of College: | For _____ |
| | Against _____ |
| Signature of Dean | Date |
| University Committee: (promotion only): | For _____ |
| | Against _____ |
| Signature of Committee Chair | Date |
| Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs: | For _____ |
| | Against _____ |
| Signature of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs | Date |
| University Appeals Committee (if applicable): | For _____ |
| | Against _____ |
| Signature of Committee Chair | Date |
| President: | For _____ |
| | Against _____ |

| |
|---|
| <p data-bbox="300 346 581 380">Signature of President</p> <p data-bbox="1256 417 1317 451">Date</p> |
|---|

APPENDIX IV
ROUTING SHEET FOR TENURE

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Name of Applicant | |
| Department Committee (optional in small departments): | |
| | For _____ Against _____ |
| Signature of Committee Chair | Date |
| Department Chair: | |
| | For _____ Against _____ |
| Signature of Chair | Date |
| College Committee: | |
| | For _____ Against _____ |
| Signature of Committee Chair | Date |

Dean of College:

For

Against

Signature of Dean

Date

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:

For

Against

**Signature of Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs**

Date

President:

For

Against

Signature of President

Date

APPENDIX IV

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

1. Name _____ 2. Department _____
3. Present Rank _____ 4. Date of Present Rank _____

5. Tenure? _____

6. Being considered for promotion to rank of _____

7. Person or committee recommending:
Departmental Committee _____ Dean
Chair _____ University Committee
College Committee _____ Provost and Vice President for
Academic Affairs
College Appeals Committee _____ University Appeals Committee

8. Action of person or committee recommending:
Promotion recommended _____
Promotion not recommended for the following reasons:
Lack of terminal degree. _____
Insufficient accomplishments of such a nature as to be considered equivalent to a terminal degree or rendering terminal degree not as necessary. _____
Insufficient progress toward terminal degree. _____
Teaching performance not equal to level required for promotion. _____
Insufficient research and/or creative productivity. _____
Insufficient evidence of innovations in methods and/or materials, initiation of new courses or development of curriculum. _____
Insufficient evidence of participation in professional organizations, attendance at meetings, membership in professional organizations, etc. _____
Lack of reasonable distinction in fulfillment of all routine, minimal obligations of teaching personnel. _____
Insufficient number of years in present rank. Quality, competence, and excellence of performance does not merit "rushing" of promotion. _____
Other _____

9. Ranking of recommended candidates: Number _____ out of _____ considered for promotion to the rank of _____

Recommended by:

Signature (person or committee chair)

Date

APPENDIX V

ARTS AND SCIENCES PROMOTION COMMITTEE SELECTION POLICY

Membership requirements and procedures for nomination and election of members to Promotion Committees.

Current Membership Requirements

The Arts and Sciences representatives to the University Promotion Committee shall consist of four tenured people, one from each division, no departmental chairs. This committee will be elected before other promotion committees.

The Arts and Sciences Promotion Committee shall consist of five tenured people, no more than one from a given department, at least one from each of the four divisions (Fine Arts, Humanities, Sciences, Social Sciences), no departmental chairs and include at least three full professors.

The Arts and Sciences Appeals Committee will have the same membership requirements and will be chosen by the same procedure as the Arts and Sciences Promotion Committee.

Procedure Established by the Arts and Sciences Council

Elect members to the three committees simultaneously by first seeking nominations, followed by an election according to the following procedure:

Seek nominations for members to the three committees by sending out a ballot instructing each faculty member to circle two names for each division.

Place the five top nominees from each division on a ballot and have each faculty member circle two names from each division.

Beginning with the person receiving the most votes and moving down the list, determine the members of the University Promotion Committee. Remove these names from the list and, again beginning with the person receiving the most votes and moving down the list, determine the representatives to the Arts and Sciences Promotion Committee (consistent with all requirements).

A faculty member being considered for promotion may not serve as a member of the Arts and Sciences Promotion Committee.

Any faculty member is prohibited from serving for two successive years as Arts and Sciences representatives on the Promotion Committees.

APPENDIX VI

PROMOTION ACTIVITY SCHEDULE

The following schedule has been arranged to allow as much time as possible for appropriate procedures in each stage of the process chronologically. Exact dates are published each year but the process begins in mid-January and ends in late April or early May. Committees and individuals must keep this in mind as deliberations occur. Each applicant should be informed by each committee chair or individual at each step in the promotion process whether there is a negative or positive recommendation. Please refer to Section B.4 of the Faculty Handbook for “Guidelines for Promotion in Rank.”

Each form indicating a recommendation for or against promotion should be dated by day and month in the space provided below the signature line.

The formal annual evaluation of all faculty will be based on a calendar year and will utilize the Annual Report by Faculty Member. Promotion salary increases will be adjusted to recommended salaries being reported to the System.

Chairs should notify departmental members who wish to be considered for promotion or who are being recommended for promotion by their chairs to begin preparing their files.

Chairs and deans conduct elections of university, college, and departmental promotion committees. As a result of Faculty Senate recommendations, the University Promotion Committee will be elected before other promotion committees.

Candidates for promotion forward completed promotion files to department chairs.

Department chairs forward files to chairs of departmental promotion committees.

Chairs of departmental promotion committees forward files and recommendations to the department chairs.

Department chairs forward files and recommendations to deans of colleges.

Deans of colleges forward files to chairs of the college promotion committees.

Chairs of the college promotion committees forward files and recommendations to the deans of the colleges.

Deans forward files and recommendations to first appeals committee for review, if necessary.

First appeals recommendations made and files forwarded to deans.

Deans of colleges forward files and recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs forwards files to the Chair of the University Promotion Committee. (Committee scheduled to meet that day.)

The Chair of the University Promotion Committee forwards files and recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs forwards files and recommendations to second appeals committee for review, if necessary.

Second appeals recommendations made and files forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs forwards files and recommendations to the President.

APPENDIX VII

EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENT

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE

This agreement is made and entered into this _____ day of _____, 20 _____, by and between TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE, a member of The Texas A&M University System, referred to herein as "University," and _____, a faculty member of University, referred to herein as "Participant."

WHEREAS, Participant has been employed as a faculty member at University for a period of _____ (____) years; and

WHEREAS, Participant desires to continue to serve University in a teaching capacity while simultaneously being eligible to receive retirement benefits; and,

WHEREAS, University desires to retain Participant's services as a faculty member on a less than full-time basis and extend to Participant the privileges of its Early Retirement Program; NOW, THEREFORE,

The parties hereto agree as follows:

1. **BENEFITS, PRIVILEGES, AND RIGHTS OF PARTICIPANT.** Participant hereby agrees that the effect of executing this agreement will be an immediate forfeiture of his/her full-time status and tenure rights to which he/she may be entitled. Other than those rights, Participant shall be entitled to all of the amenities and privileges accorded to other faculty retirees and part-time faculty members. Participant retains the right to continue his/her medical coverage and to receive the state contribution toward such coverage, as provided by state law and appropriations, as well as his/her right to life insurance coverage and benefits, as applicable.
2. **TERM OF AGREEMENT.** This agreement shall be and remain in force and effect for a period of _____ (____) years, commencing on _____, and ending on _____.
3. **FACULTY WORKLOAD.** Participant's workload shall not exceed one half of that of a full-time faculty member. For purposes of this agreement, a full-time faculty workload shall be considered to be twelve (12) credit hours of teaching in a single semester, or twenty-four (24) credit hours of teaching in an academic year.
4. **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTICIPANT.** Participant agrees that he/she will teach all classes assigned to him/her in accordance with the generally accepted teaching standards and requirements of University. Participant will not be expected to perform additional services such as student advising, service on committees, or performance of research. PARTICIPANT will maintain office hours sufficient to adequately serve the number of classes and students assigned to his/her responsibility.
5. **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNIVERSITY.**

University agrees that it will employ Participant to teach classes assigned to him/her and shall pay him/her an amount of salary to be agreed upon by the parties in writing each year in which this agreement shall remain in force and effect.

APPENDIX VII - Continued

University agrees that it will consult with Participant regarding which classes it will assign to him/her and will take into consideration teaching preferences as expressed to it by Participant.

University reserves the right to make all final decisions regarding teaching assignments. Duties other than teaching duties may be assigned to Participant.

Summer teaching assignments are not included in the teaching assignments covered by this agreement, but may be dealt with by means of a separate agreement in writing.

TERMS OF UNIVERSITY POLICY. This agreement is made subject to, and incorporates herein the terms of, the applicable policy of University dealing with the Early Retirement Program. In the event of a material conflict between this agreement and the policy, the terms of the policy will be deemed to control.

PRIOR TO EXECUTING THIS AGREEMENT, PARTICIPANT IS ADVISED TO SEEK PROFESSIONAL GUIDANCE AND ADVICE REGARDING HIS/HER RETIREMENT PROGRAM AND THE EFFECT OF THIS AGREEMENT UPON ANY BENEFITS TO WHICH HE/SHE MAY BE ENTITLED.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE:

FACULTY MEMBER:

(Typed Name of Department Head)

(Typed Name of Faculty Member)

Signature of Department Head

Signature of Faculty Member

(Typed Name of Dean)

Title of Faculty Member

Signature of Dean

(Typed Name of Provost)

Signature of Provost

(Typed Name of President)

Signature of President

Note: Requests will not be approved for a period of longer than one year, and authorizations will terminate August 31.

5. Equity ownership involved? _____ If so, the amount and type of equity interest owned: _____

I understand that consulting/outside employment may not be undertaken on that portion of time covered by federal grants or contracts. I further understand that this request applies only to that portion of my time for which I am employed by The Texas A&M University System. I agree to furnish reports and additional details of employment as required.

I certify that there will be no conflict of interest between this outside employment and my responsibilities as an employee of The Texas A&M University System. I also certify that this employment/consulting work will be conducted at no expense to The Texas A&M University System.

