**Annual Performance Evaluation and Merit RTT/PPS No. 04.02.01**

 **Effective Date: 06/01/2022**

 **Next Review Date: 06/01/2024 (E2Y)**

 **Sr. Reviewer: CHP Dean**

**POLICY STATEMENT**

*Texas State University is committed to providing fair evaluations on individual performance, and we will tie annual evaluation to merit awards.*

**01. SCOPE**

01.01 It is the policy of this University and the RTT program that all faculty will be evaluated annually. The evaluation period covers the preceding calendar year and must be completed by March 1.

01.02 Annual faculty evaluations are to provide for self-development; to identify, reinforce, and share the strengths of faculty; to extend opportunities for continuous professional development’ and to provide for identifying and strengthening the role of faculty members within their academic units.

01.03 This annual evaluation of continuing faculty is the responsibility of faculty governance, a duty shared by the chairs/directors and personnel committees.

01.04 In order to receive an award for merit, a faculty member must meet the minimal criterial in all three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative, and service, and exceed the criteria in at least one area.

**02. RELATED UNIVERSITY POLICIES/DOCUMENTS**

02.01 College of Health Professions 04.01.50

02.02 AA/PPS 04.01.01: Faculty Hiring

02.03 AA/PPS 04.01.22: Clinical Faculty Appointments

02.04 AA/PPS 04.02.01: Development/ Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

02.05 AA/PPS 04.02.20 and CHP 04.02.20: Tenure and Promotion

02.06 AA/PPS 04.01.50 (7.10) and CHP 04.01.50 Awarding Merit and Performance Raises to Texas State Faculty Members.

**03. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION**

03.01 All RTT faculty will be evaluated annually by the RTT program. These include:

 Tenured Faculty

 Tenure-track Faculty

 Continuing Faculty on a term appointment (senior lecturer, clinical, research, et al.)

 Non-continuing faculty on a per-course or FTE appointment for one semester or one year

 Graduate teaching assistants

03.02 The evaluation, which covers the preceding calendar year, must be completed by March 1 and follow the below due dates for submission of material, reviews, and reports:

 January 31: Faculty submit current Texas State Vita, Summary Form for Annual Performance Evaluation, Self-Evaluation Form, plus required supporting documents (see Summary Form for Annual Performance Evaluation) via faculty qualifications.

 February 15: Personnel Committee to submit completed RTT Personnel Committee’s Annual Evaluation of Faculty form for each faculty member following review of submitted materials and meet to discuss.

 March 1: Program Chair to submit to the Dean the completed RTT Chair Annual Evaluation of Faculty form for each faculty member based on submitted materials and the Personnel Committee feedback.

03.04 **Performance Evaluations** will be conducted according to AA/PPS 04.01.50. The evaluation will cover the previous calendar year immediately before the evaluation. Members of the Personnel Committee will rate submitted material for each of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service).

03.05 **Merit Evaluations** will be conducted according to AA/PPS 04.01.50. The evaluation will cover the previous 3 calendar years completed immediately before the evaluation.

03.06 **Communication of Evaluation Completion** will be provided through digital measures. Faculty will be able to read all comments from Chair and Personnel Committee. They may also request a meeting with the chair to discuss. If they agree with the decision, they will electronically sign and submit to next level in faculty qualifications. If they do not agree, they may request a meeting with the Chair to discuss the evaluation.

03.07 **Failure of Nontenured Faculty to Meet Expectations.** If the department determines that a nontenured faculty member is not to be retained, it will give appropriate notice to the faculty member. If the faculty member is to be retained, the chair will provide the faculty member with specific suggestions for improvement.

03.08 **Failure of Tenured Faculty to Meet Expectations**. After the regular annual evaluation of faculty is complete, if the department process finds that a faculty member may have failed to meet departmental expectations, the chair will inform the affected faculty member in writing and invite the faculty member to meet and discuss the evaluation. This notice should be given within 2 class days from completion of the annual evaluation. The meeting between the chair and the faculty member should be conducted within 6 class days after the faculty member receives the chair’s written notification. If the faculty member chooses not to meet with the chair, the faculty member should notify the chair in writing within the 6-day period. The faculty member’s failure to respond does not prevent the process from moving forward.

