



Angelo State University
Operating Policy and Procedure

OP 06.31: Annual Performance Evaluations for Non-Tenure-Track Positions

DATE: August 1, 2017 {*Effective Fall 2017*}

PURPOSE: The purpose of this Operating Policy/Procedure (OP) is to establish and describe a standard process by which the job performance of non-tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated.

REVIEW: This OP will be reviewed every three years, or as needed, by the Deans' Council and the Faculty Senate with recommendations for revision presented to the Provost/Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

1. Definitions, Job Classes, and General Expectations

- a. Non-tenure-track faculty members may be employed on a full-time or part-time basis but are not eligible to acquire academic tenure. Various job titles are defined in OP 06.25.
- b. Non-tenure-track faculty members are employed under individualized appointments. The appointment letters shall generally describe the expected job performance criteria for the position in question regarding teaching, scholarly activity, and/or service. Departments shall discuss additional or more specific performance criteria when appropriate.

2. Process to Establish Department-Level Performance Criteria

- a. Each academic department shall establish, communicate, and periodically review specific and measurable performance criteria for its non-tenure-track faculty members commensurate for each rank of faculty within the department. Each department is responsible for ensuring that all performance criteria are specifically stated, measurable, and aligned with the stated mission of the Department, the College, and the University. These criteria shall be used as the standard for all performance evaluations described below.
 - (1) Each Department or Program shall create and establish performance criteria for each rank of faculty contained in the department by providing opportunity for all non-tenure-track faculty to participate and vote on the criteria.
 - (2) The Department Chair, the College Dean, and the PVPAA, will review the submitted criteria for alignment with the needs of students, needs of the department and the College, and the mission of the University and either approve the criteria or return them to the Department for further revision. Following revision, the Chair will review the criteria with a recommendation to the Dean that the criteria be adopted; the Dean

(New Policy: June 14, 2017)

will review the criteria with a recommendation to the Provost that the criteria be adopted; the Provost will review the revised criteria and either provide final approval or return to the department for additional revision. This process will be repeated until final approval is granted.

- b. All performance criteria must be classifiable into one of three categories as defined below, though not all departments may have need to utilize the research and/or service categories in faculty evaluations. Evaluation criteria will be established by the departments and may not contradict the terms of employment stipulated in the appointment letter.
 - (1) Teaching – This category includes criteria related to student learning outcomes and classroom or laboratory learning.
 - (2) Research and Creative Works – This category includes criteria related to the development of new knowledge, product, and/or theory in the faculty member’s discipline.
 - (3) Professional Service – This category includes criteria related to organizational citizenship, defined as service behaviors which either support the internal functioning of the University or enhance the reputation of the University in the community and region.
- c. Department Chairs are responsible for ensuring that current performance criteria are published and available to all non-tenure-track faculty members in the Department.
- d. Department Chairs and the Peer-Review Committee shall be responsible for reviewing these performance criteria to determine if they still align with the needs of students, needs of the department and the College, and the mission of the University. This review shall occur at least once every three years, but may occur more often if needed. If revisions are recommended, the process outlined in 2.a above shall be used to obtain final approval of the revised criteria.
- e. Revisions of department criteria may not unfairly disadvantage any faculty members by creating a situation where new standards cannot be reasonably satisfied in the time frame allotted.

3. Creation of Peer-Review Committee

The non-tenure-track faculty of each Department shall elect to the Peer-Review Committee at least one representative from the non-tenure-track faculty. The committee may not include the Department Chair or Dean of the College. Any supervisory faculty with knowledge of the candidate’s performance relevant to a fair and equitable evaluation process may be consulted by the committee.

4. Annual Performance Evaluation: Instructor and Clinical Faculty Ranks

Each Instructor or Clinical Faculty member shall be evaluated according to the general process described in this section.

