

## **Annual Faculty Evaluation of Full-Time Faculty**

### **Texas A&M International University**

#### **College of Education**

#### **Introduction**

The Professional Portfolio Evaluation (PPE) is the primary mechanism for the annual evaluation of faculty members in the College of Education. All full-time 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.

#### **COED Rubric for Faculty Performance in Teaching**

Teaching is central to the mission of the College of Education, and all faculty members are required to demonstrate effectiveness in their teaching. Faculty are expected to: (a) contribute to instruction and support student growth; (b) demonstrate knowledge in the field of expertise, (c) actively seek to enhance their teaching effectiveness through professional learning opportunities; and (d) exhibit quality classroom instruction, student learning, and informed assessment.

<b>Criteria for Teaching Excellence and Instructional Innovation</b>	<b>Check if pertinent</b>
Demonstrated effectiveness through documented qualitative feedback from student evaluations	
Demonstrated effectiveness and change in course, curriculum, teaching practice, from documented self-evaluation	
Evidence of the utilization of feedback from at least one <sup>1</sup> peer evaluation by colleagues on teaching effectiveness.	
Awards or recognition for teaching excellence by peers, university, or professional organizations.	
Collaborating and/or supervising undergraduate and/or graduate student projects (e.g., experiential learning experiences, University Honors Program, academic conferences, manuscripts).	

Supporting student success through various academic initiatives or personal assistance (e.g., LORs, employment letters, program/career advisement, monitoring systems, or available student services).	
New course development using innovative or evidence-based practices including but not limited to ACUE, Quality Matters (QM), or other system or university-led initiatives.	
Redesign an existing course (curriculum or syllabi) using innovative or evidence-based practices from new research findings and/or assessment feedback.	
Participate in professional learning opportunities (e.g., PROF Center, ACUE, NCFDD, TAMIU OIT trainings, professional organizations).	
Serves as a teacher and/or advisor to colleagues (e.g., informal or through PROF Center mentoring program).	
Incorporating emerging technologies (e.g., AR/VR/MR, Gen AI, simulations).	
Address diverse student populations through diverse and accessible teaching practices (e.g., differentiation, culturally relevant teaching, SEL).	
Present at a conference at any geographical tier on teaching expertise or general teaching trends.	
Adoption, adaptation, or creation of open educational resources (OER).	
Creation of special course materials or publication of adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., written guides, course packets, books, audio/visual materials).	
Examples of student artifacts (exemplary, corrected, or revised) with feedback.	
Integrating experiential learning activities (e.g., service learning, community partnerships, authentic assessments, PBL, Flipped classroom, field-based experiences).	
Leading workshops or training sessions teaching expertise or general teaching trends.	
Collaborate in interdisciplinary course or program design.	

Receive competitive internal or external grant for teaching and learning projects.	
Instruction in special or non-traditional courses (e.g., WIN, Honors, large enrollment, service learning, study abroad).	
Facilitating the success of culminating exams in undergraduate and graduate programs (e.g., student certification exam, comprehensive oral and/or written exams, and capstone projects).	
Other activity in consultation with Department Chair and Dean.	

### Quantitative Evaluation of Faculty Performance in Teaching

The following rubric will be used to assess the quality of teaching based on the criteria for Teaching Excellence and Instructional Innovations: contribution to instruction and student development support, improvement of teaching effectiveness, and promotion of the college's instructional programs.

Criteria	Performance
<b>Significantly Exceeds Expectations (5)</b>	<p>Faculty members demonstrate exceptional performance, consistently exceeding expectations in teaching, engagement, and contributions to the academic community.</p> <p>The faculty member provides documentation that demonstrates effective, rigorous, and innovative teaching. To qualify for a significantly exceeds rating, the faculty member must achieve a mean of median scores of 4.0 or higher across all courses taught AND document 5 or more of the criteria outlined.</p>
<b>Exceeds Expectations (4)</b>	<p>Faculty members meet and often exceed expectations, displaying strong teaching effectiveness, active student engagement, and meaningful contributions to curriculum development and professional development.</p> <p>The faculty member fulfills the essential duties of teaching and performs effective teaching. To meet an exceeding expectations rating, the faculty member must achieve a mean of median scores of 4.0 or higher across all courses taught AND document 4 of the criteria outlined.</p>
<b>Meets Expectations (3)</b>	<p>Faculty members meet basic teaching and provide satisfactory support for student learning, demonstrating competence but lacking significant innovation or impact.</p>

