Faculty Evaluation Changes

The ideas and the specific quantities and timelines are all to be discussed by the last week of February for decision on the university directive:

- Through February and March, discussions must occur in departments and colleges for all proposed additions and adaptations for annual evaluation guidelines, which must be submitted to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost by the last week of March, for a target approval in April.
- In addition, the departments/colleges must propose any required phase in plan so that the new requirements are appropriately scaled, if needed, for all evaluations that will be conducted in 2010 for all or part of the 2009 calendar year.
- Following approval of annual review guidelines, or in parallel with these guideline adaptations, each department/college must appropriately involve faculty members in the discussion of additions and adaptations as required for tenure and promotion guidelines.
- These changes must be submitted to the DoF by the end of May and will become part of the review, appropriately considerate of the time an individual case has had to adapt to the requirement for tenure and promotion cases considered in the 2010/11 cycle and all cycles beyond this.

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans and Department Heads

FROM: Karan Watson, Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives

SUBJECT: Faculty Annual Evaluation Changes

A variety of university goals and mandates on the university have led to the need to assure that Faculty Evaluations give appropriate credit to those aiding in achieving goals and hold faculty members and administrators appropriately accountable when these efforts are not recognized and valued. The needs fall in three major areas:

- University culture supporting multidisciplinary collaboration;
- University culture enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences;
- University culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance.

The college deans and department heads will assure that faculty and administrators engage in the dialogue to appropriately integrate within the research, teaching, and service/engagement efforts these areas into the college and department guidelines for annual reviews of faculty members. Modified annual review guidelines incorporating these areas should be submitted to the dean of faculties and associate provost for approval by March 22nd. All faculty evaluations that include
any part of the last half of 2009 will be expected to use the new guidelines with appropriate
c onsiderations for the proportion of time being considered that can be responsive to the new
guidelines. The new expectations should incorporate the following ideas:

1. Faculty members should be recognized and appropriately valued in merit considerations
   for research, teaching, and service/engagement that contribute at the university level in
   strategic multidisciplinary areas and at the college level in such efforts. Such
   contributions, with due consideration of the quality of the contributions, are as valued as
disciplinary contributions, which we are accustomed to recognizing and rewarding.
   Examples of strategic areas are shown in the attached document.

2. Each college is expected to increase the number of faculty members who research, teach,
or engage in enhancing the diversity and international climate and experiences for
   students. For each college, the vice presidents of diversity and global initiatives and the
   dean of faculties will work with the dean to determine the minimal targets for increasing
   the participation of faculty in these areas. For example, it may be appropriate to choose
   to reach a total participation of 25% and 50% for FY10 and FY11, respectively. These
   engagements could include activities such as leading in study abroad efforts; offering
   workshops or other training opportunities for students or peers in US minority, gender, or
   global culture, or equity areas; formal outreach, recruitment, or retention efforts to
   enhance the representation of diverse students at TAMU; or self-improvement in relevant
   areas (8 hours or more of professional training or education). College and Departmental
   annual review guidelines must be modified to assure that faculty members who are
   engaged in meeting these goals are credited in evaluations and their contributions are
   valued along with other contributions that determine merit raises.

3. No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied
   with all mandatory training programs. (In cases where a faculty member has been
   notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation
   period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement.) In addition, each
   department head must collect, as part of the faculty member’s self report on activities, a
   section on safety (see attached). The purpose of these activity reports from faculty
   and inclusion in annual reviews is not to create personal liabilities, but rather to
   relieve the potential for any such personal liabilities by making the university aware
   of the safety concerns and by having the administration document how they believe
   the concerns can best be mitigated. Based on review of the faculty member report, the
   department head must include either one of the following statements:

   a. After review of the faculty member’s activities in environments, this faculty
      member is judged to have reasonably mitigated safety issues.
b. After review of the faculty member’s activities in areas of safety concerns, the following remediation activities have been enacted (followed by specific activities).

