

# Angelo State University

## **GUIDELINES ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION NON-TENURE-ELIGIBLE FACULTY**

### **Description and Purpose**

ASU will annually review non-tenure-eligible faculty according to criteria consistent with the faculty member's primary job assignment. These criteria should be established by the department upon appointment of the faculty member and clearly communicated to all those involved in the review process.

Lecturers typically are responsible for their nine-month teaching obligation, but may have other departmental responsibilities as designated by their contract in either faculty service or research. The contract for a Lecturer should clearly note any additional expectations beyond teaching the Lecturer is to fulfill.

The purposes of the annual evaluation are threefold:

- a. to encourage the faculty's professional growth,
- b. to determine the effectiveness of the faculty member's performance, and
- c. to assist in decisions regarding reappointment.

### **Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Folder**

No later than the third Friday of the Fall semester, each non-tenure-eligible faculty member will submit to the Department Peer Review Committee an evaluation folder [8 1/2" x 11" manila folder with the faculty member's name and academic year on the tab] containing the following items:

- a completed ASU Faculty Evaluation form;
- a self-assessment survey or cover memo by the faculty member;
- an up-to-date vita;
- IDEA evaluation forms; and
- any other materials as required or permitted by the department or college.

### **Annual Performance Evaluation Review Process**

#### ***Department Peer Review Committee***

The faculty member submits the evaluation folder to the department's faculty committee responsible for peer review. The peer review committee evaluates the faculty member's performance (unsatisfactory, satisfactory needing improvement, satisfactory, or meritorious) and submits its evaluation to the Department Head along with the faculty member's folder no later than the sixth Friday of the Fall semester. If the faculty member's performance is judged unsatisfactory or satisfactory needing improvement, the committee must provide written comments to the Department Head.

***Department Head***

Following review of the folder, the Department Head will write a report evaluating the faculty member's effectiveness and contributions to the department, rating the faculty's performance (unsatisfactory, satisfactory needing improvement, satisfactory, or meritorious), and recommending reappointment or non-reappointment. If the Department Head's evaluation contradicts the evaluation of the Peer Review Committee, that Committee's evaluation should also be forwarded to the Dean. If the faculty member's performance is rated unsatisfactory, the Department Head will explain the rating based on the department criteria. This report should be added to the folder, which is sent to the Dean no later than the ninth Friday of the Fall semester. A copy of the Department Head's report should be sent to the faculty member.

***Dean of College***

Following review of the folder and the Department Head's report, the Dean will add a memorandum to the folder indicating agreement or disagreement with the Department Head's evaluation and recommendation. In the case of disagreement, the Dean should thoroughly explain reasons. The Dean sends a recommendation along with the complete folder to the Provost no later than Friday of the eleventh week of the semester. The Dean notifies the Department Head and faculty member of the recommendation.

***Provost***

The Provost reviews the faculty member's evaluation folder as well as the Dean's and Department Head's reports and recommends reappointment or non-reappointment to the President.