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**Definitions**

For the purpose of this document, the following deﬁnitions apply:

1. The Department Personnel Committee (PC) is made up of tenured faculty who are paid at a rate of ﬁfty percent or more from faculty salary dollars budgeted to the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) and who do not hold an administrative appointment outside of the College.
2. The Department’s recommendation includes the recommendations of both the PC and the Chair.
3. A College recommendation may include the recommendation of the Dean.
4. The purposes of annual faculty evaluation are to provide an opportunity 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 departments. The evaluation also provides information that may be used in tenure and promotion recommendations, in the awarding of merit and/or performance raises, and in decisions regarding the retention of faculty or of awarding tenure.
5. The annual evaluation of faculty is the direct source for decisions regarding faculty retention and salary increases. In evaluating performance, the Department PC, Chair, and College Dean will consider the faculty member’s contributions in the context of Departmental, College, and institutional needs and the faculty member’s past performance and career path.
6. Faculty are evaluated annually for the purposes of merit salary adjustments.

C**andidates for Annual Evaluation**

1. All faculty employed as full-time faculty are evaluated annually and are, thus, required to complete an annual evaluation.
2. All faculty employed as full-time faculty are eligible for performance and merit raises awarded through this process.
3. Because all per-course faculty are hired for one semester at a time, they do not complete an annual evaluation. Instead, they are evaluated based on teaching evaluations completed by students.

**Annual Activity Report**

1. The Annual Activity Report is based on the previous calendar’s year performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and leadership/service.
2. In addition to submitting the report, faculty will also be required to upload their current CV and teaching evaluations.
3. The Annual Activity Report should document achievements that only apply to the time period of the annual evaluation. In the first year of employment, the PC will examine the materials from the time of hire onward.
4. Faculty should provide documentation that supports quality of teaching, scholarly/creative activity and leadership/service.
   1. “Scholarship” is described in the **Scholarly/Creative Activity and Products** paragraph in this document.
   2. Professional activities that support quality teaching are outlined in the **Teaching Effect and Quality Indicators** chart in this document.
   3. **Student Course Evaluation, quantitative portion,** is based on a 1-5 point scale with 5 being the highest rating. **Student Course Evaluations are anonymous and must be completed for all courses by all faculty.**
   4. According to the Texas State University CV template, the following should be entered as follows:
      1. Enter consultancies and workshops in the **Scholarship section** (III B 3 & 4)
      2. Enter grading of comprehensive examinations, work on theses, and work on dissertations within the **Teaching section** (II C)
      3. Enter administrative tasks (e.g., grant administration, program coordination) within the **Service section.**

**Review Process**

1. Annually, in early January, the Chair will notify all faculty of the required materials to be submitted.
2. The PC and the Chair will make independent and separate recommendations on each faculty member for merit taking a variety of contextualized factors into account.
3. After the Annual Activity Reports are due, the PC will have two weeks to review each faculty member’s Annual Activity Report, and to evaluate teaching, scholarship/creativity, and leadership/service, to make evaluative comments that provide a rationale for scoring and suggestions for the following year.
4. The Chair may, but is not required to, inform faculty of the final merit award for all faculty members in the Department.

