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This document describes the purpose and process of annual reviews of faculty in the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences. It is based on Texas A&M University Rule 2.5, “Annual Review” [of faculty]. In accordance with Section 2.5.3 of that Rule, this document describes a) the purpose of the annual review, b) the period of evaluation, c) the annual activity report form and content, d) the basis for evaluation, e) the timeline and procedure for evaluation, f) and the complaint procedure if a faculty member believes that the annual review fails to follow published guidelines. Appendices include forms that are used in the evaluation process and guidelines for review of select facets of performance.

I. Purpose of annual review (Rule 2.5.3.1)
Section 2.5.1 establishes the purpose of the annual review:

The purpose of the annual review is to provide a mechanism to facilitate dialogue between the administration and faculty. Annual review provides valuable information to the department head about the faculty members’ accomplishments and to the faculty members with regard to the department head’s assessment of their progress in the discipline and in the context of department goals. Annual reviews are to be conducted in an environment of openness and collegiality, with an emphasis on constructive development of the individual faculty member and the institution (University Rules, Page 3 of 27)

II. Period of Evaluation (Rule 2.5.3.2)
The period of evaluation will be the calendar year. The timeline and procedures are presented in Section V, below.

III. Annual Activity Report format and content (Rule 2.5.3.3)
The Annual Activity Report shall include the following components:

- An Annual Activity Report form that summarizes faculty members’ accomplishments for the calendar year
- A plan of work for the coming calendar year.
- A copy of faculty members’ curriculum vitae
- A copy student evaluations of teaching performance
- A peer review of teaching report (assistant professors only)

IV. Basis for Evaluation (Rule 2.5.3.4, “All sources of information to be used for the evaluation must be specified”)
The evaluation will be based on the components of the Annual Activity Report, and may also include any other evidence of accomplishments that a faculty member chooses to provide. If the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee has completed a review of a given faculty member for a particular year, results of that review will be included in faculty members’ annual performance evaluations.
V. Timeline and Procedures for Evaluation (Rule 2.5.3.5)
The calendar and procedures for annual performance evaluations of faculty will be as follows:

- **First Friday in December.** Promotion and Tenure Committee Reviews will be conducted during the month of December, and will be submitted to the Department Head by the first Friday in January. For assistant professors, these will include peer reviews of teaching. Peer reviews of teaching are completed for assistant professors each year. A senior faculty member (tenured associate professor or higher) is assigned by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee to review the curriculum for a class taught by each assistant professor, including participation in a class session. The reviewer then provides a report to the faculty member and the department head. In the report, reviewers comment on the following dimensions of the faculty member’s performance:
  - Instructional design
  - Instructional delivery
  - Assessment of student learning
  - Course and classroom management

- **First Friday in January** will be the annual deadline for submission of Annual Activity Reports and Annual Plans of Work, curriculum vitae, and the student evaluations of teaching performance. The Annual Activity Report and Annual Plan of Work will be based on calendar years, and all materials will be submitted to the Department Head.

- **Last Friday in April.** Individual reviews through meetings with the Department Head will be completed. Results of the reviews will be reported to faculty members through either formal letters or through a standard Annual Performance Evaluation Summary Form. An example of an Annual Performance Evaluation Summary form is included in Appendix A.

Regardless of whether a letter or an annual performance evaluation summary form is used, the content must include (among other facets of performance reported) reports of contributions to diversity, internationalization, multidisciplinary collaboration, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Also, the letter or the form must indicate the faculty member’s status with respect to safety practices, as reflected in the statements below:

*After review of the faculty member’s activities in environments, this faculty member is judged to have reasonably mitigated safety issues.*

*or*

*After review of the faculty member’s activities in areas of safety concerns, the following remediation activities have been enacted (followed by specific activities)*
Inclusion of comments on diversity, internationalization, multidisciplinary collaboration, and interdisciplinary collaboration follows from a March 3, 2009 memorandum from then Vice Provost Karan Watson to Deans and Department Heads regarding “Faculty Annual Evaluation Changes.” That memorandum stressed that “A variety of university goals and mandates on the university have led to the need to assure that Faculty Evaluations give appropriate credit to those aiding in achieving university, college, and departmental goals” related to interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary collaboration, diversity and internationalization, and safety and compliance. The memorandum was accompanied by separate documents that more fully describe contributions in these areas. A copy of the memorandum and the explication of the areas is included in Appendix B.

- **Second Friday in May.** The Department Executive Committee will have reviewed evaluation summaries prepared by the Department Head and will have submitted recommendations for merit pay increases for each faculty member. Each Executive Committee member will indicate her or his individual recommendation, according to the following percentages:
  - Top 5%
  - Next 20%
  - Next 50%
  - Next 20%
  - Bottom 5%

- **May 30.** All evaluations for the year will have been entered into Greatjobs, including review by the employee.

