

1. GENERAL FEATURES OF THE FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Sam Houston State University is a public baccalaureate, professional, and doctoral university committed to excellence in teaching, in diverse scholarly activities, and in service that contributes to the common good.

1.01 The Faculty Performance Review process provides an orderly, systematic, and consistent approach to the assessment and evaluation of faculty performance at Sam Houston State University. The process is designed to maximize objectivity and minimize bias. The performance review is important for purposes of (1) faculty development, (2) promotion in academic rank, (3) rewarding meritorious performance through salary adjustments, (4) contract review for probationary faculty members, and (5) decisions concerning future contracts for non-tenured faculty.

1.02 Faculty Performance Review (FPR) is intended to recognize and reward excellence serving to advance the mission and goals of the University, as well as identify opportunities for professional development consistent with the university's commitment to continuous improvement. Faculty Performance Review recognizes that faculty members' interests, strengths, and skills evolve throughout their careers (see Academic Policy Statement 790601, *Faculty Instructional Workload*). The University is best served through implementation of a review system that has enough clarity to ensure accountability, enough flexibility to reward meritorious performance, and enough structure to promote fairness and consistency. FPR recognizes four categories for purposes of evaluation, namely, teaching effectiveness (FPR 1 and FPR 2), scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (FPR 3), service (FPR 4), and collegiality.

1.03 Evaluation standards creation, review, and dissemination.

- a. The respective colleges are responsible for the delineation of specific performance criteria to be assessed in FPR 1, FPR 2, FPR 3, FPR 4, and collegiality. Deans, department chairs, and faculty should collaborate to identify specific performance criteria and the minimum performance standards that may be unique to a given department/school or program.
- b. In order to ensure uniformity in evaluation of faculty performance across departments and colleges, the performance criteria developed should be calibrated to fit the standards rating outlined in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards rating.
- c. Standards to determine what constitutes appropriate, specific performance criteria must be developed and approved by the tenured and tenure-track faculty in each tenure unit. These standards will concur with the mission of the University, the mission and goals of

the college, and the mission and goals of the unit. They are to be based on, but need not be limited to, the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, scholarly accomplishments and/or artistic creativity, service, and professional development. A copy of these standards shall be forwarded for review and approval to the dean of the college or Executive Director of Library Services (EDLS) in which the tenure unit is located. If the dean/EDLS concurs, then the statement of standards shall be sent to the Provost who may accept them or return them to the presiding academic dean with suggestions for modification. In this process of approval, the advice and comments of the faculty shall be given the utmost consideration.

- d. These standards shall be subject to review by tenured and tenure-track faculty in the tenure unit at least every five years, unless requested earlier by the chair, or the dean/EDLS. Both the dean/EDLS and the Provost must approve a motion for early review or revision of standards in a tenure unit in order to deviate from the five-year periodic review timeline. A report of the periodic review, including any recommendations for modification, must be submitted for approval to the academic dean/EDLS and the Provost.
- e. A copy of the standards shall be posted on the university websites or in shared university drives and the link/path shall be provided to every tenured and tenure-track faculty member by the chair. For the purposes of this policy, “chair” refers to the individual who conducts the annual FPR review. In most cases, this is a chair, but the term should also be understood to encompass a coordinator, the EDLS, or a departmental promotion and merit committee where such exists.
- f. If a substantive change has occurred in the standards during the period to be covered by a faculty member’s comprehensive, periodic performance evaluation, the appropriate standards to the years in the review period when the standards were enforced will be applied.

1.04 Provisions are made in the Faculty Performance Review system for the following:

- a. A rating of teaching effectiveness to be accomplished by combining the chair’s evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness and end-of-course student evaluations of faculty. The chair’s evaluation will consider the general guidelines in Section 2. The end-of-course student evaluations of faculty will follow the guidelines in Section 3.
- b. A report of scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (FPR 3) is to be completed by using the “Report on Scholarly and/or creative Accomplishments.” This report is to be completed by each faculty member as a means of indicating his/her scholarly and/or creative accomplishments. Each faculty member must submit the appropriate supporting

documentation as required in the respective college's FPR policy to verify the scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (see Section 4.)

