

Faculty Annual Performance Review Guidelines
Department Entomology
(Accepted by a faculty vote, 20 January 2017)

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Entomology faculty in consultation with the Department Head reviewed the current Faculty Annual Performance Review Guidelines. The process used to craft these guidelines involved working with the elected members of the Entomology Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) on a weekly basis from October through December 2016, holding two meetings with the entire faculty, circulating the draft documents during meetings, and culminating in a vote of the faculty approving the updated Faculty Annual Performance Review Guidelines in corresponding alignment following the adoption by the existing departmental Post-Tenure Review process for our department. The review of current procedures was needed with the Provost's office adoption of a revised Post-Tenure Review document (12.06.99.M0.01) in October 2016. The Post-Tenure Review process relies upon the annual performance review conducted by the Department Head. Changes to the Post-Tenure Review document stipulates that a mandatory Post-Tenure Review is conducted when:

- A faculty member receives three consecutive Faculty Annual Performance Reviews with an overall “Unsatisfactory” rating. During the Faculty Annual Performance Review an overall “Unsatisfactory” rating is required if:
 - An “**Unsatisfactory**” is received in any one of the three major areas (Teaching, Research, or Service) or,
 - A “**Needs Improvement**” is received in two of the three areas.

TAMU faculty in tenured or tenure-track positions must maintain job duties in Teaching, Research, and Service. No position description can have a 0% job expectation in any of these three categories. However, responsibilities may be adjusted by the Department Head under some circumstances, for example if a faculty member were assigned to temporary administrative duties, is on approved leave status for part of the year, or is a new faculty member whose teaching responsibilities do not begin immediately.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they are delinquent on any outstanding required training responsibilities (System Regulation 33.05.02).

FACULTY ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The Faculty Annual Performance Review.

A Faculty Annual Performance Review will be conducted for all faculty members at the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Distinguished Lecturer, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor. The Faculty Annual Performance Review will take into account the faculty member's assigned job expectations outlined in their position description.

In the Department of Entomology, most faculty members will have a job expectation consisting of 60% Research, 30% Teaching, and 10% Service. An analysis of the current fixed credit teaching in the department demonstrated that each faculty member's **teaching effort** in fixed credit courses is between 6 and 9 credits of teaching effort per year. (Please note that teaching effort is not equivalent to, and is often higher than, student credit hours.) This analysis used the criteria for adjusting teaching effort of fixed credit courses as outlined in the Faculty Senate Workload Document (<https://dars.tamu.edu/files/workload-policy>) and available on the Department's Intranet at (<http://entomology.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2016/12/DARS-Workload-Policy.pdf>). The Department Head will review the current teaching effort of fixed credit courses for the year under review and their contribution to graduate education through advising graduate students. Each faculty member's current teaching assignment of fixed credit courses and the planned classroom teaching in the next academic year and the number of graduate students they are advising are used to make adjustments to the faculty member's position description. Those faculty who routinely have a teaching effort in excess of 10 credits will be advised to move to a 45/45/10 appointment (R/T/S). The few faculty who have a reduced teaching effort (<6 credits of effort per year) in fixed credit teaching may have their appointment adjusted to 75/15/10 (R/T/S) to account for increased research and scholarly output to be reflected in their job expectations.

GUIDELINES FOR THE FACULTY ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

According to University Rule 12.01.99.M2, each faculty member's performance must be reviewed annually, given a written report of his or her evaluation, and must be given the opportunity to discuss the outcome of the evaluation in person with the Department Head. The department uses Appendix I in the **University's Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion** (12.01.99.M2) for "*Indicators of Merit*" and "*Indicators of Outstanding Merit*" to assess a faculty member's performance. This document is embedded in its entirety below.

In each of the major categories of Teaching, Research, and Service, the Department Head will assign a rating based on the criteria listed in Appendix I of document 12.01.99.M2. The items listed in Appendix I are listed with increasing importance. For example, publishing in refereed journal and publishing in leading refereed journals are of greater value than publishing in non-refereed journals or giving a presentation at an international or national meeting. Journal articles are part of the permanent record documenting research results while presentations at meetings or publication in non-refereed documents generally are not as impactful on the science. All of this will be taken into account when the Department Head makes a judgement and assigns a rating for each major category. An overall rating will be assigned with consideration of the stipulations outlined in the revised Post-Tenure Review document (12.06.99.M0.01). For the purposes of satisfying the revised Post-Tenure Review document, the following ratings will be considered:

Satisfactory - many of the *Indicators of Merit* or *Indicators of Outstanding Merit* are evidenced in the Faculty Annual Performance Review documents.

Needs Improvement - some of the *Indicators of Merit* or *Indicators of Outstanding Merit* are evidenced in the Faculty Annual Performance Review documents

Unsatisfactory - very few or none of the *Indicators of Merit* or *Indicators of Outstanding Merit* are evidenced in the Faculty Annual Performance Review documents.

Appendix I is copied in its entirety and without modification. Some *Indicators of Merit* or *Indicators of Outstanding Merit* are not applicable for the sciences, e.g., “Continued public activity in plastic, performing or diverse arts” or “Juried works in creative activities”. Those irrelevant items are simply ignored as not applicable to faculty in Entomology.

Examples of Criteria that may be Employed in the Evaluation of Faculty

Faculty members are to be evaluated on the quality and scope of their work in fulfillment of the multiple missions of Texas A&M University, and in the context of the particular roles and responsibilities of the individual faculty member. This is in accordance with university document “12.01.99.M2: Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion APPENDIX I.”

