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1. General

1.1. Policy Statement:
This document outlines the Department of Construction Science Annual Faculty Evaluation Process and Procedure. The procedure outlined herein is consistent with the College of Architecture’s Guidelines for Annual Review which can be found at http://archone.tamu.edu/college/Intranet/Resources/Guidelines/AnnualReviewPolicy.pdf. The purpose of the annual review is to provide a mechanism to facilitate dialogue between the administration and faculty. Annual reviews provide 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 departmental goals. Annual reviews will be conducted in an environment of openness and collegiality, with an emphasis on constructive development of the faculty member, the Department, the College and the University.

1.2. Review, Input, and Adoption:
In compliance with the above and after review and input from the faculty of the department, the faculty of the Department of Construction Science first adopted this Annual Faculty Evaluation Process and Procedure on January 16, 2009. It has since been revised and amended and was re-adopted by the faculty of the department on December 9, 2009.

1.3. Who is affected
Each person who is assigned by the Department of Construction Science the responsibility for teaching a course for resident credit (excluding extension, continuing education, and professional development courses) or is paid any part of his or her salary from Faculty Salaries provided to the Department of Construction Science is subject to this policy.

2. Deadlines and Review

2.1. Annual Review Packet
Toward the end of each calendar year, and no later than January 20 of the following year, the Department Head will initiate the annual review process by requesting that all faculty complete their Annual Review Packet and submit them to the Department Head by a specified date, said date being no later than January 31. The annual review will cover the period from January 1 to December 31 of the previous year. Faculty should follow the format presented in the Department’s Annual Review Packet. Faculty members are encouraged to
review the indicators of excellence and effectiveness in teaching, research and engagement activities so that they will include data necessary for a comprehensive review of their annual activities. At the initiation of the annual review process, the Department Head and the Chair of the P&T Committee will encourage tenure-track faculty to meet with their mentors regarding the preparation and submission of their Annual Review Packet.

2.2. Tenured Faculty, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers:

2.2.1. After receiving the Annual Review Packet for tenured faculty, senior lecturers, and lecturers the Department Head will meet with each faculty member to review the submitted materials. During the review with each faculty member it may be necessary to supplement and clarify information provided in the Annual Review Packet. It is also critical that the prospectus be reviewed and clarified if necessary. The prospectus should be challenging, yet achievable, and there should be measurable goals.

2.3. Tenure Track Faculty:

2.3.1. After receiving the Annual Review Packet for tenure-track faculty members, the Department Head will provide a copy to the Department P&T Committee. The P&T Committee will meet with each faculty member to review the submitted materials. During the review with each faculty member it may be necessary to supplement and clarify information provided in the Annual Review Packet. It is also critical that the prospectus be reviewed and clarified if necessary. The prospectus should be challenging, yet achievable, and there should be measurable goals.

2.3.2. At the conclusion of the review, the P&T Committee will prepare a written evaluation report for the Department Head. In preparation of the report the committee will consider prior annual reviews, their meeting with the faculty member and the current Annual Review Packet. This report will include two votes by the P&T committee regarding 1) whether the tenure-track faculty member should be continued for an additional year and 2) whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

2.3.3. The P&T Committee will submit their evaluation reports and the faculty member’s final Annual Review Packet to the Department Head by March 10.

2.4. Information Evaluated:

Following the review set forth in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 above, the Department Head will review in detail each faculty member’s final Annual Review Packet in terms of their teaching, research and engagement activities. In addition to the information contained in the Annual Review Packet and any material referred to therein, the Department Head may consider the following sources of information for the evaluation of the faculty member:
2.4.1. The written evaluation report of the Department P&T Committee referenced in Paragraph 2.3.2 above,

2.4.2. Prior Annual Review Packets and Annual Evaluation Reviews of the faculty member,

2.4.3. Personal observation by the Department Head,

2.4.4. Discussions with and input from faculty, staff, and colleagues,

2.4.5. Discussions with and input from students and former students, including student evaluations and comments, and

2.4.6. Discussions with and input from the Department Executive Committee.

2.4.7. In the event any information considered by the Department Head is obtained from others, including faculty, staff, students, or colleagues, the Department Head will indicate the information obtained thereby and the source of the information (faculty, staff, students, colleagues) except that the identity of the individual may be kept confidential if, in the opinion of the Department Head, such confidentiality is warranted and justified.

2.5. Evaluation Ratings:
Each area, teaching, research and service/engagement, will be reviewed separately employing the following rating system: Most Meritorious/Excellent, Significantly Above Expectations, Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Unsatisfactory/Below Expectations, and Unsatisfactory/Significantly Below Expectations. A verbal interpretation of each of these evaluations is as follows:

2.5.1. Most Meritorious/Excellent: Performance is truly exceptional, reflecting stellar quality and high productivity, notable for additional recognition.

2.5.2. Significantly Above Expectations: Performance is exceptional, reflecting high quality performance and productivity.

