Annual Review of Tenure-Line Faculty	**CLAS PPS No. 04.02.10** **Issue No. 2** **Effective Date: September 24, 2025** **Review Date: September 1, 2030** **Sr. Reviewer: Department Chair**

POLICY STATEMENT

The Department of Counseling, Leadership, Adult Education, and School Psychology (CLAS) is committed to effective performance evaluation processes and outcomes for faculty.

01. SCOPE

01.01	All continuing faculty will be evaluated annually by their academic department or school. This policy applies to lecturers, assistant professors, and tenured faculty. A separate policy (04.02.10b) addresses the annual review of clinical faculty. The evaluation, which covers the preceding calendar year, is completed by March 1.
01.02	The purposes of an annual faculty evaluation are to: a) provide for self-development by identifying, reinforcing, and sharing the strengths of both faculty as individuals and the department as a whole; b) extend opportunities for continuous professional development; and c) identify and strengthen the roles of faculty members within their respective programs, the department and the university. The annual evaluation also provides information that may be used in tenure and promotion recommendations, in the awarding of performance and merit raises, and/or in decisions regarding the retention of faculty or of tenure itself.
01.03	Faculty members should have access to mentors within the department, particularly those who are tenure-earning or who are new to their positions/ranks. Typically, a mentor is an experienced faculty member in the department who works with the candidate to build a level of trust, develop a level of understanding and confidence, and provide a perspective on the department, college, and university community. The mentor may be described as a coach who carefully guides the candidate through the challenges of university life and professional growth in one's discipline. At least one mentor is assigned by the Department Chair or Program Coordinator in consultation with the faculty member.
01.04	Specific guidelines for the performance evaluation of continuing faculty are found in Academic Affairs PPS 04.02.10. Expectations for tenured and tenure-track faculty normally include clearly documented evidence of high quality teaching, sustained peer-review scholarly/creative activity, and sustained university and professional service. Expectations for continuing non-tenure line faculty normally include clearly documented evidence of

	high quality teaching, peer-reviewed scholarly/creative activity where applicable, and university and professional service where applicable.
01.05	Annual evaluation of continuing faculty is the responsibility of faculty governance, a duty shared by department chairs and department personnel committees. The annual departmental evaluation of faculty is the direct source of decisions regarding both the retention of faculty and increases in salary. In evaluating performance, the department Personnel Committee (PC), Department Chair, and College Dean will consider the faculty member's contributions in the context of departmental, college, and institutional needs, as well as the faculty member's past performance and career path.
01.06	Faculty who meet departmental expectations as determined by the annual evaluation will be eligible for reappointment.
01.07	After the regular 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 faculty member in writing and invite the faculty member to meet and discuss the evaluation. The process and timeline indicated in Academic Affairs PPS 04.40.10 (sections 7 to 12) will be followed.

02. PROCEDURES

02.01	Annually, in early January, the Chair will notify all full-time faculty members of the required materials to be submitted and the due date for submission. The materials necessary are determined by the PC and are noted in Appendix A.
02.02	This annual evaluation is in addition to and separate from procedures and deadlines regarding the tenure and promotion evaluation process (PPS 8.10). Although the PPS for Annual Review and the PPS for Tenure and Promotion are inherently connected, they are different policies with some differing expectations, and serve a different purpose. Those seeking tenure and/or promotion should consult their mentor(s), the college, and the University tenure and promotion policies for guidance in regard to expectations, as the expectations for annual review may differ from the current expectations for tenure and/or promotion.
02.03	All faculty annual activity reports, current vita, and other required documentation are entered into the Faculty Qualifications system. The PC may also determine if hard copy packets should also be collected in a central location for PC members to access. PC members will be provided with rating sheets (Appendix B) and should follow the guidelines in this policy when evaluating faculty members' materials.
02.04	The Chair assigns PC members to review groups to review fulltime and phased retirement faculty. Group assignments are random, with adjustments made as needed to attempt to ensure that faculty being reviewed have at