Discussion of evaluation results with the faculty member, Personnel Committee proceedings, the formulation of a Professional Development Plan, and annual evaluations and proceedings under the Professional Development Plan will be pursuant **AA/PPS No. 04.02.01.**

03.09 **Documentation for Faculty Evaluation**

 **For Performance: (1-year assessment)**

 All faculty members must submit to the Chair via faculty qualifications:

1. An updated copy of the standard Texas State University vita.

2. A completed College of Health Professions Summary Form for Annual Evaluation listing activities during the previous calendar year.

3. A completed Faculty Self Evaluation Level Rating Form for the previous calendar year.

4. A Chair’s Evaluation will be completed using the criteria stipulated in the Radiation Therapy Program Evaluation of Performance Levels and Evaluation Criteria Policy.

5. Written recommendation to the Dean of the college by the Personnel Committee upon review of the faculty file for Performance Award considerations.

 03. 10 **For Merit: (3-year assessment)**

The following faculty member’s material will be compiled and used for evaluation by the Chair:

1. An updated copy of the standard Texas State University vita in addition to:

2. Completed College of Health Professions Summary Form for Annual Evaluation listing activities over the previous 3 calendar years.

3. Completed Faculty Self Evaluation Form for the previous 3 calendar years.

4. The Chair’s Evaluations over the previous 3 calendar years.

5. Written recommendations to the Dean of the college by the Personnel Committee over the 3 calendar years being assessed.

 03.11 **Basis for Recommendations**

Recommendations for Performance and Merit awards are based on the faculty’s contributions and performance in: 1) Teaching, 2) Scholarly and/or Creative Activity, and 3) Service to the Program, Department, College, University, Profession, and the Community. Attainment of minimal required levels of performance only allows but does not obligate the reviewers to recommend awards or promotions. All recommendations are based on professional judgments and the criteria are designed to inform those judgments. Additional considerations for awards are dependent on college budget allowances as well as the pleasure of the Dean of the College of Health Professions and the Provost of the University. A faculty member who meets or exceeds these expectations is in no way assured of award, reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

Each faculty member being considered for award will be reviewed using the criteria and performance levels defined in the section titled, “Required Performance Levels for Reappointment, Performance, and Merit of this document.

 **For Performance: (1-year assessment)**

Recommendation for Performance will be based on the culmination of ratings, reviews, and recommendations using the material and documentation identified above. The Personnel Committee will rate faculty members according to the Levels of Expectations, as defined in the section titled, “Required Performance Levels for Reappointment, Performance, and Merit of this document in each of three areas identified previously.

 **For Merit: (3-year assessment)**

Basis for recommendation for merit award will be the performance evaluation. No faculty member who has been determined to be non-performing in any category during any of the years covered will be eligible for a merit award.

The Chair will award meritorious performance using the merit funds available to the department distributing the funds equally to eligible faculty members. Merit pay is intended to reward those who consistently exceed the minimal standards for a rating of Performing. Merit should also be used to award those who exercise leadership and contribute positively to the overall missions of the Program, College, and University.

Guideline: If an individual is meeting but not exceeding performance criteria in one or more of the three areas, then the merit rating should not reflect an award.

Members of the Personnel Committee will review and notify the Chair of recommended changes in merit distribution.

**04. Radiation Therapy Merit**

04.01 Merit is a category which is used when the President deems it appropriate. Under the current university administration, a faculty member is eligible for merit only when his/her activities can be demonstrated as truly meritorious or outstanding as defined by the Program policy. Achieving a meritorious rating, means that a faculty person is eligible to be considered for a merit raise (if merit raise money is available). It does not guarantee or imply that a merit raise will be awarded.

04.02 The Radiation Therapy Program is guided by HP/PPS 04.02.50 and AA/PPS 04.01.50.

1. A merit raise shall be defined as additional salary to be awarded to

 faculty whose performance was clearly exceptional during the

 designated merit evaluation period.

