

CONHS Faculty Evaluation Instruments PPE and Evaluation Criteria Introduction

The Professional Portfolio Evaluation (PPE) is the primary mechanism for the annual evaluation of faculty members in the College of Nursing and Health Science. 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 (classroom or clinical)	Scholarship/Research & Creative Work	Service	Chair Evaluation
Non-Tenure Track	70	-	20	10
Tenure-Track	40	45	5	10
Tenured (w/o Research Release)	50	30	15	5
Tenured (with Research Release)	30	50	15	5

By vote of the faculty of the college in 2007 and in accordance with the Post-Tenure Review Process outlined in the *TAMU 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 *TAMU 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 and field of practice.

- Learning objectives
- Students' scores on tests and/or clinical skills 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.
 - Teaching Independent Study courses that have the credit hours
 - Teaching Independent Study courses that do not have the credit hours
 - 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 (classroom or clinical) showing suggestions for improvement and encouragement.
 - Evidence of innovation and/or general improvements in course development and delivery. For example, evidence in innovation in teaching methods and production of textbooks, or educational "software"; evidence-based teaching strategies, including technologies that promote student success.
 - Development of teaching materials for on-campus or on-line course delivery.
 - Instruction in WIN sections.
 - Instruction in Honors sections.
 - Evidence of the use of student and professional feedback to improve teaching.
 - Evidence of participation in programmatic or development grants related to teaching/ learning
 - Presents innovations in teaching techniques and/ or evidence-based clinical practices at regional, national, or international professional conferences

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

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 works 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 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.

University & Community Service

Service encompasses a variety of professionally related activities through which members of the faculty profession employ their academic expertise for the benefit of the University, the community, and the profession. Texas A&M International University places a strong emphasis on service to the University and its mission. A faculty member provides service to the University through active participation and leadership in college and University committees, councils, special projects, or duties for which the faculty member is held accountable. Community service by TAMIU faculty is recognized in any and all of those areas. For purposes of evaluation, however, activities must relate to one's academic field or discipline or else be clearly approved by the University. Participation and leadership in professional activities and associations may be considered service when it does not include peer review. Certificates of recognition, letters of appreciation, official minutes, newsletters, products of projects, and other tangible evidence of service rendered may document Service of all types. (From the TAMIU Faculty Handbook) Service to the University and the community is expected of all CNHS faculty members who are tenured, tenure track or non-tenure track. There are minimum service obligation expectations per year for all faculty, based on your faculty track.

Tenure-Track & Tenured Faculty

- Tenure-track with years 1-3 at TAMIU: two college obligations in addition to one community/professional/student obligation per academic year
- Tenure-track with years 4-6 at TAMIU: two college obligations in addition to two community/professional/student obligations per academic year
- Tenured faculty: three college obligations in addition to two community/professional/student obligations per academic year

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

- Assistant-level with years 1-3 at TAMIU: two college obligations in addition to one community/professional/student obligation per academic year
- Assistant-level with years 4-5 at TAMIU: two college obligations in addition to two community/professional/student obligations per academic year
- Assistant-level with more than 6 years at TAMIU or Associate-level: two college obligations in addition to three community/professional/student obligations per academic year

In this context, "service obligations" will be interpreted to mean a wide variety of possible tasks. Faculty will be evaluated for merit pay based on the service activity during the annual PPE. A narrative is to be included in their PPE discussing the service activities, and the roles/responsibilities of the faculty. Documentation such as committee minutes, advising rosters or other proof of involvement, will further strengthen the faculty's evaluation.

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

Department/College/University

Service on departmental, college or University committee (membership on either a standing or specially appointed committee, development of degree programs and new courses, recruitment and/or open house participation, chairperson on a committee). All faculties are assigned to specific college committees, those who are chair or co-chairs for the committee with active participation will be evaluated as such.

Advising- service as a department advisor, documented proof of student advisory meetings.

1. Special consideration will be given 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.
2. Special consideration will also be given to service as a faculty mentor to junior faculty, a program coordinator or a volunteer to be chair or co-chair of committees.
3. For non-tenured faculty, research and/or grant writing are optional and will be given special consideration. Presenting innovations in teaching techniques and/or evidence-based clinical practices at regional, national, or international professional conferences will also be given special consideration.

Community

Supervision of a non-mandatory student internship/project that benefits a community organization, service on a community committee, service on a community committee board, participation in the events of a community organization or outreach program.

Student

- Advisor/supervisor/sponsorship of a student club or honor society, supervision of a field trip, service on university committees relating to Student Affairs.
- Teaching non-credit Independent Study courses
- Documentary evidence of assistance to students outside class with course-related problems, advisement, securing employment, letters of recommendation, workshops and tutorial sessions.
- Instruction in Honors

Professional

Consulting services or workshops in the area of expertise, speaking engagements, service to professional organizations and professional association development.

Evaluation Criteria

5	Extraordinary	Exceeds excellent expectations with more than additional service activities and/or two special consideration service activities (See 1, 2, &3).
4	Excellent	The minimum service requirements plus two additional service activities and/or one special consideration service activity.
3	Good	Meets the minimum service requirements. It is expected that all CNHS faculty would rank at this level at a minimum.
2	Less than expected	Passive participant in college committees and/or did not meet the minimum service requirements
1	Poor	Absence from college committees. Makes no effort in engaging students or self in a professional manner.

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 rubric 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.

II. Research

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: 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.

Note on International/National Referred Journals

International/national referred journals must be SCOPUS, SCIE, or an SSCI index journal. Quality publications that are not indexed above should be verified by faculty with evidence.

Nursing and Health Sciences

5 (90-100): Faculty must have one of the following: 1). published 1 or 2 articles in a national/international refereed journal or a book, in his/her field of study (i.e., 1st author, mentor, corresponding author; or at least 25% contribution); 2). have a grant approved; or 3). the faculty member 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 one of the following: 1). published an article in a refereed journal (generally defined) and one or more conference papers at major conferences in the field; or 2). 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 completed all of the following: 1). presented at least one paper at a regional or national conference in his/her own field; 2). have an active research agenda; 3). and have working papers (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.