STRATEGIC AREAS FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITIES

UNIVERSITY LEVEL

For the purposes of this document, we include interdisciplinary activities under the banner of multidisciplinary activities. By multidisciplinary activities, we mean an activity that draws from or is at the intersection of more than one discipline or department.

Research:

Active in a university Landmark area of research. (Effective and Excellence metrics should be determined by the leaders of the landmark area.)

Active research with a university recognized center or institute (can be a TAMUS component center or institute if the university is a recognized partner) that is multidisciplinary. (Effective and Excellence metrics should be determined by the center or institute.)

Participation in a multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention (as demonstrated by funding, publication contracts, or other special national recognition) where investigators from three or more TAMU colleges or outside universities are involved.

Research scholarship that utilized the state of the art of multiple disciplines.

Teaching:

Teaching in multidisciplinary program courses (courses with prefixes outside of departmental degree prefixes, such as GENE, TOXI that include more than one college as an active participant).

Teaching in freshman seminar courses with UPAS prefix.

Teaching in a disciplinary course in a learning community that involves students in courses that span two or more colleges.

Service/Engagement

Active participation in the Faculty Senate, both in the Senate and assigned committee activities.

Active participation in a major university council or committee. (For 2009 these include the Councils on Finance Environment, Research Environment, Built Environment, Education
Environment, Climate & Diversity, Development, and the Committees for Academic Master Plan Steering, Research Roadmap, Teaching and Learning Roadmap, Engagement Roadmap, SACs steering."

Leadership in the CPI, Distinguished Professors, or a recognized Faculty Network.

Active participation on a search committee for a dean of another college or a university administrator.

Active participation in K–12 outreach and research especially at the local, state, or national level.

Active participation in communities or corporate partnership.

Active participation in entrepreneurship classes or activities.

Active participation in proposals submitted and awarded valued at $1.5 million or more.

Active participation in publications based upon community based projects.

Active participation in service/engagement learning development grants.

Active participation in partnerships initiated with corporate/community organizations, including funded research, training programs, development of coursework.
Faculty members are responsible for reasonable mitigation of safety concerns in the research and teaching environments where they have been assigned as the lead researcher or instructor of record. Safety concerns may typically be categorized in two major dimensions:

1. The level of potential impact to individuals or the university in the event of a safety mishap, and
2. The probability that the mishap would occur.

Impact is concerned with personal physical and mental safety as well as reputational or financial burden to the university in the event of a mishap. Probability of mishap occurrence in an educated estimate of the relative frequency of such mishaps.

Faculty Members should consider the teaching environments they were responsible for and list any safety concerns they would estimate fall into any of the colored areas above and label them with two letters for potential impact and then for probability (e.g. HH, LH, MM). For areas that are yellow, awareness is sufficient if the faculty member feels appropriately prepared to handle the issue. For pink areas, the faculty member may simply explain the training or precautions they engage in to mitigate the concern. For red areas, the faculty must attach a pre-approved plan for mitigation signed by the department head. For identifying or mitigation efforts, the faculty member or department head are encouraged to consult with the University HSS area as needed or desired. If the faculty member does not believe any safety concerns falls outside of the white area (LL), then he or she should simply check the following box, otherwise they should attach the lists and actions.

☐ After consideration of the teaching environments where I was the instructor of record I believe all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.

Faculty Members should consider the research environments they were responsible for and list any safety concerns they would estimate fall into any of the colored areas above.
They should label the colored areas with two letters for potential impact, and then two letters for probability (e.g. HH, LH, MM). For areas that are yellow, awareness is sufficient if the faculty member feels he or she is appropriately prepared to handle the issue. For pink areas, the faculty member may explain the training or precautions they engage in to mitigate the concern. For red areas, the faculty member must attach a pre-approved plan for mitigation signed by the department head. Faculty members and department heads are encouraged to consult with the University HSS area as needed to identify or mitigate efforts.

☐ After consideration of the research environments where I am the principal or lead investigator for the environment I believe all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.