**Appeals**

1. The faculty will be given an opportunity to review the recommendations made by both the Chair and the PC prior to the recommendations being forwarded to the Dean. At that time, they have the opportunity to add written comments to their own annual evaluation. Speciﬁcally, before making ﬁnal merit recommendations, the Chair shall be required to indicate to each faculty member whether the Chair intends to recommend that speciﬁc faculty member for merit and the approximate level of merit determined for that speciﬁc faculty member. After receiving the Chair’s preliminary recommendations, faculty who believe their accomplishments have been overlooked or undervalued may, within ﬁve working days, request a meeting with the Chair. At this meeting, the Chair shall explain the reasons for denying merit, and the faculty member may ask the Chair to reconsider the preliminary decision on the basis of accomplishments or achievements that may have been initially overlooked or undervalued. After reconsidering the accomplishments of all faculty who have requested a review of their activities, the Chair will make ﬁnal merit recommendations to the Dean.
2. Faculty who are dissatisfied with the Chair’s final merit recommendation may appeal to the College Dean and shall be afforded an opportunity to meet with the Dean to offer information in support of their position; if the Dean upholds the Chair’s decision, the Dean shall be required to explain why. The decision of the Dean is final and not subject to grievance. A summary of all appeals to the Dean, however they are resolved, must be forwarded with the final decision, to the Provost as a matter of record.
3. 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 three class days from completion of the annual evaluation. The meeting between the Chair and the faculty member should be conducted within six 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 six-day period. The faculty member’s failure to respond does not prevent the process from moving forward but may constitute grounds for a charge of insubordination.
4. After discussing the evaluation with the faculty member, if the Chair still finds that the faculty member may have failed to meet Departmental expectations, the Chair will notify the PC of this finding and call a special meeting of the PC. This meeting should take place no sooner than three and no later than six class days after the Chair’s meeting with the faculty member. The faculty member’s failure to meet with the Chair does not prevent the process from moving forward.
5. The Chair will present the evaluation and its supporting documentation to the PC. The affected faculty member may be present, may address the PC, and may provide additional evidence related to their performance.
6. The PC will discuss the evidence provided by the Chair and the faculty member. The faculty member will not be present during this discussion; the Chair will preside in a non-voting capacity. The PC will choose a recorder who is responsible for minutes of the deliberations.
7. The PC may decide to gather additional information before making a judgment on the faculty member’s performance. Such additional information, if required by the PC, should be provided and the PC should reconvene and make its decision within ten class days after the first PC meeting regarding the issue.
8. When it has gathered relevant information, the PC will vote by secret ballot as to whether the faculty member has performed to Departmental standards. The affected faculty member will not be present for the vote. A finding of nonperformance requires the vote of a majority of the members of the PC present at the meeting excluding the Chair and the affected faculty member. The Chair must concur in a finding of nonperformance.
9. If the faculty member is judged to have performed below expectations, the Chair and faculty member, in consultation with the PC, will design a professional development plan to help the faculty member meet Departmental expectations in the future. The PC recorder will initiate PPS 04.02.10.09.02, which will include a record of the vote and a list of the faculty voting, then forward it to the Chair. The Chair will forward the tracking form, the record of the vote, list of voters, the Chair’s recommendation, and a copy of the professional development plan to the Dean of the College within ten class days of the vote.
10. The professional development plan will follow timelines and procedures prescribed in PPS 04.02.10. The Dean may also make an independent and separate recommendation on each annual evaluation.

**Criteria for Evaluation**

1. Faculty performance in C&I is evaluated on documentation of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and leadership/service. Collegial contributions to the University community by the candidates are also important. Collegial faculty members are expected to contribute to the positive functioning of their respective Program, Department, College, and the University.
2. Faculty are assigned diﬀerent workloads based on a number of factors, including their year of employment, their scholarly productivity, and their administrative responsibilities. In light of the fact that faculty are assigned diﬀerent workloads, the workload should be considered when evaluating teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and leadership/service.
3. The Department Chair shall convene the PC, or its designee, to review the annual evaluations of eligible faculty for the relevant period and to secure the advice of that group regarding merit salary increase recommendations. At the time of the annual review, PC members will indicate if individual faculty members exceed Departmental expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and leadership/service and recommend high, medium, or low levels of merit to the Chair. The following are general guidelines for merit recommendations:

Faculty who are evaluated in only one area will receive the following:

* low merit—meets expectations
* medium merit—exceeds expectations
* high merit—exemplary performance

Faculty who are evaluated in two areas will receive:

* low merit—exceeds expectations in one area
* medium merit—exceeds expectations in two areas
* high merit—exceeds expectations in one area and exemplary performance in the other area

Faculty who are evaluated in all three areas will receive:

* low merit—exceeds expectations in one area
* medium merit—exceeds expectations in two areas OR exemplary in one area
* high merit—exceeds expectations in all three areas OR exemplary in two areas

Annual merit awards are based on a rolling three-year performance assessment.