- **July:** Salary recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean and Vice Chancellor by the date established on the annual budget calendar.

**VI. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines (Rule 2.5.3.6)**
A faculty member who wishes to submit a complaint regarding compliance with System Policies and Local Rules and Procedures should discuss the concern with the Department Head. If that discussion does not yield resolution of the concern to the satisfaction of the faculty member, the faculty member may submit a letter to the dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, with a copy to the Dean of Faculties.
Appendix A

Annual Performance Evaluation Summary Form
## Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary, CY 20xx

**A. Facmember, Associate Professor**

### Teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dept. Average</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG Credit Hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Credit Hours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Committees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters, Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Committees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Chair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers w Students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Funded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPTS 300 (avg)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPTS 399 (avg)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPTS 750 (avg)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPTS 751 (avg)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dept. Average</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Papers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed Conference Papers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Chapters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts Proposals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written/Funded Tech Papers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organizational Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dept. Average</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept: Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept: Member</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ, Member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist, Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Dept. Average</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor/Ed Board</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Member</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pub Ser</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diversity and Internationalization Initiatives

Dr. Facmember's study-abroad program to Italy has evolved to being the largest in the College and is a significant contribution to the University's globalization priority.

### Contributions to Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Collaboration

Dr. Facmember is working with an interdisciplinary team of geographers, sociologists, and rural health scholars on a funded research program that is designed to build community capacity and create community agency. This was the first year of the project, and all first-year objectives were met.

### Summary:

Dr. Facmember's contributions are exemplary. She provides extraordinary mentoring for students, is a highly effective teacher, and she provides exceptional leadership to our study-abroad program. Her study abroad program to Italy has evolved to being the largest in the College and is a significant contribution to the University's globalization priority. She is actively involved in funded projects that advance planning and decision making.
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Memoranda on Select Facets of Faculty Performance
March 3, 2009

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans and Department Heads
FROM: Karan Watson, Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives
SUBJECT: Faculty Annual Evaluation Changes

A variety of university goals and mandates on the university have led to the need to assure that Faculty Evaluations give appropriate credit to those aiding in achieving university, college and departmental goals and hold faculty members and administrators appropriately accountable when these efforts are not recognized and valued. The needs fall in three major areas:

- University culture supporting interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary collaboration
- University culture enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences
- University culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance

As you are aware I presented much of these ideas to the Council of Deans, the Council of Department Heads, and the Faculty Senate during February. Based on the feedback I received from you and the faculty I have adjusted the expectations. I adjusted the timelines. I recognize that currently we are asking departmental faculty to meet for the Academic Master Plan; and I recognize that any changes to annual review are likely to take more than one meeting. In addition, several of the expectations were modified to accommodate concerns that were voiced during the preliminary feedback opportunity. Please let me know if I can be of assistance at any meetings you convene in making the expectations clearer.

The college deans and department heads will assure that faculty and administrators engage in the dialogue to appropriately integrate within the teaching, creation and dissemination of new knowledge or creative activities, and service/engagement efforts these areas into the college and department procedures for annual reviews of faculty members. I recognize that this dialogue is not trivial and that to be done well it will take some time. These dialogues are needed so that faculty members have the opportunity to discuss how to make the first two bullets integrated with existing processes in a way to value those faculty members who can and do appropriately engage in activities in these important areas, It is for each faculty, departmental or college, to determine what will be required of all faculty members, and what will be valued because they have made choices or been chosen to engage in contributing to the areas in the first two bullets. The third bullet is a requirement for all faculty members.

Modified annual review procedures incorporating these areas should be submitted to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost for approval by May 26th. (Colleges or departments that believe no modifications are necessary to their annual evaluation procedures should inform the Dean of Faculties.) All faculty evaluations that include any part of the last half of 2009 will be expected to use the new guidelines with appropriate considerations for the proportion of time being considered that can be responsive to the new guidelines. In the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost’s review of the procedures submitted the primary evaluation will be to be certain the guidelines adhere to the requirements presented in Section 2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and integrate the new elements of this memorandum into the guidelines. In accordance with this Rule it is clear that these procedures apply to all faculty members, tenured, tenure-track, and non-
tenure track. The submission of the annual review procedures should be accompanied by a description, as needed, of how the elements will be weighed in the current annual review cycle. The new expectations should incorporate the following ideas:

1. Faculty members should be recognized and rewarded for research, teaching, and service/engagement that contribute at the university or college levels in strategic multidisciplinary areas (which include activities in recognized interdisciplinary programs). Such contributions are as valued as disciplinary contributions, which we are accustomed to recognizing and rewarding. The procedures should not require that all faculty engage in multidisciplinary activities, but should recognize that such engagements may be in all three primary categories (teaching, creating new knowledge, or service/engagement). Examples of multidisciplinary strategic areas are shown in Attachment 1.