2.5.3. Above Expectations: Performance exceeds basic expectations with evidence of additional productivity reflecting quality performance.

2.5.4. Satisfactory/Meets Expectations: Performance meets basic expectations reflecting average quality performance and productivity.

2.5.5. Unsatisfactory/Below Expectations: Performance fails to meet minimal expectations with evidence of reduced productivity and/or poor quality performance. See 3.3.5.
2.5.6. **Unsatisfactory/Significantly Below Expectations:** Performance fails to reach minimal expectations and demonstrates little or no effort or poor quality. The terms of the annual faculty appointment letter were not met or the faculty member failed to submit material in their annual review packet. See 3.3.5.

2.6. **Comparison Factors:**

The evaluation process should not be based solely on a strict comparison against an imposed set of criteria (i.e., 3 peer-review publications in top journals each year), but rather should be based, in part, on the relative comparison of where one’s performance falls relative to others in the department with similar assignments and rank in a given year.

2.6.1. This will require having all annual review information together so that the Department Head can review the faculty and assess for consistency across the faculty. It therefore is incumbent upon the faculty to complete the assembly of their packets as soon as possible to facilitate the evaluation process. Late submissions or resubmissions of annual review packets will therefore not be accepted except for good cause shown by the faculty member in writing and granted by the Department Head.

2.6.2. This policy does not clearly specify how the potential criteria within each area – research, teaching, or engagement – should be evaluated and weighted when determining the evaluation for each area. In other words, nowhere does it say what a peer reviewed paper is worth versus a presentation at a conference. As it stands now, this will inherently be a subjective process.

2.6.3. The utilization of a differential weighting scheme, based on annual assignments, does take into account the fact that faculty can have different assignments. This weighting scheme should also take into account different expectations of performance levels for faculty based upon rank.

3. **Evaluation Criteria:**

When undertaking the evaluation of teaching, research, and service/engagement multiple criteria are possible.

3.1. **Teaching Evaluation:**

Teaching is one of the most fundamentally important activities one undertakes as a faculty member. As stated by TAMU guidelines, “(4.4.1.1) Teaching: This category includes, among other things, classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories and teaching methods; publication of instructional materials, including textbooks; and supervision of graduate students.” (TAMU.12.01.99.M2). Examples of areas where faculty will be evaluated include:
3.1.1. **General teaching activities:**
Objective responses to student course evaluations utilizing weighted objective scores and considering the nature of the courses taught
Number of students taught in regular courses
Credit hour production
Regular student advisement in campus office
Appropriate syllabus available for each course taught
Development of a new course
Teaching of core courses for departmental programs
Directed independent studies
Miscellaneous teaching accomplishments
Classroom Teaching Credits generated

3.1.2. **Graduate teaching activities:**
Chair of Master’s Thesis committee
Chair of Master’s Non-Thesis committee
Master’s committee membership
Chair of Ph.D. dissertation committee
Ph.D. committee membership

3.1.3. **Instructional/Educational grants:** These include all forms of grants that facilitate the pedagogical mission of the faculty member, department or college. These forms of grants may be related to course development, technology enhancement, etc.

3.1.4. **Other teaching related criteria:**
Special response to departmental teaching needs
Special teaching awards or recognition
Noteworthy teaching innovations
Teacher training courses taken
Continuing education taken in subject matter taught
Teaching improvement efforts

3.1.5. **Multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary activities**
Teaching in interdisciplinary program courses
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

3.1.6. **Diversity and internationalization activities**
Leadership in development or conducting a study abroad course or experience
3.2. Research evaluation:

As with other departments within the College of Architecture, research can encompass a great variety of scholarly and creative activities. Again, according to TAMU guidelines; “(4.4.1.2) Creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities: For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative activities. Architectural design, engineering technology, veterinary or medical technology, fiction, poetry, painting, music and sculpture are examples.” (TAMU.12.01.00.M2). The critical element of primary importance is peer review. Hence weight is given to those research and creative activities that have elements of peer review included in their assessment. Examples of areas where faculty will be evaluated include:

3.2.1. Written productivity: In general, credit will be given for manuscripts submitted for review, revised and resubmitted, in press or in print. The focus is, of course, getting one’s work out there in circulation and that is followed closely by having one’s work placed in the most prestigious journal, presses, or meetings, thereby increasing potential influence on the scholarly field and heightening your own status and that of our department, college, and university. Faculty cannot expect to receive continuous credit for ongoing manuscripts that never see the light of day. Therefore, minimal credit will be given for works in progress and then only for a limited time period.

