COAS Faculty Evaluation Instruments

PPE and Evaluation Criteria

Attached as a single document is the Professional Portfolio Evaluation (PPE) document that we have been using for years in the College of Arts & Sciences. It was last revised in 2004.

Last year (2009-2010) the faculty committees below worked diligently to create evaluation criteria (rubrics) designed to provide faculty and chairs with much more specific guidance in the meaning of evaluation scores while also reconciling scores on the COAS PPE used to determine merit (100 pt. scale) with the university faculty evaluation instrument (5 pt. scale). A second significant change recommended by faculty committee chairs, department chairs, and the dean related to the weights in the 100 point PPE evaluation scale. The shift in weights for various faculty categories better reflects the current emphasis being given to each category (e.g., higher research expectations for new tenure-track faculty but less service, lower but escalating teaching loads).

In the fall of 2010, this entire document was approved by an overwhelming majority of the faculty of the college and by the dean and the provost. In January of 2011, the Faculty Senate voted to endorse the evaluation system in this document. The evaluation criteria contained within the document will be used to evaluated COAS faculty for work accomplished in 2011.

The faculty committees which drafted this document had representatives from all six COAS departments.

Ad-Hoc Faculty Evaluation Committee

Sub-Committee to Develop Research Rubric
Jerry Thompson, Chair
Qingwen Ni
Robert Haynes
Chris Ferguson
Ken Tobin
Richard Wright

Sub-Committee to Develop Teaching Rubric
Stephen Duffy, Chair
Hoonandara Goonatilake
Kevin Lindberg
Claudia San Miguel
Fernando Quintana
Fritz Gechter

Sub-Committee to Develop Service Rubric
Tom Vaughan, Chair
Frances Rhodes
Gilberto Soto
Gilberto Salinas
Eduardo Chappa-Leiva
Deborah Blackwell

PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO EVALUATION
College of Arts & Sciences

Introduction

The Professional Portfolio Evaluation (PPE) is the primary mechanism for the annual evaluation of faculty members in the College of Arts & Sciences. All faculty must submit a PPE each year. The information contained in the PPE will provide much of the documentation used to evaluate faculty performance for the year. Department chairs will use the evaluation criteria found in rubrics for the evaluation of teaching, research, and service found at the end of this document.

The Professional Portfolio Evaluation system includes the following categories, which carry the following percentage weights in the overall evaluation of faculty in different categories:

Faculty Category	Teaching	Scholarship/Research & Creative Work	Service	Chair Evaluation
Non-Tenure Track	**70**	**-**	**10**	**20**
Tenure-Track	**40**	**45**	**5**	**10**
Tenured (w/o Research Release)	**45**	**35**	**15**	**5**
Tenured (with Research Release)	**35**	**45**	**15**	**5**

By vote of the faculty of the college in 2007 and in accordance with the Post-Tenure Review Process outlined in the *TAMIU Faculty Handbook*, a score of below 70 by a tenured faculty member is deemed evidence of "serious deficiencies" which must be addressed in a professional development plan if a faculty member receives two consecutive evaluations below 70. See the *TAMIU Faculty Handbook* for details.

Description of the Professional Portfolio Evaluation System

Phase I: *Teaching*

The evaluation of faculty teaching efforts is to be based primarily on the evidence supplied by a teaching portfolio and supplemented by other relevant data. The evaluation will follow the criteria set forth in the rubric for evaluating teaching found at the end of this document. The portfolio must contain both student perceptions of faculty performance ("student evaluations") and a narrative describing the faculty member's efforts to achieve or maintain teaching excellence. The narrative must be accompanied by supporting documentation. Among the documents that should be considered for inclusion in the portfolio are:

- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Student comments and testimonials
- Evidence of attendance at teaching workshops and conferences on pedagogy
- Course syllabi and learning objectives
- Students' scores on tests showing evidence of learning, possibly pre- and post-test results.
- Students' work showing evidence of learning which would include, but are not limited to, such items as workbooks, class logs, portfolios, essays, creative works, and projects.
- Supervision of master's theses.
- Teaching Independent Study courses
- Supervision of undergraduate student research
- Documentary evidence of assistance to students outside of class with course-related problems, advisement, securing employment, letters of recommendation, workshops and tutorial sessions.

