



Angelo State University
Operating Policy and Procedure

OP 06.28 **Annual Performance Evaluation for Tenured
and Tenure-Track Faculty**

NEW POLICY

ORIGIN

DATE: November 28, 2011

LAST

REVIEW: N/A

PURPOSE: The purpose of this Operating Policy/Procedure (OP) is to establish guidelines and procedures for annual performance evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty.

REVIEW: This OP will be reviewed in November of odd-numbered years by the vice provost for academic affairs and Faculty Senate with recommended revisions forwarded through the provost and vice president for academic affairs (PVPAA) to the president by December 1.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

1. Description and Purpose

The annual faculty performance evaluation is a requirement for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members seeking continuance/reappointment. The purpose of the evaluation is two-fold:

- a. To offer departments guidance in the professional growth of faculty members in order to encourage and support faculty development, and
- b. To meet the requirement for recommendations for employment continuance/reappointment.

This policy is limited to annual performance evaluations. For guidelines and procedures related to post-tenure review, see OP 06.19: Regulations for Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty.

2. Criteria

The responsibilities of the university dictate the responsibilities of the individual faculty member. Faculty members, therefore, are responsible for teaching, scholarly/creative endeavor, and service. Performance in these three areas of responsibility will provide the basis for the evaluation of faculty members.

3. Procedures

The following are standardized procedures to be followed by each undergraduate college:

a. Faculty Member

- (1) No later than the third Friday of the fall semester, each faculty member shall provide, on the Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation (see Attachment A), a bulleted list of achievements for the year immediately past to the Department Peer Review Committee.
- (2) In addition to the annual report, the faculty member shall provide the IDEA Diagnostic Form Report for classes taught during the previous fall and spring semesters; a current vita, not to exceed 15 pages; and other materials requested by the Department Peer Review Committee or department head.

b. Department Peer Review Committee

- (1) Each academic department is responsible for the creation of its Department Peer Review Committee, including the membership and identification of the chair, unless such a committee is already in place. When possible, a composition of three to five tenured faculty is recommended.
- (2) The committee is responsible for providing constructive comments to the faculty member in both a narrative and a summary rating on the Department Peer Evaluation form (see Attachment B). The intention of this review is to offer honest, well-reasoned commentary about the work of the faculty member and to provide guidance, when appropriate, to help the faculty member improve performance.
- (3) No later than the sixth Friday of the fall semester, the Department Peer Review Committee chair, or a designated representative, submits the completed Department Peer Evaluation form and other required materials to the department head.

c. Department Head

- (1) After reviewing all materials submitted by the Department Peer Review Committee, the department head adds an evaluation of the faculty member's performance on the Department Peer Evaluation form and indicates agreement or disagreement with the Department Peer Review Committee's review and rating. On the Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation form, the department head provides ratings (Satisfactory; Satisfactory, Improvement Needed; Unsatisfactory) for teaching, scholarly/creative endeavor, leadership/service, and overall and marks the recommendation for continuance for tenured faculty or reappointment for tenure-track faculty.
- (2) When a rating of "Satisfactory, Improvement Needed" or "Unsatisfactory" is marked, the department head and faculty member are required to prepare a written development plan and schedule. The department head and faculty member will meet

according to the prescribed schedule to review progress on the development activities. The Department Peer Review Committee reviews progress on the development plan during the next annual faculty performance evaluation and provides appropriate commentary on the Department Peer Evaluation form.

- (3) After completing the department evaluation, the department head meets with each faculty member to discuss the Department Peer Evaluation form and ratings provided on the Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation form. The faculty member may add comments, signs the form to indicate that she/he has seen the document, and receives copies of both forms for her/his personal records.
- (4) No later than the ninth Friday of the fall semester, the department head forwards originals of the following materials to the dean: Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation form; Department Peer Evaluation form; IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports; and faculty development plan, if required. Copies of these forms and other materials are retained in the department.

d. Dean of the College

- (1) The dean reviews each faculty member's evaluation materials, signs any development plan, and submits a recommendation for continuance/reappointment to the provost no later than Friday of the eleventh week of the semester.
- (2) The dean notifies the faculty member and the department head of the recommendation following the same timeline.

e. Provost

The provost reviews the submitted materials and makes recommendations, as appropriate, to the president.

4. Reconciliation

At each level of review, an opportunity exists for reconciliation of disagreement. In cases when the Department Peer Review Committee disagrees with the faculty member, reconciliation is left to the department head. When the findings of the Department Peer Review Committee differ from those of the department head, the dean of the college resolves the conflict. When the dean's report is in conflict with that of the department head, the PVPAA is responsible for resolving the disagreement. If the disagreement cannot be resolved through this process, the faculty member may initiate a formal grievance as outlined in OP 06.11.

Attachment A: [Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation](#)

Attachment B: [Department Peer Evaluation](#)