1. Before making final merit recommendations, the Chair shall be required to indicate to each faculty member whether the Chair intends to recommend that faculty member for merit and the approximate level of merit determined for that faculty member (e.g., high, medium, low).

**Teaching**

The PC values a wide range of teaching pedagogies and practices and recognizes that it is difficult to capture the efficacy of an instructor’s practice by means of a quantitative score alone. With this in mind, faculty will explain in narrative form how they have met the expectations of teaching that transcend an evaluative measure. Faculty might draw on items from the lists of Teaching Effect and Quality Indicators that demonstrate a more detailed portrait of his or her teaching practice when constructing this narrative. The Department recognizes that there is a relationship between one’s epistemological stance, ontology, and teaching practice. And, in enacting one’s stance, a faculty member may face a more strident critique from students. Given this reality, it is important that the PC supports diverse ways of knowing, thinking, teaching, and enacting one’s pedagogical practice and that this is reflected when evaluating one another. This is particularly pressing for faculty from historically marginalized communities who enact a pedagogy that pushes students to both consider and critique institutional practices, or those seeking to disrupt an accepted teaching discourse.

1. **Documentation of Teaching Performance.** Eﬀective teachers bring the challenge of new, innovative, and/or engaging ideas to students to help them increase their critical thinking skills and motivate them toward independent scholarly/creative activity. Evidence of teaching performance can be established through consideration of formative and summative teaching documentation. Teaching eﬀectiveness will be established through summative student evaluations. Teaching effect and quality will be established through evidence presented in a teaching narrative.
2. **Summative Teaching Documentation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Teaching Documentation** | |
| Evidence of summative teaching documentation will be established through careful consideration of the following:   1. supplementary materials such as teaching narrative, teaching materials, and additional indicators as noted in the Teaching Effect and Quality Indicators list; 2. the quantitative scores obtained from student evaluations; and 3. optional supporting materials. | |
| **Teaching Narrative** | **Student Evaluations** |
| **Evidence of teaching quality should be documented.** These may include but are not limited to the **teaching effect and quality indicators listed after the rubric.** | **Comments** from student evaluations can be added to the teaching narrative to support teaching effect and quality. |
| **Teaching Effect and Quality**  Evidence of teaching effect and quality and will be obtained by the evaluation of the teaching narrative and other supporting evidence. | Additional evidence may be provided by quantitative scores  Faculty will enter the quantitative scores for each class per semester in Digital Measures. |
| The teaching narrative should   * Be no longer than 2 pages in length. * Be submitted using provided instructions. * Address the instructor’s   1. teaching methods,   2. professional activities that support teaching effect and quality,   3. goals for continued development, and   4. additional context, if applicable. | In the case of a low response rate of student online evaluations (less than 50%), faculty can submit narrative evidence and provide **supplemental** documentation to provide multilayered evidence of teaching effect and quality. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching Evaluation Rubric** | | | |
| Rank | Meets Expectations  (Rate as 2) | Exceeds Expectations  (Rate as 3) | Exemplary  (Rate as 4) |
| **Lecturer Part Time** | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **3.5 -3.9** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; and 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations. | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)     1. achieving an average score of **4.0 - 4.4** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; and 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations. | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **4.5 - 5.0** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; and 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations. |
| **Lecturer Full Time** | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **3.5 - 3.9** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and 3. provides teaching narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **4.0 - 4.4** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and 3. provides teaching narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **4.5 - 5.0** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and 3. provides teaching narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. |
| **Senior Lecturer or Clinical Faculty** | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **3.5 - 3.9** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and 3. provides teaching narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **4.0 - 4.4** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and 3. provides teaching narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of  **4.5 - 5.0** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and 3. provides teaching narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. |