- Special course materials prepared by the professor for students, such as workbooks, manuals, specialized instructional packets, collections of readings.
- Copies of corrected students work showing suggestions for improvement and encouragement.
- Evidence of innovation and/or general improvements in course development and delivery.
- Videotapes of teaching that reflect overall teaching effectiveness.
- Evidence of special preparations or modifications made to accommodate students with special needs.
- Development of teaching materials for on-campus or on-line course delivery.
- Instruction in Honors and WIN sections.
- Evidence of the use of student and professional feedback to improve teaching.

The preceding list is merely suggestive. Any evidence of teaching excellence should be included in the portfolio.

Phase II: *Research, Scholarly Activities, and Creative Work*

The evaluation of a faculty member's engagement in research, publication, and creative work will be based on the criteria described in the evaluation for research in the rubrics developed for specific disciplines and found at the end of this document. The evaluation will be determined by evidence of the three types of activities listed below:

A. Pre-publication Activities

Credit for properly documented and significant pre-publication activities is important in order to provide incentives for faculty to engage in major, multi-year research projects. These activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Drafts of grants submitted for funding
- Reading in primary and secondary sources
- Exploration of archival collections
- Creation of research materials (e.g., questionnaires)
- Data collection and analysis
- Field and lab research activities
- Drafts of papers in progress (reports, articles, book chapters, and books, etc.)
- Preliminary work for an exhibit or performance

Documentation for all activities described in the narrative should be made available to the Department Chair, who, in turn, will give appropriate research credit for the pre-publication activities.

B. Publications, Exhibits, Performances

These activities include books, articles, scholarly reports, other publications (e.g., creative as well as scholarly), exhibits, and performances. "Performances" should be understood as including such activities as directing, designing, conducting, composing, arranging, recording and choreographing:

The narrative of scholarly activities described above should be followed by a listing, with appropriate explanation and documentation, of publications, exhibits, or performances during the past year, examples of which are listed below:

- Completion of a grant proposal that has been approved for external funding.
- Sole authorship of a book; solo exhibits; solo performances or performance-related activities carried out as a featured or acknowledged individual (to include such activities as those listed within the parenthesis in item "A").
- Sole authorship of an article in a refereed journal.

- Co-authorship of an article in a refereed journal.
- Co-authorship of a book; participation as a featured artist in small group exhibits, small group performances or ensembles (two or three people) or as a principle section leader of an instrumental group in a larger ensemble (e.g., symphony, choir).
- Editing of a book or journal.
- Sole authorship of a chapter in a book.
- Co-authorship of a chapter in a book.
- Sole or co-authorship of a research paper or other document published as part of a conference proceedings; performance participation or exhibition participation as part of a large group (more than five people) where the participant is not featured or acknowledged as an individual.
- Sole authorship of an article in a non- refereed journal.
- Co-authorship of an article in a non- refereed journal.
- Sole authorship of a research monograph published for distribution among professionals affiliated with a research agency.
- Co-authorship of a research monograph published for distribution among professionals affiliated with a research agency.
- Sole authorship of a research paper published for distribution among professionals affiliated with a research agency.
- Co-authorship of a research paper published for distribution among professionals affiliated with a research agency.
- Sole authorship of a teaching syllabus, reference bibliography or teaching exercise which is published in a professional association's resource manual.
- Editor of a newsletter.
- Co-editor of a newsletter.
- Software publication– to be treated as publication in a refereed or non-refereed journal.
- Book review.
- Works published, exhibits shown, performances given.
- Patents.

C. Involvement in Professional Organizations and Meetings.

Activities include, but are not limited to, presentations, panels, workshops, juries for performing arts, sessions chaired at conferences, and other external venues for which professional participation of an individual has been solicited.

- Workshop, paper presentation, or performance at a national conference.
- Workshop, paper presentation, or performance at a state or regional conference.
- Moderator or session chair at a national, state, or regional conference.
- Discussant or respondent for a session at a national conference.
- Discussant or respondent for a session at a state or regional conference.
- External reviewer of journal submission, monograph, book manuscript by another scholar.
- External reviewer for promotion and tenure decisions for a faculty member at another university.
- Attendance at a national conference in the area of expertise.
- Attendance at a state or regional conference in the area of expertise.
- Participation in the planning of a national, state, or regional conference.
- Officer of a professional organization.
- Member of a committee of a professional organization.