I feel that my value as a faculty member and my own professional status will be enhanced and improved by the proposed outside professional activity.

I have read System policies 07.01, Ethics Policy, and 31.05, Outside Employment and Expert Witness, and System Regulation 31.05.01, Faculty Consulting, External Employment and Conflicts of Interest, and agree to conduct my outside employment/consulting in accordance with the provisions contained therein.

Employee Signature

Social
Security
Number

Date

Approval Recommended:

Release
time basis?
Yes ___
No ___

Department Head

Date

Approved:

Release
time basis?

Yes___

No___

Dean of the College

Date

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date

*President

Date

*President's signature is required only if faculty member will miss teaching days/classes/posted office hours.

Provost

Date

APPENDIX IX

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE
LEAVE/TRAVEL REQUEST FORM

_____ 20_____

I respectfully request permission to be absent from my designated headquarters from:

| Date | Time | to | Date | Time |
|------|------|----|------|------|
|------|------|----|------|------|

I will miss the following classes and have arranged for them as indicated:

| Class | Section | Hour | Dates Involved | How Arranged For |
|-------|---------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

DESTINATION AND PURPOSE OF TRAVEL:

IF MULTIPLE ATTENDEES: MUST COMPLETE BOXES BELOW:

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Y | N | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | REQUIRED FACULTY/STAFF DEVELOPMENT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | TTVN/AUDIO CONFERENCE AVAILABILITY |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ONSITE CONFERENCE/TRAINING OPTION |

PLEASE INDICATE A # WHERE YOU CAN BE REACHED DURING YOUR TRAVEL:

ESTIMATED EXPENSES:

| Cost | Estimated Amount Authorized Reimbursable | State/Federal Private Funds | |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|--------|
| | | | Amount |
| Transportation | \$ | \$ | _____ |
| Meals | | | _____ |
| Lodging | | | _____ |
| Mileage | | | _____ |
| Other (Specify) | | | _____ |
| TOTALS | | \$ | _____ |
| | \$ | | _____ |

Expenses to be Charged to:

A/C: _____
A/C: _____

State and Federal funds cannot be used to reimburse actual expenses in excess of published rates. _____

NAME _____

SOCIAL SECURITY # _____

SIGNATURE _____

TITLE _____

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED

APPROVED:

Account Manager

Department Head

Dean/Vice President or President

APPENDIX X

**Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Request for Foreign Travel Paid from State
Appropriated Funds**

Name of Traveler(s)

Title/Department

Contact Person and Phone Number:

Account Number:

Account Name:

Date Departing:

Destination:

Date Returning:

Cost of
Trip:

(Total amount of travel expenses from State
appropriated funds)

Purpose of Trip:

Approval Recommended:

Department Head

Provost

Dean or Division Vice President

President

APPROVED:

Signature Indicating Board of Regents' Approval

Date

Submit original form to:

The Texas A&M University System
Office of the Board of Regents
MSC Suite 153 TAMUS 1123
College Station, TX 77844-9021

Distribution of Approved form:

Original: Board of Regents

Copies:

1. Attention: Darrell Lynn Pray
Agency Name: Texas A&M-Kingsville
Fax No: (361) 593-3218
2. System Office of Budgets & Accounting
Attention: Audra Wilkinson
Fax No: (979) 458-6101

Requests must be submitted to the Board of Regents' Office at least 30 days prior to proposed travel dates.

APPENDIX X - Cont.

Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Request for Foreign Travel from
State Appropriated Funds
Page 2

COMPLETE THIS FORM FOR EACH TRAVELER

| COST OF TRIP: | APPROPRIATED FUNDS | LOCAL/PERSONAL FUNDS |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Acct Number: _____ | Acct Number: _____ |
| (a) Transportation | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| (b) Other Transportation | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| (c) Lodging | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| (d) Meals | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| (e) Registration Fee | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| (f) Other | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |
| TOTAL | \$ _____ | \$ _____ |

JUSTIFICATION OF TRIP: _____

Name: _____
Signature: _____
Title: _____
Social Security Number: _____
Date: _____

EMPLOYEE REGISTERING AS STUDENT / TUITION ASSISTANCE SCHOLARSHIP

(Admission to the University must be completed and approved by the application deadline.)

Employees Registering as Students

Name: _____ SS#

Department: _____ Job
Title _____

Semester: _____

Course number/section and name: _____ Hours

Hours _____

Arrangements to account for time off from regular workweek to attend classes:

- _____ Vacation time
- _____ Compensatory time (non-exempt only)
- _____ Leave without pay
- _____ Other – Explain in detail how hours missed will be made up

| | | |
|--|---------|--------|
| Does the class meet during regular work hours? | Yes ___ | No ___ |
| Are you applying for a Tuition Assistance Scholarship? | Yes ___ | No ___ |
| Are you a full-time benefits eligible employee at TAMUK? | Yes ___ | No ___ |
| Have you completed the 6 month probationary period? | Yes ___ | No ___ |

Employee's Signature Date

I certify that arrangements for time off to attend classes are acceptable and class attendance will not interfere in any way with the accomplishments of duties or the work of the department.

Supervisor/Dept. Head Date

Dean/AVP Date

Bursar-Finance & Administration - Officer

Date

Distribution (04/03)

Original - Business Office

Copies - Supervisor

- Financial Aid Office

(Business Office)

Final Action:

Approved ____ Disapproved

Hours ____ Amount

By _____

Tuition Assistance Scholarship Information and Instructions

Full-Time (budgeted) employees are eligible to take up to 4 credit hours each semester during normal work hours provided, (1) the employee must account for time missed each week using either vacation time, compensatory time (non-exempt only), leave without pay or scheduling alternative work hours during the same workweek (2) class attendance does not interfere with the work of the department, (3) arrangements are approved in advance by their department head, and (4) the employee has completed the 6 month probationary period. Employees must pay state tuition and laboratory fees. Most other fees for up to 4 SCH will be eligible for scholarship assistance. The scholarships are not available to spouses or children.

Part-time employees are not eligible for the tuition assistance scholarship.

1. Discuss enrollment plans and work schedule with supervisor.
2. Obtain approval of Advisor for class(s) selected.
3. Enroll in desired courses (s).
4. Present class bill and "Employee Registering As Student/Tuition Assistance Scholarship" form to Supervisor/Department Head, and Dean or AVP for approval. Dean/AVP signature is required.
5. Present original copy of scholarship form to Business Office and request scholarship.
6. Employees must have a cumulative GPA of 2.0 to be eligible for scholarship.

The Employee Tuition Assistance Scholarship will pay for the following fees:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| a) Designated Tuition | b) Student Service Fee |
| c) Computer Use Fee | d) Library Access Fee |
| e) International Education Fee | f) Transcript Fee |
| g) Hospital Fee | h) Student Center Fee |
| i) ID Card Fee | j) Program Fee (System Center Palo Alto) |
| k) Distance Learning Fee | l) Athletic Fee |

APPENDIX XII

TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW

Policy for Post-Tenure Review

Texas A&M University-Kingsville

1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|---|
| <i>GENERAL GUIDELINES</i> | |
| | 51-52 |
| I. | |
| | <i>PROCEDURES FOR TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW</i> |
| | 52-54 |
| A. Portfolio of Previous Activities | |
| B. Assessment of Past Performance | |
| C. Basis for Assessment — The Four Critical Areas | |
| D. Long-Range Goals for Performance Optimization | |
| E. Development Plans for Achieving Specified Performance Levels | |
| F. College-Level Peer Review Committee | |
| G. Written Narrative | |
| II. | |
| | <i>PROCEDURE</i> |

**DURE
FOR
SELEC
TING
THOSE
TO BE
REVIE
WED**

54-55

III.

**APPEA
LS
PROCE
SS**

55-56

IV.

**TIME
FRAME
S FOR
REVIE
WS
AND
COMPL
ETION
OF
GOALS
AND
PLANS**

56-57

- A. Time Frames for Five-Year Reviews
 - 1. Long-Range Goals
 - 2. Development Plans
 - (a) for Teaching Improvement
 - (b) for All Critical Areas other than Teaching Effectiveness
- B. Time Frames for Completion of Goals and Plans
- C. Time Frame for Re-Evaluations

V.

**COMMI
TMENT
TO
GUIDA
NCE
AND
FOLLO
W-UP**

57-58

VI.

UNIVERSITY SUPPORT

58

VII.

**CONSE
QUENCES OF
FAILURE TO
ATTAIN
EXPECTED
OUTCOMES OF
DEVEL
OPMENTAL
PLANNING**

58-60

VIII.

**EXEMP
TIONS
TO
TENUR
ED
FACUL
TY
DEVEL
OPME
NTAL
REVIE
W**

60-61

IX.

***MEASU
RING
TEACH
ING
EFFEC
TIVEN
ESS***

61

***X. SUNSET CLAUSE FOR THE TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL
REVIEW POLICY***

62

TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW¹

GENERAL GUIDELINES September 24, 1996 Version

The **primary purpose** of *Tenured Faculty Developmental Review* at Texas A&M University-Kingsville is to facilitate continuing productivity and development of tenured faculty members appropriate to their academic assignments, to their own professional goals, and to the mission of the University.

This type of post-tenure review provides a critical avenue for engaging faculty in **long-range professional development** over the lifetimes of their academic careers. Long-range visioning and goal-setting over a multi-year span of time versus the short-term, year-to-year type planning associated with the traditional *Annual Performance Evaluation* has the greater potential to maximize faculty's performance.

Under ordinary circumstances, Tenured Faculty Developmental Review **will be conducted every five years** for each tenured faculty member. The review will comprehensively include the measurement of individual faculty performance against **levels of performance in four critical areas** as specified in the *Annual Performance Evaluation* form; these critical areas are: (1) teaching effectiveness, (2) scholarly and artistic endeavor, (3) professional growth and activities, and (4) service (non-teaching activities supportive of university programs). [Refer to I.C.]