| **Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty** | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **3.5 - 3.9** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and 3. provides teaching narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)   1. achieving an average score of **4.0 - 4.4** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations; 2. majority of comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and 3. provides teaching narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. | Demonstrates evidence of teaching effect and quality by (all required)  1. achieving an  average score of  **4.5 - 5.0** on quantitative portion of the student evaluations;  2. majority of  comments are positive on the qualitative portion of student evaluations; and  3. provides teaching  narrative that describes **teaching effect and quality** as documented in a reflective narrative, which may influence the final rating. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Teaching Effect and Quality Indicators**  The PC supports diverse ways of knowing, thinking, teaching, and enacting one’s pedagogical practice and that this is reflected when evaluating one another. The lists below contain suggestions of items that might be included in the teaching narrative. | |
| **Teaching Effect** includes evidence of teaching performance such as the following:    1. **Syllabus alignment** with course objectives, standards, or student learning outcomes.  2. **Examples of student learning**.  3. **Evidence of student evaluations** that assess learning throughout the course of the semester, that appropriately reflect the level of the course (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate).  4. **Unsolicited** **letters of recognition** related to teaching and learning.  5. **Evidence of current scholarly/creative activity** reflected in both the content and pedagogy of instruction.  6. **Maintaining currency**, significance, and relevance of course content.  7. Participation in course, Program, and departmental **curriculum planning and development.**  8. **Innovations that support instruction and enhance student learning**.  9. Evidence that instructor draws on **a diversity of pedagogical styles and a variety of methods** in course and lesson organization to enhance student learning.  10. Indications that course planning and lessons are **relevant, well organized, and sequenced** and that they use practices for excellence in teaching and learning.  11. **Invited Guest** teaching (invited for expertise in a certain area).  12. Evidence of pedagogy that appropriately supports a diversity of learning and learners.  13. Evidence of course content that addresses equity. | **Teaching Quality** includes evidence of the following:    1. **Research-based practices (**as understood within the faculty member’s field or scholarly paradigm) embedded in course content and delivery.  2. **Planning and pedagogical practice** (e.g., planning course assignments that are relevant, meaningful, employing a diversity of style and methods to enhance and assess learning, drawing on technology, multimedia, etc).  3. **Reflection on ways to improve teaching practice** (e.g., modifications in an assignment, reflection about pedagogical decisions, course alignment, etc.).  4. **Evidence of efforts to enhance teaching quality**, including participation in professional development, conference sessions, or scholarly work related to quality teaching.  5. **Acquisition of instructional grants** (e.g. technology grants, multicultural institute grants, research enhancement program grants, online/hybrid course redesign grants, academic computing grants, book clubs, etc.).  6. **Peer evaluations** (e.g., by faculty mentors, program coordinators, PC members).  7. **Collaborative efforts** to pilot new pedagogical practices or refine current practices.  8. Evidence of **teaching awards or recognition** (local, state, national).  9. **Participation or presentation in professional development** such as workshops on effective teaching, active learning, creating motivating online courses.  10. Provides opportunities for **out-of-class application, field work, or service learning.**  11. **Development of instructional materials** used by teachers and students.  12. **Cooperative scholarship** with students, including publications and presentations.  13. **Other evidence** of applicable formal or informal instruction. |

**Scholarly/Creative Activity Criteria**

34. Scholarly/creative activities are among the primary functions of the University. A faculty member’s contribution will vary from one academic or professional field to another, or even within a field, given differences in research paradigms and researchers’ communities of practice. The general criteria to be applied are that the faculty member is engaged in high-quality scholarly/creative activity and shows clear evidence of continued scholarly growth. The PC values consistency in one’s line of research, understood as the ability to maintain a continued and steady effort to complete research and scholarly/creative work over the evaluation period, and potentially including new and innovative ways of exploring questions within one’s field.

