

Deans' Council Minutes
March 29, 2005

Present: F. Ashley, B. Doughty, A. Headley, M. Hendrix, H. Langford, R. N. Singh, P. Zelhart, J. Scott

1. Faculty Senate Recommendations – Attachment – Dr. R. N. Singh reviewed with the deans the draft recommendations for Procedure 12.20 on evaluation of faculty. Discussion focused on schedule for faculty evaluation, provision for a faculty rebuttal of department head assessment and guidance about how to achieve faculty compliance with departmental direction. Other Procedures were distributed for further review. Dr. Singh reported that the System Senate is considering a revision to tenure policy to offer an optional extension of the time limit.
2. Departmental Fee Account Balances – Dr. Scott reviewed the course fee balances and the plan to implement a course-by-course accounting with the new fiscal year. Deans indicated that such an approach makes it difficult to use money wisely, that some equipment is shared across many labs, that aligning fee accounting to a specific course does not take into account the realities of academic practice, and that it could limit participation of lower-income students in some courses. Deans asked that the administration take a look at other institutions' practice and afford flexibility.
3. Self-Assessment Certification – Attachment – Dr. Scott shared a certification statement that all division and department heads will be asked to sign as part of the annual financial statements. She asked for input about the 18 statements on the certification list, whether any needed clarification. Deans' Council is to respond within the week.
4. Texas Success Initiative Survey Recommendations – Dean Doughty will invite colleagues to speak about work going on to improve remediation in mathematics for the next Deans' Council.
5. University Smoking Policy – Attachment – Dr. Scott shared the SGA recommended policy for Deans' input. Deans concurred with the recommendations. Dean Webber will verify if the proposal has been shared with Faculty Senate; following Senate input the item will go to PAC. The proposal prohibits smoking within 20 feet of building entrances.
6. Higher Education Act (HEA) Reauthorization – Dr. Scott reviewed segments of the HR 690 and asked deans to assign tracking of the components to various members of their organizations.
7. Review of Sixth Year Probationary Faculty – Deans reviewed recommendations from the departments and college committees/deans and made final recommendations to the Provost.
8. Faculty Senate Recommendations on Retention – Deans Council reviewed the recommendations from the Senate and gave input to the Provost. Dean Webber briefed the Council on earlier attempts to offer a Mentorship Program and the lack of campus buy-in. Dean Ashley noted that the proposal to alter terms of probation and suspension for students in remedial coursework is in not in accord with statute.
9. Freshman/Transfer Orientation – Dean Webber reported that we hope to have an on-line option for orientation available for transfer students and an introductory on-line model for Freshmen before they come to campus for regular orientation.

Attachments

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-COMMERCE PROCEDURES

A12.20 Annual Evaluation of Faculty

Effective September 1, 1996

Revised July 2002; *April 2005*

Supplements System Policies 31.01, 12.02 and 12.06

1. Purpose

The annual faculty evaluation process at the university has two major goals: to provide (1) a system to facilitate the development of teaching, research or other scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), and service to the university, profession *and* community, and (2) an annual evaluation (review of performance) of teaching, RSCA, and service for the purpose of making decisions regarding the terms and conditions of the employment relationship between the faculty and the university, including merit pay, promotion, tenure, and post tenure review.

Accomplishing these purposes requires the active, joint involvement of the individual faculty member and his/her department head in developing an appropriate evaluation plan suitable to the particular responsibilities and strengths of the faculty member. However, individual faculty members are to take the initiative in promoting their own growth as teachers, scholars, and ([especially in professional and occupational fields](#)) practitioners.

2. Criteria for Evaluation

([Criteria for](#)) *The evaluation of faculty shall be based on (include)* university-wide and departmental criteria.

a. University-wide Criteria.

(1) **Teaching.** Teaching is considered to be the first priority and prime objective of the university. The Texas A&M University System Policy on Post Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness (12.06) *lists the following 'techniques' as guidelines for evaluating teaching:*

- (1) *University requirements for faculty including:*
 - (a) *course syllabi including list of topics to be covered during the semester, specific course objectives, types of activities for the course, student evaluation procedures, and required reading assignments;*
 - (b) *faculty attendance in class; and*
 - (c) *adherence to university and departmental policies.*
- (2) *Peer observation of classroom performance.*
- (3) *Departmental, college and university workshops on effective teaching.*
- (4) *Video taping of classroom performance for review and analysis by faculty.*
- (5) *Portfolio assessment by departmental review committee.*
- (6) *On-campus technology centers and other innovative programs designed to educate and support faculty in their efforts to integrate new technology into their teaching.*
- (7) *Departmental in-service training.*
- (8) *Senior faculty to serve as mentors for junior, new faculty.*
- (9) *Quality of instructional outcomes assessment by current and former students, employers of*

graduates, and faculty in graduate and professional schools attended by graduates.

