

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

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 TAMU-K

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tenured?                      Tenure-Track?

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Present Rank

\_\_\_\_\_  
Institution Where Appointed

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

SPRING \_\_\_\_\_ Through FALL \_\_\_\_\_

Name:	Dept.:	Chair:
-------	--------	--------

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 TAMU-K Tenured Faculty Development Review Policy, System Policy 12.06.

	Rating (1-7)	Weight (0-100%)	Score
I. <u>TEACHING PERFORMANCE</u> <b>(See Appendix III, Faculty Handbook)</b>	_____ X _____	=	_____

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

	_____ X _____	=	_____
--	---------------	---	-------

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

	_____ X _____	=	_____
--	---------------	---	-------

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

	_____ X _____	=	_____
--	---------------	---	-------

Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

Total of Weights and Scores (weights must total 100%) \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of the faculty member indicates that a discussion, between the faculty member and the supervisor, regarding the Annual Evaluation has been conducted.

Chairperson's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Member's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dean's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## I. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

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  
dimensions in  
which score is 3.0  
or greater

SCORE THIS PAGE \_\_\_\_\_

## OTHER EVIDENCE OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

(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)

## I. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

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

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 II in the Faculty Handbook (“Definition of Research and Appropriate Scholarly Activity at TAMU-K”).

### III. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACTIVITIES

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. SERVICE

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

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. Suggested weights are in parentheses.

I.	Teaching Performance	_____
		Weight (.25 - .65)
II.	Research and Scholarly Activities	_____
		Weight (.15 - .55)
III.	Professional Growth and Activities	_____
		Weight (.05 - .45)
IV.	Service	_____
		Weight (.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\_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

Tenured:         Yes         No

Date of Initial Appointment at TAMU-K: \_\_\_\_\_

Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Present Rank: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

NARRATIVE REPORT

Signatures:

Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Dean \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_