Under the tenets of Tenured Faculty Developmental Review, **Long-Range Goals** will be formulated and, when needed, **Development Plans** will be established in order to improve performance in one or more of the four critical areas. Goal-setting and/or developmental planning will be conducted in consensus between the faculty member and his or her department chair with input from a college-level peer review committee (Triad Method of Selection).

A **written narrative** clearly delineating one of the **two possible outcomes** of the Tenured Faculty Developmental Review will be provided to each faculty member at the conclusion of the initial assessment-evaluation phase. One outcome could draw a positive conclusion — an assessment demonstrates that a faculty member's performance meets or exceeds specified levels of performance. The alternate outcome could be a determination that a faculty member needs to further develop his or her performance in one or more of the four critical areas in order to reach expected levels; in this instance, a Development Plan with anticipated outcomes and clearly defined consequences would constitute the written narrative.

The possible **consequences of not achieving expected outcomes** of a Development Plan after the period of time delineated in this policy are described under the existing policies for tenured faculty in the TAMUK Faculty Handbook and The Texas A&M University System Policy Manual.

¹This version of the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Policy integrates the version passed in the May 1996 meeting of the Senate with suggested changes made in June-September by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and a hearing of the General Faculty held in September, and policies adopted by the Board of Regents in their May and July meetings. In a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on September 24, 1996 this amended version was voted on and was passed with a 22-to-5 vote.

GENERAL GUIDELINES continued:

An **appeals process** will be an integral component of the Tenured Faculty Developmental Review Policy. Faculty believing that decisions have been rendered unjustifiably or unfairly will have two methods of appealing — the first will be under the guidelines of this policy and the second, through ordinary means as outlined in the TAMUK Faculty Handbook.

In conducting post-tenure review, the **University will provide reasonable support** of faculty in their pursuit of continuous intellectual and professional growth. This support will include a **firm commitment to provide guidance and follow-up** of faculty's Long-Range Goals and Development Plans for achievement. The customarily scheduled **Annual Performance Evaluation** will be used for the purpose of follow-up; **amended Long-Range Goals and/or Development Plans** may result from yearly reevaluations.

I. PROCEDURES FOR TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW

The Five-Year Review Process. The review process will be conducted at the departmental and college levels every fifth year for each tenured faculty member, unless an exemption applies (refer to *VIII. Exemptions to Tenured Faculty Developmental Review*). [Specific procedures for selecting faculty for review are outlined in *Section II.* of this document.] To initiate the process, a comprehensive assessment will be conducted by the department chair and will be based upon a comparative analysis of the portfolio presented by the faculty member and the four critical areas described in *I. C. Basis for Assessment — The Four Critical Areas*. Goal-setting and, if determined by assessment outcomes, developmental planning for enhanced professional performance will be established primarily between the faculty member and his or her department chair with input from a Triad Peer Review Committee (College-Level) (refer to *I.D. - F.*). A written narrative will be provided to the faculty member after completion of the review process (refer to *I.G. Written Narrative*).

A. Portfolio of Previous Activities. The responsibility for generating a portfolio of activities for the previous five-year period and presenting this portfolio in a timely manner to the appropriate department chair lies with the faculty member to be reviewed (refer to *IV. Time Frames for Reviews*). This portfolio will provide an in-depth description of the faculty member's past five-year performance and the relevancy of this performance to the four critical areas for review. It should be prefaced with a table of contents and organized for readability.

B. Assessment of Past Performance. The primary responsibility for assessing the faculty member's past performance lies with the department chair. The department chair's evaluation of this performance will be fully described in the written narrative to be provided to the faculty member upon completion of the initial assessment phase of the Tenured Faculty Developmental Review.

C. Basis for Assessment — The Four Critical Areas. The assessment portion of the review will be based on the four major areas of academic endeavor: Teaching, scholarship and creative activities, professional growth, and university service. All reviews will be conducted with the procedures and instruments being used currently for *Annual Faculty Evaluations* by the five colleges, unless changed by the Faculty Senate. (Refer also to *IX. Measuring Teaching Effectiveness* in this document).

I. PROCEDURES FOR TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW continued:

C. Basis for Assessment – The Four Critical Areas.

1. Teaching Effectiveness²: Teaching is considered the most critical academic endeavor by the public, the legislature, and Texas A&M University-Kingsville.
2. Scholarly and Artistic Endeavors: Research, scholarship, and creative activities are essential elements in support of quality instruction.
3. Professional Growth and Activities: Continuing professional education and professional service strengthen instruction and scholarship.
4. Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs: Continued service to the university and/or activities supportive of the university further enrich the professional growth of the faculty.

D. Long-Range Goals for Performance Optimization. Every Tenured Faculty Developmental Review will culminate in the setting of long-range goals which can best result in maximizing faculty's performance. Mutually established between the faculty member and his or her department chair, these goals will extend over the five-year interval to the next review. However, the goals will not be restricted to the future five-year period; instead, the goals' parameters should be thought of as encompassing the faculty member's entire professional career.

E. Development Plans for Achieving Specified Performance Levels. If the assessment of past activities reveals that a faculty member's performance needs to be strengthened in one or more of the four criteria areas, a detailed "action" or Development Plan for achieving acceptable levels of performance will be developed. This developmental process will be conducted primarily among the faculty member, his or her department chair, and a Triad Peer Review Committee (College-Level). The completed plan will (1) fully describe the criteria area(s) to be developed, (2) identify the resources to be utilized, (3) depict the particular actions to be taken, and (4) define the time limits for these actions. The fifth and sixth components of the plan, and two of its most significant aspects, will be the clear designation of *expected outcomes and consequences of failure to accomplish designated levels of performance*.

F. Triad Peer Review Committee (College-Level). A peer review committee within the college will be chosen based on the *Triad Method of Selection*; this committee will serve as reviewers of the established Long-Term Goals and, if formulated, the Development Plans. The Triad Method typically includes three peers — one selected by the faculty member, one selected by the department chair*, and one selected by the members of the department (*if the faculty member being reviewed is the

²A measure of teaching effectiveness should, in part, be drawn from the outcomes of the *Student Evaluation of Instruction*. The instrument to be used to survey students' evaluations of instruction (i.e., "teaching effectiveness") will be a professionally developed instrument, tested for its reliability and validity.

**I. PROCEDURES FOR TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW
continued:**

department chair, then the dean of the college will make the selection). Participation as a peer reviewer should be limited to no more than two reviews per year per faculty member, unless it is mutually agreed upon by the college dean and the selected faculty that an exception to this policy is warranted.

Procedurally, the department chair will provide a draft copy of the written narrative to the Triad Peer Review Committee. The Triad Committee will then review the long-range goals and any action plan in relation to the department chair's reported evaluation of the faculty member's past performance. The Triad Committee may also request additional documentation or information; for example, they may ask to review the faculty member's portfolio or ask questions of the faculty member and/or department chair. After their review, they will provide input directly to the department chair and the faculty member. This input will be in writing.

Upon receiving congruous comments from the Triad Committee, the department chair would finalize the written narrative to be provided to the faculty member. If, however, suggestions for change were made by the Triad Committee, the department chair and the faculty member would discuss these and changes in the long-range goals and/or achievement plans could be made; although, changes would not be mandatory. The sole condition would be that the input from the Triad Committee be incorporated into the discussions between the department chair and the faculty member prior to finalizing the written narrative report.

G. Written Narrative. A written narrative clearly delineating the outcome of the Tenured Faculty Developmental Review will be provided to each faculty member at the conclusion of the assessment, goal-setting, and, if necessitated, the developmental planning process. This written narrative will be an evaluative assessment of the faculty's past performance. In the case of a positive outcome of assessment-evaluation, the narrative will describe mutually established long-range goals for the faculty member to pursue over the five-year interval prior to the next post-tenure review. If, however, assessment-evaluation has revealed that a faculty member needs to develop their performance in one or more of the critical areas, a five-year Development Plan with expected outcomes and consequences will constitute the written document. Time expectations for accomplishing goals and plans will be a major element of the narrative, too. The written narrative will serve as the faculty member's principal activity "blueprint" for the five-year interval. Amendments to the narrative's outlined goals and/or plans could occur, either during the yearly *Annual Performance Evaluations* or because a

time line has been reached (e.g., in the transition to an extension period, it is assumed that Development Plans would be reformulated).

II. PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THOSE TO BE REVIEWED

Review of tenured faculty within each college will be made in order of decreasing length of tenure among all of those faculty tenured as of September 1, 1996. Ranking the dates of tenure from oldest to most recent, starting with faculty tenured for the longest period of time, will determine which

II. PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THOSE TO BE REVIEWED continued:

20% of the faculty will be reviewed each year. In the first year of the tenured faculty developmental review cycle, the first group, consisting of those with the longest terms of tenure, will be reviewed. In the second year, the second group will be reviewed, and so on. In the sixth year of developmental review, the first group will be reviewed again, and the cycle will repeat. Newly tenured faculty will enter the corresponding review group in their sixth year of tenure.

To summarize selection, the three basic components of the process are the following: (1) Approximately one-fifth of the faculty in any college will undergo Tenured Faculty Developmental Review each year; (2) faculty who have been tenured the longest will be reviewed first and so on, in decreasing order; and (3) faculty in a college who have been tenured for the same length of time should be reviewed in the same year.