	least one PC member from their program when available on their review group and to avoid conflict of interest or evaluation of relatives.
02.05	Each PC review group evaluates a specific number of faculty. Faculty will receive written annual review evaluations from the PC and Chair via the online Faculty Qualifications system. The PC evaluations are entered into Faculty Qualifications by the assigned program coordinator/director. Faculty members will acknowledge receipt of their evaluations online by the specified deadline. Final PC and Chair ratings are entered into a cumulative spreadsheet for the purpose of input into merit recommendations. For appeals, please see Appendix C.
02.06	The Chair will meet with all tenure-track faculty members by May 15, as well as any tenured faculty member who has received a majority vote of the PC indicating the faculty member is not meeting performance standards for the department. In the latter case, PPS 8.09 will be immediately implemented. In the case of untenured faculty, the Chair will discuss their annual evaluation materials, share a summary of their annual review, discuss any professional development issues or suggestions, and discuss progress toward tenure and promotion. Tenured faculty can also request a meeting with the Chair, and, likewise, the Chair may request a meeting with any faculty member for the purpose of faculty development.

03. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

03.01	Faculty performance in the CLAS department is evaluated on documentation of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and leadership/service.
03.02	For the categories of Teaching and Service, the PC review group should examine the productivity of the faculty member in the year under review to determine the rating score. For the category of Scholarship, the PC review group should examine the productivity of the faculty member over three years, which includes the year under review and the two prior years. The Chair should calculate the mean of the PC and Chair ratings over the most recent three years when determining the faculty member's merit recommendation for that year.
03.03	In all evaluation of faculty performance, both summative and formative, our CLAS department values.
03.04	During the first and second contract years, there is an expectation that tenure track faculty will place excellence in teaching and the development of a scholarly/creative program of work as highest priorities. For teaching, the department expects faculty to demonstrate mastery of subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively with students, the ability to create a classroom conducive to learning, the ability to meaningfully and fairly evaluate student work, and the ability to manage the administrative demands of teaching. During this time also, the faculty member should be developing a

	research agenda and submitting work for publication in peer-reviewed venues. Faculty members in their first and second contract years are encouraged to recognize the expectations and value placed on scholarship and teaching when considering the amount of time and energy to devote to service. It is likely that the faculty member should devote a limited amount of time to community engagement or professional and university service during the first and second contract years. The faculty member is encouraged to consider how one's service can enhance the faculty member's teaching effectiveness and research agenda.
03.05	Following the review, the Chair and PC will provide constructive written feedback to the faculty member that will specify actions the faculty member should take to continue to develop professionally and improve performance. It is encouraged that this step includes the faculty member's mentor if the faculty member is tenure-earning.
03.06	Faculty expect the Chair and the PC to base their assessments on professional judgments of documented and convincing evidence of sustained professional achievements as provided by the faculty member. Similarly, it is the responsibility of each faculty member being evaluated to provide documented and convincing evidence of professional achievements in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service, as described in this PPS.

04. TEACHING

04.01	High-quality teaching is essential, and every effort shall be made to recognize and emphasize excellence in teaching. Collaboration with colleagues is viewed as a means of enhancing teaching. Evaluation of teaching performance rests primarily on the faculty member's departmental colleagues and the Chair. Secondarily, evaluation of teaching rests on regular student evaluations and feedback reports. Criteria for the evaluation of teaching are explained below.
04.02	Evidence of excellence in teaching and student advisement can be established through careful consideration of productivity and quality indicators as described below. • Formal end of semester student feedback reports/ student evaluations • Peer observations of teaching performance for tenure-earning faculty members • Number of formal dissertations directed and successful proposal and final defenses as chair • Number of formal dissertation direction with successful proposal and final defenses as committee • Course syllabi • Course assignments or examinations used in courses