The PC values scholarly collaboration as well as individual initiative and leadership in the scholar’s field and possibly niches within that field. Faculty will explain in narrative form how they have met the expectations of scholarly leadership and productivity within the year under review.

Single authorship and collaboration with colleagues and students are viewed as means of enhancing scholarly/creative activity. Effective collaboration occurs when all parties make a significant contribution to the scholarly/creative activity. The PC values a mix of sole, first-author, collaborative, and multi-authored publications. The faculty member should demonstrate an ability to lead and participate actively in collaborative research, and/or conduct sole-author research that contributes to that faculty member’s field. Especially at the ranks of associate professor and full professor, there should be evidence of genuine scholarly/creative contributions to an area of study. This evidence may take many forms, including but not limited to the following:

* First authorship of scholarly publications that are submitted, under review, forthcoming or published.
* Collaboration that has resulted in co-authored scholarly publications, submitted, under review, forthcoming or published scholarship (possibly including across institutions, across research sites, or across historical lines of scholarship).
* Mentorship of student researchers, including student authorship and of scholarly presentations and manuscripts submitted, under review, forthcoming or published.
* Mentorship of early-career faculty, including early-career faculty authorship (or co-authorship with junior faculty) of scholarly presentations and publications.
* Mentorship of non-tenured faculty, including co-authorship of scholarly presentations and publications (manuscripts submitted, under review, forthcoming or published) when appropriate. It is noted that being second (or subsequent) author on such research products can be a sign of commitment to mentoring early-career scholars.
* Identification of new research questions, topics, or areas of research in presentations or manuscripts submitted, under review, forthcoming, or published.
* Proposals for policy and practice presented, submitted, under review, forthcoming, or published that address persistent issues in education, such as structural inequalities, deficit views of learners, families, and teachers from minoritized groups, etc.

35. The Department recognizes the importance of a diversity of theoretical, philosophical, creative, basic, applied, and pedagogical activity. The PC highly values qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods forms of inquiry. In addition, the PC highly values conceptual, theoretical, and philosophical work. Public forms of scholarship growing out of the candidate’s field of knowledge and aimed at informing and engaging educators and the broader public are also highly valued. The PC encourages faculty to discuss their contributions in written form, such as illustrating the value of their scholarship in the narrative.

36. Faculty members may submit their scholarly/creative work for publication through many venues and formats. Submissions to national/international peer-reviewed works will receive greater emphasis when decisions are made related to annual review. A record of national/international peer-reviewed publications is expected, and an annual effort to contribute to this record (through manuscripts submitted, under review, forthcoming or published) will be recognized. The Department defines peer review as a process that occurs prior to publication through which academic writing is subjected to the scrutiny of the larger academic community and results in an accept or reject decision. Peer review might consist of the editor of a reputable journal or book publisher assigning an editorial review team to review and rate the quality of a blinded or masked manuscript. The examples provided here are not meant to be exhaustive and other methods of peer review are recognized by the Department.

37. Documentation of Criteria for Research and Scholarly/Creative Activity. Publication in selective venues is the primary form of documentation. A variety of kinds of scholarly/creative publications are valued. The quality of published work carries more weight than the mere quantity of publications. For this reason, the PC pays careful attention to the scholarly expertise and judgment of manuscript reviewers and editorial teams. The PC regards as suspect and less rigorous those publications appearing in venues that require authors to “pay to publish,” promise publication in exchange for participating in a specific conference, to serve as a manuscript reviewer of such a publication, and other practices of predatory publishers.

38. Scholarly/Creative Products. A variety of different types of scholarly/creative publications are valued, with the understanding that the quality of submitted, under review, forthcoming, or published work carries more weight than the mere quantity of publications in one’s evaluation for promotion; therefore, evidence of “quality” work submitted, under review, forthcoming, or published is highly important.