2. Each college is expected to increase the number of faculty members who create new knowledge, teach, or engage in enhancing the diversity and international climate and experiences for students. For each college, the vice presidents of diversity and global initiatives and the dean of faculties will work with the dean to determine the minimal targets for increasing the participation of faculty in these areas. For example, it may be appropriate to choose to reach a total participation of 25% and 50% for FY10 and FY11, respectively. Examples of these engagements are shown in attachment 2.

3. No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all TAMUS Regulation 33.05.02 required training. (In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a required training near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement.) Numerous faculty members have indicated that they believe a more useful training could be instituted than the current on-line courses. I encourage interested faculty members with these ideas to contact the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost to see if such development would be feasible for all faculty. In addition, each department head must collect, as part of the faculty member’s self report on activities, a section on safety (see attached). The purpose of these activity reports from faculty and inclusion in annual reviews is not to create personal liabilities, but rather to relieve the potential for any such personal liabilities by making the university aware of the safety concerns and having the administration document how they believe the concerns can best be mitigated. Attachment 3 contains more information on issues concerning this requirement, but it is expected that new procedures will minimally result in the department head including either one of the following statements:

   a. After review of the faculty member’s activities in environments, this faculty member is judged to have reasonably mitigated safety issues.
b. After review of the faculty member’s activities in areas of safety concerns, the following remediation activities have been enacted (followed by specific activities).

It is expected that by July 1, 2009 the Dean of Faculties will have reviewed and after any required adjustments approved the modified faculty evaluation procedures for all faculty members. Colleges and departments are expected to modify, and appropriately phase into practice, the required procedures for Tenure and Promotion that will align with the expectations reflected in the annual evaluations (see University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Section 4.3.5 and 4.4-4.6). Submissions to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost of these adjusted procedures should be completed by November 15, 2009.
EXAMPLES OF DIVERSITY AND INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIC AREAS UNIVERSITY LEVEL

Internationalization:
It is recognized that most scholarly fields at TAMU are engaged with the international community of scholars in the field. Continued and enhanced leadership at the international level in the field should be encouraged and valued. In the past this has included valuing: international organization publications, invited or reviewed talks/papers at international conferences or universities, or international awards. In addition, to these appropriate recognition and value should be given to activities which better prepare TAMU graduates for the global environment. Examples of areas where faculty may be recognized include:

- Leadership in development or conducting a study abroad course or experience so that large proportion (ideally, 25% or more) of those graduating in a major have high quality international curricular or experiential education.
- Scholarly publications in study abroad activities and the evaluation of their effectiveness at achieving goals and outcomes
- Engagement in University recognized MOUs with international partner institutions
- Engagement in funded projects with international partner institutions
- Engagement in significant publication projects or creative activities with international partners
- Significant recruitment of graduate or undergraduate students to enhance international participation at TAMU in alignment with goals of the department or college
- University, college, or departmental workshops, seminars, or courses to enhance interactions and understanding among global cultures with engagement of individuals, as students or invited speakers, who can represent diverse global cultures
- Significant self-improvement activities in relevant areas (8 hours or more of professional training or education).

Diversity
It is recognized that many scholarly fields at TAMU are engaged with diversity from numerous perspectives. In addition, many faculty are already involved in designing and teaching courses focused on enhancing students’ knowledge of disparities and differences experienced by diverse groups and skills in working among diverse cultures. Continued and enhanced leadership in these endeavors should be encouraged and valued. In addition, to these appropriate recognition and value should be given to activities which better prepare TAMU graduates for diverse environments. Examples of areas where faculty may be recognized include:

- Clear contributions to the department, college, or university in achieving the goals of the Campus Diversity Plan.
- Engagement in funded projects focused on enhancing diversity enrollment and graduation
- Engagement in significant publication projects or creative activities that enhance understanding of diversity issues in higher education or in disciplinary fields
- Significant recruitment and retention activities for students, faculty and staff to enhance diversity goals of the department or college
- University, college, or departmental workshops, seminars, or courses to enhance interactions and understanding among diverse cultures
- Significant self-improvement activities in relevant areas (8 hours or more of professional training or education).
EXAMPLES OF
MULTIDISCIPLINARY STRATEGIC AREAS
UNIVERSITY LEVEL