 2. Eligible Faculty: All continuing percentage-contract faculty are

 eligible for merit raises awarded through this process, with the

 exception of doctoral and graduate assistants, chairs/directors, deans,

 and a few specially assigned faculty members identified annually by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. Time period will be from January 1 of each year through December 31

 of the same year. All materials and documentation submitted for

 consideration must have been completed during this time period.

4. Faculty material will be submitted along with the material for annual

 review via faculty qualifications.

5. The personnel committee will review eligible faculty member on their

 teaching, scholarly/creative, and service, as appropriate to the

 faculty’s assigned duties. They will submit their comments to the chair

 via faculty qualifications. A meeting of the chair and personnel

 committee will take place if there are differing opinions.

6. Merit awards should be based on meritorious performance for the

 identified evaluation period, normally three years. The rolling multi-

 year period allows faculty who have stellar accomplishments in one or

 two years, but fewer in others, to qualify for an averaged degree of

 merit.

7. Before making final merit recommendations, the chair/director shall be

 required to indicate to each faculty, without necessarily mentioning a

 specific amount or percentage of increase, whether he/she intends to

 recommend that faculty member for merit and the approximate level of

 merit determined for that faculty member (e.g., High, medium, low).

8. After receiving the chair/director’s preliminary recommendation, faculty

 who believe their accomplishments have been overlooked or

 undervalued may, within five working days, request a meeting with the

 chair/director. At this meeting, the chair/director shall explain the

 reasons for the level of merit or for denying merit, and the faculty

 member may ask for reconsideration. After considering the

 accomplishments of all faculty who requested a review of their

 activities, the chair/director will proceed to make a final merit

 recommendation to the dean.

9. Chairs/directors may, but are not required to, inform their faculty of the

 final merit award for all faculty members in the department/ school.

**05. Radiation Therapy Program Faculty Evaluation Level Rating**

05.01 The RTT Program defines teaching as including not only classroom and web-delivery performance, but other factors such as preparing courses, creating effective testing strategies, developing curriculum, preparing syllabi and teaching materials, clinical coordination and materials, maintain minimum of five office hours per week for students enrolled in classes and additional hours during registration periods, advising students appropriately, timely on academic and career matters, maintaining competency in the profession by obtaining professional CE’s, maintaining ARRT certification, sponsoring student organizations/ activities outside of the classroom, and mentoring students.

05.02 The teaching of every faculty member will be evaluated every year by the RTT Personnel Committee and the Program Chair, based on contributions during the calendar year January-December. The evaluations of teaching are based on the following:

 1. Evidence of appropriate level of course preparation.

 2. Dedication as measured by commitment to class attendance, office hours, and course duties.

 3. Formal peer evaluations by faculty members.

 4. Official student class evaluations.

 5. Faculty member’s Self-evaluation.

 6. Faculty member may also request formal review of handouts, exams, assignments, and other course materials to include those related to

 on-campus as well as web-based course delivery.

 7. Tenure-track faculty should request at minimum one peer evaluation of

 teaching every semester. Tenured faculty may also request peer

 evaluations be completed.

 05.03. Required Teaching Elements: All faculty are expected to show in their annual review that they are:

1. Have a majority of student course evaluations which reflect acceptable

 teaching standards. Rating scale for course evaluations to be used is

 very high quality = 4.0+ on 5-point scale

 high quality= 3.75

 adequate quality= 3.5

 2. Maintain a minimum of five office hours per week on campus to be available for students enrolled in classes and accessible on a timely basis.

 3. provide additional office hours during peak advising/registration periods and accessible to students for advising as needed.

