Faculty Evaluation Policy
Department of Visualization

1. GENERAL

1.1 Policy Statement: The Department of Visualization will hold annual reviews between each member of the faculty and the Department Head. The review period will cover all faculty activities as they relate to the Department, College and University between January 1st and December 31st of the prior year. Each member of the faculty will be reviewed relative to the responsibilities of the position held. External feedback on faculty member performance may be requested by the Department Head from other groups and individuals including, but not limited to, the Department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department’s leadership team, faculty mentors, industry advisors, and students. A written assessment will be provided by the Department Head to each faculty member following the review.

1.2 Who is Affected: This annual review policy affects each person who is paid a majority part of his or her salary from Faculty Salaries provided to the Department of Visualization. Persons whose majority appointment is not administratively located in the Department of Visualization are not subject to review by the Department but may request Department of Visualization input for the annual review in their home department.

1.3 Reason for Policy: In compliance with University policy as set forth by the Dean of Faculties an annual review will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members at the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Distinguished Lecturer, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor. 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 their discipline and in the context of department goals.

1.4 Variability of Review Criteria Based Upon Rank: The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank. For lecturers of all ranks, the annual review will focus on performance and potential for continued appointment. For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the annual review focuses on their progress in a long-term scholarly career (and the review will be conducted differently depending upon the different stages of the faculty member’s career). For non-tenured, tenure-track assistant professors and instructors, the annual review process must also provide an indication as to their progress toward tenure and promotion.
1.5 Preparation of Annual Review Material: It is the responsibility of the faculty member to gather all material pertinent to the annual review.

1.6 Schedule and Timeline: It is the intention of the Department of Visualization to complete annual reviews by March 15th of the year following the review period. In order to accomplish this goal all material required for the annual review must be received by the Department office from the faculty member by February 1st for all faculty whose annual reviews require a report from the Promotion and Tenure Committee and February 15th if no report from the Promotion and Tenure Committee is required.

2. EVALUATION METHOD

2.1 Evaluation Period: Members of the department’s faculty are evaluated only for their performance during the period of appointment in the preceding twelve month calendar year beginning January 1st and ending December 31st.

2.2 Qualitative Evaluation Measures: It is the responsibility of the department head to assign a qualitative assessment for the performance of the faculty member in each appropriate category and overall. The qualifying terms signify varying levels of achievement from favorable to poor in the following order:
   a. Outstanding – job performance that is distinguished by its superiority to the departmental standards and expectations for the rank held.
   b. Good – job performance that exceeds the departmental standards and expectations for the rank held.
   c. Satisfactory – job performance that meets departmental standards and expectations for the rank held.
   d. Unsatisfactory – job performance that fails to meet departmental standards and expectations for the rank held.

2.3 Quantitative Evaluation Measures: It is the responsibility of the department head to assign a quantitative assessment for the performance of the faculty member in each appropriate category based upon the qualitative measures. The quantitative measures are used for comparison relative to peers and over time. The quantitative terms match to the qualitative terms in the following way:
   a. Outstanding = 3.0.
   b. Good = 2.0.
   c. Satisfactory = 1.0.
   d. Unsatisfactory = 0.0.

2.4 Distribution of Effort: Yearly appointment letters define the distribution of effort for faculty members relative to teaching, scholarship, and service.
   a. Assessment Relative to Effort: Distribution of effort defines how much value assessment in specific categories counts towards overall assessment. For example, a faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory evaluation for Service will
receive a relatively small penalty for the evaluation if Service counted for only 10% of their expected effort.

b. **Less Than Full Time Appointments**: The total effort is always 100% even though it is relative to appointment status. For example, a faculty member on two-thirds appointment will have a distribution of effort described as 100% of the time that is committed to the department.

3. **TEACHING**

A priority goal for the Department is the provision of quality instruction/teaching (which includes student development). This performance category is fundamental to all faculty positions—from Lecturer through Professor. All faculty members are expected to contribute in the area of instruction/teaching. This includes being effective in the classroom, striving to improve instructional/teaching effectiveness, and contributing to the development of our students.

3.1 **Effect on Annual Review**: Faculty will be graded as either *Outstanding*, *Good*, *Satisfactory*, *Unsatisfactory*, or *Not Applicable* for each of the following: Student Evaluations, Teaching Productivity, Teaching Innovation, Multidisciplinary Teaching Activity, Internationalization, and Diversity Enhancement. For the 2009 evaluation period only Student Evaluations, Teaching Productivity, and Teaching Innovation will contribute to the composite evaluation score. The grade *Not Applicable* will be used when the faculty member had no teaching duties during the evaluation period.

3.2 **Student Evaluations**: For each course taught student evaluations must be collected. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure student participation in the evaluation process.

- For purposes of annual reviews evaluations from individual courses will be compared to evaluations from similar courses within the department. For example, a composite evaluation from a studio course will be compared to other studio courses taught during the same semester within the department.
- On a per year basis a metric will be determined by the department head for determining a relationship between student evaluation scores and annual review grades. For example, for 2009 a student evaluation score of 4.29 may be determined to be *Outstanding* relative to peers teaching similar courses. However in 2008 the same score may have rated as *Good*.

3.3 **Teaching Productivity**: Productivity will be measured by the number of courses taught, complexity of the teaching situations (studios, large sections, etc.), and number of students supervised outside the classroom such as graduate student thesis supervision, and independent studies. The Department’s workload policy sets a minimum expected productivity. Compliance with the minimum is required for a *Satisfactory* grade in this category.