Creation of Knowledge or Creative Activities:
- Active in a University Landmark area of research. (Effective and Excellence metrics should be determined by the leaders of the landmark area.)
- Active research with a university recognized center or institute (can be a TAMUS component center or institute if the university is a recognized partner) that is either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary. (Effective and Excellence metrics should be determined by the center or institute.)
- Participation in a multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention (as demonstrated by funding, publication contracts, or other special national recognition) where investigators from two or more TAMU colleges or outside universities are involved.
- Active participation in proposals submitted and awarded valued at $1.5 million or more

Teaching:
- Teaching in interdisciplinary program courses (courses with prefixes outside of departmental degree prefixes, such as GENE, TOXI that include more than one college as an active participant).
- Teaching in freshman seminar courses with UPAS prefix.
- Teaching in a disciplinary course in a learning community that involves students in courses that span two or more colleges.
- Teaching in service learning oriented experiences for students
- Active participation in entrepreneurship classes or activities.

Service/Engagement:
- Active participation in the Faculty Senate, both in the Senate and assigned committee activities.
- Active participation in a major university council or committee. (For 2009 these include the Councils on Finance Environment, Research Environment, Built Environment, Education Environment, Climate & Diversity, Development, the Committees for Academic Master Plan Steering, Research Roadmap, Teaching and Learning Roadmap, Engagement Roadmap, SACs steering or compliance committees, the Design Review Board, Texas A&M Press Advisory Committee, others as approved by Dean of Faculties)
- Leadership in the CPI, Distinguished Professors, or a recognized Faculty Network.
- Active participation on a search committee for a dean of another college or a university administrator.
• Active participation in K-12 outreach and research especially at the local, state, or national level.
• Active participation in communities or corporate partnership.
• Active participation in publications based upon community based projects.
• Active participation in service learning development grants.
• Active participation in partnerships initiated with corporate/community organizations, including funded research, training programs, development of coursework.

These examples should be augmented by others deemed significant by the faculty and administrators, especially for examples at the college and department level. It is fully recognized that multidisciplinary activities, like disciplinary activities, take time and resources. Thus, as required by the University Rule 12.01.99.M2 section 2.5.5.2 in the Department Heads written evaluation the “memorandum and/or annual report shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research and service.” Followed by the understanding in accordance with section 2.5.5.4 “In assessing performance and determining salary increases, the weights given to teaching, research, and service shall be consistent with the expectations as determined in 2.5.5.2...” Department Heads in consultation with faculty members will need to assure that faculty loads are reasonable, and faculty members are valued for efforts that advance the department, the college, and the university.
ISSUES CONCERNING
SAFETY IN FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Faculty members are responsible for reasonable mitigation of safety concerns in the environments they have been assigned as the lead researcher or instructor of record.

Teaching Environment
Faculty members are not required to mitigate safety concerns in the normal utilization of the rooms where they are assigned to teach and utilization of the standard equipment in the room. It is expected that faculty members will report any observations of the teaching environment that seem to present a safety hazard. These reports are made to either their department head or the appropriate building proctor.

If a faculty member takes equipment or materials into the classroom for demonstration or student experiences, then they are obliged to consider the safety concerns this may create. If they take students on activities outside the assigned classrooms, such as on field trips or to laboratories, they are required to consider the safety concerns this may create. As part of this consideration, the faculty member should inform the department head of the efforts made to mitigate safety concerns. If a faculty member is uncertain if the concerns rise to a level which require such a report they should discuss the concern with the department head, or department head's designee for safety concerns.

The Instructor of Record for classes are required to work with the department head (or designee), to assure that they and any teaching assistants as well as the students are appropriately trained when the instruction involves either utilization of equipment or materials, or engagement in activities in a location where hazards are recognized. Such awareness and education are generally long standing practices in the departments, and procedures to assure that the faculty have been appropriately informed and trained in these situations is a departmental requirement.

When faculty members innovate or change a situation to include these potential hazards in a learning experience, they should inform the department head and present how the appropriate safety issues are being mitigated.

Research Environment
Existing protocols concerning laboratory and research safety concerns, through organizations such as the IRB or safety practices and inspections required by other protocols, must have complete compliance. When disagreements occur between researchers and university or other entities responsible for ensuring safety compliance, the department head must be informed immediately. Concerns about requirements for compliance may be appealed to the Office of the Vice President for Research, but ultimately compliance, in either the original or VPR adjusted requirements, must be met. Faculty members are responsible for creating the training and culture that ensure appropriate safety practices are the norm and safety hazards are reasonably mitigated.

Faculty Evaluation: Department Heads should require faculty to report any safety concerns and acknowledge that they have complied with all required departmental, college, and university safety protocols to the best of their knowledge. Any outstanding failures to comply must be resolved immediately or the annual evaluation must be deemed as unsatisfactory.