- c. A report of service activities (FPR 4) is to be completed by each member of the faculty as a means of indicating their service. Each faculty member must submit the appropriate supporting documentation as required in the respective college's FPR policy to verify service activities (see Section 5).
- d. An assessment of the collegiality for each faculty member.
 - i. In the case of tenure-track faculty, the assessment will be made separately by the DPTAC and department chair and will be recorded in the annual FPR summary report and concerns will be addressed.
 - ii. In the case of tenured faculty, the chair will assess the faculty member as part of the annual review and record the result in the annual FPR summary report. In the case where a concern with collegiality arises, the operations in sections 5 and 6 of APS 980204 Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty policy will be followed.
- e. A summary rating of each faculty member based upon FPR 1 through FPR 4 is to be completed by using the FPR Summary Report (Appendix B). This FPR Summary Report is to be completed by the department/school chair and is to be signed by both the chair and the faculty member. A faculty member who fails to sign the FPR Summary Report shall be ineligible for any merit increases based on productivity in the time period covered by the unsigned FPR Summary Report. A faculty member who believes the FPR Summary Report does not accurately reflect their productivity may appeal their summary rating as described in Section 7.

1.05 The FPR Summary Report is to reflect faculty activity for the twelve-month period beginning January 1 of each calendar year and ending December 31 of the same calendar year. Should a faculty member change their workload during this twelve-month period, they will negotiate with their academic dean and chair to determine the appropriate review standards.

1.06 Should a faculty member receive an administrative FPR X assignment (see APS 790601), the faculty member will receive a separate evaluation for the FPR X assignment by the supervisor of the assignment. Performance criteria for FPR 3 and FPR 4 may be modified to reflect any changes in expectations in these domains resulting from the administrative assignment (e.g., a possible decrease in reasonably expected numbers of publications [FPR 3] and possible increase in activities traditionally viewed as service [FPR 4]).

1.07 The timelines for the completion of the forms for each college and the library are to be established by the dean of each college/the EDLS.

2. CHAIR'S ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

2.01 A department/school chair may decide to use a faculty committee to assist in the assessment of teaching effectiveness and provide recommendations for ongoing professional development.

2.02 Teaching may include, among other things, classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; publication of and/or development of electronic instructional materials; and supervision of undergraduate and graduate students. The chair's rating of faculty teaching effectiveness should be based on as much information as can be reasonably obtained. FPR 1 Worksheet (see Appendix C) may be used. A variety of inputs are necessary to give the evaluation maximum validity. Two primary sources of information may be a teaching portfolio prepared by the faculty member and a conference with the individual being evaluated. Other inputs may include, but are not limited to, comments from students outside of the student evaluation instrument reflected in FPR 2, peer review of teaching, peer observation of teaching, student outcome measures, and results of assessment measures. Each college/department/school should define its own performance criteria for the chair's rating of faculty teaching effectiveness. Those criteria should be measured using the scale in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards. Items that may be considered by the chairs include, but are not limited to:

- Professionalism
- Adheres to scheduled class meeting times
- Is reasonably available for student conferences and counseling; maintains appropriate office hours
- Submits grades, reports, etc. in a timely manner
- Maintains appropriate professional demeanor in teaching situations
- Maintains high ethical standards of honesty and objectivity
- Adheres to university, college, department and/or school timelines, policies, and procedures
- Regularly prepares for teaching
- Attempts to assess and improve own teaching
- Commitment and contribution to course and/or program assessments
- Engages in professional development aimed at improving teaching effectiveness
- Uses fair and appropriate grading practice(s)

In accordance with college and/or department/school policy, each faculty member may present a teaching portfolio and update it on an annual basis. The portfolio should provide information relating to teaching effectiveness. Because of the wide variety of programs and teaching

situations, departments/schools should develop criteria as to the appropriate content, limitations, and uses of portfolios. Those criteria should be articulated in and aligned with standards identified in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards.

2.03 FPR 1 reflects the chair's rating of teaching effectiveness for each faculty member on a ten-point scale corresponding to the standards identified in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards. The FPR 1 worksheet or a similar tool will be used by the chair to document the chair's rating of teaching effectiveness.

3. STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

3.01 End-of-course student evaluations of faculty are required by the Texas Education Code § 51.974(h).

3.02 End-of-course student evaluations of faculty are used as inputs for the FPR 2 score. If necessary, department/school chairs shall translate the scores provided through the university approved student evaluation of faculty instrument to fit the standards identified in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards.