- a. A synopsis of relevant activities pursuant to the performance expectations listed in the

- individual faculty member's appointment letter and prescribed by the department's criteria, concluding with a set of specific personal goals for the next academic year, shall be submitted to the Peer-Review Committee according to the timeline listed below. The individual faculty member will also include the prescribed student evaluation summaries for the evaluation term. The synopsis shall be written on the required form in the boxes provided. *It is the responsibility of the faculty member to clearly describe all activities, goals and measures to facilitate review.*
- b. The Department's Peer-Review Committee shall be the primary evaluator of all Instructors and Clinical faculty. The evaluation shall be conducted by comparing the submitted narrative descriptions of job performance against the department's criteria (see Section 2).
 - c. Each non-tenure-track faculty member shall be assigned a rating in each relevant category according to the following scale by the Peer-Review Committee:
 - "On track to surpass target criteria"
 - "On track to meet target criteria"
 - "Improvement needed to meet target criteria"
 - "Unsatisfactory progress toward meeting target criteria"
 - d. Once the Peer-Review Committee has reviewed each faculty member, the ratings shall be communicated to the Department Chair according to the timeline outlined in Section H below. Any assessment of "Improvement needed to meet target criteria" or "Unsatisfactory progress toward meeting target criteria" must be accompanied by written justification of the rating based upon established department criteria. The Department Chair will add his or her own assessment of the faculty member's job performance and shall make a recommendation concerning reappointment to the College Dean.
 - e. A meeting shall be conducted between the Department Chair and each non-tenure-track faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation. If a "On track to surpass target criteria" or "On track to meet target criteria" rating has been assigned, the Department Chair shall clarify performance expectations for the next contract cycle during this meeting. If an "Improvement needed to meet target criteria" rating has been assigned, the Department Chair shall explain the justifications for the rating provided by the Peer-Review Committee and any corrective actions that may be required. If an "Unsatisfactory progress toward meeting target criteria" rating has been assigned, the Department Chair shall explain the ramifications of such a rating up to and including non-reappointment. The signature of the faculty member shall be attached to the evaluation form to signify completion of this step.
 - f. The Department Chair shall submit all annual performance evaluations to the College Dean for review according to the timeline outlined below.
 - g. The College Dean shall review the performance evaluation of the faculty members and make a recommendation to the Provost either concurring with or dissenting from the recommendation of the Department Chair regarding reappointments. All non-tenure-track faculty members receiving acceptable performance ratings in a given year shall have a general expectation of continued employment contingent upon departmental need.

- h. All annual evaluations of Instructors and Clinical faculty shall follow the timeline below:
- (1) A Year One evaluation, defined as the first full year of service to ASU in residence, shall be initiated no later than the first Friday of the Spring semester of the first year of service. It shall be completed in its entirety no later than the sixth Friday of the Spring semester of the first year of service.
 - (2) All other annual evaluations, including Year Two and Third-Year evaluations shall follow the same timeline below:
 - (a) Faculty members shall submit materials to the peer review committee chair by the third Friday of the Fall semester.
 - (b) The peer review committee chair shall submit the committee ratings and materials to the Department Chair by the sixth Friday of the Fall semester.
 - (c) Department Chairs shall submit materials and personal recommendations to the College Dean by the ninth Friday of the Fall semester.
 - (d) College Deans shall submit all materials along with their independent recommendations for reappointment by the eleventh Friday of the Fall semester to the PVPAA.
 - (e) The PVPAA shall submit all materials along with an independent recommendation for reappointment to the President by the end of the Fall semester.
 - (f) The President shall make the final decision and will notify faculty according to the timeline outlined in OP 06.29, section 4.

5. Annual Performance Evaluation: Adjunct Faculty

Each adjunct faculty member shall be evaluated according to the general process described in this section.

- a. The Department Chair shall be the primary evaluator of adjunct faculty. The evaluation shall be conducted by comparing the performance of the adjunct in the courses assigned to the expectations outlined in the department's criteria.
- b. Each adjunct faculty member shall be assigned a rating of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" by the Department Chair.
- c. The Department Chair retains the authority to rehire adjunct faculty members on a term-by-term basis. The Department Chair shall have the option to meet with adjunct faculty to clarify ratings in order to make decisions about rehiring.
- d. The Department Chair shall complete the forms required by the relevant College and submit those forms to the College Dean for approval. As per ASU OP 06.25 ("Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty Titles"), all adjunct faculty members receiving satisfactory performance ratings in a given year shall have a general expectation of continued

(New Policy: June 14, 2017)

employment, contingent upon departmental need.

Annual evaluations of adjunct faculty shall be conducted in a reasonable timeline based on the constraints of course scheduling, frequency, and departmental requirements.

Attachment A: [Faculty Evaluation Form](#) (*Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty*)

Attachment B: [Department Peer Evaluation](#) (*Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty*)