 4. Maintain professional competence by securing appropriate CE’s.

 5. Maintain ARRT certification.

 05.04. Additional Teaching Elements: Elements which further demonstrate teaching quality are:

 1. Positive peer evaluations of teaching by faculty members (required for tenure-track faculty).

 2. University Mentor status

 3. Sponsorship of student organization

 4. Sponsorship of outside student activities

 5. Teaching overloads, large classes, or writing intensive courses

 6. Teaching courses via distance education

 7. Developing library or other learning resources

 8. Maintaining/ coordinating lab software, hardware, and usage

 9. Developing or using challenging instructional methods over and above normal classroom expectations

 10. Successful procuring grants for student stipends, curriculum development, or program support

 11. Conducting guest lectures

 12. Conducting program orientation sessions, clinical instructor workshops, or Bobcat Days

 13. Winning a teaching award

 14. Demonstrating progress toward a relevant advanced degree

 15. Providing meaningful input into curriculum development

 16. Other elements as approved

 05.05 Teaching Level Rubric

 1. Teaching Level I

 a. A Level I rating in Teaching indicates that all of the following elements were above standard.

 i. A majority of students evaluations reflect a very high quality of teaching (4.0+ on a 5-point scale).

 ii. All other Required Teaching Elements (see above list) are strongly evident

 iii. At least three (3) Additional Teaching elements are evident as determined by the Personnel Committee.

 2. Teaching Level II

 a. A Level II rating in Teaching indicates that all of the following elements are evident.

 i. Presenting a majority of student evaluations that reflect a high quality of teaching (at least a 3.75).

 ii. All other Required Teaching Elements are clearly evident.

 iii. Faculty have demonstrated at least two (2) of the additional teaching elements.

 iv. Must demonstrate at least one (1) of the additional teaching elements as determined by the Personnel Committee and the Chair.

 3. Teaching Level III

 a. A Level III rating in Teaching indicates that all of the following elements are evident.

 i. Presenting a majority of student evaluations that reflect quality teaching (at least 3.5).

 ii. All other Required Teaching Elements are evident

 4. Teaching Level IV

 a. A Level IV rating in Teaching indicates a failure to meet any two

 (2) of the following criteria:

 i. Presenting a majority of student evaluations that reflect quality teaching (below 3.5)

 ii. Any Required Teaching Elements are evident

 5. Teaching Level V

 a. A level V rating in Teaching indicates a failure to meet any two

 (2) of the following criteria:

 i. Presenting a majority of student evaluations that reflect

 quality teaching (below 3.5)

 ii. Any of the other Required Teaching Elements

 05.06 Scholarly and Creative Activity

 1. Scholarship is defined as original research (quantitative or qualitative), applied research, and pedagogical research.

 2. In no case will "equivalent activities" be considered to replace completely traditional “refereed” scholarly activities. Refereed means blind peer review in the case of a journal article. In the case of a book, chapter in a book, or monograph, it means peer review, but not necessarily blind peer review.

 3. Articles, books, or monographs “in press” can be counted in annual review only once. (For example, a document cannot be counted “in press” during one annual review cycle and counted again in subsequent years when it is actually in print. The faculty member must indicate in which annual review cycle he or she wants the document “in press” to be counted and must document its status.)

 4. In addition to the quantitative requirement, there is an important

 qualitative requirement. The Chair and Personnel Committee will

 provide a qualitative assessment of the candidate's scholarship based

 on such factors as acceptance rates of journals in which articles have

 appeared, prestige of organizations to which papers were presented,

 and opinions of experts outside the university. They will also examine

 whether a presentation or written work is refereed or not, and the

 source, award amount, and educational or research significance of any

 grant or contract.

 5. Elements Demonstrating Scholarly/ Creative Activity: including but not

 limited to the following list:

 a. One (1) funded grant or contract from outside the university

 b. One (1) renewal of an existing funded grant from outside the

 university

 c. One (1) approved but not funded outside grant or contract

 d. One (1) publication in a refereed book or an article in a refereed journal

 e. Serving on one (1) editorial board of a national journal (with

 documentation to demonstrate substantial activity)

 f. Two (2) scholarly presentations (international, national, regional, or state)

 g. Two (2) Discussant or Presenter (panel discussion or workshop leader at the international, national, regional, or state level)

