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Dr. Ray M. Bowen
President
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Dear President Bowen:

On Monday, May 11, 1998, the Faculty Senate met for the final time in its 15th Session. At that meeting the Senate received and approved the enclosed interim report submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Reconciling the Faculty Reward System with the Multiple Missions of Texas A&M University. The Senate also approved a request from that group to continue its work into the next session. I simply enclose a copy of that interim report to update you as to the progress of that committee thus far. It is hoped that the work of this ad hoc committee will conclude this coming session.

Sincerely,

Wayne E. Wylie
Speaker, 1997-98
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REPORT OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON RECONCILING THE FACULTY REWARD SYSTEM WITH THE MULTIPLE MISSIONS OF TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, 1997-98

During the Summer of 1997, Faculty Senate Speaker Wayne Wylie asked the Senate Executive Committee to approve the formation of an Ad-Hoc Committee to explore the relationship between the multiple missions and the faculty reward system of Texas A&M University. He did so out of concern that some of the missions are perhaps receiving inadequate attention from the faculty because there are greater opportunities for promotion, tenure, and monetary rewards associated with pursuit of other missions. Forming the committee was approved, Senate Secretary Thomas McKittrick was appointed as its Chair, and the Executive Committee identified its members.

A briefing paper was then prepared for the committee in which various sources cited the need for faculties to reconsider their rewards systems in light of growing public dissatisfaction with, and mistrust of, institutions of higher education and their faculties. It has become clear that this university must have a reward system in place that enables it to fully satisfy all of its missions and responsibilities to its students, the state of Texas, and the world.

The committee organized itself into sub-committees for the purpose of gathering data and making recommendations about various aspects of its charge. The National Survey sub-committee was asked to gather data about whether and how peer institutions have responded to these concerns. A Cross-College Inventory Comparison sub-committee agreed to gather information about stated reward policies in the academic units. An Evaluation Methods sub-committee set out to gather information about the evaluation methods that have been developed for teaching, research, and service. A Rewards sub-committee took on the task of identifying currently used rewards and potential alternative rewards that might be used in addition to promotion, tenure, and salary increases.

The initial work of the sub-committees is nearing completion. Two of their reports and tentative recommendations are included herewith, as is the briefing paper. It has been expanded to include additional references as they have become known. As this Senate year is nearing its end, the committee wishes to recommend that the 1998-99 Senate Executive Committee authorize the continuation of its work. Toward that end, this committee wishes to make the following points very clear:

It was agreed that there must be opportunities created for the faculty to debate a proposed new reward system in order for meaningful change to be embraced and accepted throughout the university.
It was agreed that the recommendations must allow the faculty flexibility in implementation details related to their department's missions, but within the framework of guidelines agreed upon at the highest levels. An analogy used was the post-tenure review guidelines.

It was also agreed that there should be deadlines established for implementation, and a mechanism created to monitor compliance.

It was further agreed that a revised faculty reward system must continue to emphasize the importance of funded research, and that teaching, extension, integration and application must also be rewarded if they meet evaluation criteria and serve the missions of the department, college, and university.

It is suggested that, following approval of this interim report by the Senate, representatives of the Senate Executive Committee and this committee meet with the President and Provost to discuss the report before proceeding further.
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RECONCILING THE FACULTY REWARD SYSTEM WITH THE MULTIPLE MISSIONS OF TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Thomas L. Mckittrick, FAIA, Associate Professor, TAMU
Chair, Ad-Hoc Committee on Reconciling the Faculty Reward System with the Multiple Missions of Texas A&M University

The term faculty reward system is widely used to describe the components of scholarship upon which faculty are evaluated for purposes of promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases. Much has been written in the last decade about faculty work, the faculty reward system, the purposes served by colleges and universities, and public attitudes about higher education that are often reflected in actions by governing boards and legislatures. (Bok, 1986, 1990; Boyer, 1990, 1995; Fairweather, 1996; Richardson Foundation Forum, 1997; Schon, 1995; Tierney and Bensimon, 1996). The purpose of this brief paper is to extract from these authors, and from certain internally generated reports, statements that support the need for a study of the faculty reward system at Texas A&M University.

Derek Bok, former President of Harvard University, addresses in particular professional schools, which he says are influenced by the expectations and demands of the academy, the students, the profession, and the larger society. Faculty in professional schools, he states, are expected by the academy primarily to develop and publish new knowledge, by the students to prepare them for future careers, by the profession to train new practitioners in leading edge skills, and by society to make competent services available at reasonable cost, and delivered with high ethical standards. Bok discusses how different faculties strike a balance between teaching and research, and how the selection of new members from either the profession or from Ph.D. programs affects this balance. He also addresses the concerns of faculty in those disciplines where little or no funding exists for sponsored research, notably in the arts. In Universities and the Future of America, Bok discusses the role of faculties in applying knowledge toward solutions of national social issues and international competitiveness.

The late Ernest Boyer, former President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning, calls for a reconsideration of how scholarship is defined and rewarded as a component of engaging universities in addressing the nation's many problems. He states, "At no time in our history has the need been greater for connecting the work of the academy to the social and environmental challenges beyond the campus. And yet, the rich diversity and potential of American higher education cannot be fully realized if campus missions are too..."
narrowly defined or if the faculty reward system is inappropriately restricted. It seems clear that while research is crucial, we need a renewed commitment to service, too.” Boyer calls for universities to “break out of the tired old teaching versus research debate and define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar.” He cites a survey of academic vice-presidents and deans at over eight-hundred colleges and universities, the overwhelming majority of whom supported the proposition that scholarship should be viewed as more than research, as evidence that educators are ready to rethink what it means to be a scholar. Boyer proposes the adoption of the following four general views of scholarship:

- The Scholarship of Discovery: The commitment to the development of knowledge for its own sake, to the freedom of inquiry, and to following, in a disciplined fashion, an investigation wherever it may lead. The intellectual excitement fueled by this quest enlivens faculty and invigorates higher learning institutions, and in our complicated, vulnerable world, the discovery of new knowledge is absolutely crucial.

- The Scholarship of Integration: The work of scholars who give meaning to isolated facts, putting them in perspective; who make connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context; or who illuminate data in a revealing way, perhaps educating non-specialists in the process. This is serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research. It is often characterized as interdisciplinary work.