Phase III: *University & Community Service*

Service to the University and the community is expected of all COAS faculty members who are tenured or tenure-track, and is desirable for full-time non-tenure-track faculty as well. The College requires a minimum of two service obligations per year per tenured or tenure-track faculty member, with a sliding scale of **minimum** expectations as follows:

- Tenure-track, during years 1-3 at TAMIU: two service obligations per academic year (committees, community projects, student or professional services)
- Tenure-track, during years 4-6 at TAMIU: three service obligations per academic year (committees, community projects, student or professional services)
- Tenured: four service obligations per academic year (committees, community projects, student or professional services), with the expectation of increasing leadership within the University

In this context, "service obligations" will be interpreted to mean a wide variety of possible tasks, as is indicated in the list below. Faculty who wish to be evaluated for merit pay will be required to include a narrative of their service activities as a part of the annual PPE. The narrative should go beyond a list of one's participation in service activities to discuss what role(s) the faculty member played in each instance. Documentation, such as committee minutes, advising rosters, or other proofs of involvement, will help further strengthen the faculty member's case that their service meets and exceeds the minimum requirements.

Service obligations may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Service on Departmental, College, and University Committees (membership on either a standing or specially appointed committee; development of degree programs and new courses; recruitment and/or open house participation; chairmanships of committees);
- Advising (service as departmental advisor; documented proof of student advisory meetings);
- Community Service (supervision of non-mandatory student internships/projects benefitting a community organization; service on a community committee; service on the board of a community committee; service provided without compensation to the community; membership in a community organization; participation in the events of community organizations);
- Student Service (sponsorship of a club or honor society; supervision of a field trip; service on University committees relating to Student Affairs);
- Professional Service (consulting services/workshops in area of expertise [to include artwork, performances, and accompaniment], speaking engagements [with or without compensation]; service to professional organizations).
- Special consideration will be given to service as a faculty mentor to junior faculty and to service on the following committees: Faculty Senate, Grievance Committees, University Honor Council, Institutional Review Board, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, College and University Promotion and Tenure Committees, and College and University Curriculum Committees.

Phase IV: *Evaluation by the Department Chair*

The faculty member will submit a written self-evaluation (PPE) summarizing his/ her professional performance for the year in Phases I through III. The Department Chair will review the PPE and will present his/ her written evaluation to the faculty member and the Dean.

Evaluation Criteria

The descriptive criteria for the evaluation rubrics below were developed by college faculty committees containing representatives from all college departments. For each level of performance, the committees have identified the appropriate score for the university's official faculty evaluation and for the score range on the college's PPE faculty evaluation, which is used for merit pay purposes. Scores 3 and above or 70% or above are deemed satisfactory. Scores 2 and below are deemed unsatisfactory. As with all rubrics, the following rubrics are meant to provide a list of descriptive statements typical of those meriting a certain score. Evaluators, however, must inevitably use their best judgment in interpreting whether or not a faculty member has met all or simply most of the descriptive criteria to merit a particular score. As an example, an evaluator may not consider student evaluations of much use for determining the quality of teaching if the percentage of respondents for a class falls well below the department mean.

I. Teaching

5 (90-100) Faculty maintains and presents evidence of exceptional standards of teaching and learning. Students are presented with clear objectives, held to the highest academic standards and consistently challenged to think critically on the subject matter. Students develop a clear understanding of their responsibility in learning. The students should indicate the opinion that the instructor effectively presents relevant information and the course materials are well prepared and organized. Feedback on student work regular and timely. Evaluation and grading perceived as fair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a score of "5" for teaching are most often 4.7 or higher.

4 (80-89) Faculty maintains and presents evidence of very high standards of teaching and learning. Students are presented with clear objectives, held to the high academic standards and regularly challenged to think critically on the subject matter. The students should indicate the opinion that the instructor effectively presents relevant information and the course materials are well prepared and organized. Feedback on student work regular and timely. Evaluation and grading perceived as fair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a score of "4" for teaching are most often 4.0 or higher.

3 (70-79) Faculty maintains and presents evidence of high standards of teaching and learning. Students are presented with clear objectives, held to the high academic standards and regularly challenged to think critically on the subject matter. Students opinions indicate some dissatisfaction with preparation and/or organization. Feedback on student work regular and timely. Evaluation and grading perceived as fair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a score of "3" for teaching are most often 3.5 or higher.

2 (60-69) Evidence indicates low standards of teaching and learning. Little evidence of students being sufficiently challenged to think critically. Course objectives not clearly stated. Somewhat ill-prepared or disorganized. Instructor displays little motivation or enthusiasm. Students indicate little feedback on submitted work. Evaluation and grading perceived as unfair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a "2" for teaching are most often below a 3.5.