	• Published materials on teaching techniques • Letters, awards/honors, or other evidence of teaching impact • Teaching or instructional grants • Teaching narratives • Other evidence of teaching
04.03	Productivity and Quality: These refer to the efficient application of time and energy to the instructional needs of the students, program, department, and college. Instructors who demonstrate excellence in teaching bring the challenge of new and/or stimulating ideas to students. These instructors are instrumental in helping students to increase their critical-thinking skills and in motivating them toward independent scholarly/creative activity. Examples of documented and convincing evidence include the following: • Nature of courses taught each semester and course load—Reviewers should recognize that some courses such as field-based courses may place a heavier demand on instructor time and effort than others. Many factors may contribute to increased amounts of work required for a course. Some factors may include field-based courses, writing intensive courses, online or hybrid courses, and large class size. Teaching loads may vary for faculty members depending on administrative responsibilities, faculty leave, or other scenarios. When assessing teaching reviewers should consider teaching relative to one's work load and should review faculty members' workload reports. Reviewers should also consider faculty time and energy given to independent study courses. • Dissertations, theses, and seminar papers- Reviewers should give consideration to committees chaired and those committees on which the candidate has served as a member. Additional consideration should be given to the number of seminar papers directed. • Graduate comprehensive examinations reviewed and graded- – reviewers should recognize the time required to engage in the evaluation of graduate student comprehensive examinations (when applicable). • The faculty member's expected or assigned contributions to advising, mentoring, recruitment, retention, and timely graduation of students. • Developing and/or revising programs, courses, seminars, and assessments. Faculty members should list development of courses in their annual activities and on their vita. • Using new and appropriate technology to support instruction and enhance student learning. • PC members can review the syllabi of the courses taught with a view towards answering: ○ Are the course objectives well defined and appropriate for the course?

	○ Is there a diversity of style and format and a variety of methods in course and lesson organization to enhance student learning? ○ Does the format promote student engagement and intellectually challenge the students? ○ Are the content of the subject matter and the reading materials appropriate? ○ Are the evaluation methods appropriate for the course objectives? ○ Is the course design appropriate for the course level?

05. SCHOLARSHIP

05.01	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, but the general test to be applied is that the faculty member is engaged consistently and effectively in scholarly/creative activity of quality and distinction. In general, faculty will be evaluated based on their productivity while working at Texas State University.
05.02	Consistency is the ability to maintain a continued and steady effort toward a sustained record of research and scholarly/creative work over the evaluation period. Tenure track faculty members must show evidence of an emerging line of research. Tenured faculty members must maintain a continued and steady line of research and scholarly/creative activity that is focused on a specific and defined area over the evaluation period.
05.03	The quality and quantity of scholarly/creative work are evaluated by the PC. Quality refers to the insights, significance, and importance of the work to a degree indicated by the stature of the venue, acceptance rate, circulation number, and subscriber characteristics of the venue in which it is published, or for creative works, the importance of the venue. Awards for outstanding scholarship, research grants solicited, and research grants awarded on the basis of scholarly merit of the proposal are also indicators of quality scholarly/creative activity. It is up to the faculty member to communicate the quality of the scholarly/creative work to the reviewers. Further, colleagues on the PC from the faculty member's program may be able to make determinations of quality and should be consulted when making these ratings.
05.04	In some cases, faculty members may communicate in the review materials that a scholarly/creative activity, though not necessarily published in a traditional venue, has made a significant, positive impact on knowledge, theory, practice, policy, or communities. The PC should consider such impacts when evaluating scholarly/creative activity.
05.05	The CLAS department recognizes that faculty scholarly/creative activity can enhance teaching and service and vice versa; therefore, an inclusive view of

	scholarly/creative activity is held that recognizes the importance of discipline-based (theoretical), application-oriented (action), and pedagogical (instructional) research and scholarship/creative activity.
05.06	Even though faculty members may publish in many venues, peer-reviewed works will receive greater emphasis when decisions are made related to annual review. Venues should be sought that will result in the greatest recognition by colleagues; therefore, more emphasis will be given to national/international works.
05.07	The CLAS 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 manuscript or a peer review of a fully developed research paper for a conference proceeding. Other methods of peer review may also be recognized by the department.
05.08	Publication in esteemed venues is the primary form of documentation of scholarly/creative activity. Given that the quality and distinction of achievements in research and scholarly/creativity are of higher value than the quantity of these works, decisions will be based on the professional judgment of the evaluators. Each scholarly product/activity should be weighted appropriately based on contribution and impact. Internal and external recognition of scholarship (e.g., awards and honors) may also be taken into consideration. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide supporting documentation of research and scholarly/creative activity that informs the evaluators.
05.09	The following examples illustrate three levels or degrees of importance of scholarly/creative productivity. Level I represents the highest degree of importance. The examples in each level are not listed in rank order of importance or value: Level I a. refereed journal articles published b. refereed books published[1] c. edited books published d. refereed book chapters published e. edited themed issues of journals published f. monographs published g. refereed published proceedings of professional presentations at national/international meetings h. award of competitive research external grants or contracts for research Level II