- The Scholarship of Application: The engagement of scholars in addressing consequential problems through the responsible application of knowledge. This can be a form of service tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge, or it can be the practice of one’s profession. It is serious, demanding work, requiring the rigor and accountability traditionally associated with research activities. It should promote new intellectual understandings, and have the potential to inspire further discovery.

- The Scholarship of Teaching: As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must, above all, be well informed, and steeped in the knowledge of their fields. Teaching can be well regarded only as professors are widely read and intellectually engaged. Successful teaching stimulates active learning, and encourages students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over. Inspired teaching and mentoring keeps the flame of scholarship alive by encouraging successive generations of young people to enter the academy.

The report *Restructuring the University Reward System* by the Richardson Foundation Forum contains the results of surveys of university faculty and academic administrators concerning the current reward system for faculty. The survey shows that only 36% of provosts and 30.6% of deans are satisfied with the current system, while 17% of faculty are satisfied with it. Provosts, deans and faculty all consider class preparation and teaching to be more important than research. Faculties consider advising and academic service to be virtually as important as
research. These opinions are not supported by promotion and tenure decisions, which give more weight to research than other faculty activities. The report supports the need for changing the reward system, describes the barriers to change, and outlines the kinds of support and resources that must be marshalled if change is to occur. Boyer and this report agree that university faculty, particularly promotion and tenure committees, must look beyond the constraints of tradition for change to begin. The report suggests that differentiated staffing, wherein each faculty member is evaluated on his or her own set of scholarly strengths, could be implemented as a means of changing the reward system.

Boyer, in The Scholarship of Engagement, recounts historical statements from leaders of major universities declaring that the entire university movement in this country was “toward reality and practicality”, and that America’s universities were filled with the democratic spirit of “serviceableness”. He quotes Woodrow Wilson as a 40-year-old Princeton University professor: “We dare not keep aloof and closet ourselves while a nation comes to its maturity”. Wilson insisted that the spirit of service would give a college a place in the public annals of the nation. Later history is cited by Boyer, including the role played by universities in winning World War II, and the affirmative-action programs of the 1960’s in almost every university in this country to promote human justice. Boyer thus describes the historic mission of higher learning as “the scholarship of engagement”. The thrust of this article is that academics have become silent and invisible in public discourse concerning the major issues of society, and instead have become preoccupied with conforming to an academic reward system that encourages disengagement, and even penalizes professors whose work becomes useful to non-academics. Boyer says: “But, what I find most disturbing...is a growing feeling in this country that higher education is a part of the problem rather than the solution.” He cites Derek Bok’s observation that “the most consequential shifts in public policy in recent years have come not from academics, but from works [by non-academics] that place the environmental, industrial, economic, and gender issues squarely in a social context”. He questions why the most pressing issues are discussed endlessly by politicians and journalists, but rarely by university scholars. He then outlines how his four-part definition of scholarship and its associated reward system would encourage greater engagement in the issues of society.

The Final Report of the Task Force on the Multiple Missions of Texas A&M University was presented to the President in May 1991. It was prepared by more than 60 faculty, staff and students at the behest of the President. Among its twenty-eight recommendations are the following:

- The University should publish a comprehensive statement of its missions, emphasizing its dual and interactive roles in human development and knowledge development, and the continuation of its historic thrusts as both a land-grant institution and a research university.
• Programs should be instituted to ensure awareness of all members of the university community of the scope and depth of the University missions.
• The University should conduct detailed studies of the role and scope of its public service missions, and the manner in which they are implemented. An institutional rationale needs to be developed for expressing the roles of professional programs, which are not well perceived at Texas A&M University.
• The University should emphasize the improvement of its teaching mission, giving attention to the use of techniques that have been successful in the development of the research mission.
• The University should encourage, recognize, and support interdisciplinary efforts that focus on broad issues of public policy or social concern.
• The university should review its criteria and procedures for hiring, evaluating, promoting, and rewarding faculty so that all University missions are considered; so that individual contributions toward the total intellectual and University community are given appropriate weight along with contributions toward the disciplinary communities; and so that scholarship is considered to be more inclusive than the conduct of research or the publication of refereed articles.
• The University should adopt practices that will improve the academic focus and quality of research and increase the degree to which the research mission supports the other missions of the University. It is important to all of the missions that the research focus be upon knowledge advancement, which is as appropriate for applied research in support of public service missions as [it is] for basic research.
• The University should strive to have all faculty members engaged in some aspect of undergraduate education, should encourage more one-to-one contact between faculty and students, and should give detailed attention to learning and teaching procedures that affect quality.
• The University should consider the creation of a Board of Visitors to provide the President with a continuing assessment of the manner in which the missions of the University are responsive to the needs of the public that the University serves.

The report also includes proposed statements of purposes and missions. It is obvious that some, but not all, of the recommendations have been implemented.

The most troubling issue raised in regard to revising the reward system is that of evaluating teaching and service, or in the case of Boyer’s four-part definition of scholarship, teaching, integration, and application. There is common belief that peer-reviewed publications and citations provide a convenient method of assessing research, or discovery. Scholarship Assessed, the report of an important 1997 study by The Carnegie Foundation, states: “The academy must confront the central question of evaluation, or it will not be able renew the vitality of college learning because scholarship will remain too narrowly assessed.” The broad-
based study found that when people praise a work of scholarship, they usually mean that the project in question shows that it has been guided by these qualitative standards:

1. Clear goals.
3. Appropriate methods.
4. Significant results.
5. Effective presentation.
6. Reflective critique.

The report states that it is important to give these familiar standards explicit articulation for the form of scholarship being assessed, and it includes questions that evaluators are using in many universities for that purpose.

Lest the objectives of the Carnegie Foundation reports, and of this committee, be misconstrued, this statement from Scholarship Assessed is important to reiterate: “The challenge to the academic community was and continues to be the need to expand the definition of legitimate faculty work in ways that put research in proper perspective without doing it harm.” This must be done if we are to re-gain public trust and fulfill all of the missions set for us.

