Department Chair Guidelines and Rubrics for Evaluating Faculty Performance on Yearly Evaluation (ADEP)
TAMU-CC College of Education and Human Development

The faculty evaluation rubrics described in this document are aligned with University Policy 33.99.99.C0.02 (Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members). University regulations for evaluation of faculty are the primary basis for COEHD and Departmental decisions regarding promotion and tenure, merit/equity, and faculty reappointment, when appropriate.

TAMUCC descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service are detailed in University Policy 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

**COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Teaching**

In the ADEP evaluation process, the Department Chair should consider the extent to which the faculty member demonstrates a broad knowledge of the discipline and an in-depth knowledge in one or more parts of the field. The member should demonstrate a continuing interest in improving as a teacher and in developing knowledge of university-level pedagogy. Evidence of quality in teaching may be demonstrated by instructional innovation, new course development, or other similar activities compiled in a teaching portfolio.

The college recognizes that not all teaching loads require equal effort because of differences in class size, number of preparations, and course level (graduate or undergraduate). As an important element of the ADEP process, department chairs are required to meet with faculty to discuss teaching and administrative responsibilities for the academic year. These discussions are documented in the beginning of the review period ADEP process on the Faculty activity report within digital measures.

As part of this planning process, faculty in coordination with their academic department chair should detail and articulate how teaching efforts and expected performance will be addressed in the context of their teaching workload assignments. In ADEP evaluations, academic department chairs should consider student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluation, and the number and magnitude of student advising activities. Weight should be given to teaching load, average number of students taught, average number of classroom preparations, and undergraduate versus graduate courses. The COEHD considers participation and involvement in the mentoring of graduate (Masters and Doctoral level) as a thesis or dissertation advisor/ or methodologist as a teaching activity for which a faculty may receive teaching workload reassignment.

**Excellent (4): Faculty member Demonstrates Exceptional Performance Exceeding expectations**

Multiple sources suggest effective, rigorous, and innovative teaching. Syllabi should be up to date as to provide students with best access to contemporary content. Student feedback is positive and conveys a sense of a productive and stimulating learning environment; there is evidence of a challenging classroom. Teacher ratings should be above college and/or departmental average. Other evidence of excellence may include graduate advisees, new course preps, variety of courses taught, designing a new course, revising program curriculum, teaching awards, or other outstanding contributions; other indicators (peer reviews, self-assessments, and course materials) suggest a teacher that revises based on
feedback and works to improve and expand on teaching. In addition, serving as a Dissertation and/or Master’s Thesis advisor and/or Methodologist will be considered indicative of excellent engagement in university teaching.

**High (3): Faculty member Exceeds performance Expectations but does not rise to level of excellent**

Information suggests conscientious and effective teaching on the whole, although not at the level of “excellent.” Syllabi, course materials, and peer reviews suggest effective teaching, and student evaluations are positive overall and at or above (departmental/college) average. Evidence provided suggests that students are learning and challenged by the course. Student ratings and written feedback should reflect faculty efforts to provide a quality educational experience that may not reflect the excellent level. Accordingly, some problems, reflected in student evaluations, or less evidence of self-reflection and revision in teaching may be allowable at this rating level. In addition, serving as a Dissertation and/or Master’s Thesis advisor and/or Methodologist will be considered indicative of excellent engagement in university teaching

**Meets Expectations (2): Faculty member meets performance expectations**

Information suggests that the teacher is responsibly meeting the duties associated with teaching (syllabi, class preparation, responsible grading, etc.) and is, on the whole, an effective teacher. Evidence provided suggests that students are learning in the course. Student evaluation and/or peer evaluations may reflect some causes for concern in terms of effectiveness of classroom activities, helpfulness of grading, or other issues. Self-reflection suggests some awareness of these issues as they come up and willingness to address them.

**Unsatisfactory (1): Faculty member is below performance expectations**

Information suggests problems with responsible and effective teaching (e.g. insufficient class preparation, lack of helpful comments and/or lateness with grading; class activities are not conductive to learning; class time is not used effectively).

Information suggests significant problems with responsible and effective teaching. Class preparation may be inadequate; class time may be used poorly; written feedback and comments on graded assignments may be insufficient or unhelpful; students may not be receiving feedback in a timely manner; basic responsibilities such as a timely beginning to class, adequate communication with students outside of class, and holding of office hours may not be met. Problems in previous annual evaluation cycles may not have been adequately addressed.

---

**COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Scholarship and Creative Activity**

**Excellent (4): Faculty member demonstrates Exceptional Performance Exceeding expectations**

Consistent with the TAMU-CC and COEHD P&T policies, faculty are expected to demonstrate engagement in scholarly activity annually that reflects competence and productivity in scholarly
activities (applied scholarship, instructional development, and/or basic scholarship) that are related to the candidate's discipline and to the mission of the college.

Specific exemplars of Intellectual contributions are detailed in University P&T policy categorical description of Scholarly and Creative Activity
http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/rules_procedures/assets/12.01.99.c0.04_descriptions_of_teaching_etc.pdf

"Intellectual contributions can be accumulated through books or chapters in books; publication in peer-reviewed journals (scholarly and/or professional); conference presentations (international, national, state, and/or local); published abstracts and conference proceedings; grants (funded or unfunded); and published instructor manuals and software.