3.4 **Teaching Innovation**: Effective teaching requires recognition of the evolving nature of students, subject matter, and instruction methods. A *Good* grade recognizes that the faculty
member is adopting innovative methods for teaching across a broad range of activities and achieving admirable results.

3.5 Multidisciplinary Teaching Activity: University, College, and Departmental culture supports and encourages interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary collaboration in teaching. The following efforts are recognized as contributors to these goals.

- Teaching in interdisciplinary program courses (courses with prefixes outside of departmental degree prefixes, such as CPSE, MUSC that include more than one college as an active participant).
- Co-teaching with an instructor from another College or Department.
- 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.

3.6 Internationalization Teaching Activity: University, College, and Departmental culture supports and encourages faculty efforts that enhance diversity and internationalization climate and experiences for our students. The following efforts are recognized as contributors to these goals.

- 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.
- 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

4. SCHOLARSHIP

This performance category is fundamental to all tenured and tenure-track faculty positions. Non-tenured/tenure-track faculty may enhance their annual performance review through scholarship, but doing so is not a requirement for satisfactory performance. Scholarship consists of research, publication, creative works, and exhibitions.

4.1 Effect on Annual Review: Faculty will be graded as either Outstanding, Good, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Not Applicable for each of the following: Scholarly Productivity, Scholarly Quality, Scholarly Innovation, Multidisciplinary Scholarly Activity, Internationalization, and Diversity Enhancement. For the 2009 evaluation period only Scholarly Productivity, Scholarly Quality, and Scholarly Innovation will contribute to the composite evaluation score. The grade Not Applicable will be used when the faculty member had no scholarship responsibility during the evaluation period and produced no scholarly work.

4.2 Scholarly Expectations for Tenure-Track Faculty: Contributions to the body of knowledge and the creation of new ideas are critical to the Department’s academic reputation for excellence. The University, College, and Department view high quality scholarly activities...
and dissemination or exhibition of the results as fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and international prominence. It is therefore critical to the question of tenure that tenure-track faculty achieve the grade of Outstanding for the majority of their annual assessment. A majority of grades as Good or below will result in the Department Head’s assessment that the candidate did not make success progress toward tenure during the review period.

4.3 Scholarly Productivity: Productivity will be measured by the number of funding proposals submitted, publications of scholarly work, creative works exhibited, and commissions received during the review period. The requirement for a Satisfactory grade in this category is dependent upon the percentage of effort assigned for scholarly work during the review period.

4.4 Scholarly Quality: Indices of scholarly quality include: publications in leading scholarly/professional journals in the relevant disciplines, inclusion in major exhibitions or solo exhibitions of creative work, successful participation in major design competitions, peer recognition via research or publication and design awards, citations or evidence of precedent-setting testimony, membership on prestigious scholarly or practitioner editorial boards or juries, and significant external funding for research or creative activities.

4.5 Scholarly Innovation: Highly original scholarly activity is fundamental to attaining the Department of Visualization’s goals of academic excellence and international prominence. An Outstanding grade recognizes that the faculty member is achieving prominent results through unusual insight and adoption of innovative methods of inquiry.

4.6 Multidisciplinary Scholarly Activity: University, College, and Departmental culture supports and encourages interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary collaboration in scholarship. The following efforts are recognized as contributors to these goals.

- Activity in a University Landmark area of research.
- Active scholarly work with a university recognized center or institute that is either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary.
- Participation in a multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention (as demonstrated by funding, publication contracts, exhibition, or other special national recognition) where scholars from two or more TAMU colleges or outside universities are involved.

4.7 Internationalization Scholarly Activity: University, College, and Departmental culture supports and encourages faculty efforts that contribute to internationalization. The following efforts are recognized as contributors to these goals.

- Scholarly publications in 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.
4.8 Diversity Enhancing Scholarly Activity: It is recognized many faculty are involved in designing and conducting scholarly activity focused on knowledge of disparities and differences experienced by diverse groups and skills in working among diverse cultures. Continued and enhanced leadership in these endeavors is encouraged and valued. Examples of areas where faculty may be recognized include:

- 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

5 SERVICE/ENGAGEMENT

This performance category encompasses all duties to the institution, to students, colleagues, the department, College, and the University, as well as beyond campus.

5.1 Service to the Department: Examples include:
- Active participation in the administrative leadership of the department
- Active participation in Department level committees
- Participation in Departmental initiatives and exercises
- Participation in Departmental activities outside of course instruction and scholarship

5.2 Service to the College
- Active participation on College level committees

5.3 Service to the University
- Providing active leadership to a student organization
- 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.

5.4 Service to the Profession

5.5 Service to the Community
- 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.
6 SAFETY AND POLICY COMPLIANCE

Faculty members are responsible for reasonable mitigation of safety concerns in the environments they have been assigned as the lead scholar or instructor of record. Faculty must be in compliance with all required departmental, college, and university safety protocols to the best of their knowledge.

6.1 Effect on Annual Review: Faculty will be graded as either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. The safety and compliance grade will not be factored in to the composite score on the annual review. However, any outstanding failures to comply with required departmental, college, and university safety protocols must be resolved within 30 days after the annual review or the annual evaluation will be deemed as unsatisfactory.

6.2 Reporting: Faculty must report any safety concerns to the Department Head (or designee).

6.3 Classrooms: 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. 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.

6.4 Non-classroom Teaching Environments: If faculty members 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 designee) for safety concerns.

6.5 Teaching Assistants: 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.

6.6 Introduction of New Risks: When faculty members innovate or change the accustomed teaching environment to include potential hazards in a learning experience, they should inform the Department Head (or designee) and present how the appropriate safety issues are being mitigated.

6.7 Laboratory and Experimental Research: 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.