The leadership of the Faculty Senate agrees with Ernest Boyer’s statement excerpted from Scholarship Reconsidered: “...faculty themselves must assume primary responsibility for giving scholarship a richer, more vital meaning. Only as faculty help shape their purposes and engage actively in policy formulation will a broader view of scholarship be authentically embraced.” To this end an ad-hoc committee has been formed and charged with developing recommendations for reconciling the faculty reward system at Texas A&M University with its multiple missions.
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INTRODUCTION

This subcommittee was charged with the inventory and comparison of existing tenure, promotion, and annual review policies within Texas A&M University. We focused our inventory on the official college-level and department-level documents which were provided to us through the Dean of Faculties. No documents appear to have been requested or received from the Galveston campus.

Individual colleges responded to the Dean of Faculties' request with a wide range of documentation, consisting mostly of tenure and promotion guidelines for professors. See Appendix A for a complete list of documentation. There was very little information on annual review policies, and almost nothing on the review and promotion of lecturers. Consequently, our comparison focuses on promotion and tenure guidelines.

This report presents the results of our review of all available promotion and tenure documents, and recommendations based on our review.

THE ELEMENTS OF A PROMOTION/TENURE DOSSIER

The contents of a promotion and tenure dossier are governed by the University (Appendix B). Dossiers include the candidate's statement, statements from the promotion and tenure committee or department head on the quality of teaching, research, service, and other activities, and letters from outside reviewers. The letters from outside reviewers typically
emphasize research and, to a lesser extent, professional service, making the remainder of the dossier critical for judging teaching and service to the institution.

Student evaluations, with a statement from the department placing the evaluations in perspective, are required for the dossier. Peer evaluation must consist of (a) evaluation of course materials (syllabi, assignments, exams, and grading methods) and (b) evaluation of non-classroom teaching (graduate research direction, minority scholars program, etc.). Peer evaluation of classroom teaching is not required by the University but is required by Business. Computer Science requires the inclusion of course materials.

Other items may be included but are not required. The University gives a non-inclusive list of such items (see Appendix B). Other units list additional items, such as lists of student accomplishments, reputations of former students, evidence of student learning, comparison of students in multi-section courses, and evaluation of continuing education activities.

While some units mention that teaching portfolios may be used as an evaluation tool, a teaching portfolio is not required in the dossier by any unit. However, Business required a teaching portfolio to be developed in the third year of Assistant Professorship and in the fifth year of Associate Professorship. Educational Psychology required an intensive teaching evaluation after the third year of Assistant Professorship.

Service to the University is judged on the basis of peer evaluations and lists of activities contained in the curriculum vitae.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (12.01.99.M2) states that tenure and promotion decisions are to be based on teaching, creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities, and service. The document goes on to list examples of possible indicators of performance in each of the categories: Indicators of Excellence and Indicators of Effectiveness. In addition, many colleges and departments go beyond the University guidelines and list additional indicators of excellence or effectiveness.

We have compiled these and list them in Appendix C. The list is interesting in its breadth, and we mention only a few of these indicators here. For teaching, additional indicators
include employer evaluations of former students, evidence of flexibility in teaching abilities, editorship of a major journal on teaching scholarship, and evidence of effective student learning shown by mastery of material in subsequent courses. For scholarly activities, additional indicators include publications in the popular press, publication of invited reviews, supervision of independent work by undergraduates, and service as a host for a visiting researcher. Service indicators include contributions to external development efforts, significant and effective mentorship of students or faculty, leadership and participation in developing interdisciplinary and/or multi-faculty centers, laboratories, and programs, and workshop presentations. Finally, professional outreach indicators include periods spent in industry and request by individuals from other institutions to train with the individual. An additional list of evaluation criteria for extension personnel is included in Appendix D.

**THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE**

The governing university document for promotion and tenure states that while excellence in performance in all areas are important, primary emphasis should be paced on teaching and research. This document also notes that exceptions may be made for individuals who particularly excel in one area and are merely acceptable in the other two.

Several units went beyond the bare University policy in stating the relative importance of various areas. Some, by not drawing a distinction, implied that all areas should receive equal weight. Agricultural Education stated that top performance in teaching or research was required. Health and Kinesiology stated that a specific requirement for early promotion was outstanding research. Two units (Business; Educational Curriculum and Instruction) emphasized that good teaching was a prerequisite for advancement.

Two departments tailored the relative importance of performance in various areas to the specific candidate. In Educational Psychology, the relative emphasis of teaching, research, and service activities are derived from the candidate's statement, in congruence with departmental needs. In Agricultural Education, the relative importance is determined by the candidate's mentoring committee during the process of evaluation.

A small number of units listed specific requirements for promotion and tenure.

**THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS**
The descriptions of procedures for the promotion and tenure process in the college documents lack consistency. Perhaps even more inconsistent is the awareness of faculty members of their own departmental and college procedures. Some colleges distribute the complete information annually to all faculty members. This is a valuable service, not only to the faculty members eligible for tenure and promotion, but also to those who will be voting on tenure and promotion dossiers that they may be fully aware of the evaluation guidelines.

It is helpful to have a specific timeline laid out in the documentation, including the responsibilities and deadlines of various participants in the process. This, again, was included in some documents and absent in others.

Formal mentoring takes place in some departments but not others. In many departments which have formal mentoring, the mentoring procedures are clearly described, including procedures for designating mentors and the period of time each mentor serves. These procedures are presumably of benefit to junior faculty, and the impact of these mentoring activities would be worth studying.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Note: Since similar recommendations have been made before, particularly with regard to teaching evaluation criteria, we expect that successful implementation of these recommendation would require that they be made a high priority at the University level.

1) Guideline content: Each unit (department or college) should have an official document on promotion, tenure, and annual review. This document should state, among other things,
   a) the relative importance of teaching, research, and service by rank, or how such importance is determined for particular individuals;
   b) the minimum requirements for promotion and tenure, below which tenure or promotion are not possible;
   c) the responsibilities of all parties in the promotion and tenure process;
   d) the timelines and procedures for the promotion and tenure process; and
   e) the procedures for selecting departmental and college promotion and tenure committee members.
2) **Guideline distribution:** Promotion, tenure and annual review guidelines should be affirmatively provided to all candidate faculty members at hiring time and at least every three years thereafter. The Dean of Faculties should be responsible for distributing university-level and system-level documents at least every three years. If documents are posted on the Web, a summary of relevant information should nevertheless be distributed to each faculty member by conventional means.

3) **Job criteria:** If specific job requirements are established or specific criteria are to be used in the granting of tenure that differ from the normal expectations for someone hired at that rank in that unit, these should be explicitly stated in the letter of appointment. In all cases, the letter of appointment should be included in the tenure dossier.