III. APPEALS PROCESS

Should assessments by department chairs, deans, or peer review committees (college- or university-level) identify areas of unsatisfactory performance during the following three periods and should the faculty member believe these decisions have been rendered unfairly the faculty member can appeal: (1) After the initial assessment-evaluation period in the cycle of Tenured Faculty Developmental Review, a deficiency in the faculty member's documented past activities as compared to the levels of performance designated for the four critical areas; or (2) As reported in an *Annual Performance Evaluation* follow-up, a lack of progress on the faculty member's part in pursuing Development Plans; or (3) At the designated time period concluding a Development Plan, any stage of the procedure that follows a failure to successfully achieve specified levels of performance (Note: In situation (3), refer to *VII. Consequences of Failure to attain Expected Outcomes of Developmental Planning*). The appeal process for (1) and (2) will be as follows:

An elected College Appeals Committee³ within each college will review the documentation of affected faculty and render a judgment as to whether unsatisfactory performance exists in the following periods:

Period 1: Should the College Appeals Committee find in the faculty member's favor in the assessment of past performance, the faculty member will pursue a normal work load toward professional goals until the next five-year review. Should the College Appeals Committee find against the faculty member in the case of assessment of past performance, the faculty member, in consensus with the department chair, will create a Development Plan to pursue. The formulation of the plan will follow

³The College Appeals Committee established to hear appeals will be one body elected annually by the faculty in the college. This committee would exclude any faculty serving as a Triad Peer Committee member in the initial planning procedure for a particular faculty member (See Section *I.f.*) or as a member of the University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee (See Section *VII.*). Consequently, alternates should be elected to the College Appeals Committee to serve when necessary.

III. APPEALS PROCESS continued:

the regular procedure as outlined in *Section I.F.* of this document, thus the process will have input from a Triad Peer Review Committee.

Period 2: In the interim time period between beginning a Development Plan and concluding it or in the two-year time period when a faculty member is pursuing an extension of a Development Plan, should the College Appeals Committee find in the faculty member's favor in the progress toward fulfillment of an existing Development Plan, the faculty member will receive a "satisfactory progress" for the particular *Annual Performance Evaluation* progress check and continue to pursue his or her development plan. Should the College Appeals Committee find against the faculty member in the case of progress toward fulfillment of an existing Development Plan, an amended plan will be formulated with input from the initial Triad Peer Review Committee selected to review the faculty member's goal-setting and planning documents.

Period 3: If a faculty member appeals a decision made at the conclusion of the normal time period designated as the developmental period or at the end of an extension period, then they should refer to *VII. Consequences of Failure to attain Expected Outcomes of Developmental Planning*, the university-level appeals committee, and to appeal procedures outlined in the TAMUK Faculty Handbook.

Note: The written narrative, the faculty development plan, the expected outcomes, the amended plans, if applicable, and any rebuttal by the faculty member will be placed in the faculty

member's departmental and college personnel files.

IV. TIME FRAMES FOR REVIEWS AND COMPLETION OF GOALS AND PLANS

A. Time Frame for Five-Year Reviews.

1. **Tenured Faculty Developmental Review Process.** Due to the relationship between Tenured Faculty Developmental Review and the Annual Performance Evaluation, the post-tenure review process and the subsequent follow-ups will be conducted during the same time period each year as the Annual Performance Evaluations.

The college deans will originate and maintain a list of those subject to post-tenure review in any given year and will be responsible for notifying both the individual and the appropriate department chair. After the post-tenure review process has taken place, the college deans will forward a list of names and the results of each review to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; thus, this office will serve as centralized Tenured Faculty Developmental Review data bank for the University.

2. **Tenured Faculty Developmental Review for Individual Faculty Members.** Ordinarily, each faculty member in the University will undergo Tenured Faculty Developmental Review every five years, except in the situations delineated in this document under *VIII. Exemptions to Tenured Faculty Developmental Review.*

IV. TIME FRAMES FOR REVIEWS AND COMPLETION OF GOALS AND PLANS - continued:

B. Time Frames for Completion of Goals and Plans.

1. **Long-Range Goals:** Those long-range goals designated for accomplishment over a five-year period should be attained by the faculty member's next Tenured Faculty Developmental Review. It should be anticipated that often goals will be more longitudinal in nature and go beyond the five-year cycle; however, significant progress in fulfilling the goal(s) should be demonstrated each five-year period.

Development Plans:

(a) **for Teaching Improvement.** Due to the critical nature of effective teaching, less latitude to achieve acceptable performance levels will be given to faculty members in this domain — faculty members who need to develop their teaching skills will be given a three-year period for improvement with annual progress checks (refer to *V. Commitment to Follow-Up*).

Faculty members who do not achieve desired teaching performance levels within a three-year development period will be given one additional two-year extension and an amended development or “action” plan. Under these guidelines, the minimum and maximum time parameters for achieving acceptable levels of professional performance will be three to five years.

(b) for All Critical Areas other than Teaching Effectiveness. In the criteria areas of scholarly and artistic endeavors, professional growth and activities, and non-teaching activities supportive of university programs, faculty members needing improvement will be given a **five-year period** to achieve the designated performance levels with annual progress checks (refer to *V. Commitment to Follow-Up*). If they do not attain acceptable levels of performance within the five-year period, they will be given one additional two-year extension and an amended action plan. Under these guidelines, the minimum and maximum time parameters for achieving acceptable levels of professional performance will be five to seven years.

C. Time Frame for Re-Evaluations. Faculty members whose performance has been deemed unsatisfactory in a regularly scheduled five-year review, and whose performance later is found to be satisfactory, will be reviewed again in the fifth year following reinstatement to good standing, not from the date of the initial review.

**Faculty engaging in additional two-year developmental periods or “extensions” will be eligible for advancement in rank or for merit increases if they successfully complete their Development Plan. This eligibility could occur during the spring evaluation period of either year.*

V. COMMITMENT TO GUIDANCE AND FOLLOW-UP

The University has a responsibility for regularly following-up faculty members’ long-range goals for maximizing performance as well as a responsibility for guiding those faculty members with action plans for achieving higher levels of professional performance. This responsibility can be realized through continual performance reviews that occur as integral components of *Annual Performance Evaluations*. These annual reviews will be followed by the subsequent five-year Tenured Faculty

V. COMMITMENT TO GUIDANCE AND FOLLOW-UP continued:

Developmental Review, except in the case of Developmental Plans for Teaching Effectiveness. In this latter instance, an interim three-year rather than a five-year time parameter is in effect (refer to *IV.b.2 (a) Time Frames for Completion of Plans*).

VI. UNIVERSITY SUPPORT

The University has an increased responsibility to provide all faculty and departments with funding and other resources consistent with individual performance goals and expected developmental levels. Additional resources needed to enable faculty to meet required developmental expectations resulting from unsatisfactory performance reviews should be set aside in a special university fund established for this purpose.

To promote equity and faculty enhancement, the University should endeavor to allocate additional funding to a department if needed to achieve excellence in performance. Faculty members have a reciprocal responsibility to make reasonable requests for scarce resources based upon the following *Principles of Equity*:

Scarce resources should be fairly apportioned among all members of a department, contingent upon an allocation system congruous with the college's budgetary policies. This system should provide every faculty an equal opportunity to request resources for the implementation and enhancement of their professional activities. Thus, resources earmarked for Development Plans should not be so great as to lessen or to preclude the opportunity for activities by the faculty of a department who are pursuing long-range career goals.

VII. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO ATTAIN EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF DEVELOPMENTAL PLANNING

Faculty members who do not achieve acceptable levels of performance after the time period for implementing development plans described in *IV.2. Time Frames* will be considered for termination. The determination⁴ of “unacceptable performance” will be made by the faculty member’s department chair, Triad Peer Review Committee, College Appeals Committee, college dean, University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee, provost and vice president for academic affairs, and the university president.

The University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee will be comprised of 10 tenured faculty members equally representing the five colleges within the University — College of Agriculture and

⁴To judge the appropriateness and the legality of this determination, evaluators should refer to policies for Tenured Faculty — TAMUK Faculty Handbook and The Texas A&M University System Policy Manual.

VII. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO ATTAIN EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF DEVELOPMENTAL PLANNING continued:

Human Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business Administration, College of Education, and College of Engineering. (No member of the Committee can be undergoing a Tenured Faculty Developmental Review or be engaged in a Development Plan to enhance their performance.)

Process:

•**Step 1:** If after the length of time defined in this policy as the maximum period to develop performance under a Development Plan a department chair concludes that a faculty member's performance has not reached satisfactory levels, *Step 2* will be taken.

•**Step 2:** The department chair forwards the faculty member's files (i.e., his or her previous five-year Tenured Faculty Developmental Review, the evaluations and recommendations of the Triad Peer Review Committee, the College Appeals Committee, and the department chair, the subsequent Development Plan and, lastly, the department chair's evaluation of the faculty member's performance in achieving the designated levels of performance in the Development Plan) to the college dean for his or her review. If the college dean concludes, after a comprehensive review of the faculty member's files, that the faculty member's performance in fulfilling their Development Plan has been satisfactory, the files are returned to the department and the faculty member will pursue normal activities until the next five-year review. If, however, the dean's evaluation is unfavorable, he or she will initiate action to forward the files with the dean's written evaluation/recommendation to the University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee and Step 3 will ensue.

•**Step 3:** The dean of the college notifies the University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee that a faculty member has completed his or her developmental period and a third-party evaluation is requested. At this time, the dean will take the faculty member's files and written evaluations by the chair, Triad Peer Review Committee, College Appeals Committee, and dean to the University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee for review by all committee members. (Proceed to Step 4)

•**Step 4:** The University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee will convene to review the outcome of the faculty member's development plan. After a thorough and comprehensive review by each of the 10 members of the Committee and a discussion among all members, a "satisfactory"/ "unsatisfactory" vote will be taken.