The list of products below serves as a guide to the assessment of scholarly/creative work, with the understanding that contextual factors will inform the assessment of scholarly/creative work. The PC recognizes that a bulleted list implies a hierarchy from top to bottom. The PC also recognizes that, although in some academic disciplines, refereed journal articles historically have been considered to be higher in a value hierarchy than books or book chapters, traditions and assumptions should be questioned. The quality of a specific work is ultimately more important than a particular publication venue.

* refereed journal articles (generally considered in this order: international, national, regional, state)
* refereed books or monographs
* refereed edited books
* refereed book chapters
* refereed proceedings of professional presentations
* invited refereed journal article
* invited refereed books or monographs published
* invited refereed edited books published
* invited refereed book chapters published
* non-refereed journal articles published in journals that are recognized by the department and Program as premier outlets for scholarship/creative activity (considered in this order: international, national, regional, state)
* non-refereed books or monographs published
* non-refereed edited books published
* non-refereed book chapters published
* non-refereed proceedings of professional presentations at national/international meetings
* non-refereed proceedings of professional presentations at state/regional/local meetings

39. Scholarly/creative work may also be demonstrated through a variety of supplemental scholarly activities, including public scholarship, submitting research approval requests to the University’s Institutional Review Board, and developing and submitting proposals for funded research. The PC regards completed grant proposals (funded and unfunded) as scholarly activities; whereas, publications based on grant-funded research are counted as scholarly products.

Scholarly/creative activities include but are not limited to the following:

* funded external grant/contract research proposals that support scholarly/creative activity;
* funded external grant/contract proposals that support teaching activity;
* funded external grant/contract proposals that support leadership/service activity;
* funded internal grant/contract research proposals that support scholarly/creative activity;
* funded internal grant/contract proposals that support teaching activity;
* funded internal grant/contract proposals that support leadership/service activity;
* grant proposal reviews conducted;
* refereed presentations at national/international meetings;
* refereed presentations at state/regional/local meetings;
* published abstracts and translations of professional presentations;
* tests or assessment instruments developed;
* software, multimedia, or other electronic products developed;
* technical reports published;
* published book reviews; and
* alternative contributions to important conversations (such as “public pedagogy”) including but not restricted to collaborative, cross-disciplinary professional work that engages the community with the scholar’s particular line of research of expertise, and that can be documented and has had a local, regional, national, or international impact.

40. Quality. The quantity of published material is not sufficient evidence of scholarly/creative activity. The quality of each endeavor must be carefully documented. Quality refers to the insights, significance, and importance of the work, which might be indicated by, for example, in its design, methodological rigor, and scholarly or professional influence. The PC will rely on its collective scholarly and professional judgment in assessing the quality of publications.

**Criteria Matrix for Lecturer/ Senior Lecturers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Meets Expectations (2 point)** | **Exceeds Expectations (3 points)** | **Exemplary (4 points)** |
| Note: | Lecturer/Senior Lecturer requires Scholarship OR Service, but not both. But this rank of faculty can submit evidence of BOTH Scholarship and Service and be awarded a cumulative score across the two categories. | | |
| **Scholarship**  **[Please see Addendum 1 of this document for specific information about evaluating “scholarship” as scholarly/creative activity]** |  | Some scholarly/creative presentations were made or manuscripts submitted, are under review, forthcoming or published, a substantial segment of a long-range or large-scale scholarly/creative endeavor has been completed, or other scholarly/creative activities were completed | At least one of the scholarly/creative presentations made or manuscripts submitted, under review, forthcoming or published within the review period are assessed to have attained a **high level of quality**. |

