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COE OP 10.31: Comprehensive Performance Evaluation Procedure

Date: January 2008

Purpose: The purpose of this College of Engineering Operating Procedure (COE OP) is to establish uniform guidelines and procedures for comprehensive performance evaluations of tenured engineering faculty members and engineering faculty members who receive an academic promotion.

Review: This Operating Policy will be reviewed in the summer of every even-numbered year by the dean’s office, with recommendations for revision presented to the COE Executive Committee by August 15.

University Ops related to faculty workload
- OP32.31 Comprehensive Performance Evaluations for tenured faculty members and faculty who receive an academic promotion
- OP32.03 Academic Dean, Associate or Assistant Deans, and Department Chairpersons

POLICY/PROCEDURE

1. Background
In accord with VTCA, Education Code Section 51.942, and Board of Regents Guidelines for Comprehensive Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty and Faculty Members Receiving Academic Promotions, each faculty member who is tenured or who receives an academic promotion at Texas Tech University is subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation. The evaluation will be conducted no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion.

2. Application
All tenured faculty members in the College of Engineering will have a comprehensive performance evaluation every one to six years. While the legislature specified comprehensive performance evaluations following tenure and also following promotion, the College of Engineering requires only a single review regardless of whether or not the tenure and promotion occurred simultaneously. The single review will cover criteria for the academic rank of the person under review. Such criteria are listed in the COE OP10.01 Tenure and Promotion Standards and Procedures. It should be noted that the comprehensive performance evaluation in no way is a substitute for the annual performance evaluations.
Associate Deans and other College of Engineering faculty members holding administrative appointments within the University will be subject to comprehensive performance reviews if their academic appointment within a department is 25% or above. These evaluations should carefully evaluate the contributions of the faculty member with respect to the percentage of time allocated to academic work within the department. Comprehensive evaluations of Department Chairpersons will be done by the Dean in accordance with TTU OP 32.03.

3. **Criteria**
   In the evaluation process a Review Committee will determine whether or not the person being reviewed is conscientiously and with professional competence carrying out his/her duties at his/her current academic rank, and is continuing to make a contribution to his/her department and college. The evaluation must take into account changes that occur over the course of an academic career, such as working in an administrative role, developing new academic programs, etc..

4. **Departmental Guidelines and Procedures**
   Each department within the College of Engineering will prepare a Departmental Comprehensive Evaluation Procedures document. At minimum, this document should describe the composition of the Review Committee and any procedures specific to the department in addition to those described in this document and TTU OP 32.31. These procedures must be agreed upon by a majority of the voting members of the department and be approved by the Dean.

5. **Timing**
   a. All faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure are given a comprehensive evaluation as described in COE OP 10.01. These evaluations are considered equivalent to those described in this OP.
   b. The period between comprehensive evaluations will be no more than six years and no less than one year. This period will normally be six years, however, it may be shortened at the discretion of the faculty member’s Department Chairperson in consultation with the Dean.
   c. For faculty on leave from the University, the comprehensive review will be delayed until the first spring semester following their return.
   d. Faculty with pending retirements or pending resignations will not be subjected to comprehensive performance reviews.
   e. A Faculty database for Promotion and Tenure will be maintained in the Dean’s Office by the Senior Associate Dean.
   f. Faculty who have been identified for comprehensive performance evaluation will be notified by the Department Chairperson no later than September 1. In addition to this notification, they will be provided with a copy of this OP and the Departmental Comprehensive Evaluation Procedures.
   g. The person under review will submit an Evaluation Package no earlier than February 1 to the Department Chairperson.
   h. The Department Chairperson will assemble a peer review committee that reviews the material, meets and votes on the person prior to April 1 of the year following
notification of the comprehensive performance evaluation.
i. The Evaluation Package will be sent to the Review Committee 2 weeks prior to their meeting.
j. The Department Chairperson will inform the Dean of Engineering in writing of the outcome of the review by April 15.
k. The Dean of Engineering will notify the faculty member in writing of the outcome of the evaluation by May 1.

6. Evaluation Package
a. The faculty member being evaluated will prepare the Evaluation Package.
b. The Evaluation Package will consist of copies of the annual performance reviews for the previous five years, plus a performance summary to be completed by the faculty member (see Attachment A). The faculty member may submit such additional supporting documentation as he or she deems is relevant for the comprehensive performance evaluation.

7. Review Committee
a. The Review Committee will be formed as described in the Departmental Comprehensive Evaluation Procedures document.
b. Only committee members may attend the committee meeting(s).

8. Evaluation Procedures
a. A Review Committee meeting will be scheduled between February 1 and March 1 of the year following notification to the faculty member of the comprehensive performance evaluation. The department Chairperson will chair these meetings but will not vote.
b. The committee will first discuss any questions of clarification pertaining to the Evaluation Package.
c. The committee will then discuss the performance of the faculty member over the last annual evaluation period.
d. A secret ballot will be taken where each committee member shall select one of the following recommendations:
   (1) Performance is satisfactory.
   (2) Needs to be placed in a development program.
   (3) Tenure should be revoked.
   (4) Abstain.

