

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Report on Faculty Evaluation System
Spring, 2001**

The Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Faculty Senate was charged with identifying major concerns regarding the Faculty Evaluation System (FES) at Sam Houston State University and making recommendations accordingly to the Senate as deemed appropriate by the Committee. In consideration of this charge, the Committee reviewed the FES from a broad scope perspective dealing with general problems related to the system as a whole rather than focusing on procedural implementation. Although the Committee recognizes that some University-wide standardization of procedures is necessary for the system that is already in place to be fair and equitable, it is generally felt by members of the Committee that procedural "fine-tuning" should be performed at the college level where recommendations are made regarding the distribution of merit monies, as well as tenure and promotion. The Committee also views the FES critical to faculty development and as a management tool and, therefore, is of the opinion that its recommendations for changes in the system should not impede flexibility within the colleges. The Committee's recommendations focus on the needs of the FES to encompass defined performance measurement criteria, goal oriented directives, and a wide-range reward system.

Committee's Process of Identifying Concerns

- *Faculty input through members of Faculty Senate
- *Review of Academic Policy Statement 823017, "The Faculty Evaluation System," revised 2/9/99
- *Review of report by Review of Faculty Merit Committee (Tom Camfield, Chair) dated July, 1997
- *Interviews with Deans of the Colleges
- *Interviews with members of the University Faculty Evaluation Committee

Committee's Recommendations

Performance Measurement

A standing committee should exist for each college within the University to develop and periodically evaluate a comprehensive process for the annual review of faculty performance for the purposes of merit as well as reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The committee should consist of full-time faculty from each major discipline within the college, and should be appointed by and report to the dean of the college. It should be the responsibility of the committee and the dean of the college to establish precise and thorough performance criteria with designated weightings (values) within three of the four broad categories identified in the University's FES policy: scholarly and artistic endeavor, professional growth and professional activities, and non-teaching activities. A system of rating teaching effectiveness already exists within the University's FES policy. The committee and the dean of the college should have the flexibility to define and weight criteria of faculty performance deemed appropriate based on the value of various types of activities with special consideration given to the diversity of discipline programs

within the college and the missions of the college and the University. It should also be the responsibility of the committee and the dean of the college to reevaluate and refine the criteria for faculty performance and weightings on a continuing basis.

Individual Faculty Plan

To aid in clarifying and delineating faculty goals and administrative expectations, each department within the University, the chair in conjunction with the faculty members, should develop and implement an Individual Faculty Plan as part of the faculty evaluation process. The plan, on an annual basis, should incorporate faculty self-evaluation and self-improvement goals. Following discussion between the faculty member and the department chair concerning the FES reports completed during the previous year, the faculty member would be responsible for completing and submitting an Individual Faculty Plan during the early part of the Fall semester. At this time, the plan should be discussed in detail with the department chair. This process should enable the chair to offer guidance and assistance to the faculty member in selecting those activities that will lead toward achieving merit, tenure, or promotion.

Reward System

Since the State legislature requires all salary increases for faculty to be awarded on the basis of merit, the University's process of awarding merit should continue to distinguish between basic (level 1) merit based on a percentage of a faculty member's salary and higher levels of merit based on a percentage of salaries. This practice allows a percentage increase to be awarded to faculty who faithfully and satisfactorily perform the jobs they are employed to do and a percentage of salary, in increments, to be awarded to faculty who deserve greater recognition. However, the dean of each college should be allowed greater flexibility in establishing the percentage of salary and number of increments for the purpose of awarding higher levels of merit.

Additional Issues Considered by the Committee with No Recommendations

- *Student Evaluation: Separation and elimination from the University's FES
- Sole use of question 20 for rating teaching effectiveness
- Mean score of all student responses rather than mean score of all classes taught in a semester used for rating teaching effectiveness
- Electronically administered student evaluations
- *Evaluation of faculty granted reassigned and release time
- *Merit evaluations of department chairs
- *Emphasis on research