 h. Four (4) book review and/or newsletter articles

 i. One (1) international, national, regional, or state-level recognition for scholarly contribution through a variety of media (such as developing software)

 j. One (l) refereed chapter in a book, textbook, or monograph

 k. One (1) technical report or monograph based on grant activity

 l. Editing one (1) book

 m. Or any combination of equivalent activities (for example, 1 scholarly presentation and 1 panel discussant meets the criteria)

 n. One (1) funded grant from inside the university

 05.07 Scholarly and Creative Activity Rubric

 1. Scholarly and Creative Activity Level I

 a. A level I am rating in Scholarly/ Creative Activity indicates that all of the following elements are achieved:

 i. One (1) publication in a refereed book or a refereed journal ii. Any two (2) Elements Demonstrating Scholarly and Creative Activity

 2. Scholarly and Creative Activity Level II

 a. A level II rating in Scholarly/ Creative Activity indicates that the following elements are evident:

 i. One (1) publication in a refereed book or a refereed journal, or any one (1) funded grant or contract. ii. One (1) of the Elements Demonstrating Scholarly and Creative Activity

 3. Scholarly and Creative Activity Level III

 a. A level III rating in Scholarly/ Creative Activity indicates that the following elements are evident:

 i. Any one of the Elements Demonstrating Scholarly and Creative Activity.

 4. Scholarly and Creative Activity Level IV

 a. A level IV rating in Scholarly/ Creative Activity indicates that the following elements are evident:

 i. Some activity listed in Elements Demonstrating scholarly and Creative Activity, but less than the minimum requirements in Level III, or projects that are underway that will lead to future scholastic activity.

 5. Scholarly and Creative Activity Level V

 a. A Level V rating indicates no activity documented in the Scholarly/ Creative area

 05.08 Service

 1. The program defines service and service leadership as professionally related activity, other than teaching or scholarship, which contributes to the college, university, community, or profession. Service activities encompass those performed using competencies relevant to the faculty member’s role as a radiation therapy educator. For a faculty member to receive a ranking of adequate or above during the annual review process, he/she must demonstrate service and/or leadership at the Program level.

 2. In addition to the requirement that the faculty person must engage in service and/or service leadership at various levels, including the Program level, the Personnel Committee and Chair also assess the quality of the service or leadership, based on the documentation that the faculty member provides. Examples of service activities include but are not limited to 1) active membership and participation in professional organizations, 2) active membership on committees, 3) training, volunteering, supervising, and consulting with health-related agencies and organizations.

 3. The Chair and the Personnel Committee assess the quality-of-service leadership based on the faculty member’s documentation of same. Examples of service leadership include but are not limited to 1) holding office in professional organizations, 2) directing university, college, or program committees, 3) organizing a task force, 4) initiating a special project, or 5) other equivalent activities.

 05.09 Service Level Rubric

 1. **Service Level I**

 a. Documented quality contributions on five (5) of the following levels, or documented quality contributions on three (3) of the levels with documented extraordinary service or leadership on at least one (1) additional level

 i. Leadership and Service at the Program level

 ii. Leadership and/or service at the College level

 iii. Leadership and/or service at the University level

 iv. Leadership and/or service at the community level

 v. Leadership or active participation in an international, national, or state professional organization

 vi. Active participation in advisory board meetings and activities

 2. **Service Level II**

 a. Documented quality contributions on four (4) of the following levels, or documented quality contributions on two (2) of the levels with extraordinary service or leadership on at least one (1) additional level

 i. Leadership and service at the Program level

 ii. Leadership and/or service at the College level

 iii. Leadership and/or service at the University level

 iv. Leadership and/or service at the community level

 v. Leadership or active participation in an international, national, or state professional organization

 vi. Active participation in advisory board meetings and activities

 3. **Service Level III**

 a. Documented quality contributions on three (3) of the following levels or documented quality contributions on one (1) of the levels with extraordinary service or leadership on at least one (1) additional level

