Faculty Annual Evaluation and Post-Tenure Review
in the Department of Philosophy at Texas A&M

This document describes the faculty annual evaluation procedures that are current in the Department of Philosophy as of the 2012-2013 cycle, and how the requirement for post-tenure peer review is incorporated into those annual procedures.

Faculty Annual Evaluation Procedures

Early in each spring semester, faculty file an annual report of their accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and service over a three calendar-year period. On the basis of this information, the Head evaluates each faculty member separately on research, teaching, and service using the following five point scale:

- 5 = Excellent,
- 4 = Exceeds Expectations,
- 3 = Meets Expectations,
- 2 = Minimally Satisfactory, and
- 1 = Unsatisfactory.

These separate evaluations of research, teaching, and service are combined into an overall annual numerical evaluation using the following standard weightings.

- Tenured faculty: research = 40%, teaching = 40%, service = 20%.
- Untenured faculty: research = 45%, teaching = 45%, service = 10%.

Individual faculty may provide a written request and rationale for departing from the standard weightings, to which the Head replies, indicating what weightings will be used and why. (Note: having had a one or two semester release from teaching during the three-year reporting period does not suffice to justify an adjustment in the standard weightings.)

Post-Tenure Peer Review

In 2008, in response to the Office of General Council’s finding that Department Head only review did not satisfy the statutory requirement that all faculty receive post-tenure peer review at least once every six years, the Department of Philosophy created a Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee (the FAEAC).

The FAEAC is composed of three faculty serving staggered three year terms, plus an alternate (who becomes a voting member when a regular member recuses him- or herself). After a year, the alternate becomes the junior member of the FAEAC, so in effect members serve four year terms. The initial order of appointment to the FAEAC was determined by a randomly-generated list of all tenured faculty (except the Head), and newly tenured faculty (and Heads when their terms end) are added to the list at a random position following the names of all those currently serving on the committee, with the proviso that at least one associate professor and one full professor must always be included among the regular members.

Each year, the Head provides the FAEAC with copies of draft annual evaluations of faculty. The FAEAC then reports to the Head whether or not it concurs with each draft evaluation, indicating in what parts of the evaluation it does not concur in particular cases, why, and suggesting an alternate rating. The Head then responds, indicating in which cases ratings are being changed or not, and why.

In this way, post-tenure peer review of all faculty is incorporated into the annual evaluation process on an annual basis.