A six-to-four vote of the 10-member committee will constitute unsuccessful progress to fulfill a Development Plan; i.e., at least six (6) negative votes will be necessary for a finding of "unsatisfactory." (If the University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee renders a vote of "unsatisfactory" performance, the Committee has the responsibility to provide a written narrative of the conclusive factors in their decision.) (Proceed to Step 5)

VII. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO ATTAIN EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF DEVELOPMENTAL PLANNING *continued*:

•Step 5:

(a) A vote of “satisfactory” in Step 4. The faculty member is notified in writing by the University Post-Tenure Peer Evaluation Committee that he or she has satisfactorily completed their Development Plan.

(b) A vote of “unsatisfactory” in Step 4. The faculty member, the department chair, the dean of the college, and the provost and vice president for academic affairs are notified in writing that the faculty member has not satisfactorily completed his or her Development Plan and termination proceedings are recommended under the terms of “Causes of Dismissal of Tenured Faculty” in the TAMUK Faculty Handbook and The Texas A&M University System Policy Manual. (The written narrative of the conclusive decision-making factors will accompany these notifications.) (Proceed to Step 6)

•Step 6: If a vote of “unsatisfactory” is taken in Step 4, the faculty member’s files, the written narratives and recommendations from the department chair, the Triad Committee, the College Appeals Committee, the college dean, and the University Post-Tenure Evaluation Committee will be forwarded to the provost and vice president for academic affairs for his or her review and evaluation. (Proceed to Step 7)

•Step 7: The provost and vice president for academic affairs, after a thorough review, will forward a written narrative of his or her evaluation with a recommendation to the university president. (Proceed to 8)

•Step 8: The president of the university will review all files, written narrative evaluations and recommendations and make a final decision.^{Note}

Note: The faculty member has a right to appeal under the appeal process outlined in the TAMUK Faculty Handbook.

VIII. EXEMPTIONS TO TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW

(1) If a tenured faculty member undergoes a review for a promotion and subsequently receives the promotion, that successful review will satisfy the Tenured Faculty Developmental Review for the particular time frame. Consequently, the next developmental review will be five years from the promotion review, not five years from the last Tenured Faculty Developmental Review.

(2) At the discretion of the department chair and/or dean, a faculty member subject to review may be temporarily exempted due to extenuating circumstances (e.g., significant health problems). Documentation of extenuating circumstances must be presented to the department chair and/or dean; these documents will become a part of the faculty member’s permanent file in the department and college.

VIII. EXEMPTIONS TO TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW *continued*:

(3) Exemptions may also be granted to faculty who are serving in an institutional service capacity or who are given a special assignment of major importance to the department, to the university, or to the country (e.g., Faculty Senate Chair). In such a situation, a faculty member may not be able to actively engage in the four critical areas subject to review.

(4) If a faculty member is in a two-year extension period under the guidelines of Section *IV.B.2.(c)*, the Developmental Review cycle will be delayed until the end of the extension period.

(5) If a faculty member who is serving a 0.75 to 1.0 FTE in an administrative position — e.g., as president, provost, vice-president, dean, or assistant dean — would routinely be scheduled for a post-tenure review, that comprehensive review will be deferred until the fifth full year of service after the faculty member takes up duties related to his or her academic discipline. Prior to the Tenured Faculty Developmental Review, the faculty member will be counseled for any deficiencies in performance during the Annual Performance Evaluation.

IX. MEASURING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Because teaching is a highly valued component of the University's mission, the evaluators of teaching effectiveness have a profound responsibility to faculty to use as many representative measures of effectiveness as are necessary to yield a fair and accurate portrait of the teaching-learning experience.

One measure is the students' evaluation of instruction. The criterion-based instrument to be used to measure teaching effectiveness should be the most reliable and valid instrument available. Therefore, the instrument will be selected from among professionally developed scales in the nation that are rated as "excellent" by experts in the field. The selection and criteria of a student evaluation of instruction instrument will be determined by the Faculty Senate.

A second way to provide an additional understanding of teaching effectiveness should be the teaching portfolio (e.g., Seldin's model⁵). This method is considered by experts in the field of teaching effectiveness to be a comprehensive and valid documentation over a teaching professional's career. This mode, alone, has the capability to provide insight into the individual's philosophy of teaching, and his or her goals and criteria for imparting knowledge. The selection and criteria of a portfolio model will be determined by the Faculty Senate.

⁵Seldin, Peter. *THE TEACHING PORTFOLIO — A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 1991.

X. SUNSET CLAUSE FOR THE TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW POLICY

The guidelines and procedures of the Tenured Faculty Developmental Review Policy will be examined by the Faculty Senate after the initial review process and every two years thereafter. The Faculty Senate will recommend any changes to the president and the provost and vice president for academic affairs of the University.

APPENDIX XIII

***DEFINITION OF RESEARCH AND APPROPRIATE SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY AT TAMUK**

The following definitions apply to the faculty as a whole and are based upon three premises: First is the premise that every faculty member must be intellectually lively. Second, the faculty should be continuously engaged in scholarship and professional development. Third, the faculty must participate in the process of documenting and proving the intellectual vigor of their scholarship and professional development.

For the purposes of this definition, scholarship is defined to include four types of intellectual activity. They are: (1) the scholarship of discovery, (2) the scholarship of application, (3) the scholarship of teaching, and (4) the scholarship of integration. These four types of scholarship are to be equally recognized, accepted, and respected, and the overall performance of each faculty member is to be carefully assessed and held to a high standard of excellence. Further discussion of these areas is found below.

RESEARCH

Scholarship of Discovery

Discovery and creativity both have the important aspect of originality. Both are forms of scholarly work that match most closely with the usual image of “basic research.” Any piece of such original work represents a mixture of both, although the proportions can vary substantially. Many disciplines prefer a term other than “research” to specifically denote the work of this type that is normally done in their fields.

In detail, the nature of what constitutes discovery or creativity is discipline-specific. Each discipline in an institution of higher education can identify appropriate scholarly or professional activities for its academic area, in keeping with established standards that would satisfy peers in the discipline.

*Note: The definitions of scholarship used in this appendix are derived from Scholarship

Reconsidered by Ernest L. Boyer, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Scholarship of Application

The **scholarship of application** will encourage the faculty to direct research to practical activities in their fields.

The **scholarship of application** moves toward the active engagement of the scholar. It focuses on the responsible application of knowledge to consequential problems, and requires intellectual creativity and critical thinking in analyzing those problems. This type of research is also referred to as applied research and/or development. The scholarship of application must be tied directly to one's field of knowledge and relate to and flow directly out of creative professional activity. The engagement in applied research and/or development may take the form of contract research, consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, or program evaluation.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Scholarship of Teaching

The **scholarship of teaching** starts with what the teacher knows - teachers must be widely read and engaged in their fields; but teaching is consequential only when knowledge is conveyed and can be understood, internalized, and acted upon. The scholarship of teaching has to do with understanding how students learn in different fields. Being a good teacher means more than knowing one's field; it also means knowing one's self as a teacher and, as importantly, understanding and using the most effective teaching methodologies to bridge the knowledge gap between one's students as novice learners and oneself as expert mentor. This includes the development of new teaching materials and the conceptualization of new curricular sequences, the development and evaluation of new methods of instruction (e.g., cooperative learning, collaborative field-based instruction), and the development of techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. Each of these activities must be documented and assessed. Documentation could include publications dealing with pedagogy and/or teaching techniques, participation in workshops and seminars resulting in an action plan for improving teaching skills, written evaluations of teaching materials, and the development of outcomes assessment tools.

Scholarship of Integration

The **scholarship of integration** is defined as interpreting, drawing together, and bringing new insights into larger intellectual patterns either within or between disciplines. Therefore, the **scholarship of integration** is necessary in dealing with the boundaries of the human problems of today which do not always neatly fall within defined disciplines. It is essential to integrate ideas and then apply them to the world in which we live. Therefore,

comprehensive articles

and monographs, participating in curricular innovation, conducting interdisciplinary seminars, and textbook writing are examples of the scholarship of integration.

SUMMARY

In summary, the research and scholarly activities reviewed in this document comprise what is meant by 'research' and have in common (1) the creation of a discipline-appropriate product and (2) the discipline-appropriate presentation of that product. The types of research and scholarly activities include but are not limited to applied, artistic, basic causal-comparative, correlation, descriptive, experimental, explanatory, exploratory, historical, improvement-oriented, predictive, qualitative, quantitative, and theoretical. The evidence of research and scholarly activities includes, but is not limited to, such formats as published refereed works, reviews, technical reports, shows, exhibits, displays, performances of artistic works and talents, research grants, contracts, editorial contributions, invited papers, citation indices, and other recognitions.

APPENDIX XIV

IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY - KINGSVILLE

February 2, 2000

INTRODUCTION

Each faculty member at Texas A&M University - Kingsville, whether tenured, probationary, or non-tenure track will be evaluated annually for purposes of reappointment (in the cases of probationary and non-tenure track faculty), promotion in rank, reassignment, and discretionary salary increases. All faculty are evaluated individually utilizing a process that conforms to the overall university policy for *Annual Evaluation of Faculty*. (Paragraph B.3, Faculty Handbook and Appendix A)

The Annual Report by Faculty (Appendix B) shall serve as the measure of individual performance regarding personnel decisions related to reappointment, reassignment, promotion, tenure, discretionary salary increases, and tenured faculty developmental review. Each college and department is responsible for implementing established university procedures for faculty evaluation including student rating of instruction. It is important to remember that the annual evaluation of faculty is the basis for all personnel decisions related to the subject areas listed above. Therefore, the process must be consistently applied for all faculty by chairs and deans with a thorough understanding that the annual evaluation will be used as the basis for decision making regarding not only a faculty member's professional growth and development but also the personnel decisions listed above.

The major purpose for annual evaluation of faculty is to improve the quality of instruction throughout the university. The annual evaluation process is intended to facilitate the continuous development of faculty relative to their academic assignments, their own professional goals, and the mission of the university.