**Criteria Matrix for Clinical Faculty**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Meets Expectations (2 point)** | **Exceeds Expectations (3 points)** | **Exemplary (4 points)** |
| **Scholarship**  **[Please see Addendum 1 of this document for specific information about evaluating “scholarship” as scholarly/creative activity]** | Some scholarly/creative presentations were made or other scholarly/ creative activities were completed | Some scholarly/creative presentations were made or manuscripts submitted, are under review, forthcoming or published, a substantial segment of a long-range or large-scale scholarly/creative endeavor has been completed, or other scholarly/creative activities were completed | At least one of the scholarly/creative presentations made or manuscripts submitted, under review, forthcoming or published within the review period are assessed to have attained a **high level of quality**. |

**Criteria Matrix for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Meets Expectations (2 point)** | **Exceeds Expectations (3 points)** | **Exemplary (4 points)** |
| **Scholarship**  **[Please see Addendum 1 of this document for specific information about evaluating “scholarship” as scholarly/creative activity]** | Some scholarly/creative presentations were made or manuscripts submitted, are under review, forthcoming or published, or a substantial segment of a long-range or large-scale scholarly/creative endeavor has been completed, or other scholarly/creative activities were completed. | Some scholarly/creative presentations were made or manuscripts submitted, are under review, forthcoming or published, a substantial segment of a long-range or large-scale scholarly/creative endeavor has been completed, or other scholarly/creative activities were completed;  AND  At least one of the scholarly/creative presentations made or manuscripts submitted, under review, forthcoming or published within the review period are assessed to have attained a **high level of quality**. | Some scholarly/creative presentations were made or manuscripts submitted, are under review, forthcoming or published, a substantial segment of a long-range or large-scale scholarly/creative endeavor has been completed, or other scholarly/creative activities were completed;  At least one of the scholarly/creative manuscripts submitted was published within the review period and are assessed to have attained a **high level of quality**. |

Service

1. In addition to demonstrated excellence in teaching and scholarly/creative activity, faculty are expected to have a commitment to the University and their professions through participation in service activities. Such participation may take several diﬀerent forms, including: leadership/service to the University (leadership/service on committees established by the Texas State Faculty Senate or by an administrator at the Dean level or higher) leadership/service to the College (service on a committee established by the Dean of the COE) leadership/service to the Program and Department (service on a committee established by the Chair of the Department) and leadership/service to the profession or to higher education in general (leadership/service appointments made by oﬃcials representing professional organizations, public schools, cities, states, or the nation).
2. Faculty members are expected to participate in the conduct of their department, college, and university in professional organizations and in professional leadership/service to schools, colleges, universities, and other agencies in the community. Evidence of superior leadership/service may be established through careful consideration in the areas of productivity and quality. Although, leadership/service activity is expected of each faculty member, leadership/service shall not substitute for expectations in teaching or in scholarly/creative activity.
3. Service expectations will vary among ranks.
   1. Seniors lecturers are expected to perform service or scholarly activity.
   2. Tenure-track faculty are expected to perform targeted service that increases as they move toward tenure.
   3. Tenured faculty are expected to assume leadership roles and perform extensive service activities that increases as they move through the ranks.
4. Productivity. Evidence of a faculty member’s productivity is manifested by the extent of participation on Program, departmental, college, and university committees in professional organizations at the local, state, or national levels in outreach activities related to student organizations and in service to scholarly/creative activity, such as serving as editor, reviewer, speaker, and panel member.
5. The following list provides some examples of service that faculty might complete. This list does not indicate preferred service.

* committees and task forces
* participation on the faculty senate
* recruiting activities
* creation and coordination of international opportunities
* program coordinator
* student advising
* mentoring students outside of formal advising
* mentoring professional colleagues
* participation on search committee
* participation on award selection committees
* participation in departmental recruiting activities
* leading professional development events
* sponsoring student organization
* serving on advisory board
* participation in outreach programs related to the university, college, or department
* provision of professional expertise service to the community
* facilitation of student involvement in the community
* service on committees for a governmental board of education or education-related agency
* contribution to media related to the field
* advisor to or participation in professional organizations
* officer of a professional group
* participation in conference reviewing, planning, or management
* editorship or editorial board membership of a journal
* journal reviewer
* grant reviewer

1. Quality. Leadership/service involves working with others so that professional knowledge has an impact. The impact of leadership/service typically is of critical importance in evaluating quality of leadership/service. Added value should be given for committees with signiﬁcant impact and/or signiﬁcant time commitments.

