

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

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
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 _____

Faculty Evaluation
Reporting Year _____

Name: _____ Date _____

I. Teaching Performance: Weighting 0.25 - 0.65 as determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair.

A. Student Ratings of Instruction: This section 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. The average of individual scores on the indicated questions should be rounded to one decimal place and entered in the appropriate space below.

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>SRI Score</u>
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 (question 3, 9)	_____
9. Workload/difficulty (question 16, 17)	_____

Scoring: A rating of 3.5 or above (out of 5.0) for all nine dimensions would result in the awarding of the maximum score agreed upon for this page. A rating of less than 3.5 on one or more dimensions would result in a reduction in the maximum score by 0.111 (1/9th) for each dimension less than 3.5 unless known biases or other explanations are judged to be responsible for the rating less than 3.0.

% weighting (.25-.50) _____ X 7.0 = _____ Maximum weighted score Section I.A (MWS I.A)

MWS I.A _____ X n dimensions > 3.5 _____ X 0.111 = _____ **Score for I.A**

B. Other Evidence of teaching performance: This section can account for a minimum of 50% and a maximum of 75% of the overall score for teaching performance the proportion to be determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair.(The percentages for SRI and this section must add up to 100%). Items that can be Included in this section are evidence of:

1. **Graduate and Undergraduate Research Education.** To include thesis advisement and graduate student committee service. Based on the percentage release time from teaching it is expected that faculty members maintain a cumulative annual average of 1.5 graduate students per 25% release time from teaching. This section could also include evidence of undergraduate research education as documented by enrollment in ANSC/RWSC 4395 or completion of an undergraduate research project.

2. **Preparation for teaching.** Examples include: development of instructional materials (e.g. course syllabi, outlines, handouts), evidence of maintaining currency in the field, incorporation of technology in the classroom where appropriate and feedback from current students related to the instructors preparation for teaching (e.g. student comments on SRI or other sources of feedback).

3. **Activities and efforts that impact teaching effectiveness:** Examples include: teaching portfolio, workshops/training conducted or provided for, peer reviews, colleague reviews, trained observers, feedback from current students (students 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, 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 or service as a mentor for other faculty.

Scoring: Scoring of this section of will be based on the proportion determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair (50-75%) and assessment by the department chair (scored as a percentage). Assessment will include both consideration of agreed upon goals for this section by the faculty member and department chair, as well as the chairs appraisal of the attainment of those goals and the contribution of the documented items to the role and mission of the department.

% (0.50 - 0.75) _____ X 7.0 = _____ Maximum Weighted Score section I.B (MSW I.B)

MSW I.B _____ X Rating by Department Chair (%) _____ = _____ **Score Section I.B**

Score Section I.A = _____

Score Section I.B = _____

Score for Teaching Performance (Section I.A + I.B)

(Enter this score in A "Summary of Annual Evaluation of Faculty" Sheet)

II. Research and Scholarly Endeavors: Weighting 0.15 - 0.55 as determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair.

A. Grants:

Funded external grants	0.02 per \$1,000	_____
Funded internal grants	0.01 per \$1,000	_____
Grant Proposals, < \$5,000	0.02 each	_____
Grant Proposals, \$5,000 - 50,000	0.05 each	_____
Grant Proposals, \$50,000 - 100,000	0.10 each	_____
Grant Proposals, > \$100,000	0.25 each	_____

B. Refereed Publications: Refereed conference proceedings where the entire paper is published should count as a publication and a presentation.

State	0.50 each	_____
Regional	0.75 each x1	_____
National -- International	1.00 each x1	_____

C. Presentations at Professional Conferences: If presentation is invited, multiply by 1.5; refereed conference proceedings where the entire paper is published should count as a publication and a presentation.

State	0.15 each x 8	_____
Regional	0.20 each x4	_____
National -- International	0.25 each x1	_____

D. Publication/Presentation of Popular (lay) articles: If invited, multiply by 1.5.

Newsletters	State	0.05 each x1	_____
	Regional	0.10 each	_____
	National -- International	0.15 each	_____

Magazines	State	0.10 each	_____
	Regional	0.15 each	_____
	National -- International	0.20 each	_____

Scholarly Presentations to Lay Audiences	0.05 each x11	_____
--	---------------	-------

E. **Author on a published abstract:** _____ 0.01 each x30 _____

F. **Other Scholarly Activities:** This section includes faculty efforts directed towards the Scholarship of Teaching and the Scholarship of Integration as defined in Appendix XIII of the Faculty Handbook. The Scholarship of teaching could include items such as development of new teaching materials, conceptualization of new curricular sequences, development and evaluation of new methods of instruction (e.g. cooperative learning, collaborative field-based instruction, etc.) and the development of techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. The scholarship of integration could include items such as participation in curricular innovation, conducting interdisciplinary seminars and textbook writing. For each of these activities there must be sufficient documentation and assessment. Scoring of this section will be based on the proportion determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair (Maximum 2.0 points) and assessment by the department chair (scored as a percentage). Assessment will include both consideration of agreed upon goals for this section by the faculty member and department chair, as well as the chairs appraisal of the attainment of those goals and the contribution of the documented items to the role and mission of the department.