	The faculty member meets the basic requirements of teaching but demonstrates inconsistent effectiveness in his or her role. To meet a meets expectation, rating the faculty member must achieve a mean of median scores of 3.0 or higher across all courses taught AND document 3 of the criteria outlined.
<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<p>Faculty members are willing to improve but do not consistently meet expectations, struggling with certain aspects of teaching and requiring additional support and development.</p> <p>The faculty member demonstrates a willingness to improve teaching practices but has not yet consistently met effective teaching standards. To meet a deficient rating, the faculty member must achieve a mean of median scores of below 3.0 across all courses taught AND documented progress in 2 of the criteria outlined.</p>
<b>Seriously Deficient (1)</b>	<p>Faculty members' performance is below expectations, characterized by ineffective teaching and insufficient engagement with students, along with a lack of effort to improve or enhance the academic environment.</p> <p>The faculty members encounter challenges in their teaching practices and require significant support to meet effective teaching standards. To meet a seriously deficient rating, the faculty member scores a mean of the median scores of below 3.0 across all courses taught AND documented progress in 1 of the criteria outlined.</p>
<b>Egregiously Deficient (0)</b>	Evidence reflects no interest in teaching or learning. Instructor shows no motivation for improvement. No course objectives, preparation, or organization. The faculty member scores a mean of the median scores of below 3.0 across all courses and no documented progress in of the criteria outlined.

### **Evaluation for Faculty Performance in Scholarship**

The primary goal of evaluating scholarship and creative activities is to encourage faculty to actively engage in scholarly activities that align with the mission of the College of Education and TAMIU. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate productivity and competence in their scholarly and creative endeavors, in accordance with the University Policy on an annual basis. The effectiveness and quality of research play a significant role in decisions on promotion, tenure, and merit-based compensation for faculty members. The criteria established in the two areas of productivity and competence will be used to evaluate scholarship performance.

<b>Criteria for Quantitative Measures of Scholarship Activities (QMSA)</b>	
<b>Category A. Research &amp; Scholarship Productivity</b>	<b>Values</b>
Article published in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal (state, regional, national, or international) as sole, first, or second author	20
Article published in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal (state, regional, national, or international) as third author or below	10
First or second author of a book published by a peer reviewed academic press (including contracted works)	30
Third author or below of a book published by a peer reviewed academic press	15
Editor or co-editor of an edited academic book	15
Third editor or beyond of an edited book	10
Book chapter(s) published in peer reviewed edited volumes	15
Published scholarly book review	10
Funded grant as Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI)	20
Funded grant as Senior Personnel	10
Refereed conference presentation at an international or national conference	10
Refereed conference presentation at a state or regional conference	5
Published and peer reviewed conference proceeding (excluding abstract-only publications)	5
Unfunded grant submission as PI or Co-PI	3
<b>Category B. Research Activities &amp; Professional Development (Competence)</b>	<b>Values</b>
	10
Translation of a book or scholarly work	7
External grant proposal submitted and under review (credit granted only once)	7
Development or creation of research materials (e.g., survey instruments, analytical models)-credit granted only once	5

Grant proposal in progress (credit granted only once)	3
Manuscript in progress for a peer reviewed article and/or book chapter	5
Book manuscript in progress (credit may be granted for up to two years)	7
Participation in external professional development related to research (e.g. grant writing, big data)-credit granted only once)	3
Data collection and analysis for emerging, ongoing, or continuous studies (credit granted per year of the study)	5

### Quantitative Evaluation of Faculty Performance in Scholarship

The scholarship of intellectual contributions will be evaluated using a comprehensive rubric below. This assessment will consider the breadth and depth of scholarly activities, including publications, presentations, and other relevant outcomes. In evaluating these contributions, three key factors will be considered: (a) the quantity and quality of contributions, recognizing the importance of both productivity and excellence; (b) the individual's relative effort and contribution, acknowledging the significance of personal involvement and impact; and (c) the overall impact on the profession, considering both the internal university community and the broader academic and professional landscape.

Criteria	Performance
<b>Significantly Exceeds Expectations (5)</b>	<p>The faculty member demonstrates exceptional performance in intellectual contributions, consistently and significantly exceeding expectations. To achieve this level of performance, the faculty member must earn at least 30 points during the evaluation period, as specified in the QMSA criteria.</p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one peer-reviewed journal article published in a scholarly journal as sole or second author in the education field; and</li> <li>• A conference presentation at a peer-reviewed state, national, international conference in the field or a qualified granting product listed in the QMSA criteria worth 10 points or more.</li> </ul>
<b>Exceed Expectations (4)</b>	<p>The faculty member exceeds expectations in scholarship. To achieve this level of performance, the faculty member must earn between 25 and 29 points during the evaluation period, as outlined in the QMSA criteria.</p> <p>This includes:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one peer-reviewed journal article published in a scholarly journal, or a scholarly book chapter published; and</li> <li>• An internal TAMIU research grant awarded in the faculty member's discipline, or a qualified granting product listed in the QMSA criteria worth 10 points or more.</li> </ul>
<b>Meets Expectations (3)</b>	<p>The faculty member adequately meets expectations in scholarship. To achieve this, they must earn between 20 and 24 points during the evaluation period, as outlined in the QMSA criteria.</p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one manuscript submitted and designated as “under review” in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, or a qualified granting product listed in the QMSA criteria worth 10 points or more; and</li> <li>• A qualified granting product listed in the QMSA criteria worth 10 points or more.</li> </ul>
<b>Deficient (2)</b>	<p>The faculty member demonstrates a willingness to improve but does not consistently meet expectations in scholarship, indicating a need for additional support and development.</p> <p>To achieve this level, the faculty member must earn between 15 and 19 points during the evaluation period, as outlined in the QMSA criteria.</p>
<b>Seriously Deficient (1)</b>	<p>The faculty member's performance is below expectations in scholarship.</p> <p>This rating applies when the faculty member earns fewer than 15 points during the evaluation period, as outlined in the QMSA criteria.</p>
<b>Egregiously Deficient (0)</b>	<p>The evidence reflects no engagement in scholarship and no demonstrated motivation for improvement.</p>

