3.7.2

Faculty: Faculty evaluation

The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status.

Judgment

☑ C	ompliant		Non-Compliant	⊐	Not Applicable
-----	----------	--	---------------	---	----------------

Narrative

Note: Text for all linked documents below can be increased/decreased for ease of reading by pressing your keyboard's Ctrl key while rotating the mouse wheel.

Angelo State University has a formalized and comprehensive system of procedures to facilitate the evaluation of its faculty members. Faculty evaluations encompass professional responsibilities in three broad domains—teaching, scholarly activity, and university or community service. These broad areas of responsibility align with the institution's mission, and assessment of each area is based on published criteria. In short, faculty members are evaluated annually using a department-level process, are evaluated on a semester basis by students using standardized and normed self-report course evaluations, and are evaluated regarding promotion and tenure using a multiple-stage process consonant with published timelines. Each of these processes is detailed below.

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Basic Procedure

All faculty members employed by the institution—including tenured faculty, non-tenured/tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure-eligible faculty (part-time and full-time)—are evaluated annually using a department-level process overseen by department heads. Each fall semester, department heads inform faculty members of the necessity of evaluations and the timelines for completing them. Faculty members are responsible for preparing a report of their activities in three broad areas—teaching, scholarly activity, and service. The report covers the preceding fall, spring, and summer terms and is completed on a standardized Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation Form, which is then submitted to the appropriate Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC). The DPRC formally evaluates the information each faculty member presents and delivers a recommendation to the department head using a Department Peer Review Evaluation Form (Department Peer Evaluation Form for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, Department Peer Evaluation Form for Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty). The department head creates a portfolio for each faculty member that includes a Faculty Evaluation Form (Faculty Evaluation Form Example for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty; Faculty Evaluation Form Example for Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty), the faculty member's report, the recommendation of the DPRC, and student evaluation data (redacted example of an IDEA Course Report used with permission) for the time period under review. This portfolio is submitted to the appropriate dean no later than the end of the tenth week of the fall term. The dean is responsible for evaluating these portfolios and either concurring with or dissenting from the recommendation offered. The portfolio is then passed to the provost of the university no later than the

end of the twelfth week of the fall term. Upon receipt of the portfolio, the provost evaluates the materials offered and provides an ultimate opinion regarding the reappointment of the faculty member. Finally, the portfolio is delivered to the president, who has the responsibility of submitting final recommendations on faculty reappointment to the Board of Regents. This step is completed no later than the end of the fifteenth week of the fall term. The above description of the evaluation process applies equally to all faculty, regardless of tenure status or eligibility.

Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with the laws of the State of Texas (TEC §51.942), *The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System* (Section 04.03, *Regents' Rules*), and the policies of ASU (ASU OP 06.19, Regulations for Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty), all tenured faculty at ASU, excluding full-time academic administrators, must be reviewed at least once every six years following the granting of tenure. The process is initiated by the appropriate college dean, who notifies the faculty member in question that a comprehensive performance evaluation is due. The notification must reach the faculty member by September 1. Further, the evaluation must begin by February 1 of the following year and must be completed by May 1. Because this is a relatively new policy, the OP dictates that the procedures for tenured-faculty evaluation must be in full operation and the initial evaluation of all tenured faculty must be completed no later than September 1, 2014. The procedure for this evaluation follows the same steps outlined above for the general evaluation of faculty.

Uses of Faculty Evaluations

The faculty evaluation process is directed toward the professional development of ASU faculty and, as a result of an evaluation, a faculty member may be required to construct and implement a professional development plan. Essentially, this plan includes specific goals for self-improvement, connected explicitly to measureable outcomes and timelines for completion. As indicated in Section 4 of ASU OP 6.19, a development plan is usually the first step in the remediation of faculty performance that is deemed to be less than adequate. This section also outlines procedures for the termination of tenured faculty if circumstances warrant, and Section 3 of ASU OP 6.19 describes the right to due process afforded tenured faculty members.

COURSE EVALUATIONS

Basic Procedure

ASU uses the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) Student Ratings of Instruction system to assess teaching competence with students as raters (The IDEA Center home page). Courses taught on campus are evaluated in class via paper forms, and online courses are evaluated electronically. The IDEA rating system focuses on student learning and is standardized across the institution. The process is initiated when the Institutional Research and Accountability office distributes an email asking faculty members to complete a Faculty Information Form (FIF) for each course they teach. The FIF includes information about how many students are enrolled in the course, what times the course meets, and, most importantly, the specific objectives the course is intended to meet. Using the list of objectives provided on the FIF form, the faculty member must rate each objective as essential, important, or minor. These ratings are used to emphasize student scores appropriately during data analysis. For example, low scores on a minor objective would be minimized since, by definition, the objective was not supported by the

course plan. Near the end of the term, each faculty member must allow a portion of class time for administration of the evaluation. The evaluation forms (Diagnostic or Short; both have the same core set of items) are distributed by a faculty or student proxy. Instructors are allowed to ask up to 20 questions of their own in addition to the standardized evaluation form, but the instructor of record cannot be present for the evaluation, cannot return the forms to the Institutional Research and Accountability office, and cannot seek to influence the evaluation process in any way.

