

# **PART ONE: ANNUAL REVIEW POLICY**

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE

LAST REVISED: 8/8/2002, 05/17/2004

## **PREAMBLE**

Annual reviews are a requirement of the College and the University. The annual review process must be completed to support the Department Head's recommendations on merit pay increases for faculty.

The evaluation of the contributions of faculty members, with multiple and diverse skills, to the missions of the Department, the College, and the University is a complex process. There is no way in which human judgment can or should be eliminated. The annual review process should allow for diverse contributions to our mission to be adequately assessed. It is assumed, through the culture of the College and Department that there be competence in executing the teaching assignments, scholarly works and services undertaken. These are the criteria under which people are hired and continue in service to the students, their peers and professions, and the institution. There are certain expectations built into the execution of our work. Meeting threshold expectations is not meritorious, but rather some assurance that the faculty is "doing the job." This could be called expected behavior. For example, being in class for all scheduled class times, challenging the students, preparing thoughtful examinations, being available outside the teaching hours-these are all expected behaviors.

This document is constructed to foster informed discussion between the Department Head and faculty member about the contributions that have been made over the past year and that are planned for the future. Diligence is required on the part of the faculty member and the Department Head to render honest and fair assessments in all dimensions of the annual review process, in the light of the Department's goals and directions. The establishment of any review process requires mutual confidence that is not always present in bureaucracies. For example, a faculty member must have some confidence that he or she is being treated in an equitable manner. In turn, the Department Head must have some confidence that the faculty member is fair in their own assessment of the work in which they are involved. Many institutions do not engender high levels of two-way confidence. The intent of this process is to continue to build such confidence as a sure way to build quality.

The ultimate purpose of the process is to seek higher levels of quality in the work that is carried out. Additionally, if utilized correctly the formative aspect of the review process should help both the Department Head and the faculty in determining future goals and objectives for the individual, and the Department. Lastly, this annual review serves as a form of institutional memory for our collected work.

## GENERAL

Each faculty member must submit an annual review package (Sections 1-5) to the Department Head each year. The package will normally be due by January 31 for the preceding calendar year. The Department Head will notify faculty each year of the due date. The package will generally conform to the following exhibits:

Exhibit A.	TEACHING
Exhibit B.	RESEARCH
Exhibit C.	SERVICE
Exhibit D.	PROSPECTUS
Exhibit E.	EVALUATION

The Department Head will schedule a face-to-face conference with each faculty member to go over the package, discuss performance, and agree on goals for the next year. The signature of the faculty member and the Department Head on Exhibit E will serve to confirm the annual review.

## TEACHING

*This category includes, among other things, classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; publication of instructional materials, including textbooks; and supervision of graduate students. (TAMU.12.01.99. M2)*

The TEACHING Section (Exhibit A) will document the faculty member's teaching accomplishments for the review year. Teaching is the primary mission of the University, but more than acceptable teaching is expected. The publication of instructional material and the development of methods that improve the curriculum is both desired and meritorious.

1. COURSES TAUGHT covers all those courses taught at Texas A&M University. The College instrument used to assess student perceptions will be used by all faculty in all courses in all semester. The Department Head will compare assessments by students in like courses and subject matters as one aspect of excellence. For example, graduate and undergraduate, required and elective, laboratory and didactic or seminar settings should all be factored into the assessment process. Awards from organizations from within and outside the Department, College and University might be used to substantiate excellence in teaching. Other evidence could be developed through teaching portfolios, course syllabi and similar artifacts of the teaching process.
2. GRADUATE STUDENTS SUPERVISED documents graduate student committee assignments. For those students who graduated during the year, list the date of

graduation. Show the expected date of graduation for other students. Indicate whether responsibility is as chair (C) or member of (M) the student's committee. In teaching of graduate students through committee work as a chair or member of a graduate student committee, it is expected that an assessment of the success of the candidate as evidenced in career placement, publications, or other significant activity would be included.

3. OTHER COURSES TAUGHT recognizes the development of, or participation in, recognized programs for continuing education, short courses or special workshops. Written assessments by participants is required. Funding support agency (if any) should be identified. Normally a workshop/short course with a majority of participants rating the instructor as a superior teacher for a given course/workshop would be recognized as a significant contribution. Documented national /international recognition or adoption of program by professional society, state agency, etc., is highly desirable.
4. TEACHING INNOVATIONS such as the development of innovative teaching methods and materials (textbooks, software, new curricula, etc.) should be documented. Any of the following would indicate a significant contribution: creation and teaching of a new course, adoption by other professors of methods/materials developed during the prior year, the introduction or further significant development of courses or course materials which explicitly incorporate international, interdisciplinary or multicultural perspectives, and/or positive review of these methods/materials appearing in respected publications.
5. INVITED LECTURES include lectures, presentations, or invited addresses at scholarly societies or outside institutions. Normally an invitation at the national or international level would constitute a significant contribution. Combinations of numerous invitations are valued. Lectures to trade associations and public groups, as well as University-wide presentations at TAMU are important to note. Please list in descending order of perceived significance.
6. SELF EVALUATION is a candid assessment by the faculty member of performance in the teaching area.