- Articles published in refereed journals
- Articles submitted for review in refereed journals
- Articles in non-refereed journals
- Papers in juried proceedings
- Paper presentation at peer reviewed conferences
- Authored books
- Edited books
- Monographs
- Book chapters
- Book review
- Editor of journal
- Edited special issue of journal
- Review of articles submitted for review in refereed journals
- Review of book
- Technical reports / Policy papers
- Encyclopedia entries
- Abstracts in juried proceedings
- Commentaries
- Paper presentation in non-peer reviewed conferences
- Presentation of joint-authored paper with graduate student
- Publication of joint-authored paper with graduate student
3.2.2. **Grants and contracts:** Grants and contracts are awards of funds to help one undertake research or research related activities. In evaluating these activities the following issues will be considered: nature of award (grants vs. contracts); source (internal vs. external; national, state, local); competitiveness (peer reviewed, success rate, etc.); and prestige of award (NSF, NIH, etc.)

- Grant received
- On-going grant
- Grant proposal submitted
- Contracts received
- On-going contract
- Funding of graduate students
- Indirect returns to the department

3.2.3. **Other activities:**

- Research efforts following the department research roadmap
- Special research awards or recognitions
- Miscellaneous research/creative related contributions
- Special presentations or invited talks
- Researcher training courses taken
- Research improvement efforts

3.2.4. **Multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary activities**

- Active in a university landmark area of research
- Active research with a university recognized center or institute
- Participation in a multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention where investigators from two or more TAMU colleges or outside universities are involved

3.2.5. **Diversity and internationalization activities**

- Scholarly publications of study abroad activities and the evaluation of their effectiveness at achieving goals and outcomes
- Engagement in funded projects with international partner institutions
- Engagement in significant publication projects or creative activities with international partners
- 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

3.2.6. Senior Lecturers and Lecturers have no research expectations and will not be evaluated regarding research activity. Therefore any research activity conducted by Senior Lecturers and Lecturers will be evaluated as service.
3.3. **Service/Enhancement Evaluation:**

Service is fundamental for the operation of a successful department, college and university. Service is the foundation for true self-governance. In addition, service to our respective disciplines and broader fields is equally important for the advancement of knowledge and the maintenance of healthy disciplines. Furthermore, such service is equally important for recognition of our department, college, and university. As a consequence, service can come in many forms. According to TAMU guidelines, “(4.4.1.3) Service: This includes service to the institution, to students, colleagues, department, college and the university—as well as service beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.” (TAMU.12.01.00.M2). Examples of areas where faculty will be evaluated include:

3.3.1. **Departmental Service:**
- Associate department head activities
- Program coordinator activities
- Leadership on departmental committees or task forces
- Active and effective mentorship of junior faculty
- Active participation on departmental committees or task forces
- Special contribution toward meeting departmental needs
- Student mentoring
- Attendance and participation in departmental meetings
- Guest lectures (here or elsewhere)
- Involving new faculty in research and scholarly activities of more senior faculty

3.3.2. **College or University Service:**
- Leadership positions held on college or university committees
- Active participation on college or university committees
- Any other evidence of college or university service
- 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
- Clear contributions to the department, college, or university in achieving the goals of the Campus Diversity plan

3.3.3. **Professional Service:**
- National or regional leadership positions held
- Organization of international, national, or regional professional meetings
- Other service to professional organizations
- Reviewing individual manuscripts and/or grant proposals
- Meeting panel organizer
- Meeting paper panel participant
Panel commentator
Community service (pro-bono professional practice or discipline-related contributions to communities)
Newspaper editorials or Op-Ed columns
Community talks
Service on boards
Special service award or recognition
Active participation in partnerships initiated with corporate/community organizations, including funded research, training programs, development of coursework
Continuing Education Courses or Lectures
Miscellaneous service accomplishment

3.3.4. Environmental Health and Safety:
Uses best practices to assist in ensuring the health and safety of self and others
Follows all safety procedures and practices
Reports unsafe work conditions, accidents, near misses or injuries
Encourages others to help create and maintain a safe work place
Attends safety training
Familiar with applicable sections of the Texas A&M University safety manual

3.3.5. Compliance with TAMU required training:
No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they are not in compliance with all TAMUS Regulation 33.05.02 required training.
Completed all required training in a timely manner.

3.3.6. Multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary activities
Active participation in K-12 outreach and research especially at the local, state, or national level

3.3.7. Diversity and internationalization activities
Significant recruitment of graduate or undergraduate students to enhance international participation at TAMU in alignment with goals of the department or college
Significant recruitment and retention activities for students, faculty and staff to enhance diversity goals of the department or college

4. Annual Evaluation Review

4.1. An Annual Evaluation Review statement will be written by the Department Head and presented in person, if practical, to each faculty member no later than May 31. This statement will briefly discuss the faculty member’s accomplishments in research, teaching and service along with the Department Head’s evaluation. An overall evaluation will also be presented. The final element included in the
evaluation will be a statement regarding the prospectus that will establish the baseline for next year’s assignment. Both the Department Head and faculty member will sign this report. The faculty member’s signature does not necessarily endorse the Department Head’s evaluation; it simply means that the faculty member received and reviewed the report.