### COED Rubric for Faculty Performance in Service

Faculty service reflects a commitment to contributing at departmental, college, university, and professional levels as a member of TAMIU. Active participation, whether as a leader or a member, in program improvement, curriculum development, and institutional assessment reports is a key aspect of this service, and faculty are expected to document these contributions. Additionally, service activities at the community and professional levels will be considered if they relate to the faculty member's academic discipline and align with the goals and strategic

plans of the department, college, or TAMIU. The College of Education requires a minimum of the following service obligations per year as follows:

Expectations:

- Tenure-track or Fixed Term with 1-3 years of service: a total of three service obligations per academic year with at least one being at the college level. The remaining service must be university, community, professional, or student obligations.
- Tenure-track with 4-6 years of service or Fixed-Term with 4-5 years of service: a total of four service obligations per academic year with at least one being at the college level. The remaining service must be university, community, professional, or student obligations.
- Tenured faculty and Fixed-Term with more than 6 years of service: a total of four service obligations per academic year with at least one being at the college level. The remaining service must be university, community, professional or student obligations with increasing leadership at the college, university, and professional organization(s).

In this context, “service obligations” will be interpreted to mean a wide variety of possible tasks, as is indicated in the list below.

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; chairpersonships 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 –including but not limited to letters of recommendation (employment and academic), thesis, comprehensive exams, State exam preparation, State practice exam grading, sponsorship of a club or honor society; supervision of a field trip; service on University committees relating to Student Engagement
- Professional Service (e.g. consulting services, workshops in area of expertise, speaking engagements [with or without compensation]; service to professional organizations).
- Active service on editorial board
- Active participant in scholarly review for an academic journal, conference proposals, grants, and awards



- Special consideration will be given to service to accreditation including but not limited to the Texas Education Agency, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and education companies partnering with TAMIU to support COED online degree programs
- Special consideration will be given to service as a faculty mentor to junior faculty
- Special consideration will also be given to service on the following committees: Faculty Senate, Grievance Committees, University Honor Council, Institutional Review Board, College and University Promotion and Tenure Committees, and College and University Curriculum Committees.

### **Evaluation of Faculty Performance in Service**

The following rubric will be utilized to assess a faculty member's service contributions across multiple levels, including departmental, college, university, and professional contexts. This evaluation is grounded in the Criteria for Quantitative Measures of Services (QMS). It will take into account the faculty member's involvement in activities that strengthen the learning community and align with TAMIU's mission and goals.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>
<b>Significantly Exceeds Expectations (5)</b>	Faculty members demonstrate exceptional performance in service, significantly exceeding expectations. Uniformly excellent effort and results in important projects; generosity of spirit in volunteering; effective leadership appropriate to rank and position
<b>Exceeds Expectations (4)</b>	Faculty members often exceed expectations in service. They contribute substantial service time and show excellent initiative and effort with consistently beneficial results on important projects, appropriate to rank and position at multiple organizational and professional levels.
<b>Meets Expectations (3)</b>	Faculty members meet expectations in service. Their contributions include appropriate service time and show consistently effective service at multiple organizational and professional levels appropriate to rank and seniority; show initiative; responsive to needs of students and department. It is expected that COED faculty would rank at this level or above each year
<b>Deficient (2)</b>	Faculty members are willing to improve but do not meet expectations, requiring additional support and development. There is a minimal level of useful activity, relative to rank and seniority, in serving the Program, Department, College, University or Profession.

<b>Seriously Deficient (1)</b>	Faculty members' service is seriously deficient. There is little or no meaningful or useful activity in Department, College, or University. Or, behavior of a professionally unacceptable kind or of a harmful effect.
<b>Egregiously Deficient (0)</b>	Evidence reflects no participation in service. Faculty members show no motivation for improvement.