1 (59-60) Evidence indicates low standards of teaching and learning. Little evidence of students being sufficiently challenged to think critically. No course objectives, preparation, organization. Instructor resists change and rejects constructive criticism. Evaluation and grading perceived as unfair. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a "1" for teaching are most often below a 3.5.

0 (<50) Evidence reflects no interest in teaching or learning. Instructor shows no motivation for improvement. No course objectives, preparation, organization. The student evaluations of faculty receiving a "0" for teaching are most often below a 3.5.

II. Research

Because research activities vary considerably in nature from discipline to discipline, the faculty committee charged with developing a rubric for evaluating research, scholarly, and creative activities felt it necessary to create criteria appropriate to four basic areas: behavioral sciences ; engineering, mathematics, and biological and physical sciences; fine and performing arts; and humanities and social sciences.

Note to Tenure-Track Faculty: Tenure is not a "sum of the parts." In the relationship of yearly evaluations and final decisions about tenure and promotion, do not assume that acceptable yearly evaluations add up to tenure. For instance, a faculty member might earn a "3" in research each year because of presenting conference papers, but if at the end of the tenure-track period the faculty member has not published sufficiently, then tenure is almost certainly to be denied.

Note on Co-Authorship: Where a research rubric does not mention co-authorship specifically (e.g., Behavioral Sciences and Humanities and Social Sciences), the assumption is that co-authorship of a publication meets the criteria specified for "publication." Generally, sole authorship carries greater credit than co-authorship. Also the position of the author's name in the series of co-authors generally signifies the weight of the author's contribution to the research or the writing, but the protocols of each discipline vary in how this contribution is signified (e.g., first author as principal researcher or last author as principal researcher or alphabetical equality).

Note on Selectivity/Status of Publication: The faculty member in submitting the PPE should describe to the chair and the dean the nature of his or her contribution to a co-authored publication. The faculty member should also provide to the chair and the dean whatever evidence is available to demonstrate the influence or status or selectivity of the journal or publisher in which the publication appeared.

Behavioral Sciences

5 (90-100):	Faculty must have published 1 or 2 articles in a national/international refereed journal or a book, in his/her field of study. Or several refereed journal articles (generally defined), or have a grant approved. Or the faculty demonstrates his/her impact in the field by providing citation counts (e.g., 2-4 citations) published by the Social Science and/or Science Citation Indexes of his/her work.
4 (80-89):	Faculty must have published an article in a refereed journal (generally defined), and one or more conference papers at major conferences in the field. Or the faculty member wrote one or more competitive grants that were not funded and made demonstrable progress in his or her own research (e.g., manuscripts, conference papers).
3 (70-79):	Faculty must have presented at least one paper at a regional or national conference in his/her own field and have an active research agenda (as evidenced by manuscripts in draft form, research data, etc.).
2 (60-69):	Faculty in this category have an active research agenda but failed to publish, write a grant, or produce evidence of substantial progress toward publication of an article during the year. Such a faculty member, however, has remained current in his or her field and is likely to publish or secure a grant in subsequent years.
1 (50-59):	Faculty in this category do not have an active research agenda but are current in their fields and are capable of being more productive than they have been. They may attend conferences.
0 (<50):	Faculty in this category do not have an active research agenda and are not current in their fields.

Engineering, Mathematics, and Biological and Physical Sciences

5 (90-100): Faculty member has published at least one article in a referred journal over the last two years and has external grant support of a significant magnitude. Faculty without external funding can still demonstrate excellence with publication of at least one article in a referred journal in which the faculty member is the sole author or the first author listed. External acknowledgement of a faculty member's leadership in his/her area of research needs to be demonstrated by acting as a peer reviewer for several manuscripts and/or grant proposals.

4 (80-89): Faculty member has published as a co-author (not listed first) of an article in a referred journal or made demonstrable progress towards completion of a referred publication in the last two years (at a minimum a paper in the submission process) or publication of a significant conference paper or non-referred report in his/her field of study. In addition, the faculty member must have submitted an external grant proposal (funded or not) or completion of a peer review of a manuscript and/or grant proposal.

3 (70-79): Faculty member has presented at least one paper at a regional or national conference or has an active research agenda as evidenced by manuscripts in draft form, research data, or other documentation that demonstrates that he/she is making fair progress toward development of an active research agenda.

2 (60-69): Faculty member has remained current in his/her field but has not published, submitted an external grant, or presented at a conference in the discipline. The faculty member may have attended conferences in his/her field or participated in other developmental activities related to his/her field.