3.03 Federal and state law protects each student's privacy rights. For this reason, the class instructor should not have access to completed individual survey forms or score summaries until after all grades have been submitted to the Registrar. Even then, any information on the forms that identifies a student shall be redacted prior to being provided to the instructor.

4. REPORT ON SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

4.01 This report is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department/school chair as input for the FPR 3 score. The final FPR 3 score will be on a ten-point scale corresponding to the standards identified in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards.

4.02 For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publications. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative works and activities, such as instructional technology; poetry; painting; musical, dance, or theatrical performance or composition; and sculpture. Scholarly activities may include, but are not limited to, scholarship of discovery (this is the traditional "basic research"); scholarship of integration (interpretation and analysis of existing knowledge); scholarship of application and practice (application of knowledge to address important individual, institutional and societal challenges); scholarship of teaching and learning (development and improvement of pedagogical practices, disseminated to the discipline); scholarship of engagement (collaborative partnerships with communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources). Deans, department chairs, and

faculty should collaborate when adding additional subcategories or activities in accordance with department/school/college expectations.

4.03 Different disciplines and individuals define creative accomplishments in different ways, engage in different types of artistic endeavors, and evaluate such endeavors differently. As such, the criteria for assessment and evaluation can be defined here in only the most general terms. Each college/department/school should define its own specific criteria. Ultimately, individuals must be evaluated on the merit of their creative accomplishments and the level of their critical success.

4.04 The respective colleges are responsible for the determination and development of specific performance criteria to be assessed in FPR 3. Deans, department chairs, and faculty should collaborate to identify specific performance criteria that may be unique to a given department/school or program. Those criteria should be calibrated against the standards identified in Appendix A. In establishing performance criteria, each college is encouraged to address quality as well as quantity.

5. REPORT ON SERVICE

5.01 This report is to be completed by each faculty member and submitted to his/her department/school chair as input for the FPR 4 score. The final FPR 4 score is assigned according to the standards identified in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards.

5.02 Service includes service to students, colleagues, program, department/school, college, and the University; administrative and committee service; and unpaid service beyond the University to the profession, locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, including academic or professionally related public service. Activities that may be considered, but are not limited to, include:

- Compliance with department policies and procedures related to service
- Committee service
- Student recruitment
- Student advisement
- Student mentoring
- Acquisition and development of facilities, equipment, and other resources
- Appropriate professional development activities
- Student organization(s) sponsorship
- Program/curriculum development
- Program/curriculum assessment
- Faculty-community projects for leadership, economic, or social service development

5.03 The respective departments and colleges are responsible for the determination and development of specific performance standards to be evaluated in FPR 4. Deans, department chairs, and faculty should collaborate to identify specific performance standards that may be unique to a given department/school or program. Those standards should be calibrated against those identified in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards. The performance standards should identify types of service that advance the mission and goals of the University, college, and department/school.

5.04 In order to ensure that faculty receive full credit for their service contributions, the nature and extent of those contributions must be documented. In addition to letters, notes, e-mails, and so forth from beneficiaries of that service, faculty service may be documented through the Committee Service Contribution form in Appendix D.

6. COLLEGIALITY

6.01 The university environment is based on the principles of free exchange of ideas and information. Diverse viewpoints and ideas are a cornerstone of this university environment and can lead to disagreement. Differences of opinion are necessary for the growth of the university and the advancement of our respective fields. Respectful interaction and professionalism that is consistent with advancing the department or university are Sam Houston State University's definition of collegiality. Unless otherwise demonstrated and documented, it is assumed that all faculty at SHSU are collegial members of the university community.

6.02 In the rare instance where a DPTAC and/or the respective department chair have a concern that an individual's behavior:

- a) Hinders the department/school/program, college, or university mission or
- b) Hinders the effectiveness of SHSU colleague(s)

then that individual will be deemed to be non-collegial.

6.03 In order to facilitate a conversation about collegiality, a faculty member's collegiality will be assessed annually. The faculty member's rank will determine if the DPTAC and Chair or Chair alone will evaluate whether each tenured or tenure track faculty member is or is not collegial for the purposes of the Annual FPR. Collegiality is *not* subject to the standards identified in Appendix A, Faculty Performance Standards numerical rating system like the other four FPR categories.

If collegiality is identified as a concern, the Department Chair will document evidence of the concern and take steps to address the concern appropriate to the faculty member's rank.

