

Appendix C

Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics

Summary

- Annual evaluation of faculty performance is conducted by the Department Head.
- Evaluation is based primarily upon data and metrics pertaining to the previous calendar year. These data are obtained from the faculty and administrative sources. However, trends extending past the previous year, and into the current year will also be factored in as appropriate.
- Department Head meets annually with each faculty member.
- All research, teaching and service activity of a faculty member is relevant to their evaluation.
- A report is made to the faculty member, and they are invited to provide a written response if they wish.
- Evaluations are made against expectations delineated in job descriptions, which for tenured and tenure-track faculty include research, teaching, and service.
- Faculty receiving a "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" rating in any category will develop a plan to achieve necessary improvement in consultation with the Department Head.
- Normal effort distribution for tenured and tenure-track faculty is 60% research, 30% teaching, and 10% service. Adjustments to this norm can be made on an individual case basis.

Process

Faculty evaluations in the Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics are performed by the Department Head. Under normal circumstances (i.e. unless the faculty member is on leave), one on one discussions between the Department Head and each faculty member will be held at a mutually convenient time usually early in the Spring semester. Prior to the meeting, the faculty member will be asked to supply relevant information, including: a complete and up to date CV; germane grant proposal activity not adequately summarized in the CV; reprints of up to 5 papers published during the previous calendar year (Associate Professors can include preprints of manuscripts in press, Assistant Professors can include manuscripts submitted); teaching summary for the previous calendar year, including summary of classroom teaching, research students (including postdoctoral researchers) and any materials that might speak to the quality of teaching performed that the faculty member wishes to include; and any additional activities, accomplishments, awards, etc that the faculty member might feel is inadequately described in the other submitted materials. The discussions encompass the research, teaching, and service contributions, accomplishments achieved, and challenges

experienced by the faculty member, during the past year. Classroom teaching assignments for the coming academic year are also discussed. Progress toward tenure is discussed with Assistant Professors; progress toward promotion is discussed with Associate Professors. A written summary of the discussion and evaluation is provided to the faculty member no later than 4 weeks after the date of the one-on-one meeting. The faculty member is asked to sign an acknowledgement that the document has been received, and the faculty member is free to provide a written response if he/she so chooses. The evaluation document, acknowledgement, and any response are kept in the departmental faculty personnel file.

For faculty receiving a rating of “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory”, the faculty member will meet with the Department Head to develop a plan for improving the performance. This plan should be developed as much as possible by the faculty member. Should resources be required to meet the plan, the Department Head will make every effort to secure those resources. The plan should articulate specific goals and a timeline for achieving those goals. The faculty member and the Department Head should meet subsequently to evaluate progress being made toward meeting the proposed goals, and the plan revised as necessary if appropriate. These subsequent meetings should take place no less frequently than once every 6-months until the goals have been achieved.

Criteria

Faculty are evaluated relative to the expectations listed in their respective offer letters and/or job descriptions. Accordingly, except in unusual circumstances that would be described in such documents, tenured and tenure-track faculty will be judged relative to progress in meeting the following expectations: 1) Establishment of a nationally competitive research program able to attract necessary grant funds; 2) Dissemination of the results of research in peer-reviewed publications and oral presentations; 3) Effective research training of graduate students, undergraduate students, and/or postdoctoral fellows; 4) Effective classroom teaching at both undergraduate and/or graduate levels to an extent comparable to other research-active faculty in the Department; 5) Conscientiously performed service to the Department, College, University and profession. Particular weight is given to achievements that reflect national or international peer-review.

The customary expectation is that tenured and tenure-track faculty distribute their professional effort approximately 60% toward scholarship, 30% toward teaching, and 10% toward service. Each faculty member and the Department Head should discuss at the annual meeting if an adjustment to these loads should be made for the coming year if anticipated activities warrant.

Performance Expectations

Scholarship:

A rating of ‘Excellent’ can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Publications judged to have a particularly high impact as evidenced, for example, by number, or the profile of the journal within and outside the specific discipline associated

- with the research results. Faculty will be requested to address the impact of their research papers when submitting their materials.
- Continuous competitive funding adequate to fully support the faculty member's ongoing research program (Note that a laboratory is not 'fully supported' if students receive TA support unless the TA appointments were requested by the department.) However, if by the time of the annual review, the faculty member has received an award notice or information indicating that substantial funding is imminent, this will also be considered evidence of excellence.
- Receiving major award recognition
- Delivery, as the result of a specific invitation, of oral presentations of research results to a National or International meeting.
- Faculty whose research program does not lend itself to these conventional means for dissemination of research results should present alternative evidence.
- Invited research seminars at other institutions

A rating of 'Satisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Peer-reviewed publication or publication of an invited review article or presentation of research results at a regional or national or international meeting.
- Active effort to achieve external research funding as evidenced by the submission of proposals
- Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.
- Presentation of a seminar at another academic or industrial institution

A rating of 'Needs Improvement' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Active conduct of research or scholarship that has not yet resulted in publication or other means of dissemination
- Research proposals being developed but that have not yet been submitted.
- Attendance at research conferences or national meetings, but without presentation of research results.

A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Very little if any research or scholarship actively being conducted
- No research grant proposals under development.
- No attendance at research conferences or national meetings

Teaching:

A rating of 'Excellent' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidence by such measures as peer-evaluation, student evaluations, and/or student outcomes.
- Outstanding direction of undergraduate and/or graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated.
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Development and utilization of effective pedagogical methods and materials

- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional material
- Developing a new course that fills an identifiable need in the curriculum
- Chair of doctoral research committees
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions
- Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University honors program)
- Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor.

A rating of 'Satisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Effective teaching performance as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Effective direction of undergraduate and/or graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- Development and utilization of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching as evidenced by self-evaluation
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- effectively coordinating a multi-section course.
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students

A rating of 'Needs Improvement' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Little evidence of improvement of low class room performance despite efforts to do so.
- Students in laboratory not making normal progress
- Little participation in graduate or undergraduate programs and/or student advisory committees

A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Poor classroom performance with no effort to improve
- No students being trained in the laboratory
- No service on graduate student advisory committees

Service:

A rating of 'Excellent' can be achieved by evidence such as:

- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal or being regularly requested to be a peer-reviewer
- Serving as an appointed [full] member of a peer-review committee for a national granting agency such as NIH or NSF.
- Being an officer in a national or international professional organization
- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board (e.g. NIH study section)
- Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University
- Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting
- Serving as an officer in the faculty Senate
- Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service.
- Performing conscientiously in multiple service roles or providing significant leadership in one or more roles in the Department, University, and Profession. These expectations are normalized to academic rank; i.e. less service is expected for assistant professors, etc.

A rating of 'Satisfactory' can be achieved by evidence such as:

- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals
- Service as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations such as NIH or NSF
- Being a committee chair in national or international professional organization
- Being an officer in regional or state professional organization
- Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting
- Serving in an elected role in a national, regional, or international professional organization
- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Serving on University, college, and departmental committees and task forces
- Serving as a consultant
- Being an advisor to student organizations
- Serving in administrative roles within the department
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

A rating of 'Needs Improvement' can be achieved by evidence such as:

- Minimal service on Departmental and University committees
- Limited involvement with reviewing manuscripts or grant proposals
- Limited professional involvement off campus

A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- No service on departmental committees

- No professional service reviewing manuscripts or grants
- No service in professional organizations