4) **Teaching evaluation:** The university should require additional evidence of classroom teaching effectiveness beyond student evaluations. This evidence might include teaching portfolios, peer classroom evaluations, or interviews of former students and employers. Resources should be provided by the University for comprehensive peer evaluation or student interviews so that they may become an essential part of the promotion and tenure dossier.

5) **Lecturers:** Statements on promotion and annual review should include explicit policies for evaluation and promotion of lecturers, reflecting their status as faculty members and their role within the university.

6) **Research scientists:** At the department or college level, explicit policies governing the evaluation and promotion of research scientists should be developed and distributed.

7) **Mentoring:** Procedures for mentoring young faculty should be explicitly established within each department or college. Appropriate weight for mentoring activities, including quality of mentoring, should be given during promotion, tenure, and annual review.

8) **Third-year review:** The value of a third-year review for new, untenured faculty, presently being done in some colleges and departments, should be investigated to determine whether such an activity should be promulgated throughout the University.
APPENDIX A

Summary of Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review Documents received by the cross-college inventory and comparison subcommittee

Content codes: G=guidelines, E=evaluation criteria; A=appointment, M=annual review and/or merit raise, R=post-tenure review, and P=promotion T=tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit (date)</th>
<th>Pages (coll. level)</th>
<th>Pages (dept. level)</th>
<th>Document contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (1991)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>GE:MPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economics (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GE:P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education (?)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>GE:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Engineering (draft)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science (1997)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology (1997)</td>
<td>125 (est.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GE:AMRPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (?) in revision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMCaGSo Business (1997)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:AMRPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (?)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration (1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GE:M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Curriculum and Instruction (1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Human Resource Development (?)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology (1986)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Kinesiology (1994)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (?)</td>
<td>12 (+PPM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GE:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering (1997)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>GE:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science (1997)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>GE:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution (1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GE:APT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering (1994)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>GE:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Library (?)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences (?)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts (1994)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (?)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (1994)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology (1991)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry (1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>G:APT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics (1997)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics (1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GE:MPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine (1996)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>G:MPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences Library (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>GE:P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-College Inventory Report Appendices
1. Candidate's statement on teaching, research and service .......................... Pg.
2. Statement on quality of teaching (see below) ........................................ Pg.
3. Statement on quality of research (see below) ....................................... Pg.
4. Statement on quality of service (see below) ......................................... Pg.
5. Statement on quality of other activities, if any, relevant to the missions of the University (see below) ............................................................... Pg.
6. Statement on qualifications of outside reviewers, along with outside reviewers' letters evaluating the candidate's performance ................................................ Pg.
7. Complete departmental committee report and recommendation ................ Pg.
8. Recommendation of Department Head ..................................................... Pg.
9. Complete Committee Report and Recommendation ............................... Pg.
10. Recommendation of Dean or Director ................................................... Pg.
11. Candidate's curriculum vitae (including candidate's attestation of correctness) ................................................................. Pg.
12. Other materials and documentation as desired (please include the candidate's acknowledgement of contents of the P&T dossier as submitted to the departmental review committee) ................................................ Pg.

Statements in 2-5 are typically supplied by the departmental P&T committee and Department Head and must be documented. As appropriate, reference can be made to items 7-12. For the teaching statement, student and peer evaluations are required. Student evaluations can include former student evaluations in addition to those of current students. Peer evaluation items are specified in the annual memorandum from the Dean of Faculties to Deans and Department Heads. For the research statement, the outside reviewers' letters are extremely important. The stature of each letter writer must be indicated in a brief paragraph (item 6). Support for assertions of quality of publications and research must be given. If grant activity is to be used as a quality indicator, the extent of peer review in the competitive process must be indicated. For service, peer evaluation of the quality of service to the department, college, University or other relevant constituencies must be included. Other activities of the candidate relevant to the mission of Texas A&M University will typically be manifested in the teaching, research, or service activities of the candidate. Special mention may be made of exemplary activities that have influenced the teaching, research or service mission of the University.

SUMMARY OF VOTES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommended action by: Yes No Absent Abstain Total Eligible Date

Department Committee
Department Head
College Committee
Dean
Provost
President

*Please provide number of yes, no, absent and abstain votes. Also please list the total number of faculty members eligible to vote.

For an individual college, the contents 2 through 9 may be reordered. Also, page numbers can be replaced by section or tab indicators.
Candidate's Statement on Teaching, Research and Service. The candidate is to supply in concise form (three pages, single spaced, maximum) a statement on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in the three categories of performance. The purpose is not for the candidate to make an argument for promotion or tenure--it is to provide a context for review of the file at each level. The candidate must understand that this is an important document.

Statements on quality of teaching, research, service or other activities (items 2, 3, 4, 5). These will be typically supplied by the promotion and tenure committee and department head. In case of multiple statements, one may refer to other parts of the dossier. The key is that reviewers be able to find concrete statements based upon documented evidence and peer review.

For evaluation of teaching, the following must be included in the dossier:

1. Evaluation by colleagues of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods to determine levels of scope, rigor and quality.
2. Student evaluations of teaching, with assessment by colleagues. Summaries of the student evaluations must be included, longitudinal perspective should be given, and numerical data should be set in context of departmental standards and norms. This document must contain a listing by academic year of the courses taught.
3. Evaluation of contributions in non-classroom teaching situations (e.g. graduate student research directions, University Undergraduate Fellows, Minority Scholars Program) of value to the department and university.

The following item is not required but should certainly be provided if items 1. through 3. are insufficient to render a definitive assessment of the candidate's teaching quality, or if the candidate has engaged in team-teaching or similar activity that has facilitated observation by colleagues.

4. Evaluation by colleagues of the candidate's performance in classroom teaching situations. This statement should indicate the methods and frequency of observation as well as criteria for assessment of performance. If a department engages in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of the candidate's service for the purpose of developing teaching ability this evaluation would be a natural addition to the dossier.