1 (50-59): Faculty member has remained current in his/her field as demonstrated in a passive manner (e.g., by membership in a professional society) but has done little else in terms of research, scholarship, or external grants.

0 (<50): Faculty member does not have an active research agenda and is not current in the field.

Fine and Performing Arts

5 (90-100): Faculty must have published 1 or 2 articles in a national/international refereed journal or a book in his/her field of study. Or the faculty member may have published several refereed journal articles (generally defined), or have written and won an external grant. Adjudicated artistic works and or performances selected through a competitive process. Or the faculty member may have had a solo exhibit or have given a solo performance as a featured or acknowledged artist.

4 (80-89): Faculty must have published an article in a refereed journal (generally defined), and given one or more conference papers at major conferences in the field. The faculty member may have also edited a book or journal or been sole or co-author of a chapter in a book, or the faculty member wrote one or more competitive grants that were not funded and made demonstrable progress in his or her own research (e.g., manuscripts, conference papers). Or the faculty member was a featured artist in a small group exhibit or ensemble performance or was a section leader of an instrumental group in a larger ensemble (e.g., symphony, choir).

3 (70-79): Faculty must have presented at least one paper at a regional or national conference in his/her own field and have an active research agenda (as evidenced by manuscripts in draft form, research data, etc.). The faculty member may have had a paper published in a conference's proceedings, a non-refereed journal, or an encyclopedia. The faculty member may have written a book review, a research report for a professional organization, or edited a newsletter. The faculty member may have given an exhibition or performance as part of a large group (more than five people) where the participant is not featured.

2 (60-69): Faculty in this category have an active research agenda but failed to publish, write a grant, or produce evidence of substantial progress toward publication of an article during the year. Such a faculty member, however, has remained current in his or her field and is likely to publish or secure a grant in subsequent years. Or the faculty member is actively and regularly practicing in his/her creative specialization/instrument/medium.

1 (50-59): Faculty in this category do not have an active research agenda but are current in their fields and are capable of being more productive than they have been. They may attend conferences. Or the faculty member is not as active and regular in practicing in his/her creative specialization/instrument/medium.

0 (<50): Faculty in this category do not have an active research agenda and are not current in their fields. Or the faculty member is inactive in practicing in his/her creative specialization/instrument/medium.

Humanities & Social Sciences

5 (90-100): Faculty must have published 1 or 2 articles in a national/international refereed journal or book chapters. Or a book (monograph). Or editing a book for a recognized academic press. Or several refereed journal articles (as generally defined and whether single or co-authored), or have a grant approved. Or the faculty demonstrates his/her impact in the field by providing citation counts (e.g., 2-4 citations) published by the Social Science and/or Science Citation Indexes of his/her work, by providing published reviews of his/her work, or by other means.

4 (80-89): Faculty must have published an article in a refereed journal (as generally defined), and one or more conference papers at major conferences in the field. Or a chapter in a book, published by a recognized academic press Or the faculty member wrote one or more competitive grants that were not funded and made demonstrable progress in his or her own research (e.g., manuscripts, conference papers).

3 (70-79): Faculty must have presented at least one paper at a regional or national conference in his/her own field and have an active research agenda with a goal of publication (as evidenced by manuscripts in draft form, research data, etc.) or publication of one or more book reviews.

2 (60-69): Faculty in this category have an active research agenda but failed to publish, write a grant, or produce evidence of substantial progress toward publication of an article during the year. Such a faculty member, however, has remained current in his or her field and is likely to publish or secure a grant in subsequent years.

1 (50-59): Faculty in this category do not have an active research agenda but are current in their fields and are capable of being more productive than they have been. They may attend conferences.

0 (<50): Faculty in this category do not have an active research agenda and are not current in their fields.

III. Service

5 (90-100): Extraordinary. Uniformly excellent effort and results in important projects; generosity of spirit in volunteering; effective leadership appropriate to rank and position.

4 (80-89): Excellent. Excellent initiative and effort with consistently beneficial results on important projects, appropriate to rank and position at multiple organizational and professional levels.

3 (70-79): Good. Consistently effective service at multiple organizational and professional levels appropriate to rank and seniority; shows initiative; responsive to needs of students and department. It is expected that COAS faculty would rank at this level or above each year.

2 (60-69): Minimal. A minimal level of useful activity, relative to rank and seniority, in serving the Program, Department, College, University or Profession.

1 (<60): Little or no meaningful or useful activity in Department, College, or University. Or, behavior of a professionally unacceptable kind or of a harmful effect.