   The ballots will be unsigned but may contain handwritten comments. It should be noted that the ballots are discoverable in case of litigation.
e. The Chairperson and one other committee member will count the ballots and record the votes in the presence of the committee. The Chairperson will announce only the wishes of the majority of the Review Committee. When there is no simple majority among the possible selections in 8.d., but selections 2 & 3 together form a simple majority, the Chairperson will inform the Review Committee that the vote reflects an unsatisfactory evaluation. The Chairperson should make every effort to ensure the confidentiality of the vote. A recommendation to revoke tenure would only be made to the Dean of Engineering following the initial review if the prior annual reviews show a record of
the faculty member not meeting the standard and failing to respond to a development program.

f. In case of a positive evaluation from the Committee, the results of the ballot and written comments will not be forwarded to the Dean of Engineering, provided that the Chairperson is in agreement with the finding. In this case, the Dean of Engineering will simply be informed of the positive outcome by way of a letter from the Chairperson. If the Chairperson disagrees with the findings, the ballot forms and any written comments, together with Attachment B, which includes the Chairperson’s evaluation and recommendations for improvement and institutional support to sustain that improvement, will be forwarded to the Dean of Engineering.

g. In case of an unsatisfactory evaluation from the Committee, the Committee will develop specific recommendations for improvement and institutional support to sustain that improvement. The Chairperson will complete Attachment B and forward it together with the ballot forms, any written comments, and the Committee recommendations to the Dean of Engineering who will determine the appropriate course of action and so inform the faculty member and his/her Chairperson.

h. In cases where a committee member is unable to attend the review committee meeting, he or she may submit an absentee ballot to the department Chairperson prior to the committee meeting.

9. Special Cases
   a. In the case of a Chairperson undergoing a comprehensive performance evaluation, an Associate Dean will perform the duties normally performed by the Chairperson. In these cases, there will obviously be no recommendation from the Chairperson.
   b. In the case where a faculty member is on a development leave, the evaluation will take place at the first regularly scheduled evaluation following his/her return.

10. Actions and Appeals
    As a result of the review process described above, a faculty member may be terminated, placed in a development program as specified in OP 32.32, Section 5, or other appropriate disciplinary action, or subject to revocation of tenure if incompetency, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present.

    If an engineering faculty member disagrees with the findings of his/her evaluation, he or she shall follow COE OP10.06 Mediation of Faculty Disputes.
Attachment A

PERFORMANCE SUMMARY
Please type complete and specific information in each category as outlined below. Limit responses to the last six years.

1. Academic Background (begin with last degree; include post-doctoral work)
   Include: Degree
   Field
   Institution
   Year Awarded

2. Professional Experience, Academic and Non-academic (begin with present position)
   Include: Title
   Institution/Agency
   Year(s)

3. Contributions in Area of Teaching:
   Include: Percent of assignment to teaching
   Teaching load (List course numbers only once plus year each was taught)
   Student advising
   Teaching effectiveness (show summary of instructor evaluations)

4. Contributions in Direction of Graduate Students (theses and dissertations directed in last six years)
   Include: Student’s Name
   Degree
   Year Completed

5. Other Service on Graduate Committees in Last Six Years (excluding 4)
   Include: No. Students
   Department

6. Published Research and Creative Activity in Last Six Years.
   List: papers, articles, books, and creative activities pertinent to your discipline.
   For publications, show complete authorship and provide exact titles and inclusive page numbers.

7. Current Participation in Professional Associations
   Include: Association
   Years Meetings Attended
   Offices, Participation, Etc.

8. Successful Grants and Contracts for Last Six Years
   List grants, contracts or other types of sponsored research funded in the last six years. Note title of the proposal, date, and the sponsoring agency: dollar amount is optional. Include only those proposals that (a) were funded, (b) were evaluated by an appropriate peer group, and (c) made a contribution to graduate and undergraduate education.

9. Administrative Responsibilities
   Describe administrative responsibilities and contributions made to department and college.
Attachment B

Comprehensive Performance Evaluation Form
College of Engineering
Texas Tech University

Name: ___________________________ Department/Unit: ___________________________

Date of Employment: _______________________

Rank/Title: ____________________________________________

Date Rank Obtained: _____________________

Date Tenure Granted: _______________________

Date Submitted: ___________________

Review Committee Members:


Review Committee Vote: (record vote)

_____ Satisfactory Performance
_____ Development Program Required
_____ Unsatisfactory Performance

__________________________  ________________________
Committee Chairperson Signature  Witness Signature

ATTACH SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSION & ANY RECOMMENDATIONS
Attachment B (Cont.)

Chair, Department/Area: ________________________________

Comments:

____________________________________
Signature

____________________________________
Dean Of Engineering: ________________________________

Comments:

____________________________________
Signature
Attachment C

POST-TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE BALLOT

Name of Candidate: ______________________________ Date: ____________

Department: ______________________________

Satisfactory Progress [ ]
Remedial Action Required [ ]
Unsatisfactory Progress [ ]

Reasons for vote:

(Comments shall be handwritten. Comments will be shared with the candidate, College Committees, dean, & provost. The ballots are discoverable in case of litigation. Please do not sign.)