The following items should be submitted if appropriate:

5. Evaluation of development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses.
6. Evaluation of special efforts made by the candidate to improve his/her teaching or to develop new teaching materials.
7. Evaluation of publications with teaching focus in refereed journals, including journals dedicated to education in the professor's discipline (e.g. Journal of Chemical Education).
8. Documentation and evaluation of participation in honors programs and development of honors courses.
9. List of awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, with explanation if necessary.
10. List of external invited presentations on teaching innovations.
11. List of competitive, refereed, externally funded grants for projects with strong teaching focus.
12. Evaluations by former students or exiting students, if gathered in an unbiased way.
13. Evaluation of publication of instructional materials, including textbooks.
14. Other evidence of teaching quality as deemed important by the department.

Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (item 11)

- Provide a concise curriculum vitae. There should also be a short statement signed by the candidate stating that the vitae being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature. Please do not provide an annual report. (An annual report may be useful at the department or college level but is not needed at the President or Executive Vice President and Provost level.) In short, the aim should be to provide a crisp document focusing on essential information. "Padding" should be avoided.

- Indicate clearly by identified separate category those publications or other types of creative work that appeared in refereed journals or were jury reviewed and other types that were not. Provide complete documentation for each citation including date of publication and number of pages.
APPENDIX C

Additional indicators of excellence or effectiveness (beyond those included in university guidelines 12.01.99.M2) listed in one or more college or department promotion and tenure documents. Examples of colleges and departments using those criteria are in parentheses.

Teaching

- Evidence of effective student learning shown by mastery of material in subsequent courses (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
- Exit interviews (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
- Alumni evaluation of knowledge/preparation (Geosciences)
- Employer evaluations of students (Engineering)
- External invitations to present teaching innovations (Geosciences)
- Other institutions using educational materials developed (Engineering)
- Participation in the development of continuing education programs (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
- Guest lecturer in TAMU-related instructional programs (Entomology)
- Flexibility in teaching abilities (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
- Supervision of independent projects (Business)
- Favorable citation index listing for teaching research publications (Veterinary Science)
- Editor major journal in chosen area of teaching scholarship (Veterinary Science)

Scholarly Activities

- Publication of monographs, reports, bulletins, handbooks, articles in the popular press (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
- Publication of articles about the faculty member (Entomology)
- Publication of invited reviews (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
- Development of patented and non-patented products (software, equipment, genetic material, design methods and criteria, etc.) (Agriculture and Life Sciences, Engineering)
- Doctoral Research commissioned by professional associations, scholarly bodies, local school districts, or state or national agencies (Educational Administration)
• Activity in seeking funds and other tangible support for the department (Educational Administration)
• Projects conducted/completed (Educational Human Resource Development)
• Number of graduate students supported (Engineering)
• Supervision of independent work by undergraduates (Liberal Arts)
• Key role in forming collaborative arrangements with industry (Veterinary Medicine)
• Service as host for visiting researcher (Medicine)

Service

• Committee membership in local, state or national professional organization (Medicine)
• Contribution to external development efforts (Business, Veterinary Medicine)
• Significant and effective mentorship of students/faculty (Veterinary Medicine, Educational Curriculum and Instruction)
• Student recruiting or placement activities (Geosciences, Agriculture and Life Sciences, Educational Administration)
• Public relations activities (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
• Contribution to worldwide economic and cultural development and enhancement of global understanding (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
• Awards, honors, certificates (Liberal Arts, Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution)
• Leadership and participation in developing interdisciplinary and/or multi-faculty centers, laboratories, or programs (Engineering)
• Directing department’s consulting, continuing education, and outreach to industry efforts (Statistics)
• Conferences attended/chaired (Educational Curriculum and Instruction)
• Professional service to agency applied and commercialization efforts. (Engineering)
• Formal and informal programming in youth education and development (Agriculture and Life Sciences)
• Participation in assignments in TAMU international projects or short-term international assignments on behalf of other agencies (Agricultural Education)
• Workshop presentations (Educational Curriculum and Instruction)
• Participant evaluations of workshops/seminars (Educational Human Resource Development)
Professional Outreach

- On-site supervision of graduate internship students (Engineering)
- Extension, continuing education and short courses developed and taught (Engineering, Veterinary Medicine)
- Periods spent in industry (Engineering)
- Preparation and presentation of public information and service programs (Veterinary Medicine)
- Collaborative activities with other universities; state, national, and international (Engineering)
- Evidence of excellent performance in veterinary patient management or in diagnostic support services (Veterinary Medicine)
- Requests by individuals from other institutions to train with the individual (Veterinary Medicine)
APPENDIX D

Agriculture and Life Sciences Extension Evaluation Criteria in Consideration of Merit Review, Promotion and Tenure

- Long and short-term goal statements

- Evaluation by clientele and peers of program development as to content, quality, priority and emphasis
  - Awards for program or service

- Evaluation by clientele and peers of teaching effectiveness and quality
  - Command of the subject discipline
  - Progressive assimilation of new knowledge
  - Ability to present information with knowledge and conviction

- Financial and material support for disciplinary, multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs
  - External educational grants for the development of new and creative Extension programs

- Cooperative and coordinative efforts
  - Leadership in networking leading to integrated interdisciplinary programming
  - Catalyst for the initiation of new programming approaches within and/or across disciplines

- Scholarly contributions and professionalism
  - Publication of widely accepted educational programs and/or materials
  - Development of techniques or new modes of educational delivery such as interactive video, satellite broadcasting
  - Revision or development of new educational approaches in the base program areas
  - Contributions to professional societies
APPENDIX E

Promotion and Tenure Process Data

I. College Review Process

Time Table
The overall time frame is set by the University Schedule; Deans and Department Heads
Attend a meeting on P&T issues and regularly receive guidelines and information from
the Dean of Faculties Office

Distribution of Policy & Procedure Info
Some Colleges annually send all faculty members the procedure and a College Time
Table complete with dates for forming committees, asking for letters from outside
reviewers, etc. This is a valuable feature of the procedures, since at least anecdotal
evidence suggests that many faculty are not aware of the time table, including some
who are eligible for Promotion and Tenure. Sending the data to the faculty annually
avoids the appearance that the administration is hiding the ball.

Nomination or Initiation of Candidacy Process
Some Colleges send each Department head a list of faculty eligible for P&T, and
request a written verification. In some, the candidates are self nominated, and in others
they may be nominated by another faculty member, especially when early tenure or
promotion is being suggested.

Promotion & Tenure Committee
Each college must have a P&T committee, usually chosen by the Dean, or in some cases
consisting partly of elected and partly of appointed members. The Faculty Advisory
Committee of the College may perform some of the functions of the P&T committee.

