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All faculty in the COEHD will be evaluated annually as part of the Annual Development and Evaluation Planning (ADEP) process. The Annual Development and Evaluation Plan (ADEP) provides faculty the opportunity to establish professional goals (teaching, research/scholarship, and service) for the upcoming academic year in a formative consultation process with their academic department chair. This process allows for specific consideration of their yearly workload assignment when establishing yearly performance expectations.

Annual evaluations will be consistent with the requirements of University Rule 12.01.99.C1.03 (Responsibilities of Full-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members) and University Rule 12.01.99.C1 (Evaluation and Promotion of Full-Time Faculty). Evaluations of non-tenured faculty will be conducted within the requirements of University Rule 12.07.99.C0.01.3 (Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Positions: Appointment and Evaluation). If the faculty member undergoes promotion or tenure review in an academic year, a separate annual review is not necessary.

Annual evaluations are completed by the appropriate department chair. The evaluation will be provided to the faculty member in writing as part of an End of the Year ADEP meeting on or before May 15 of each academic year. The evaluation will detail the department chairs’ evaluation of performance in each of the three areas of faculty responsibility. Faculty members will have an opportunity to provide a written (2-page maximum) response to the ADEP evaluation within five (5) working days of the end of year ADEP meeting. A copy of the Department chairs performance evaluation as well as any faculty candidate response will be forwarded to the Dean for review and placement in the faculty member’s University personnel file.

Uses of ADEP Evaluation results
The faculty member’s end-of-the-year ADEP annual evaluation results will be used as one documentation source for: (a) annual merit pay considerations; (b) applications for tenure; (c) applications for promotion; and (d) post-tenure review (e) annual re-appointment for non-tenured faculty. Faculty at any rank receiving unsatisfactory ratings in any area will automatically trigger additional reviews. All ADEPs will remain as confidential documentation within the faculty member’s personnel file. ADEP evaluations are in accordance with scale described in University Rule 33.99.99.C0.02 (Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members).

Criteria in Evaluating Faculty Performance Academic Preparation and Experience:
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).
Faculty evaluations are based upon measures of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Evaluations shall focus on individual performance relative to assigned responsibilities and contributions consistent with that of a faculty member of comparable rank and workload assignments as determined in consultation with his/her Department Chair and approved by the Dean of the COEHD.

Instructors, clinical-track faculty, professional-track faculty, assistant professors, and associate professors will be evaluated with regard to the criteria for their present rank and their progress toward meeting the criteria for the next higher rank. Full professors will be evaluated with regard to continued performance consistent with the criteria for that rank.

Evaluation criteria must meet university requirements for the faculty position held, as described in University Rule 12.01.99.C0.03 (Responsibilities of Full-Time Faculty Members). Criteria and evidence used in evaluations shall be consistent with written measures of the discipline or department (if applicable), as well as University Rule 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

In all evaluations of faculty, when teaching comprises at least half of the faculty member’s assignment, evidence of teaching effectiveness must count at least half of the total possible weight in the evaluation.

Teaching activity criteria for evaluation:
Demonstrates a continuing interest in improving as a teacher and a developing knowledge of university-level pedagogy. Shows evidence of instructional innovation, updating and revising current courses, and new course development. Shows quality in teaching through a teaching portfolio consisting of: (1) teaching assignments by semester, (2) teaching load, (3) student evaluations, and (4) summaries of course revisions and/or innovations implemented in courses. Since academic advisement and career counseling are considered part of the faculty’s total teaching responsibility, the faculty member should be familiar with degree requirements and other matters related to academic advisement, career development and opportunities.

Scholarship and Creative Activity Criteria for Evaluation
Demonstrates competence and productivity in scholarship and creative activity (applied scholarship, instructional development and/or basic scholarship) which are related to the faculty’s discipline and to the mission of the college. Demonstrates a record of participation, competence, and productivity in their field through a combination of the following: (1) publication in peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journals, (2) conference papers or presentations including those in proceedings, (3) published case studies, (4) instructor manuals, (5) instructional videos, software and web pages supporting instruction, (6) books or chapters in books, (7) monographs, (8) funded grants and funded research proposals, and (9) significant contributions to funded grants or research proposals. See University Rule 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

Service Activity Criteria for Evaluation
Serves in leadership positions on College and University committees. Participates in professional and community services such as consulting, editorial, or peer review activities that serve the mission of the College, the University’s purposes, or the faculty member’s professional academic discipline. Program development activities, program area advertising and marketing activities, and College and University-level consulting activities are also recognized as part of the faculty’s record of service.
COEHD ADEP Procedure and Timeline

**Faculty Activity Report.** Annual evaluation of faculty is documented in the Faculty Activity report in digital measures. The faculty activity report is the TAMUCC supported digital measures platform within which faculty members can document and upload exemplars of their performance in Teaching, Scholarship and Service.

Each Year faculty are required to complete a faculty activity report in digital measure in which they document performance in teaching, scholarship and service for one calendar year (April 16 of one year through April 15 of the subsequent year).

The Faculty Activity Report also allows for documentation of faculty annual goals.