a. journal editorships
b. book reviews published
c. abstracts and/or proceedings of professional presentations published
d. refereed proceedings of professional presentations at state/regional/local meetings
e. refereed presentations at national/international meetings
f. award of competitive internal research grants or contracts for research
g. submitted external grant proposals
h. unfunded external grant proposals
i. non-refereed manuscripts published in venues that are recognized by the department as premier outlets for scholarship/creative activity
j. tests or assessment instruments developed

Level III

a. submitted internal grant proposals
b. unfunded internal grant proposals
c. refereed presentations at state/regional/local meetings
d. software and/or multimedia products developed
e. internet products developed
f. non-refereed electronic publications/activities
g. technical reports and policy briefs
h. grant proposal reviews conducted
i. non-refereed presentations at national/international meetings
j. non-refereed presentations at state/regional/local meetings
k. invited talks/presentations

The examples provided are not an exhaustive list. There may be some scholarly/creative activities that are represented in the examples provided that have a significant impact and should be considered by reviewers

05.10

Guide for Evaluating Productivity/Quality of Scholarly/Creative Activity
This rubric serves as a guide to assist the PC in evaluating and rating faculty scholarly/creative activity. The categories are not exhaustive of all potential scholarly/creative activity, and PC members should use their best professional judgment in assigning ratings.

Year of Review⁺	**3 exceeds expectations**	**2 meets expectations**	**1 does not meet expectations**
First year on tenure track^	At least 2 Level I scholarly publications / activities **in progress*** AND at least 1 additional scholarly activity.	At least 1 Level I scholarly publication / activity **in progress*** AND at least 1 additional	No Level I scholarly publications / activities **in progress*** AND/OR no additional scholarly activity **in progress*.**

		scholarly activity **in progress***.	
Second year on tenure track	<u>In considering this current year under review and the prior 1 year:</u> An average of 1 or more Level I scholarly publications / activities **in print/in press** AND an average of at least 2 additional scholarly activities per year. <u>In considering the current year:</u> 1 Level I scholarly publication / activity **under review**.	<u>In considering this current year under review and the prior 1 year:</u> An average of 1 Level I scholarly publication / activity **in print/in press** AND an average of 1 additional scholarly activity per year. <u>In considering the current year:</u> 1 Level I scholarly publication / activity **in progress*.**	<u>In considering this current year under review and the prior 1 year:</u> An average of less than 1 Level 1 scholarly publication / activity **in print/in press** AND/OR an average of less than 1 additional scholarly activity per year.
Third year and beyond	<u>In considering this current year under review and the prior 2 years:</u> An average of 2 or more Level I scholarly publications / activities **in print/in press** AND an average of 2 or more additional scholarly activities per year.	<u>In considering this current year under review and the prior 2 years:</u> An average of 1 Level I scholarly publication / activity **in print/in press** AND an average of 1 additional scholarly activity per year.	<u>In considering this current year under review and the prior 2 years:</u> An average of less than 1 Level I scholarly publication / activity **in print/in press** AND/OR an average of less than 1 additional scholarly activity per year.

+A scholarly publication/activity should only be considered/counted for one annual review cycle (i.e., if considered as a qualified scholarly publication/activity in the year it is accepted/in press, it should not be counted again in a subsequent year when published).
* "In progress" is defined as a rough draft that has been reviewed by mentor.
^ In their first year faculty members are reviewed after only one semester.