(2) Research or other Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA). *Producing knowledge and performance in professional/creative activities are essential aspects of faculty roles. (These are judged to be essential components in support of teaching.) Examples of RSCA include engagement in writing and publishing through peer reviews, procurement of external funds for research and creativity goals, and participation in professional encounters or activities in one's discipline.*

(3) Service. *Service to the profession (discipline), the university, and the community is an integral part of a faculty role. (judged to be an essential complement of teaching and RSCA.) Examples of service include engagement in the university, college and departmental committees and/or particular assignments, work on student advisement and student's extra-curricular activities, and involvement in community exhibiting one's professional expertise.*

b. Departmental Criteria.

Faculty members in each academic department of the university, **as a group**, shall be responsible for identifying measures *and criteria* of **evaluating** (1) teaching, (2) RSCA, and (3) service **(for evaluations) suitable to their own discipline and professional interests.** **(Selected criteria are listed in the faculty handbook.)** *However, the departmental criteria and measures for evaluating faculty must be comprehensive and consistent with the general framework of the university-wide criteria stated above.*

As an example of a particular measure, faculty in each department shall develop a procedure for conducting the process of student evaluation of teaching. The following guidelines must be observed in developing that procedure: (1) student evaluations in classes should be coordinated by the department head; (2) teachers of record should not be present in a class when students evaluate them; (3) all records of students' evaluations should be maintained in the departmental office so they can be used in faculty evaluations for merit, promotions, and tenure considerations; and (4) faculty members should be provided numeric scores and summaries of all evaluations for formative purposes.

A few examples of measures and indicators for the three criteria (e.g. evaluations by students, peers, and department head; self assessments and portfolios) shall be summarized in the Faculty Handbook. This listing, however, will not be meant to be exhaustive.

Departmental faculty shall (should explore and) identify and develop appropriate criteria and measures of teaching, RSCA, and service suitable to their own discipline and professional interests.

3. Evaluation Procedure

a. Department Faculty Evaluation Plan in General. All full-time faculty members in each department will participate in developing a departmental plan for measuring and evaluating teaching, RSCA, and service.

A department's plan will identify how evaluations of teaching, RSCA, and service areas will *be conducted in terms of various criteria and measures. These shall be published by each department, after having been approved by the department head, college dean and provost, and shall be regularly updated when necessary. They shall be distributed by the department head among current and new faculty.*

Additionally, the departmental faculty will develop procedures for determining how the areas of teaching, RSCA, and service will be weighted and used for the purpose of making decisions regarding the terms and

conditions of the employment relationship between the individual faculty members and the university. ([In drawing up the department's plan, no department shall allow any full-time teaching faculty member to have less than 50% weight for teaching.](#)) Relative weights for *teaching*, RSCA and service will be determined on the basis of such criteria as the department's involvement in graduate programs, national disciplinary standards, *applicable reassigned time for faculty members for research grant, service and administrative assignments, and so forth. (etc.)* While assigning relative weights for three areas of functioning, department faculty should remember that lower weight for RSCA in the annual evaluation may disadvantage them in the long run when they are evaluated for promotion, tenure, and post tenure review. Each department's plan, including details on measures and instruments, minimums and maximums of percentages allowable in teaching, RSCA, and service will be submitted by the department head to the appropriate college dean for approval and then forwarded to the *provost &* vice president for academic *and student* affairs. Changes or annual updates in departmental plans will be submitted when necessary through the same channels. The office of the *provost &* vice president for academic *and student* affairs will maintain a file of departmental plans.

b. Faculty - Department Head Plan for a Given Year. Using the framework of the department's plan, each faculty member and his/her department head will discuss and select suitable/possible measures of his/her teaching, RSCA, and service before the beginning of each year. They will then formulate an individual faculty plan for achievement (in the format attached) including a written statement of goals commensurate with faculty rank and seniority (see Post Tenure Review Procedure A12.22) by January 20, spelling out the following for the forthcoming year:

(1) The proportion of the faculty member's work in teaching, RSCA, and service.

The faculty member and department head, acting together, will determine the percentage of weight for teaching, RSCA, and service, as per the departmental plan.

(2) Specific measures to be employed for evaluating the faculty member's teaching, RSCA, and service.

[Teaching: A faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of student evaluations and a minimum of one other method selected from the department's plan.](#)

[RSCA and Service: A faculty member will select from the department's plan applicable measures or activities for each.](#)

Unresolved disagreements in sections 3.b.(1) and /or 3.b.(2) will be forwarded to the appropriate college dean's office for resolution.