**Service criteria**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Lecturers/ Senior Lecturers** | **Tenure-Track** | **Tenured** |
| Meets **Expectations** | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Participates in the conduct of their Program and department 2. Demonstrates participation on one institutional committee or equivalent service activity (e.g., student organization sponsorship) | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Participates in the conduct of their Program and/or department 2. Demonstrates participation on one institutional committee or equivalent service activity (e.g., student organization sponsorship) or one professional organization committee | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Demonstrates participation in the conduct of their Program and department 2. And two of the following:   a. demonstrates participation on at least one departmental, college, or university committee(s)  b. demonstrates participation in at least one professional and/or community effort in their field.   1. At least one service activity involves leadership or demonstration of progress towards a leadership role. 2. Service facilitates teaching and/or research. |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Participates in the conduct of their Program and department 2. Demonstrates participation on one institutional committee 3. Participates in at least one professional and/or community effort in their field | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Participates in the conduct of their Program and/or department 2. And two of the following: 3. demonstrates participation on at least one institutional committee 4. participates in at least one professional and/or community effort in their field 5. Service facilitates teaching and/or research. | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Demonstrates participation in the conduct of their program and department 2. Demonstrates leadership in the conduct of their program and department 3. And two of the following: 4. demonstrates leadership on departmental, college or university committee(s) 5. demonstrates leadership in at least one professional and/or community effort in their field |
| **Exemplary** | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Participates in the conduct of their program and department 2. Demonstrates participation or leadership on an institutional committee or serves on more than one institutional committee 3. Participates in at least one professional and/or community effort in their field | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Demonstrates participation in the conduct of their program and department 2. And more than two of the following:   a. demonstrates participation on at least one departmental, college, or university committee(s)  b. demonstrates participation in at least one professional and/or community effort in their field.   1. At least one service activity involves leadership or demonstration of progress towards leadership. 2. Service facilitates teaching and/or research. | The faculty member completes the following:   1. Demonstrates participation in the conduct of their program and department 2. Demonstrates leadership in all of the following: 3. Departmental, college or university committee(s) 4. The conduct of their program and department 5. At least one professional and/or community effort in their field |

**Faculty with Release**

1. Faculty on 100% release for research and grant supervisors will be evaluated as meeting expectations based on fulﬁllment of the terms of the release contract. Evaluation will be made in consultation with the overseeing the contract. Judgment on the criteria for research, exceeds expectations and exemplary, will be made on a case-by-case basis in accordance with interpretation of the contract. Judgment on the criteria for service will be based on criteria stated above.
2. Faculty on administrative release will be evaluated by prorated work load (as determined by Department policy or contract).

**Relationship between Annual Review and Tenure/Promotion Review**

1. Although these two processes are not necessarily related, successful candidates for consideration of tenure and promotion typically have exceeded expectations during annual reviews.

**Eligibility for Merit**

1. A merit raise shall be deﬁned as additional salary to be awarded to faculty whose performance exceeds Departmental expectations during the preceding merit evaluation period.
2. Each faculty member is evaluated by at least five members of the PC. The assigned PC members will a) score teaching, scholarship, and service based on the criteria stated above, and b) write evaluative comments that provide a rationale for scoring and suggestions for professional growth and development.
3. The Chair will independently score teaching, scholarship, and service based on the criteria stated above and then carefully review the PC’s summary.

**Certification Statement**

This C&I PPS has been approved by the reviewers listed below and represents the C&I policy and procedure from the date of the document until superseded.

Voting Faculty Representative: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_                   Date:   \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Approver:  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_                                               Date:   \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

                  Chair