Points (0 - 2.0) _____ X Rating by Department Chair (%) _____ = _____ Score
Section II.F

* Can accrue a maximum of 7.0 pts.

**Sum of Section II.A -- II.F _____ X Weight _____ = _____ Score for
Research and Scholarly Endeavor
(Enter this score in “Summary of Annual Evaluation of Faculty” sheet)**

III. Professional Growth and Activities: Weighting 0.05 - 0.45 as determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair.

A. Membership in a professional organization 0.05 each _____
(Credit for no more than 5)

B. Committee member, professional organization

State 0.10 each _____
Regional 0.20 each _____
National -- International 0.50 each _____

C. Committee chair, professional organization

State 0.50 each _____
Regional 1.00 each _____
National -- International 1.50 each _____

D. Elected officer, professional organization

State 1.00 each _____
Regional 1.50 each _____
National -- International 2.00 each _____

E. Attendance at professional meetings

State 0.10 each _____
Regional 0.20 each _____
National -- International 0.50 each _____

F. Session Moderator at professional meetings

State 0.30 each _____
Regional 0.40 each _____
National -- International 0.70 each _____

G. Referee for a submitted manuscript to a professional journal or grant application

State 0.10 each _____
Regional 0.20 each _____
National -- International 0.30 each _____

H. Member, grant review panel

State	1.00 each	_____
Regional	1.50 each	_____
National & International	2.00 each	_____

I. Editor or associate editor of a peer-reviewed scientific journal

State	1.00 each	_____
Regional	1.50 each	_____
National & International	2.00 each	_____

J. Other: Additional evidence of continued professional growth and activities, could include items such as professional service (e.g. facilitator), professional honors received and continuing professional education (e.g. training received in workshops and non-university courses). Scoring of this section will be based on the proportion determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair (Maximum 2.0 points) and assessment by the department chair (scored as a percentage). Assessment will include both consideration of agreed upon goals for this section by the faculty member and department chair, as well as the chairs appraisal of the attainment of those goals and the contribution of the documented items to the role and mission of the department.

Total J. Points: 3 pts.

Points (0 - 2.0) _____ X Rating by Department Chair (%) _____ = _____ Score Section III.J

Total Points:

*** Can accrue a maximum of 7.0 pts.**

**Sum of Section III.A - III.J _____ X Weight _____ = _____ Score for Professional Growth and Activities
(Enter this score in “Summary of Annual Evaluation of Faculty” Sheet)**

IV. Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs: Weighting 0.15 - 0.55 as determined by the faculty member and agreed upon by the department chair.

A. Service on committees

1. University-level committees

Chair	_____ X 0.50	_____
Member	_____ X 0.25	_____

2. College-level committees

Chair	_____ X 0.50	_____
Member	_____ X 0.25	_____

3. Department-level committees

Chair	_____ X 0.25	_____
Member	_____ X 0.10	_____

1 Student recruitment and retention

1. Student advisement (0.1 points per undergraduate advisee) _____

2. Student recruitment (0.05 points per recruiting effort) _____
 (Includes trips, letter writing, appearance in television interviews, appearance in newspaper articles, manning booths, phone calls, freshman mentoring programs, etc)

3. Active club sponsor (1.0 point) or co-sponsor (0.5 pt) _____

C. Other service to the university

1. Student organization

Guest speaker _____ X 0.20 _____
Participant _____ X 0.05 _____

2. Scholarship supervisor _____ X 0.50 _____

3. Internal review of manuscripts _____ X 0.25 _____

4. Attendance at university-sponsored events _____ X 0.01 _____

5. Director of university-sponsored units _____ X 1.0 _____

D. Service to community

1. Presentation to lay audiences _____ X 0.25 _____

3. Other services as a university representative _____ X 0.25 _____
(i.e. science fair judge, school presentations, volunteer service to
nonprofit organizations, etc.)

Total Points:

*** Can accrue a maximum of 7.0 pts.**

**Sum of Section IV.A - IV.D _____ X Weight _____ = _____ Score for Non-Teaching Activities Supportive of University Programs
(Enter this score in "Summary of Annual Evaluation of Faculty" Sheet)**