Copies of the faculty - department head plan for each faculty member will be signed by both with copies retained by both. Changes in a faculty member's plan may be negotiated between the faculty member and the department head during a given year only when the faculty member's plans or assignments change significantly for that year, and such changes will be recorded and signed by both parties and copies of new document retained by both parties.

4. Schedule for Annual Evaluations (Annual Reviews of Performance)

The following schedule will be used for annual evaluations:

a. The calendar year (January through December) will be utilized for annual evaluations.

b. From January 5 to January 20, the department head will consult with faculty as they establish annual goals, supported by a plan of activities, for January through December of that year. A copy of each faculty member's plan, describing the activities to be pursued during the period of evaluation, will be submitted by the department head to the dean of the college for review and approval by January 25.

c. The annual evaluation conference between the faculty member and the department head will take place from December 5 through December 15 of each year. A first year faculty member will be evaluated for the fall semester only (plan will be filed in September).

d. The annual evaluation process will include the following steps:

(1) Each faculty member will prepare for the department head, by December 15, an annual report on accomplishments in teaching effectiveness, RSCA, and service as per the plan which the faculty member signed at the year's beginning.

(2) For each faculty member the department head will draft an assessment of the degree to which the faculty member fulfilled the plan formulated the previous January. The departmental plan for evaluation will be the foundation for the assessment; depth, breadth, and quality of the achievements should be considered. The assessment will include a numerical rating for each of the three categories of teaching, RSCA, and service, and an overall numerical merit rating which is calculated by weighting the teaching, RSCA, and service numbers according to the plan formulated for that year (see Faculty Evaluation Format at the end of this procedure). The department head will then have a conference with each faculty member to explain and discuss the assessment, and the faculty member will receive a copy.

(3) The department head will forward a copy of faculty reports and department head recommendations (in the faculty evaluation format) to the dean of the college by January 15. The dean will review the materials, and where the dean wishes to revise any faculty member's overall merit rating, the dean will have a conference with the department head and faculty member involved.

(4) The dean will forward faculty reports, department head recommendations and dean's recommendations to the vice president for academic affairs by February 1.

(5) The vice president for academic affairs will review the recommendations. In instances of disagreement with the dean's recommendations, the vice president will consult with the dean. Any changes made in ratings at whatever level will be shared with the department head and faculty member. The vice president will make faculty merit recommendations to the president by March 1.

5. Merit

The following example demonstrates the process.

A faculty member and his/her department determine the following allocation of involvement that would be appropriate for him/her in the upcoming year.

Areas of Faculty Involvement	Weight of Effort (%)
Teaching	.60
RSCA	.20
Service	.20

Following the academic year, the department head shall determine the appropriate ordinal rating which best describes the level of effectiveness that the faculty member achieved in each of the planned areas. The following levels of effectiveness will be used.

Ordinal Rating Level of Effectiveness

- 1 The highest level of performance
- 2 A high level of performance
- 3 A moderate level of performance
- 4 A minimal level of performance
- 5 An unsatisfactory performance

Using the previously agreed upon proportions of involvement, the overall rating will be determined as the weighted average of the ratings and these proportions. The overall merit rating stated to one decimal would be determined as the sum of each rating multiplied by the appropriate proportion. The spreadsheet below demonstrates the result.

Areas of Faculty Involvement	Weight of Effort (%)	Annual Rating	Merit Rating Calculated
Teaching	.60	1	$.60 \times (1) = 0.60$
RSCA	.20	1	$.20 \times (1) = 0.20$
Service	.20	3	$.20 \times (3) = 0.60$
Overall Rating			1.40

6. Split Appointments

Faculty who have split appointments (where work load credit is granted for responsibilities outside the home department) will consult with the appropriate administrator to establish goals supported by a plan of activities. They will be evaluated by each administrator to whom they are responsible. The merit rating shall be determined by using each evaluation in proportion to the percent of time the individual is assigned to each entity. For example, if a faculty member has a one-half time administrative assignment during a given year, he/she will have 50% of total expectations of performance in teaching, RSCA, and service as compared to a full-time teaching faculty.

7. *Evaluation of Department Heads*

Department heads as faculty members will be evaluated by the dean and faculty of the particular college and follow the pattern and schedule described herein for the general faculty. They will also be evaluated by the dean in their administrative role (See Academic Administrator Evaluation Procedure A12.21). The merit rating shall be determined through consultations between the department head, the dean, and *provost & vice president of academic and student affairs*.

8. Appeals

Appeals beyond the departmental level regarding adverse decisions are to follow regular administrative channels. TAMUS policies and regular A&M-Commerce university grievance procedures (A12.01) are available for use by individual faculty members.

9. Professional Development Action

If a faculty member receives an overall rating of 4 or 5 ([greater](#)), the department head and the faculty member will develop formative recommendations in the following year's plan to help the faculty member overcome deficiencies or shortcomings in teaching, RSCA, or service.