NORMAL ACADEMIC (TEACHING) APPOINTMENT

Faculty will be evaluated annually based on their normal academic assignment (paragraph C.2, Faculty Handbook), unless they choose, and are approved for, one of the short-term, specialized tracks.

OPTIONAL SPECIALIZED APPOINTMENTS – Teaching Track, Research and Scholarly Activity Track, Professional Growth Track, and Designated College Recruiter Track

In order to promote excellence in Teaching, promote excellence in Research and Scholarly Activities, promote Professional Growth, and emphasize the importance of Student Recruitment and Retention, Texas A&M University - Kingsville has four “speciality tracks” that faculty may pursue in their professional growth and development activities. These tracks provide flexibility for faculty members who desire to engage in activities that improve their classroom teaching, enhance productivity in research and scholarly activities, or enhance professional growth, or allows them to gain experience and an appreciation for student recruitment activities. With the specialty tracks and the normal academic assignment track, a faculty member has five options with which to pursue his or her professional growth and development activities.

Participation in any of the specialized appointments is strictly voluntary for interested faculty. Any participation in the specialized appointments is a consequence of faculty interest, not administrative request, and is initiated only by faculty. Faculty who desire to pursue one of the options are required to gain approval from their department chair and dean preferably in the preceding Fall semester but no later than the beginning of the calendar year. Faculty who apply for one of these specialized appointments will be required to submit a proposal to their chair and dean describing how the appointment will benefit the individual, the college, and the university. If the faculty member requests a “Special Assignment” and it is approved by the dean, the Provost shall be notified.

Teaching Track (TT) — This appointment is a short-term special assignment of not more than two years duration. Faculty members, with approval of the chair and dean, and consistent with the academic needs of the department, can request a special assignment to a TT. The TT is designed for those faculty who desire to concentrate on improving their level of teaching effectiveness. (Faculty desiring to engage in the scholarship of teaching should apply for participation in the Research and Scholarly Activity Track). Faculty must apply for the TT preferably in the preceding Fall semester but no later than the beginning of the calendar year. Those individuals who apply for the TT must submit a proposal to their respective chair and dean describing new innovations and/or techniques they wish to develop and how this effort will enhance their teaching effectiveness.

In preparation for the TT and in order to provide time to develop new innovations and/or techniques, if the departmental teaching requirements permit, faculty members can be given three to six hour (3-6 SCH) load reduction from their normal teaching responsibilities on any long semester during assignment on TT. Conversely, during assignment on TT, faculty member can be given a three hour (3 SCH) load increase above their normal load for a maximum of 15 SCH per any long semester. Although the faculty member may have an increase in teaching load, teaching should be performed in an exemplary manner. While on the TT the faculty member will be given the opportunity to waive or reduce the requirements of Section II (Research and Scholarly Activity) and/or Section III (Professional Growth) and/or Section IV (Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs) of the *Annual Evaluation of Faculty* form and increase the weight for Teaching Performance to a maximum of 80%. The exact assignment of weights for all categories and the SCH load decrease/increase will be made with the consensus of the faculty member, chair, and dean, consistent with the mission for the college (see Faculty Handbook and most recent Strategic Plan).

Clearly, expectations related to performance during the TT will be greatly influenced by teaching effectiveness, and to a lesser extent, the other evaluation categories. It is incumbent on the process to provide documentation and assessment data to evaluate faculty performance each year that one holds this specialized status. This will be especially important when decisions are made outside the college relative to annual performance (e.g. tenure, promotion, and merit pay).

Research and Scholarly Activity Track (RSAT) – This appointment is a short-term special assignment of not more than two years duration which is designed to permit faculty members the opportunity to enhance their research or scholarly activity. With the approval of the chair and dean, and consistent with the teaching requirements of the department, faculty members may request a special assignment to an RSAT. Faculty must apply for the RSAT preferably in the preceding Fall semester but no later than the beginning of the calendar year. Faculty members will be required to submit a proposal to their chair and dean describing how the assignment would benefit their development in research and scholarly activities.

If the departmental teaching requirements permit, faculty members can be given a three to six hour (3 - 6 SCH) load reduction from their normal teaching responsibilities per long semester during the current calendar year. While on the RSAT, faculty members may waive or reduce the requirements of Section III (Professional Growth) and/or Section IV (Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs) and increase the weight of Section II (Research and Scholarly Activities) to 70%. The exact assignment of weights for all categories will be determined by the faculty member, chair, and dean consistent with the mission for the college (see Faculty Handbook and most recent Strategic Plan).

Although the faculty member has a reduced teaching load, it is anticipated that their teaching responsibilities will continue to be performed in an exemplary manner, and the weight assigned to the Teaching Performance Section (I) will be no less than the low end of the allowable range. For the reasons cited above in the TT it is incumbent on the process to provide appropriate documentation and assessment data to validate faculty performance each year that one holds this specialized status.

Professional Growth Track (PGT) — This appointment is a short term special assignment of not more than two years duration. The college deans, at their discretion, consistent with the teaching responsibilities of the department and support from departmental chairs, may approve the faculty member’s request to develop professionally in selected areas. Individuals approved for the PGT might develop technology skills in order to help others in the department or college; develop leadership skills; develop mediation skills for helping to resolve conflicts; or develop professionally in other areas.

If the departmental teaching requirements permit, faculty members can be given a three to six hour (3 - 6 SCH) load reduction from their normal teaching responsibilities per long semester during the current calendar year. A proposal must be submitted through the department chair to the dean outlining a “plan of action” and the expected benefits to the college or university. Faculty must apply for the PGT preferably in the preceding Fall semester but no later than the beginning of the calendar year. While engaged in the PGT, the faculty member may waive or reduce the requirements of Section II (Scholarly and Artistic Endeavor) and/or Section IV (Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs) of the *Annual Evaluation of Faculty* form and increase the weight for Section III (Professional Growth) to 60%. The exact assignment of weights for all categories will be made with the approval of the faculty member, chair, and dean, consistent with the mission of the college (see Faculty Handbook and most recent Strategic Plan).

Although the faculty member will have a reduced teaching load, it is anticipated that their teaching responsibilities will continue to be performed in an exemplary manner, and that the weight assigned to the Teaching Performance section (I) will be no less than the low end of the allowable range. As in the case of the other tracks, and for the reasons cited above, it is incumbent on the process to provide documentation and assessment data to validate faculty performance each year that one holds this specialized status.

Designated College Recruiter (DCR) — This appointment is a short term special assignment of not more than two years duration. The college deans, at their discretion, consistent with the teaching responsibilities of the department and support from departmental chairs, may approve a faculty member’s request to serve as a designated college recruiter. Individuals approved for the DCR track are expected to make visits to area high schools and community colleges, attend senior day and college night activities and in general take the lead for recruitment activities in the college.

If the departmental teaching requirements permit, faculty members can be given a three to six hour (3 - 6 SCH) load reduction from their normal teaching responsibilities per long semester during the following calendar year. A proposal must be submitted through the department chair to the dean outlining a “plan of action” and the expected benefits related to the recruitment efforts for the college. Faculty must apply for the DCR track preferably in the preceding Fall semester but no later than the beginning of the calendar year. While serving as DCR the faculty member may waive or reduce the requirements of Section II (Scholarly and Artistic Endeavor) and/or Section III (Professional Growth) of the *Annual Evaluation of Faculty* form and increase the weight for Section IV (Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University

Programs) to 70%. The exact assignment of weights for all categories will be made with the approval of the faculty member, chair, dean, consistent with the mission of the college (see Faculty Handbook and most recent Strategic Plan).

Although the faculty member will have a reduced teaching load, it is anticipated that their teaching responsibilities will continue to be performed in an exemplary manner, and that the weight assigned to the Teaching Performance Section (I) will be no less than the low end of the allowable range. As in the case of the TT assignment, and for the reasons cited above, it is incumbent on the process to provide documentation and assessment data to validate faculty performance each year that one holds this specialized status.

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The following procedures are to be adhered to by the academic colleges in their implementation of current policy for the Annual Evaluation of Faculty. The exact procedure can, with approval of the Senate and President, vary to some extent among the colleges, but the end result must culminate in completion of the *TAMUK ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY* form (*Appendix A*), complete with all supporting data. *In special situations where a faculty member has a unique appointment requiring an adjustment of category weights outside the approved ranges, it must be approved by the dean with concurrence of the Provost.*

Special care should be taken to ensure that consistency is maintained in the annual evaluation of faculty and future recommendations are made on their performance as it relates to tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions. Faculty who receive strong annual evaluations and positive narrative reports each year from chairs should logically expect that tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions would be viewed accordingly. It would be under only very unusual circumstances that this would not be the case.

Procedure for Implementing the Annual Evaluation of Faculty

1. Application for and approval of any special tracks will occur preferably in the preceding Fall semester but no later than the beginning of the calendar year, before the spring semester begins. There is no standard form for such an application. At the time of application, the current year's weightings for teaching, research, growth, and service will not be established. Regardless whether the normal academic assignment track or a specialized track is taken, weightings for teaching, research, growth, and service will be established for the current year only after the evaluation of the previous year's performance has occurred.
2. Early in the spring semester, department chairs will review the previous year's *Annual Report by Faculty Members (Appendix B)* relative to the *Proposed Activities Form or Special Assignment Form (Appendix C or D)* as it was completed the previous spring. The chair will complete the *Summary of Annual Evaluation of Faculty form (Appendix A)* by assigning individualized scores for each of the four performance categories and sign the form. A copy of the appropriate *Proposed Activities or Special Assignment* form signed by the chair must be included with the *Annual Evaluation of Faculty* form so that a clear understanding of the criteria by which the faculty member was evaluated can be understood by all. This will be especially important in

decisions regarding tenure and promotion when professional credentials are reviewed by peers both inside and outside the faculty member's own college.

