Resolution on Proposed Faculty Evaluation Changes

Whereas, The Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives has proposed that departmental guidelines be modified where necessary to change standards for annual evaluation of faculty; and

Whereas, Those revised guidelines are to include formal recognition of multidisciplinary collaboration and efforts to enhance the climates of diversity, internationalization, and safety; and

Whereas, The guidelines also require completion of all legally required compliance programs; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate endorses the proposed changes with the following modifications, concerns or exceptions:

1) The Strategic Area guidelines for Service or Engagement should credit active participation in intercollegiate faculty committees such as recruiting, hosting rotation students, mentoring graduate students, etc. to the same degree as similar activities within the department.

2) Individual faculty contributions toward assessment efforts to meet SACs, ABET or other required accreditation standards, or to prepare for external reviews, should be included among the list of valued contributions for Service and Engagement.

3) Point 2 should be restated to place the focus on individual faculty members who contribute to the international image of Texas A&M, whether through student activities or research. As indicated, these individuals deserve credit whether or not departmental guidelines are met. Failure to reach departmental quotas cannot be attributed to those who are contributing!

4) Some guideline to the term “appropriately valued in merit considerations” may be essential to attain the desired goals.

5) Faculty members should not be required to complete any training exercise proven to be of no value in attaining its target objective and thus not serving to reduce University or personal liability for offenses.

6) It is not clear how the Safety color coding would apply to research laboratories. Perhaps “activities” would be more appropriate than “areas”. Since HHS already conducts laboratory safety surveys, the RSO inspects labs for safe use of isotopes and lasers, Biological safety inspects those labs to verify safety compliance, and all new employees must be trained for at risk activities, doesn’t being in compliance already demonstrate an adequate level of safety precautions?

7) The timeline for changes, if required, does not allow for significant input by faculty members within those departments where changes in the current standards must be made.