## RESEARCH (Inquiry)

*For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative activity. Architectural design, engineering technology, veterinary or medical technology, fiction, poetry, painting, music, and sculpture are examples. (TAMU. 12.01.99. M2)*

Experts in the same or related disciplines must make decisions about the quality or merit of scholarly and creative work. Peer review is essential. An article written but unpublished, an artwork completed but not juried or the rendering of professional service and consultation not subject to peer recognition must be placed in a section that is separate from peer reviewed work. Examples of the creation, influence and dissemination of the ideas/work must be documented.

1. PUBLICATIONS include publications in refereed journals, conferences and/or leading professional journals; the publication of scholarly books, conference proceedings, and/or chapters in scholarly books; publication of professional projects; acknowledgment of creative work through selection as a subject for a published article, inclusion in an exhibition catalogue or descriptions in a curator's statement; and creative work included in a public or private collection, invited exhibition, traveling exhibition, screening, or broadcast.

The essence of this section is that intellectual work, and its by-products are subject to external peer review. A significant publication of one article in a leading academic journal would indicate an important contribution in a given year. However, a number of other indicators are also worth noting. For example, conference papers, show awards, or other forms of external recognition are important. The valuing of these contributions is difficult. For example, a conference might be held at a location outside the United States, and therefore be international, but in fact be less rigorous in its selection of papers than a regional conference held in Dallas or Houston. Clearly, not all juried art shows or academic journals are equal. These are matters of discussion and deliberation for the Department Head and the faculty member. There are no formulas. The intent of this dimension is the dissemination of intellectual work products to the larger community. It is a fundamental responsibility of faculty members at a state-assisted research institution.

2. RESEARCH includes recognition of receipt of external resources and/or evidence of completed peer reviewed unfunded research activities. External resources might include, but would not be limited to, fellowships, contracts or research grants. The status of any research work in progress should be stated. Proposals pending and/or not funded should also be shown in order of significance.
3. AFFILIATIONS include potential activities of a research center/laboratory in the College of Architecture or a similar research entity not affiliated with the College.

4. OTHER recognition in the form of juried peer awards by professional societies or national/international groups, refereed non-published presentations, editorship of a refereed journal, member of an editorial board, editorship of a professional journal, membership as judge/critic for national/international organization, or reviewer for competitions, grants, publications, expert witness, invited exhibition curator, and external peer reviewer for a funding agency or tenure/promotion review for another university. Work equivalent to participation in two of the following activities (or two items within one activity) would be considered a significant contribution: (1) serving on editorial boards; (2) judge or critic for national/international competitions; (3) ad hoc reviewer for competitions, grants, journals or contract funding agencies. Please list in order of perceived significance.
5. SELF-EVALUATION is a candid assessment by the faculty member of performance in the research area.

## **SERVICE**

*This includes service to the institution-to students, colleagues, Department, College, and the University-as well as service beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large. (TAMU. 12.01.99.M2)*

A variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of our goals of pre-eminence through service to the institution, students, colleagues, professional societies, governmental agencies and to the public at large. In each case the dominant consideration is service that results in the creation of ideas, the influence of ideas and the dissemination of ideas.

*Quality service is expected from each member of the faculty.*

It is important to distinguish “service” from “citizenship.” As defined in this context, service is the active participation in organizations or other bodies that utilize a faculty member’s professional expertise in their field, as an educator, etc.

1. SERVICE ACTIVITIES are categorized as shown in Exhibit C.
  - a. Advising students at the undergraduate level beyond the expectations of regular advice of faculty to students is noteworthy. At the undergraduate level this should be substantiated by a review from the Department Head or degree coordinator.
  - b. Administrative performance as evaluated over time and including written assessments concerning vision, new initiative and programmatic development. Demonstrated accomplishments at the Departmental, College, or University level. Please list in order of perceived significance.

- c. Faculty mentorship and service on University, College, Departmental committees, or the Faculty Senate. Please list memberships and roles in order of perceived significance.
  - d. Demonstrated leadership service on a governmental commission task force, standing committee, council or board. Holding an office in or serving as a member of a regional, national, or international society, professional organization, or accreditation board. Being the primary organizer of a program for regional, national, or international meetings is considered to have high value. Please list in order of perceived significance.
  - e. External development activity that contributes to the University, College, or Department goals such as fundraising, endowments, scholarships, Professorships, etc. Please list activities, funds, and perceived contribution to goals of the organization in order of perceived significance.
2. OTHER service activities not discussed above may be included in this section.
3. SELF-EVALUATION is a candid assessment by the faculty member of performance in the service area.

## **PROSPECTUS**

The Prospectus Section, Exhibit D, provides the opportunity for the faculty member to set goals for the coming year. Goals in each of the areas of teaching, research and service are required. Goals should be measurable so that performance against these goals can be assessed in future years. At the annual review session with the Department Head, these goals may be amended, deleted, or new goals added.

## **EVALUATION**

Signatures by the faculty member and the Department Head, at the top of Exhibit E, signify that an annual review session was held. The Department Head will, following the annual review session, complete the sections-teaching, research, and service-to include an evaluation in each area and an overall evaluation and return a copy to the faculty member within 30 days of the annual review session.