3. Department chairs will meet with the individual faculty member to review the annual evaluation and discuss the rationale for the individual scores. Prior to the meeting, written narrative (*Appendix E*) will be prepared and signed by the chair and discussed with the faculty member explicitly communicating the rationale underlying the evaluation scores. If specific areas of the overall performance are judged as needing improvement, the narrative must address in detail: (a) those areas; and (b) the university's obligation in providing resources to address improvement in those areas. Thus, the faculty member knows the areas of their performance that require attention in the future and what resources will be available. A copy of the written narrative must be included with the Annual Evaluation of Faculty form.
4. If the department chair and the faculty member agree relative to the final score and narrative given by the department chair, a copy of the evaluation signed by the department chair and faculty member will be forwarded to the dean for his/her approval. If the chair and the faculty member do not agree as to the appropriateness of the evaluation, a copy signed by the chair but unsigned by the faculty member will be forwarded to the dean for resolution.
5. In cases where consensus is lacking, the faculty member, chair, and dean, in open dialog, will attempt to reach consensus on whether the evaluation and the written narrative fairly represent the faculty member's performance during the evaluation period. They will also seek a consensus regarding any suggestions for improving performance for the coming year. If consensus is reached, the written narrative and the evaluation will or will not be revised as appropriate and signed by all parties. Where consensus is not reached, the faculty member, chair, or dean shall respond in writing as to why, and these responses will be attached to the annual evaluation documents.
6. Following completion of the annual evaluation of all faculty members in a department and prior to the end of the semester in which evaluation occurs, the department chair will report in a memo, distributed to all faculty in the department, a record of the individual annual evaluation scores awarded (without names) to all faculty in the department. A copy of this memo shall be attached to the faculty member's Annual Evaluation.
7. To fully link the annual evaluation process with continuance, tenure, promotion, and merit decisions, the most recent annual report and relevant (i.e., those reports covering the most recent year and previous years being reviewed for promotion, tenure, or continuance) annual evaluations by the department chair will be made available to departmental tenure, promotion, continuance, or merit committees. For continuance decisions, the faculty member would update the most recent annual report as necessary to include activities completed since the most recent annual evaluation. For promotion and tenure reasons, the promotion or tenure portfolio will serve this purpose. The promotion/tenure portfolios should include annual evaluation forms and the department chair's narratives.
8. Documentation for the annual evaluation should be kept to the minimum necessary to demonstrate or reflect a faculty member's level of performance in a given section (I, II, III, IV) and will be found in the appendix. The following are intended as guidelines to reduce documentation of

submitted materials.

In the annual evaluation report itself, a summary should be written for each section (I, II, III, IV). For example, in section I (Teaching Performance), the report itself might read as follows:

1. List of courses taught - number of students enrolled in each course in appendix
2. Course syllabi - in appendix
3. Computerized summaries of student rating of instruction - in appendix
4. Describe teaching load (number of courses taught, overload, release time), whether courses taught were required courses or electives, explanation of results of student rating of instruction and possible biases affecting results
5. Summary discussion of other evidence of teaching performance (teaching portfolio, educational workshops conducted, peer reviews, feedback from current students or alumni, dissertations and theses directed, in-service training, etc.; documentation should appear in appendix).

In Section II (Research and Scholarly Activities), the report itself should include a list of publications, grants submitted and/or awarded, exhibits or performances, and a listing of other research and scholarly activities. Documentation should be included in the appendix. For publications, documentation will be the first page of the published journal article, front matter of a book, or letter of acceptance from publisher. For grants, executive summary of grant, listing of principal investigators, and budget pages of grant submitted and letter of award (if successful) will appear in appendix. Documentation of other research and scholarly activity should follow a similar model. In section III (Professional Growth and Activities), information as requested should be listed, and the report should contain a discussion of how the activities resulted in professional growth. Other documentation, such as dates of meetings attended, sessions attended, etc., should be included in appendix. In section IV (Non-teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs), the report should include a listing or summary of the meetings, committees, other administrative activities, and other service activities. For committees, the name of the chair of the committee, dates of meetings attended, number of meetings attended and number missed, and approximate hours of involvement should be included in the report in addition to any special role played on the committee. Letter of appointment may be included in the appendix but announcements of meeting dates and committee reports should not.

In all cases, faculty should maintain records and documentation for the annual evaluation that can be provided upon request following submission of the annual report to the department chair.

9. To insure that College and Departmental requirements for tenure and promotion are reflected in the annual review process, each college/department should make certain that any specific requirements that may not be reflected in the University's annual evaluation process are taken into account in the annual evaluation. So long as they do not contradict university wide guidelines and criteria, departments and colleges are allowed to supplement the basic annual evaluation instrument. Any such additional requirements or changes must be approved by the Faculty Senate and President.

An example follows. Below the rating for research and scholarly activity, there may be an insertion like this:

The department requires:

for tenure: two articles published in refereed journals or equivalent (e.g. competitive grants acquired, presentations of research or scholarly activity at regional/state/national conference [peer reviewed-either prior to acceptance for presentation or at conference], invited presentations of research or scholarly activity at regional/state/national conference, conduct of interdisciplinary seminars at regional/state/national meetings)

for promotion to associate professor: same as above

for promotion to professor: same as above but published after promotion to associate professor and while at this university

- faculty member is making satisfactory progress on the requirement toward tenure, promotion to associate professor, promotion to full professor (underline applicable terms)
- faculty member has not met this requirement and needs to make additional efforts to do so
- faculty member has already met or exceeded this minimum requirement

In any requirements specified by the department or college, maximum flexibility should be provided for the faculty member to meet the requirements (e.g., in the above example of research and scholarly activity, “two articles published in refereed journals OR grants acquired OR presentations made”).

11. Reasons for denial of promotion or tenure should consist of an explanation that provides specific reasons or cites evidence lacking (e.g. insufficient scholarly activity should be explained).
12. After evaluations have been completed for the previous calendar year, department chairs will hold a conference with their faculty to complete the *Proposed Activities Form (Appendix C)*, or the *Special Assignment Form (Appendix D)*, if a faculty member has been approved for one of the specialized appointment tracks. Discussion will occur relative to proposed activities for the current year, and the establishment of weights for the four evaluation categories that comprise the annual evaluation: (1) Teaching Performance; (2) Research and Scholarly Activity; (3) Professional Growth and Activities; and (4) Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs. The completion of the appropriate form, with approval by the chair and dean, will collaboratively establish the criteria by which the faculty member will be evaluated for the current year. A clear understanding of the criteria by which the faculty member will be evaluated during the current year must be understood by all. If unanticipated circumstances should arise during the year such that the agreed weightings no longer fit the circumstances, the faculty member may request in writing that the weightings be changed. The new weightings can become effective by agreement of the chair and dean. If there is no agreement between the faculty member and chair or dean, the faculty member may seek to follow a formal grievance procedure.

**TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE
SUMMARY OF ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY**

(Appendix A)

SPRING _____ Through FALL _____

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|
| Name: | Dept.: | Chairman: |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|

Judgments of faculty performance for each of the four activity areas are based on a seven-point rating scale as defined below:

- 7 **EXEMPLARY** This rating should be used only in rare cases. It carries the implication that the individual's performance in a particular category (section of the annual report evaluation) reflects the highest degree of productivity and effectiveness. Awarding this score implies consideration of meritorious performance.
- 6 **EXCEPTIONAL** This rating should be applied to a faculty member whose performance is determined to be well above the average level of expectations for level 4 (GOOD). Faculty awarded this score should expect consideration of meritorious performance.
- 5 **OUTSTANDING** This rating should be applied to faculty who have performed above the average expectations for level 4 (GOOD). Faculty awarded this score are available for possible consideration of meritorious performance.
- 4 **GOOD** This rating should always be interpreted in a favorable light. In any group, no matter what level, there is a middle range of performance. This rating implies that the individual has been productive and effective in the area that is being evaluated. The expectation for TAMUK faculty is that all will strive to attain this level of performance, or higher, in each of the four sections of evaluation. It is expected that this rating will be one which is most frequently applied.
- 3 **ACCEPTABLE** This rating implies that the faculty member is meeting the accepted expectations for the college in a respective section of evaluation. Performance is judged to be in line with the general expectations for faculty at this institution.
- 2 **DEFICIENT** This rating implies that a faculty member is barely attaining the level of desired performance for a specific section of evaluation. Considerable room for improvement exists. Recommendations for improving performance should be discussed with the faculty member as a part of the Annual Evaluation process.
- 1 **UNACCEPTABLE** The individual's performance in the area which is being evaluated has not been productive or effective. The chair and dean will meet with the individual faculty member to implement a development plan designed to improve performance in the following year.

Specific parameters for each of the evaluation sections II, III, and IV are to be determined at the college level, subject to approval by the Faculty Senate and President, and consistent with TAMUK Tenured Faculty Development Review Policy, System Policy 12.06, and Appendix XIII in the TAMUK Faculty Handbook.

| | Rating (1-7) | Departmental Weights | Score |
|---|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| <hr/> | | | |
| I. <u>TEACHING PERFORMANCE</u> Rating from following pages. | _____ | X _____ | = _____ (.25-.65) |
| II. <u>RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES</u> Involvement in the scholarship of discovery or application (research) or teaching or integration (scholarly activities) (See Appendix XIII, Faculty Handbook.) | _____ | X _____ | = _____ (.15-.55) |
| III. <u>PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACTIVITIES</u> Membership in professional organizations, attendance at professional meetings, professional consulting and lectures, professional service, continuing professional education | _____ | X _____ | = _____ (.05-.45) |
| IV. <u>NON-TEACHING ACTIVITIES SUPPORTIVE OF UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS</u> Committee service, recruitment, advisement, degree planning, acquisition or development of facilities and equipment, program and curriculum development, attendance and support for general university functions, other service. Cooperates with colleagues, engages in professional conduct, and displays ethical behavior. | _____ | X _____ | = _____ (.15-.55) |

Weights Must Total 100%

| | | |
|----------------------------------|------|---------------|
| Chairperson's Signature _____ | Date | _____ = _____ |
| Faculty Member's Signature _____ | Date | _____ |
| Dean's Signature _____ | Date | _____ |

I. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

(Appendix A, page 2)

The criteria for establishing the quality of Teaching Performance is outlined below and should be consistently applied by all academic colleges. (Library faculty will be evaluated in this section for "Professional Performance" according to the "Statement of Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure for University Librarians" 1995).