In the ADEP evaluation process, the department chair should consider the merits of the intellectual contributions as a whole, with consideration given to the number and quality of documented contributions as well as the general impact of the contribution to the profession within and beyond the university. In general, intellectual contributions that have been subjected to some level of peer review should be given more weight.

The candidate should have:

- A minimum of four (4) intellectual contributions and must include a minimum of 1 peer-reviewed article in professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journals

AND

- A minimum of at least one (1) intellectual contribution submission to a peer reviewed professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journal or a submitted grant proposal

Articles with documented designation as ‘accepted or In-press’ will be considered evidence for peer-reviewed contribution minimum for only one ADEP cycle. If counted as such in one year, the completed article will not be considered for the subsequent ADEP cycle.

High (3): Faculty member exceeds performance Expectations but does not rise to level of excellent

The candidate should have a minimum of three (3) intellectual contributions and must include a minimum of 1 peer-reviewed article in a professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journal

OR

Two (2) published (accepted or in-press) intellectual contributions such as textbook chapter, abstracts, book reviews. One of these contributions could be a professional presentation at a peer reviewed conference (State, regional, national or international)

AND
• A minimum of at least one (1) intellectual contribution submission to a peer-reviewed professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journal or a submitted grant proposal.

Articles with documented designation as ‘accepted or In-press’ will be considered evidence for peer reviewed contribution minimum for only one ADEP cycle. If counted as such in one year, the completed article will not be considered for the subsequent ADEP cycle.

**Meets Expectations (2): Faculty member meets performance expectations**

• A minimum of two intellectual contributions which may include:
  
  • Publication (in press; accepted) in acceptable outlet (peer reviewed or non-peer reviewed). Authored Published conference abstracts (beyond the presentation)
  
  • Presentation at a peer reviewed professional conference (state, regional, national or international)

AND

• A minimum of at least one (1) intellectual contribution submission to a peer-reviewed professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journal or a submitted grant proposal

Articles with documented designation as ‘accepted or In-press’ will be considered evidence for peer reviewed contribution minimum for only one ADEP cycle. If counted as such in one year, the completed article will not be considered for the subsequent ADEP cycle.

**Unsatisfactory (1): Faculty member is below performance expectations**

Minimal or no evidence of engagement in research activity by participation in professional meetings, conferences or Submissions to Peer Reviewed professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journals or submission of grant proposals

**COEHD Rubric for Faculty Performance in Service**

'Service' may include committees, events, and special projects at the University, College, Department, Community, and/or Professional levels. Service at the Community and Professional levels will be considered as long as it supports the University, College, Department, or the candidate's academic discipline. (suggested revision from faculty feedback on Qualtrics)

Service is an essential part of faculty membered responsibility and as such is important for annual evaluation. Faculty should endeavor to engage in a diversity of service contributions at multiple levels (departmental, institutional, national and professional) during their career as a faculty member at TAMUCC. Department Chairs in coordination with Associate Dean should ensure that faculty members within their departments have opportunities to fulfill service commitments appropriate for the level of
development as a faculty member. Specific and deliberate dialog at the beginning of each ADEP review period should focus on each faculty member’s service commitment for the year.

In ADEP evaluations, the academic Department chair must evaluate the extent to which the faculty member has documented how he or she has taken an active role in service to the College of Education and Human Development and/or to the University on committees, task forces, councils, and/or special projects. Administrative work in the department as a program coordinator is an important indicator of departmental service in which a faculty member may be granted a course reassignment in overall workload. Participation and leadership in professional and community service will also be considered as long as the service supports the mission of the college, the university's purposes, or the candidate's academic discipline. The evaluation of service effort also varies depending on level of effort, type of committees, and visibility of effort. Department chairs should consider the time commitment involved in specified service commitments.

**Excellent (4): Faculty member Demonstrates Exceptional Performance Exceeding expectations**

Faculty member contributes substantial and significant service time at all levels. Profession (national, regional, State)- Leadership role; Editorial Board (beyond AdHoc reviewer)  
University-serves on or chairs university Committee  
College- Serves on a standing college committee  
Department- works with departmental colleagues on curriculum development  
Community- volunteers in community

A faculty members' service commitment may include a substantial (documented) administrative responsibility for coordination of department or college program/initiative (program coordinator/Task force leader).

Examples might include administrative positions, labor-intensive service involving the reading of many files, chairing a substantial department committee, etc.; plus significant College, University, and professional service or outreach

**High (3): Faculty member Exceeds performance Expectations but does not rise to level of excellent**

Faculty contributes substantial and significant service time at multiple levels.  
Profession (national, regional, State)- Leadership role; Editorial Board (beyond AdHoc reviewer)  
University-serves on or chairs university Committee  
College- Serves on a standing college committee  
Department- works with departmental colleagues on curriculum development  
Community- volunteers in community

While not formally in a major administrative position, the faculty member contributes significant service to the department, college and University.

**Meets Expectations (2): Faculty member meets performance expectations**
Serves on at least 2 department committees/taskforce or initiatives. Contributes significant service at one or more level beyond the department (college, University national/professional).

**Unsatisfactory (1): Faculty member is below performance expectations**

Limited departmental committee or other very light service at other appropriate levels (college, university, national/Professional).