TEACHING

Includes classroom instruction, academic advising (may also be included as a Service activity where appropriate), supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, clinical supervision and mentoring.

Indicators of Merit

- Effective teaching performance as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a Service activity where appropriate)

- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students

Indicators of Outstanding Merit

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- Chair of doctoral research committees
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions
- Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program)
- Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a Service activity where appropriate)

Possible Measures/Sources of Information

- *Self-evaluation*
 - Reflective response to student ratings and comments and to peer review
 - Analysis of strengths/weaknesses of course materials and delivery
 - Analysis of student achievement of course objectives
 - Statement of goals for improvement
 - Participation in teaching workshops or other improvement activities
- *Peer-evaluation*
 - Peer critique of course materials
 - Peer critique of classroom teaching
- *Student satisfaction*
 - End-of-semester student ratings of instruction
 - Mid-semester questionnaires
 - Exit interviews
- *Student outcomes*

- Evidence of student growth over the semester
- Student performance in current and/or subsequent courses
- Placement of graduate students in academic or professional positions
- Publication of graduate student thesis
- Employer reports of student performance

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

(equivalent to the Research category in a faculty member's position description in Entomology)

Scholarly activities are defined as the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities (includes research, creative activities, and all other forms of scholarship -- creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and is communicated).

Indicators of Merit

- Publication of scholarly book(s)
- Publications in refereed journals
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
- Editing a scholarly book
- Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines
- Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals
- Continued public activity in plastic, performing or diverse arts
- Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness
- Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
- Publications with teaching focus in refereed journals

Indicators of Outstanding Merit

- Publications in leading refereed journals
- Receiving major fellowship or research award
- Frequent citation of publications
- Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s)
- Awards for, or publication of, peer reviewed creative activities
- Juried works in creative activities
- Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
- Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research
- Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research
- Publication(s) with teaching focus in leading refereed journals
- Evidence of creative professional practice

SERVICE

Includes extension, outreach, clinical service, service to the department or unit, service to the university, advising (may also be included as a Teaching activity where appropriate) and professional service. NOTE: Evidence of outstanding merit or merit may be found in the selection process itself or in documentation of performance.

Indicators of Merit

- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations. This activity *per se* is considered service; however, being asked to serve as reviewer can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.
- Being a committee chair in national or international professional organization
- Being an officer in regional or state professional organization
- Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting
- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Serving on University, college, and department committees and task forces
- Serving as consultant
- Being an advisor to student organizations
- Serving in administrative roles within the department
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

Indicators of Outstanding Merit

- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal. This activity *per se* is considered service; however, being selected as editor or member of an editorial board can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.
- Being an officer in a national or international professional organization
- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
- Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University
- Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting
- Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate
- Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service

End of Appendix 1

Departmental procedures related to the Faculty Annual Performance Review

- The Department Head requires that each faculty member submit a Performance Data Report, an updated CV, their Annual Plan of Work and a 1-page self-assessment document. The self-assessment document will be a standard form that will contain three components: Teaching, Research, and Service. All documents are needed to complete the Faculty Annual Performance Review. Failure to provide these documents in a timely fashion will result in an overall “Unsatisfactory” rating.
- A meeting will be scheduled between the Department Head and the faculty member to discuss their performance during the previous reporting period with particular attention to his or her overall rating in Teaching, Research, and Service. Any missing data or errors in reporting can be brought up for inclusion into the assessment. Areas of superior performance along with areas where improvement is needed will be indicated and specific goals will be agreed to if overall performance was rated below Satisfactory. These goals, if met, are designed to elevate the overall performance rating to Satisfactory or above in the next evaluation period.
- The Department Head assigns a rating (Superior, Exceeds Expectations, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory) for each broad category (Teaching, Research, and Service) along with an overall rating, which is shared with the faculty member. The Department Head provides a written summary of the review to the faculty member.
 - For cases where the faculty member is not in agreement with the overall rating assigned by the Department Head, the faculty member has an opportunity to add written comments and append those comments to the Faculty Annual Performance Review.
 - The Department Head can modify the summary document using the written input from the faculty member’s response and returns the revised version to the faculty member for their signature.
 - In cases where the overall performance rating assigned by the Department Head is “Unsatisfactory”, and the faculty member’s written input does not result in a change in rating by the Department Head, the faculty member may request a review of the Faculty Annual Performance Review by the TAMU subcommittee of the elected Promotion and Tenure Committee. The subcommittee provides a written report to the Department Head. The Department Head will use this additional evaluation to consider changing the “Unsatisfactory” rating. This internal process does not preclude any rights the faculty member has to appeal to the Dean or the Dean of Faculties.
- Once the Faculty Annual Performance Review document is completed, the Department Head and the faculty member sign the evaluation to indicate the review session and feedback occurred. No merit increase can be given without a signed copy of the Faculty Annual Performance Review and position description on file.
- A copy of the Faculty Annual Performance Review is provided to the faculty member and the department retains an electronic copy in the faculty member’s personnel file, including any written comments by the faculty member regarding their Annual Performance Review.
- Job expectations are adjusted annually at the annual performance review and written into a

new position description to account for faculty members who plan to take on an administrative duty, who will be on approved leave during the reporting period, when a new faculty member is hired and will not be teaching classes immediately, or in other circumstances where, on a temporary basis, their job expectations may be 0% in one or more categories.