	[1] Authorship of one refereed book may count for multiple scholarly activities

06. LEADERSHIP/SERVICE

06.01	In addition to demonstrated excellence in teaching and scholarly/creative activity, faculty should have a commitment to the university and their profession through participation in leadership/service. Such leadership/service may take place on several levels: • Leadership/service to the University, including but not limited to service on the Faculty Senate, committees established by the Senate, committees established by the University President or Provost, committees established by the Dean of the Graduate College, and service to other colleges or divisions in the university. • Leadership/service to the College of Education, including but not limited to service on a committee created by the Dean of the College and/or Associate/Assistant Dean, service on the Faculty Advisory Council, or service to another department within the College. • Leadership/service to the Program/Department, including the faculty member's program or another program within the Department. Examples of service at the Department level include but are not limited to: participation in the ongoing work that maintains the functioning of the program/department including faculty meetings; faculty governance; recruitment and admissions; program coordination; curriculum review/development; accreditation/university program reviews (as applicable); student learning outcomes; faculty search committees; participation in candidate interviews. Program/department engagement is expected regardless of other service activity and is required in order to meet expectations in review. • Leadership/service to the Profession, including but not limited to professional associations, educational institutions and organizations, venues for scholarly publication, and government agencies at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels. • Leadership/service that meets the needs of the Community (i.e., local, state, regional, national, international).
06.02	There are several criteria on which the quality of the faculty member's leadership/service is judged: • The levels (university, college, program/department, profession, community) at which the faculty member serves. It is recognized that there are fewer leadership/service opportunities at some levels and that some levels of leadership/service may not be as applicable or relevant to a faculty member based on faculty rank, scholarly agenda,

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>or other factors. Thus, leadership/service in all five levels is not necessary for an exemplary rating.
• The duration or frequency of the leadership/service (i.e., time periods involved in service commitments, number of meetings or other work activities necessary to complete service commitments).
• The results/impact of the leadership/service. Reviewers should consider impact on schools, colleges, professional organizations, community agencies, and other groups/institutions.
• Recognition for the service including awards or other forms of recognition signifying impact.</td></tr>
<tr><td>06.03</td><td>The PC will review the faculty member's activity report and optional materials that document the leadership/service, which are listed in Appendix A.</td></tr>
<tr><td>06.04</td><td>All faculty, regardless of rank, are expected engage in the service needs at the program/department level. In recognition of the considerable time and energy required and expected in establishing a record of excellence in teaching and scholarly/creative activity, leadership/service expectations of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members will be minimal during the first two academic years, and their evaluation shall reflect that expectation. In faculty members' first and second years some program/department service is expected as part of their engagement with the program, with increased service expectations across various levels thereafter. Tenured faculty members are expected to mentor tenure-earning faculty members. Although it is understood and acknowledged that many tenured faculty play leadership roles in national and international venues, it is expected that the ongoing work of the program and department remains fundamental.</td></tr>
<tr><td>06.05</td><td>Guide for Evaluating Productivity/Quality of Leadership/Service Activity
<u>This rubric serves as a guide to assist the PC in evaluating and rating faculty leadership/service activity.</u> The categories are not exhaustive of all potential leadership/service activity, and PC members should use their best professional judgment in assigning ratings.

<table>
<tr><th>Year of Review+</th><th>3 exceeds expectations</th><th>2 meets expectations</th><th>1 does not meet expectations</th></tr>
<tr><td>First and second year on tenure track</td><td>Service provided at program / department level and to 1 additional level.</td><td>Service provided at program / department level.</td><td>No service provided at program / department level.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Additional years on tenure track</td><td>Service provided at program / department level and at 2 or more additional levels.</td><td>Service provided at program / department level and at 1 additional level.</td><td>No service provided at program / department level and/or no service</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

	Substantial* service demonstrated to at least 1 of these levels.		provided at any additional levels.
Tenured	Service provided at program / department level and at 3 or more additional levels. Substantial* service demonstrated to at least 1 of these levels.	Service provided at program / department level and at 2 or more additional levels.	No service provided at program / department level and/or service provided at less than 2 additional levels.

^ There are 5 levels of service: university, college, program/department, profession, and community.

*Substantial service may involve: significant time commitment, duration, or frequency of the leadership/service activity; notable impact or contribution through the leadership/service activity; holding a primary role (e.g., President, Vice President, Committee Chair); or other characteristics deemed substantial by the PC members. Reviewers should use their professional judgement as well as review evidence provided in materials and narrative when rating faculty members.