Student Rating of Instruction: Adjustments should be made in the following ratings based on known biases or other factors as explained in the "Guidelines for Interpretation and Use of Student Ratings of Instruction." Ratings from the student rating instrument should be rounded to one decimal place. This section of assessing teaching performance can account for a minimum of 25% and a maximum of 50% of the overall score for teaching performance, the proportion to be determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair. Other evidence of teaching performance (next page) accounts for 50%-75% of the overall score for teaching performance. The percentages must add up to 100%

Dimension

1. Value (questions 4, 12) _____
2. Enthusiasm (question 13) _____
3. Organization (questions 2, 7) _____
4. Group interaction (questions 1, 11) _____
5. Individual rapport (questions 1, 6, 10, 14) _____
6. Breadth of coverage (question 15) _____
7. Examinations/grading (questions 3, 5, 8) _____
8. Assignments (questions 3, 9) _____
9. Workload/difficulty (questions 16, 17) _____

A rating of 3.0 or above (out of 5.0) for **all** nine dimensions would result in the maximum score agreed upon for this page being awarded. A rating of less than 3.0 on one or more dimensions would result in a reduction in the maximum score by 1/9 for each dimension rating less than 3.0 unless known biases or other explanations are judged to be responsible for the rating of less than 3.0.

% (range of 25-50, see above, expressed as decimal) _____ X 7.0 = _____ maximum weighted score this page

maximum weighted score this page X _____ X 1/9 or 0.111 = _____ score for student rating of instruction
n dimensions in
which score is 3.0 or greater

SCORE THIS PAGE _____

OTHER EVIDENCE OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

(Appendix A, page 3)

(range of 50-75% of overall score for teaching performance consistent with percentage used for “Score for Student Rating of Instruction”)

All faculty are expected to demonstrate appropriate professional demeanor in teaching situations. They are also expected to be punctual and dependable and to adhere to teaching philosophy consistent with the role and mission of the university. Included in this section is evidence of preparation for teaching (e.g. maintain currency in field, development of instructional materials [e.g. syllabi, outlines, handouts, etc.], incorporation of technology in classroom where appropriate).

In addition, consistent with System Policy 12.06, other evidence of effective teaching includes efforts and activities that impact teaching effectiveness. Examples include: teaching portfolio, reflective self-review, workshops or other training conducted or provided for others excluding continuing education courses taught, peer reviews, colleague reviews, trained observers, feedback from current students (student comments on SRI or other informal sources of feedback including interviews, e.g., of graduating seniors), performance of students in subsequent courses, feedback from alumni and employers of graduates, direction of dissertations and theses, participation in workshops on effective teaching, in-service training, results from conduct of recognized assessments of teaching effectiveness, use of instructional consultant, use of on-campus technology centers and other programs to support integration of new technology into teaching, service as mentor for other faculty, enrollment in elective courses taught, student performance on standardized exams (e.g. ExCET, certification exams).

% (range of 50-75, see above, expressed as decimal) _____ X 7.0 = _____ maximum weighted score this page

maximum weighted score this page _____ X _____ = _____ score for other evidence of teaching performance
rating by department chair (% expressed as decimal)

SCORE THIS PAGE _____

Score for student rating of instruction (previous page) _____

+

Score for other evidence of teaching performance (this page) _____

Overall Score for Teaching Performance

(enter this score in “Summary of Annual Evaluation of Faculty” sheet)

**TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE
ANNUAL REPORT BY FACULTY MEMBER**

(Appendix B)

Spring_____ through Fall_____

This report serves multiple purposes: (1) to annually update your personnel file, (2) to provide information on job performance as it relates to decisions affecting tenure and promotion, (3) to form the basis for the Tenured Faculty Developmental Review, and (4) to serve as a basis for merit pay recommendations.

Report only those activities for the current evaluation period. All information related to a faculty member's professional accomplishments should be included on this form. Include supporting information for the sections (I - IV) in an appendix.

Name

Rank

Department

Highest Degree

Institution Granting Degree

Date of Initial Appointment
at TAMUK

Tenured?

Tenure-Track?

Date of Present Rank

Institution Where Appointed

I. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

(Appendix B, page 2)

Present in summary form evidence of your teaching performance. Include supporting data in an appendix. Use such evidence as student rating of instruction, preparation for teaching (e.g. maintain currency in field, development of instructional materials, incorporation of technology in classroom where appropriate); development of new courses or curriculum (not accounted for under scholarly activities); consistent with System Policy 12.06, other evidence of effective teaching including efforts and activities that impact teaching performance (e.g. teaching portfolio, reflective self-review, workshops or other training conducted or provided for others excluding continuing education courses taught, peer reviews, colleague reviews, trained observers, feedback from current students [student comments on SRI or other informal sources of feedback including interviews e.g. of graduating seniors], performance of students in subsequent courses, feedback from alumni and employers of graduates, direction of dissertations and theses, participation in workshops on effective teaching, in-service training, results from conduct of recognized assessments of teaching effectiveness, use of instructional consultant, use of on-campus technology centers and programs to support integration of new technology into teaching, service as mentor for other faculty, enrollment in elective courses taught, student performance on standardized exams [e.g. ExCET, certification exams]).

II. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

(Appendix B, page 3)

List articles, monographs, books, book reviews, presentations to professional and learned societies, creative and artistic endeavors, grantsmanship, contract research, consultation (which focuses on application of knowledge to consequential problems), technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, participation in workshops and seminars resulting in an action plan for improving teaching skills, written evaluations of teaching materials, development of teaching/learning outcomes assessment tools, participation in curricular innovation, and conduct of interdisciplinary seminars. Submit a copy of each publication, review, contract, policy, program evaluation, action plan, evaluation of teaching materials, and outcomes assessment tools (if available). Any research in progress that is listed must have documentation to indicate the extent of the progress during this reporting period. The activities and documentation listed are illustrative, but not exhaustive.

NOTE: For a more detailed and complete discussion of research and scholarly activities, see Appendix XIII in Faculty Handbook (“Definition of Research and Appropriate Scholarly Activity at TAMUK”).

III. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACTIVITIES

(Appendix B, page 4)

List information in the following order:

1. Membership in professional organizations, including offices held during the year;
2. Attendance at professional meetings (in an appendix attach dates of meetings, list of sessions attended, and other professional activities engaged in at meetings);
3. Professional consulting and lectures (not accounted for in scholarship of application or integration, include supporting data);
4. Professional service (moderator, facilitator, journal editor, reviewer [e.g. manuscripts, grants], etc., include supporting data);
5. Professional honors received;
6. Continuing professional education (status of doctorate if not conferred; post-graduate or post-doctoral work at a university; training received in workshops and non-university courses).

IV. NON-TEACHING ACTIVITIES SUPPORTIVE OF UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS (Appendix B, page 5)

List information in the following order:

1. Significant committee and administrative assignments on campus (indicate number of meetings and hours of work during reporting period);
2. Sponsorship of student organizations (indicate number of meetings and hours of work during reporting period);
3. Recruitment and retention activities (including sponsorship of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities);
4. Student advisement;
5. Acquisition and development of facilities; program and curriculum development (not accounted under teaching performance or in scholarship of teaching);
6. Attendance at and support of general university functions;
7. Other service supportive of the university (i.e., community).

Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Proposed Activities Form

(Appendix C)

Spring _____ through Fall _____

Name _____ Dept.: _____ Date: _____

I am proposing that the evaluation of my performance for the calendar year noted above be determined by the weights assigned to each of the four categories listed on the *Annual Evaluation of Faculty* form as follows. My proposed activities for the current year are noted below.

- I. Teaching Performance _____
(.25 - .65)
- II. Research and Scholarly Activities _____
(.15 - .55)
- III. Professional Growth and Activities _____
(.05 - .45)
- IV. Non-Teaching Activities
Supportive of University Programs _____
(.15 - .55)

Weights must total 100%.

Proposed Activities for Current Year: _____

(Attach additional pages as necessary)

(To be completed for faculty on a normal teaching assignment.)

Approved by:

Faculty Member _____ Date: _____

Dept. Chair _____ Date: _____

College Dean _____ Date: _____

Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Narrative of the Annual Evaluation of Faculty
Spring ____ through Fall ____

(Appendix E)

Faculty Member _____

Department _____

Tenured: **Yes**____ **No**____

Date of Initial Appointment at TAMUK: _____

Rank: _____

Date of Present Rank: _____ / _____

NARRATIVE REPORT

Signatures:

Chair _____

Date: _____

Faculty Member _____

Date: _____

Dean _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX XV

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-KINGSVILLE CHECK-OUT LIST

| NAME | Position | Termination of Employment Date | City | Last Paid Date | State | Date | Retirement Plan | Zip Code |
|--|----------|--------------------------------|------|----------------|-------|------|-----------------|----------|
| FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL | | | | | | | | |
| Effective | | | | | | | | |
| This completed form will be filed with the department chairperson, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. | | | | | | | | |
| (1) Social Security _____ Social Security ID# _____ (2) Basic Life Office) _____ (3) Dental Office) _____ (4) COBRA Form will be mailed to my address. I certify that I have returned all state | | | | | | | | |

Revised 6/9