References: Prior ETSU Policies II N 10 and D-32; approved February 18, 1983; revised May 1, 1992, November 28, 1994, January 22, 1997; and July 2002. June 2002 Deans Council Minutes to meet SACS regulations.

CONTACT FOR INTERPRETATION: Provost and Vice President for Academic *and Student* Affairs

FACULTY EVALUATION FORMAT Annual Review of Performance

This format is to be used for reporting the supervisor's narrative evaluation, and the numerical performance ratings. Attach the narrative report to this page. Faculty having split appointments will be evaluated proportionally by each supervisor.

Faculty Name _____ Department _____

Evaluation Period: From _____ To _____

Narrative Evaluation: The attached narrative should include 1) Teaching, 2) Research or other Scholarly and Creative Activities, and 3) Service.

Performance Rating: Provide performance ratings as identified in the Annual Evaluation of Faculty Procedure.
(1=highest...5=lowest).

Areas of Faculty Involvement	Weight of Effort (%)	Annual Rating	Merit Rating	Calculated
Teaching				
RSCA				
Service				
Overall Rating				

Department Head/Supervisor Signature _____ Date _____

Faculty's Response: I agree I disagree

Faculty Signature _____ Date _____

Dean's evaluation: I agree I disagree

If rating is changed: I evaluate the faculty member's performance as:

Teaching _____ RSCA _____ Service _____ Overall _____

Dean's Signature _____ Date _____

INDIVIDUAL FACULTY PLAN FOR ACHIEVEMENT FORMAT
Plan Year _____

This format is to be used for reporting the individual faculty member's plan for a given year. The plan is to be in line with the particular responsibilities and strengths of the faculty member. Continue on additional sheet if extra space is needed.

Faculty Name

Department

Rank Years in Rank

Years of Teaching in Higher Education

Responsibilities:

Goals (commensurate with faculty rank and seniority):

Activities planned:

Area of Faculty Involvement Weight to be Applied (%) Specific Measures/Activities to be Employed
Teaching 1) Student Evaluations 2) 3)
RSCA 1) 2) 3)
Service 1) 2) 3)
100%

Department Head's response:

- Agree
- Disagree (If department head disagrees, changes are noted above and discussed with the faculty member).

Department Head Signature _____ Date discussed with Faculty _____

- Agree
- Disagree (Unresolved disagreements will be forwarded to the dean's office for resolution.)

Faculty Signature Date

Comments:

Faculty Senate Recommendations re Student Retention:

Dr. Mcfarland:

The Faculty Senate at A&M-Commerce unanimously approved the following recommendation at its last meeting for improving the retention of students in our academic programs, particularly at the undergraduate level. It seems that one of our major suggestions concerns improvement in the academic advisement program, particularly at the departmental level involving faculty advisors. The service our faculty advisors perform needs to be recognized in order to reward and motivate them in promoting programs for retaining students or in cutting down their drop out rates.

Given below are specific recommendations:

1. Establish a faculty mentorship program on volunteer bases. Add this as a category of “special” service and give credit for the student oriented faculty who work as an advisor. Advisement and mentoring should carry additional weight in service than what is given right now.
2. Create a Counselor in Resident program for the resident halls where a counselor will reach students who seem in trouble right a way. This program has been proven effective in other institutions.
3. Make the campus student services users friendly. We have good number of commuters at all levels. For example, we can extend the essential offices operation (student services such as financial aid, etc.) hours to 6:00 or 7:00 P.M. as well as keep them open during the lunch hours so commuters as well as other students can have an easy access to staff members to get their needs met or processed.
4. Change the policy regarding remediation classes. The result of remediation classes should not affect the academic status of students. As it is now, those who fail the remediation class, will be placed on academic probation/suspension regardless of their GPA (about 17% of first year students are in the remedial courses). Students in remedial courses should be allowed to continue regardless of failing those classes as long as they have the required minimum overall GPA.
5. Add an alert semester where students who go on probation on first semester (usually Fall Semester) have more than one semester to catch up. As it is now, those who go on probation will have to do well in the following semester (usually spring) or will be suspended. There is not enough time to diagnose what their problems are and help them to overcome the difficulties. They need an alert semester (usually fall semester), if not successful, then put them on probation in the following semester (usually spring). In this case they still have the following summer and fall semesters to work on their problems (go through counseling, tutoring, study skills training, time management training, etc.) before they be placed on academic suspension. This will include students who are admitted on probation to begin with.

Please let me know if you approve our recommendations stated above or if I should ask the Faculty Senate to make additional recommendations with regard to retention or revise any of them. We must do this assignment right as it is a pressing area of concern for all of us. Thank you. RN