Faculty members receive feedback on their courses in the following term. Thus, a faculty member will receive summary statistics (redacted example of IDEA course report used with permission) and individual responses from evaluations of courses offered in the fall in the following spring semester. These summary statistics indicate how the course compares to similar courses in the IDEA database in terms of progress on relevant objectives, teaching excellence, and course excellence. All evaluations are confidential and anonymous, so it is highly unlikely that a faculty member will know which student completed a certain form, unless the student somehow identifies himself or herself in the process of writing comments. The university maintains records of all evaluations for all faculty in the Institutional Research and Accountability office and also in individual department offices.

Uses of Course Evaluations

Course evaluations are administered to assess the effectiveness of faculty, especially in terms of student learning, and evaluation results are used in a number of ways. For example, individual faculty members use evaluation results from their own courses to adjust instructional methodologies and course content as appropriate to improve student learning outcomes. Results indicating below average performance are also used by department heads to suggest to faculty members ways in which they might improve their teaching approaches and increase student learning. In addition, course evaluation data are included in the review portfolio each time a faculty member seeks promotion or tenure consideration. (The attached is an example used to show faculty what the final report looks like.) If a faculty member's courses are consistently rated as significantly below average compared to similar courses in the IDEA database, even after departmental and institutional interventions intended to improve evaluation scores, the evaluation data may be used in proceedings to terminate or refuse to extend the contract of that instructor.

TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

The process for assessing the work of a faculty member seeking promotion and/or tenure at ASU is defined in ASU OP 06.23, Tenure and Promotion Standards and Procedures. As specified in this OP, faculty in individual colleges are responsible for developing college-specific tenure and promotion standards and procedures in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in *The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System* (Section 04.02, *Regents' Rules*) and ASU operating policies and procedures. Each College Tenure and Promotion Criteria Development and Review Committee reviews such standards and procedures once every three years or as needed. Revisions are submitted to the Deans' Council for its approval and recommendation to the provost, who in turn recommends revisions to the president for approval. Tenure and promotion guidelines are being updated in all colleges because of college reorganization. For example, the College of Liberal and Fine Arts and the College of Sciences were combined to form the College of Arts and Sciences, and this past year, the College of Arts and Sciences used the separate guidelines. The guidelines used in academic year 2011–2012 are attached for each of the ASU colleges, as follows:

- College of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
- College of Business Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
- College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
- College of Health and Human Services Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

All of the tenure and promotion standards, procedures, and guidelines comply with the basic process defined in ASU OP 06.23, which dictates that, save extraordinary circumstances, a faculty member cannot be tenured without simultaneous promotion to the Associate Professor rank. Therefore, faculty members are considered "tenure-eligible" at the same time they are considered eligible for promotion, that is, after the completion of the fifth full year of service to the institution. If this time criterion is met, then the faculty member must collect, organize, and submit a portfolio of documentation that supports his or her candidacy. In the case of tenure, the faculty member is notified by administration that a tenure application must be completed in the current academic year; in the case of promotion, the faculty member is responsible for tracking the time of service and proving that enough time has indeed passed. The university has a multiple-stage process for tenure and promotion evaluations that begins with review by a department-level committee of tenured faculty. Tenured faculty members applying for promotion to Full Professor cannot evaluate their own portfolios. The committee's recommendation is passed to the department head, who adds an evaluation and then passes the portfolio to the dean of the college. After adding an evaluation to the portfolio, the dean sends the portfolio to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, who vote to decide if tenure or promotion should be granted or denied. It is also the responsibility of the college committee to vet the application and determine if irregularities are present. Next, the portfolio is sent to the provost; the provost sends a recommendation to the president of the institution and notifies the faculty member of the ultimate decision. Finally, the president submits the recommendation to the Board of Regents, who ultimately grant the tenure or promotion (or deny said action) to the faculty member.

A similar, albeit simpler, process applies for the initial appointment and promotion of non-tenure-track faculty. The university has recently adopted a policy that identifies all non-tenure-eligible faculty designations (ASU OP 06.25, Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty Titles). This OP includes, for each job title, the requirements for initial appointment as well as any requirements for promotion to a higher rank in all three core areas—teaching, scholarly activity, and university service. This OP primarily addresses the Clinical job title group, but also includes Instructors, Lecturers, and Adjunct Faculty members.