- For tenured faculty, the Chair will follow the corrective action steps outlined in APS 980204 Performance Review of Tenured Faculty Policy, sections 5 & 6.
- For Tenure-track faculty, for whom the DPTAC is annually consulted to review a faculty member, if collegiality is identified as a concern, the chair will follow the policies outlined in this policy, section 7.02, and will be noted in the review. In a case where a concern with collegiality arose from egregious non-collegial behavior and where the tenure-track faculty member refuses to correct the behavior, the steps outlined in APS 900417 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, section 5 would be followed.

7. SUMMARY RATING REPORT

7.01 The "FPR Summary Report" is to be completed by the department/school chair, EDLS, or dean, as appropriate.

7.02 There must be an individual conference between the faculty member being evaluated and the chair to discuss the FPR Summary Report and to facilitate ongoing professional development.

7.03 Once completed, the "FPR Summary Report" is to be signed by the chair and by the faculty member. The signature of the faculty member represents merely an indication that the completed report has been reviewed with the faculty member by the chair and does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the report's contents. The faculty member's signature does not preclude the faculty member from appealing the summary rating report.

7.04 Participation in the Faculty Performance Review process is required of all full-time faculty. Failure to participate in the process will result in scores of zero and may subject the faculty member to disciplinary procedures per the Texas State University System Rules and Regulations related to: (a) insubordination (§ 451(2)), (b) serious professional or personal misconduct (§ 451(3)), and/or (c) professional incompetence (§ 451(4)).

7.05 A faculty member may appeal his/her FPR Summary Rating Report score to the chair and/or academic dean. The faculty member must submit in writing their rationale for the appeal accompanied by appropriate documentation. If not satisfied with the dean's decision, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost. The decision of the Provost is final.

APPROVED: _____

Dana G. Hoyt, President

DATE: _____

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This academic policy statement (APS) has been approved by the reviewer(s) listed below and represents SHSU's Division of Academic Affairs' policy from the date of this document until superseded.

Original Date: October 2, 2018

Review Cycle: Five Years

Reviewer(s): Council of Academic Deans
Faculty Senate
Academic Policy Council

Review Date: Fall 2019

Approved:

Date:

Richard Eglsaer
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs

Proposed

Appendix A

Faculty Performance Standards

Outstanding	10
Far exceeds expectations	9
Exceeds expectations	8
Somewhat exceeds expectations	7
Meets expectations well	6
Meets expectations	5
Minimally meets expectations	4
Somewhat below expectations	3*
Below expectations	2
Well below expectations	1

Appendix B

FPR SUMMARY REPORT

Ratings by the students and chair should be considered separately. Student ratings should be converted, based on national norms, to align with Faculty Performance Standards. The remaining activity areas are each to be evaluated as a whole. For example, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (FPR 3) should be evaluated and assigned an overall rating from 1 to 10.

Faculty Member's Workload Assignment (check one): Normative nine credit hours per semester
Normative twelve credit hours per semester FPR X (if applicable)

	FPR Category	Rating
1	Chair's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness	
2	Students' Rating of Teaching Effectiveness	
3	Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments	
4	Service	
5	Collegiality	Concern? (attach documentation)
6	FPR X (%FTE)	

Appendix C

FPR 1 WORKSHEET

Chair's Rating of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness Worksheet

Faculty Member's Name:
Identification Number: _____ Date:

Using the guidelines in Section 2 and the appropriate college/department/school criteria, please document evidence/rationale for the chair's rating of teaching effectiveness score listed below. The broad categories listed in Section

2. are reproduced for your convenience.

Professionalism

Content and Pedagogy

Other

Chair's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness

The signatures below indicate only that the department/school chair and faculty member met to discuss the faculty member's annual evaluation pertaining to APS 820317 and do not necessarily indicate the faculty member's concurrence with the same.

Chair's Signature: _____

Faculty Member's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix D

Committee Service Contribution Form Committee member:

Committee name: _____

Committee chair:

The amount of work typically required for this committee is (pull-down menu): Less than 1 hour per week

1-2 hours per week 2-5 hours per week 5-8 hours per week

More than 8 hours per week

The time I spent on this committee was (pull-down menu): Less than 1 hour per week

1-2 hours per week 2-5 hours per week 5-8 hours per week

More than 8 hours per week

Please describe the how your efforts on this committee advanced the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the program, school, department, college, or university.

Comments (open-ended):