In preparation of the annual ADEP process, faculty members will be instructed to identify and document individual developmental goals for the upcoming year as a component of their annual activity report. Faculty will be encouraged to consult with their department chair with the appropriate department chair. Mutually agreed-upon goals will be documented in the ADEP. Goals are to be selected in the light of requirements for promotion, tenure, and professional development. Written documentation and approval of the ADEP will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Developmental goals must be considered by department promotion and tenure review committees; department chairs; and the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and mentioned in their written evaluations.

The following steps will be completed in the ADEP process:

The period of annual evaluation in COEHD is considered April 16 through April 15 of the next academic year

The ADEP process begins each year with a formative goal setting process.

1. **September 30.** At the beginning of the year the faculty member will submit her/his goals on the annual faculty activity report. Goals should be written to reflect what a faculty member expects and hopes to accomplish over the course of the upcoming academic year within each area of responsibility as a COEHD faculty member. These goals should also be based on the feedback on the previous end-of-year ADEP provided by the Department Chair in May. The goals will be available to the faculty member at the beginning of the new academic year and must be completed by the first week of October of the new academic year.

2. **October 15.** Faculty member meets with the Department Chair to review the ADEP. The Department Chair’s role is to provide initial feedback on the faculty member’s goals and offer recommendations if needed for refining goals or including additional goals that reflect departmental assignments and corresponding expectations. Consideration will be made of the faculty member’s previous year’s ADEP to facilitate any goal revision for the new academic year. Both the faculty member and Department Chair will sign off on the ADEP signifying there is mutual agreement of the faculty member’s goals. By signing the ADEP, the Department Chair is committing to providing as much support as possible to help the faculty member attain her/his
goals. The ADEP is kept in the faculty member’s personnel file. This initial meeting with the Department Chair will take place during the month of October of the new academic year.

3. **April 1.** The end-of-the-year ADEP is submitted to the Department Chair by the first week in April of the same academic year. The original goals of the faculty member’s ADEP are submitted at the end of the academic year along with annotation for each goal explaining the extent to which each goal was accomplished.

4. **May 15** The Department Chair meets with faculty member to review end-of-year ADEP. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure the faculty member receives prompt feedback on her/his ADEP. The Department Chair’s feedback is made in writing on the ADEP form and can be used by the faculty member for the development of goals for the next academic year. The faculty member must receive a “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory rating”. Both the faculty member and the Department Chair will sign off on the written feedback provided by the Department Chair. It will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. This meeting will take place no later than the last week of April.

**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 Policy 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

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).

**Overall Summary Rubric for Annual Evaluation**

A composite score of faculty performance will be computed for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Then, based upon the weighting agreed upon by the faculty member and Department Chair for each of the three areas (i.e., Teaching Scholarship, and Service) the chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will multiply the average score by the assigned weight. For example, a candidate who negotiated a 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% Service would have each multiplied by the average faculty rating for that area arriving at a total average faculty rating.

**Example #1**

Candidate negotiated 40% teaching, 40% in scholarship and a 20% service. The average faulty ratings were:

- Teaching 3.2 x .4 = 1.28
- Scholarship 3 x .4 = 1.20
- Service 3.2 x .2 = .64
- Total composite average faculty rating = 3.12

Faculty members are generally expected to meet or exceed expectations (receive at least a 2 rating) in each area of responsibility for teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty receiving a score of less than 2 in any area will be subject to additional review according to COEHD and University policy. The results of all annual reviews must be submitted as part of the promotion and tenure application portfolio.

**Faculty Appeal Process for ADEP**

A faculty member may make a formal appeal of the feedback received on the ADEP. The appeal process is as follows:

1. If upon review the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Department Chair’s feedback, she/he may submit a formal written response addressing areas of disagreement. This formal written response must be submitted to the Department Chair within five (5) days of the meeting with the Department Chair.
2. The Department Chair is required to review the faculty member’s formal written response and meet again with the faculty member to attempt reconciliation. This meeting must take place within two weeks from the time the Department Chair receives the faculty member’s formal written response or within two weeks of the beginning of the next academic year. The proceedings of this meeting must be formally documented and signed off by both the faculty member and the Department Chair. If the faculty member is unwilling to sign, it will be so noted.

3. If disagreements persist after the Department Chair and faculty member meet to discuss the faculty member’s formal written response, the faculty member may submit a written request for a meeting to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development to present an appeal. This meeting must take place within two weeks from the time the Dean receives the faculty member’s written request. The Department Chair must be present at this meeting. Upon request for a meeting with the Dean, the faculty member must submit to the Dean any and all written documentation in support of her/his appeal, including the ADEP under appeal, Department Chair’s written feedback, faculty member’s written response, documentation of faculty member’s reconciliation meeting with the Department Chair, and any other material the faculty member wishes to use in support of the appeal.

After the faculty member has met with the Dean and the Department Chair, the Dean will submit in writing to the faculty member her/his decision with justification concerning the faculty member’s appeal. This written decision must be submitted to the faculty member within two weeks after the meeting with the Dean and Department Chair. This decision will be considered the final step in the College of Education and Human Development appeal process for the faculty member concerning her/his ADEP feedback. All written documentation on the appeal will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.