 i. Leadership and service at the Program level

 ii. Leadership and/or service at the College level

 iii. Leadership and/or service at the University level

 iv. Leadership and/or service at the community level

 v. Leadership or active participation in an international, national, or state professional organization

 vi. Active participation in advisory board meetings and activities

 4. **Service Level IV**

 a. Documented quality contributions on two (2) of the following levels or documented quality contributions on only one (1) level

 i. Service at the Department level

 ii. Service at the College level

 iii. Service at the University level

 iv. Service at the community level

 v. Participation in an international, national, or state professional organization

 vi. Active participation in advisory board meetings and activities

 5. **Service Level V**

 a. Documented quality contributions at only one (1) level or no documented service contributions at any level

 i. Service at the Department level

 ii. Service at the College level

 iii. Service at the University level

 iv. Service at the community level

 v. Participation in an international, national, or state professional organization

 vi. Participation in advisory board meetings and activities

**06. Radiation Therapy Program Required Performance Levels for Reappointment, Performance, and Merit**

 06.01 The Radiation therapy Program has defined the definition of Teaching Levels I-V; Scholarly and Creative Activity Levels I-V; and Service Levels I-V.

 1. Reappointment. Non-tenured faculty may be appointed either as continuing faculty, temporary faculty or clinical faculty. According to the 2019-2020 Faculty Handbook, <https://www.provost.txstate.edu/faculty-handbook.html>, continuing faculty include those who are hired in a traditional academic rank with the clear understanding that they may be rehired for one or more additional years. Eligibility for reappointment is contingent upon a continuing faculty member achieving satisfactory annual evaluations.

 2. Annual Review. The purposes of annual review include providing an opportunity for self-development; identifying, reinforcing, and sharing the strength of faculty; extending opportunities for continuous development; and identifying and strengthening the role of the faculty members in the unit.

 3. Faculty annual reviews are separate from but related to the tenure and promotion reviews. Cumulative annual reviews inform the Personnel Committee and Director about the body of work that the faculty person is developing over time. Annual evaluations form part of a faculty member’s file in tenure and promotion decisions.

 4. Specific guidelines for evaluating tenure-track faculty members are found in:

 AA/PPS No. 04.02.01: Development/Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

 AA/PPS No. 04.02.20: Tenure and Promotion Review

 HP/PPS 04.02.20: Tenure and Promotion

 5. Performance. Performance is a term used at this university to indicate that an employee meets the demands of the job appropriately. Achieving an acceptable performance rating means that a faculty person is eligible to be considered for a performance raise (if performance raise money is available). It does not guarantee or imply that a performance raise will be awarded.

 6. Merit. Merit is a category which is used when the President deems it appropriate. Under the current university administration, a faculty member is eligible for merit only when his/her activities can be demonstrated as truly meritorious or outstanding as defined by Program policy. Achieving a meritorious rating, means that a faculty person is eligible to be considered for a merit raise (if merit raise money is available). It does not guarantee or imply that a merit raise will be awarded.

 7. According to our Program policy, in general:

 Level I equates excellent activity and progress toward meeting Program and personal professional goals

 Level II equates very good activity and progress toward meeting Program and personal professional goals

 Level III equates good activity and progress toward meeting Program and personal professional goals

 Level IV equates poor activity and progress toward meeting Program and personal professional goals

 Level V equates inadequate activity and progress toward meeting Program and personal professional goals

 8. Levels of Expectation. To be deemed eligible for reappointment, performance, or merit, a faculty person’s activities should meet the following minimum levels of expectations of Teaching, Scholarly/ Creative Activity

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  Teaching |  Scholarly and  Creative Activity |  Service |
| Reappointment and Performance |  III |  III |  III |
| \*Merit(\*Must have a I in at least one area) |  I or II |  I, II, or III |  I or II |

**07. Annual Evaluation and Merit Forms**

 07.01. Below are the forms that will be utilized by faculty, Chair, and Personnel

 Committee during the evaluation process:

 Evaluation Summary Form

 Self-Evaluation Form

 Chair Evaluation of Faculty Form

 Personnel Committee Evaluation of Faculty Form