Membership, terms
Membership in the College P&T committees is restricted to tenured faculty, and in some
cases to tenured Full Professors; visiting and adjunct faculty are normally excluded. It is
customary for P&T actions at each level to be judged by faculty of at least that level or
higher. In the case of promotion to Full Prof, the nomination would be judged by Full
Profs.

How chosen
Little information was available about the process of choosing the College P&T
Committee Members; they may be appointed by the dean, or nominated by the
Department heads. The chair of the committee may be appointed by the dean
or be elected by the members of the committee.

Voting process
Voting is anonymous as far as the candidate is concerned and in some cases is done by secret ballot within the committee. One college appoints a chair from a department other than that of the candidate, and the chair does not vote.

Other

The College P&T Committees conduct confidential meetings about each candidate, and submit a written report to the Dean summarizing their findings. In some cases the "argument" for the candidate may be presented to the committee by one of its members, in others by a faculty member who is not part of the committee. The deans of the colleges provide their own written reports on the qualifications of the candidates and forward both reports to the office of the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties.

Some colleges have one set of uniform procedures for all P&T actions across all departments, while others explicitly allow variation so that the department process is somewhat autonomous.

Formal Mentoring

There is little formal mentoring done at the College level. In some cases the college documents suggest the establishment of a mentor or mentoring committee at the department level. The Women's Faculty Network has a mentoring program which provides mentors for assistant professors.

Advocates for Candidate

The case for awarding Promotion and Tenure to a candidate is presented variously by a member of the College P&T committee, an advocate appointed by the department head, a member or director of a center, or a head of an interdisciplinary program.

Third Year Review for Asst. Profs

Third year review processes are mentioned for several colleges. They are conducted in the same manner as the regular P&T reviews, but are for the purpose of giving early feedback to assistant professors so that they can correct their efforts if necessary.

II. Department Review Process

Department review processes differ across campus, and in some cases between department in the same college.

Promotion & Tenure Committee

Promotion and tenure committees may consist of tenured faculty at the same or higher rank than that of the candidate; visiting and adjunct faculty (and commonly faculty holding administrative positions) are normally excluded from voting.

Membership, terms

In departments with standing P&T committees, the members are tenured associate and full professors. Some departments (e.g. Entomology) with extensive joint membership of faculty in TAES and
TAEX have very specifically designated P&T committee membership based on the employment assignment of each candidate. Membership in the committees lasts for three years, with staggered terms for different members.

How chosen
Members may be elected by their peers or appointed by the department heads, or selected by some combination. The chair of the committee may be elected by the members or appointed by the head.

Voting Process
Voting in the committee is confidential, and in some departments done by secret ballots. The committee produces a summary and recommendation document which is forwarded to the department head; the department head adds an additional summary and recommendation and forwards all information to the deans office. The recommendation of the committee is advisory, and is not binding on the department head, but is forwarded along to the college with the other materials.

Other votes
In some departments, a vote on the candidate's application is made by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank. This information is forwarded to the College along with other materials. If the recommendation for a promotion or early tenure decision is negative at any step, the candidate may withdraw the candidacy.

Ad Hoc Promotion and Tenure Committee
In some departments, the P&T Committee is appointed separately for each candidate. In such cases the membership term for the committee lasts only until the application in question has been reviewed. The committee provides a written review and recommendation to the College.

Formal Mentoring
There is a great deal of variability among departments both within colleges and across the campus in the amount of formal mentoring that is specified in the procedure documents. In some departments, specific arrangements are made for the candidate to have a mentor or a mentoring committee at every step. In other cases, the written procedure encourages the candidate to seek the advice of the P&T committee in preparing the dossier necessary for review. Where the latter is the case the responsibility of the committee members to respond to the request is not specified.

In some instances mentoring in academic departments is considered explicitly, down to the level of either prescribing the same mentor for the person throughout the pretenure time period, or prescribing a different mentor each year to prevent members of the P&T committee from having "favorite" candidates. The availability of mentoring is an attractive feature in P&T procedures and its impact is worth studying. Interviews of faculty who have gone through a recent P&T review in departments with and without mentoring would be worthwhile.

Third Year Review for Asst. Profs
Many departments have third year review processes mandatory for Assistant
Professors, and at least one has such a process for Associate Professors working toward promotion. This feature is in effect a kind of mentoring in that it gives the person a formal feedback on all the criteria on which the tenure decision will be made at a time half way through the probationary period.

By Whom

Normally conducted by Dept. P&T Committee and passed to Department Head and in some cases on to Dean's Office. At least one College has the policy of not renewing the contract of untenured faculty who clearly will not be able to meet the requirements at this stage.

Information Considered

Annual Reviews, teaching reviews, peer teaching reviews, teaching portfolios, letters from outside reviewers, etc., in combination similar to P&T review.

Candidate Notification

Orientation meetings for new faculty on a University wide basis cover this kind of P&T information in general. It is important that the faculty be informed of the specific procedures, time schedules and division of responsibility for P&T issues in their colleges and departments at regular and frequent intervals.

Information about P&T Process

Depending on the department involved, memos with this information may go out to all faculty or to the faculty eligible for tenure or promotion. In some cases the faculty are themselves responsible for informing the dept. head of their candidacy; in others the P&T committee or dept. head’s office directly contacts the candidate to begin the process. A formal orientation meeting may be required between the new faculty member, the dept. head and the chair of the P&T committee to discuss the entire process and explain what steps and considerations are necessary.

Colleges and departments are all required to inform the candidate of the results of the P&T processes at each step along the way from the conclusions of the P&T committee to the approval of the Board of Regents.

The notification is by writing in cases where the results are negative. Where positive the results can be transmitted verbally for many depts and colleges.
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Interim Report of the Evaluation Methods Subcommittee
Ad Hoc Committee on Reconciling the Faculty Reward System with
the Multiple Missions of Texas A&M University

Susan L. Kelly, chair
Linda Parrish
J.N. Reddy

INTRODUCTION

This subcommittee's initial intent was to gather examples of the various instruments of evaluation currently in use at Texas A&M University. During preliminary discussions held by the committee-at-large, it became apparent that the collection of these documents was only one component of what would grow into a more extensive search. In analyzing the various promotion and tenure documents from individual colleges and departments, the subcommittee found a variety of criteria and/or indicators of excellence/ effectiveness listed. There was, however, little information on: (1) the specific methods used in determining whether these criteria were being met; (2) whether qualitative vs. quantatative methods were appropriate; (3) what value, or weighting, was placed on an individual faculty's performance in the areas of Research, Teaching and Service. Additionally, there was little or no information provided on the criteria and/or methods of evaluation in use for annual merit recommendations or in the post-tenure review process. Few examples of formal documents were found that clearly outlined, to the individual faculty member, what criteria or measures were to be used in determining faculty rewards.

DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

In consultation with the committee-at-large and with the Cross-College Inventory and Comparison Subcommittee, a questionnaire was developed to gain information at the departmental level, where most decisions concerning faculty rewards are made. The following issues/questions to be covered were: (1) range of percentage of weighting used; (2) frequency of use of various methods of evaluation; (3) relative value of the various methods of evaluations currently being used, in the department head's opinion; (4) level of satisfaction with the current system; (5) new methods of evaluation that have been developed over the past five years. All questions asked the respondent to assess the three major decision-making processes independently - Promotion and Tenure, Annual Merit Recommendations and Post-Tenure Review. (Copy of questionnaire is attached.)
The central part of this questionnaire used portions of the National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards done by the Carnegie Foundation in 1994 and published in *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. Input from committee members helped to shape additional questions that were responsive to the needs and goals of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The questionnaires were distributed to the 68 department heads within the 10 colleges. 37 departments responded by the March 16th due date for a return rate of 54%. The subcommittee has completed the tally of the responses in Part II, and has presented a preliminary report on Part I, but has not yet completed the analysis or drawn any comparisons to the results from the national survey. In order to gain as much information as possible, both on the wide range of methods being used and on new instruments or methods being developed, the subcommittee requests that this project be continued through the fall semester of 1998. To aid in this completion, three additional tasks have been identified: (1) a second round in order to gather responses from the remaining 31 department heads; (2) a follow-up with those departments who have developed or are developing new methods to gather specific examples; (3) an expansion to include those units not contacted in the first round to ensure that all missions have been adequately addressed.

**PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Although it is too early in the process to adequately formulate recommendations, there are several recommendations put forward by the Cross-College Inventory and Comparison Subcommittee in its report that the Evaluation Methods Subcommittee wishes to support.

- **Guideline Content**: Each unit (department or college) should have an official document on promotion, tenure, and annual review. This document should state among other things: the relative importance of teaching, research, and service by rank, or how such importance is determined for particular individuals.

- **Job criteria**: If specific job requirements are established or specific criteria are to be used in the granting of tenure that differ from the normal expectations for someone hired at that rank in that unit, these should be explicitly stated in the letter of appointment.

- **Teaching evaluation**: The University should require additional evidence of classroom teaching effectiveness beyond student evaluations. This evidence might include teaching portfolios, peer classroom evaluations, or interviews of former students and employers. Resources should be provided by the University for comprehensive peer evaluation or student interviews so that they may become an essential part of the promotion and tenure dossier.
CONCLUSION

For a faculty reward system to be developed that is responsive to the expanding view of scholarship and that recognizes and encourages the multiple missions of the University, clearly defined and appropriate methods of evaluation must be developed. The importance of this is highlighted in the following section from Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate.

"The introduction of new definitions and new standards of scholarship heightens the need to ensure that faculty evaluation is a trustworthy process. The campus community must be confident that the institution honors the range of scholarship that supports its mission and that appropriate standards are in fact used. The commitment of colleagues to a conscientious application of the standards is key. As one senior professor with long experience on his institution's promotion and tenure committee put it, 'In the end, faculty must believe that they will be treated fairly. It's far more important to have a climate of trust than well-defined standards, as important as they may be.'

A process that broadens definitions of scholarship, adheres to qualitative standards, and uses rich documentation enhances trust. Clearly, however, these same innovations widen the scope of judgment in evaluation. Broader definitions of scholarship and richer documentation introduce new kinds of work and evidence into the process. Therefore, a framework of trust must buttress this process so that faculty feel free to engage in a wide range of scholarly activities. Only then can higher education institutions meet their missions of research, teaching and service through applied and integrative scholarly work.

Given the importance of evaluation to both individual scholars and their institutions, faculty should come to view the process as a collaboration involving each segment of the academic community: students, through the faculty rating forms they submit; faculty, through the committees in which they participate; deans, provosts, and presidents, through the policies they carry out; and trustees, through the policies they ratify. As a collaborative project, it follows, faculty evaluation should then be subject to the same standards proposed in this report for assessing scholarship itself.

Understood in this way, successful evaluation would be a process with clear goals for institutional and individual performance and adequate preparation for evaluators and candidates. Appropriate methods would be used, and significant results would advance the institution and individuals toward their goals. The process would be effectively presented and discussed as openly as possible in public forums. Finally, reflective critique would keep evaluation flexible and open to improvement over time."
QUESTIONNAIRE ON CURRENT EVALUATION METHODS FOR FACULTY

COLLEGE __________________________________________

DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM ________________________________

NAME/ TITLE OF RESPONDENT ______________________________

ATTENTION: Please return to Susan L. Kelly, Coordinator, Theater Arts Program (MS 4234 or BLOC 152) by March 16, 1998.
This questionnaire is designed to gain information about the methods of evaluation being used, or under consideration, in the three major decision-making processes: Promotion and Tenure; Annual Merit Recommendations; Post-Tenure Review. Each question will ask you to consider these processes separately, with the expectation that different methods of evaluation may be used for different processes. You will also be asked for your opinion as to the relative values of these methods and your level of satisfaction with the current inventory of methods being used. Feel free to add comments throughout the questionnaire that would: (1) expand on any question or (2) add methods that are specific to your discipline.

PART I

1. In your department or program what is the standard percentage of weighting, for the purposes of promotion and tenure, given in the three areas of research, teaching, and service? (e.g. Research 50%, Teaching 35%, Service 15%.) If any area is not applicable to your particular discipline or administrative unit, please indicate with N/A. If percentages vary, give the range of percentages in current use.

   Research _______ %
   Teaching _______ %
   Service _______ %
   Other (Please specify) _______ %

2. Are the percentages of weighting different for the purposes of annual merit recommendations and/or post-tenure review? YES _______ NO _______ If YES, please indicate below (in questions 3 and 4).