07. APPENDICES

07.01	APPENDIX A Documentation to be Submitted for Annual Review The following materials should be submitted for review on Faculty Qualifications. If any required materials are omitted an explanation as to why they are omitted should be provided. I. Annual Activity Report (Required) a. Carefully review report to ensure accuracy b. Ensure the following information is provided for each Scholarly/Creative publication that appears on the report: 1. Month & Year manuscript was submitted 2. Month & Year manuscript was accepted (if applicable)

3. Month & Year manuscript was published (if applicable)
4. Notation of whether or not the manuscript was "peer reviewed/refereed" (if the field is not completed the PC will assume it was not peer reviewed/refereed)

II. Full Texas State Vita (Required)

III. Teaching Documentation:

Include each of the following items (Required):

a. Formal end of semester student feedback reports/ student evaluations for all courses taught during the calendar year under review including quantitative and qualitative feedback
b. Peer observations of teaching performance for tenure-earning faculty members
c. Copy of one course syllabus

Include at least one of the following items (One Required and Others Optional):

a. Copy of a substantial course assignment or examination used in one of the courses taught during the calendar year
b. Published materials on teaching techniques
c. Letters, awards/honors, or other evidence of teaching impact
d. Teaching or instructional grants
e. Teaching narrative
f. Other evidence of teaching

IV. Scholarly/Creative Documentation:

a. Copies of all manuscripts, grant proposals, conference proposals, and other scholarly activity for the calendar year (Required):
    1. Submitted/Under Review – copy of manuscript that was submitted and confirmation of submission; subsequent communication regarding revision requests or other status reports from editor may also be provided
    2. Accepted/In Press – copy of letter or email documenting acceptance
    3. Published – copy of published manuscript, or, for books, copy of cover, title page, and table of contents
b. Scholarly/Creative Self-statement (Optional):
c. A self-statement no longer than one page may be submitted describing scholarly/creative activity including but not limited: research agenda, productivity, achievements, and impact.

	V. Leadership/Service Documentation (Optional): a. Self-statement (no more than one page) explaining and/or summarizing leadership/service activity. This statement can be used to communicate substantia duration, frequency, or impact of leadership/service activity to assist PC members in their review.
07.02	APPENDIX B CLAS Personnel Committee Faculty Annual Evaluation Year_____ Name_____ Rank_____ Scale for evaluation: 3 points: Exceeds Expectations 2 points: Meets Expectations 1 point: Below Expectations Teaching Meets performance criteria of the department: _____yes_____no Score_____ Research/scholarship Meets performance criteria of the department: _____yes_____no Score_____ Leadership/Service Meets performance criteria of the department: _____yes_____no Score_____
07.03	APPENDIX C Appeals Process Faculty members who wish to appeal one or more of a PC subgroup's ratings shall submit a written appeal to the PC Appeals Committee. PC Appeals Committee One PC member from each academic program shall serve on the appeals committee. A term on the appeals committee shall be two years. A new appeals committee shall be elected every two years. Appeals Process The faculty member wishing to appeal shall provide a written appeal to the appeals committee by a date decided upon and announced by the department chair. The appeal shall include and be limited to the following:

	• A written statement requesting that the rating be changed that addresses the criteria for the rating the faculty members believes is deserved and provides any additional rationale for being assigned the higher rating. • A copy of the annual review statement as it was originally submitted to the PC. • A copy of the supplemental material related the area (teaching, scholarship, or service) for which the rating is being appealed, as it was originally submitted to the PC. The appeals committee shall meet in a timely manner, consider the appeal and make a judgment of whether the appeal should be granted. If the appeal is granted, the committee shall decide upon the new rating for the faculty member. A majority vote of the appeals committee members who are present is necessary to grant the appeal and to change a rating. The appeals committee shall inform the Chair and the faculty member of its decision.

08. REVIEWERS OF THIS PPS

08.01	Reviewers of this PPS includes the following:	
	Position	**Date**
	Department Chair	September 1 E5Y
	Personnel Committee	September 1 E5Y

09. CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

09.01	This PPS has been approved by the following individuals in their official capacities and represents the CLAS Department policy and procedure from the date of this document until superseded. Department Chair Personnel Committee