3. Weightings for annual merit recommendations:

   Research _______ %
   Teaching _______ %
   Service _______ %
   Other (Please specify) _______ %

4. Weightings for post-tenure review:

   Research _______ %
   Teaching _______ %
   Service _______ %
   Other (Please specify) _______ %

5. Thinking about your own situation, do the following faculty activities count more or less today--for purposes of faculty advancement--than they did five years ago?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT MORE TODAY THAN FIVE YEARS AGO</th>
<th>COUNT ABOUT THE SAME AS FIVE YEARS AGO</th>
<th>COUNT LESS TODAY THAN FIVE YEARS AGO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Applied scholarship (outreach)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Service to the institution (citizenship)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Professional activity (national committees, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II

FREQUENCY OF USE

Questions 1 - 4 seek to determine what methods of evaluation are currently in use in your department or are under consideration for use in the future. If your department uses different methods, according to the purpose of the evaluation - i.e. for Promotion and Tenure, Merit Recommendations, or Post-Tenure Review - use the separate columns provided to indicate any differences.

Rate the following methods using 1, 2, 3, or 4

1 - CURRENTLY IN GENERAL USE
2 - NOT IN GENERAL USE, BUT UNDER CONSIDERATION
3 - NOT IN GENERAL USE AND NOT UNDER CONSIDERATION AT THIS TIME
4 - NOT APPLICABLE TO DISCIPLINE

1. Rate the following methods of evaluation as to frequency of use by your department in determining effective performance in RESEARCH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTION &amp; TENURE</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>POST-TENURE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Securing judgments by outside scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Securing judgments by colleagues within the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Asking reviewers to use specific qualitative criteria in their evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Counting numbers of publications and presentations, weighted by type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Evidence of student participation in a research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Evidence of a research project's impact on teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Evidence of a research project's impact on applied scholarship (outreach, extension, clinical practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Rate the following methods of evaluation as to frequency of use by your department in determining effective performance in TEACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTION &amp; TENURE</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>POST-TENURE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Peer review of classroom teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peer review of syllabi, examinations and other materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Systematic student evaluations of classroom teaching

e. Student evaluations of advising

f. Evidence of student achievement

g. Evidence of continuing student interest (i.e. majors, course enrollment)

h. Opinions of former students

i. Evidence of the impact of teaching on research

j. Evidence of the impact of teaching on applied scholarship (outreach, extension, clinical practice)

k. Other (specify) ________________________

l. Other (specify) ________________________

3. Rate the following methods of evaluation as to frequency of use by your department in determining effective performance in APPLIED SCHOLARSHIP (outreach, extension, clinical practice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Promotion &amp; Tenure</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Post-Tenure Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Client or user evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Evaluations of the project by specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evidence of student participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evidence of the impact of applied scholarship on teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Evidence of the impact of applied scholarship on future research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (specify) ________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other (specify) ________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Rate the following methods of evaluation as to frequency of use by your department in determining effective performance in SERVICE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Promotion &amp; Tenure</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Post-Tenure Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Securing judgments, letters of support from outside the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Securing judgments, letters of support from within the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Counting assignments and activities, weighted by type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Personal observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (specify) ________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (specify) ________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTIVENESS OF METHODS

Now that you have rated the methods of evaluation as to frequency of use in your department, consider the same sets of evaluation methods as their effectiveness.

Questions 5 - 8 seek to determine, in your estimation, the relative value of the current methods of evaluation being used in determining effective performance. The same inventory of methods of evaluation is used for this section as for the previous section. Once again, separate columns have been provided so that you can respond to the relative value for the three decision-making processes, independently, should there be differences.

Rate the following methods using 1, 2, 3 or 4
1 - HIGHLY EFFECTIVE/ VALUABLE
2 - SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE/ VALUABLE
3 - NOT AN EFFECTIVE METHOD
4 - NOT APPLICABLE TO DISCIPLINE

5. Rate the following methods as to their effectiveness or value, in your estimation, in determining effective performance in RESEARCH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>PROMOTION &amp; TENURE</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>POST-TENURE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Securing judgments by outside scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Securing judgments by colleagues within the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Asking reviewers to use specific qualitative criteria in the evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Counting numbers of publications and presentations, weighted by type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Evidence of student participation in a research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Evidence of a research project's impact on teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Evidence of a research project's impact on applied scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Rate the following methods as to their effectiveness or value, in your estimation, in determining effective performance in TEACHING.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>PROMOTION &amp; TENURE</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>POST-TENURE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Peer review of classroom teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peer review of syllabi, examinations, and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Rate the following methods of evaluation as to their effectiveness or value, in your estimation, in determining effective performance in APPLIED SCHOLARSHIP (outreach, extension, clinical practice).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTION &amp; TENURE</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>POST-TENURE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Client or user evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Evaluations of the project by specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evidence of student participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evidence of the impact of applied scholarship on teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Evidence of the impact of applied scholarship on future research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Rate the following methods as to their effectiveness or value, in your estimation, in determining effective performance in SERVICE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTION &amp; TENURE</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>POST-TENURE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Securing judgments, letters of support from outside the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Securing judgments, letters of support from within the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Counting assignments and activities, weighted by type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Personal observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III

1. Please circle the appropriate response indicating your level of satisfaction with the current methods used in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGHLY SATISFIED</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</th>
<th>VERY DISSATISFIED</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. How satisfied are you with the current methods of evaluation for promotion and tenure?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In your opinion, how satisfied are the faculty in your department or program with the current methods of evaluation for promotion and tenure?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. How satisfied are you with the current methods of evaluation for annual merit recommendations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In your opinion, how satisfied are the faculty in your department or program with the current methods of evaluation for annual merit recommendations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. How satisfied are you with the current methods of evaluation for post-tenure review?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. In your opinion, how satisfied are the faculty in your department or program with the current methods of evaluation for post-tenure review?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Over the past five years, has your department or program developed new methods of evaluating faculty in any of the following areas? If you answer YES to any, please briefly describe the changes or new methods below, specifying whether they are for the purpose of promotion and tenure, annual merit recommendations, or post-tenure review. You may attach separate pages or documents if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teaching</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Advising</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Research</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Creative work (i.e., art and design, dance, music)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Applied scholarship (outreach)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Service to the college or university (citizenship)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Service to the profession (citizenship)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>