Physics Annual Review Guidelines 12-2009 – extracted from departmental by-laws

H. Performance Evaluation Committee

1. Duties:

To recommend allocation of the raise pool among the faculty according to criteria and procedures adopted by the faculty. The recommendations of the performance evaluation committee to the Head are non-binding but the Head must report in writing to the committee if he or she does not follow its recommendations and give justification for any deviations. In addition the Performance Evaluation Committee is responsible for the initial phase of the annual Post Tenure Review of each faculty member (see Section VII of these bylaws). The Performance Evaluation Committee will also recommend the allocation of RI equivalent teaching credit to individual faculty.

2. Membership:

The committee is to have one member from each of the established departmental groups (Section III). Each of these groups will nominate at least two candidates for its place on the Performance Evaluation Committee. The candidates for each position will be voted on by the whole faculty. All members will serve a term of one year. It is required that the representative from each research group alternate between a theorist and an experimentalist from one year to the next. For the first election under these Bylaws the designation of a Group's representative to be a theorist or an experimentalist will be determined by drawing lots.

3. Visitors. The Performance Evaluation Committee meetings are closed, unless the committee votes otherwise.

VII. Evaluation of Faculty

A. Procedure

Evaluation of faculty in the department is the responsibility of the Department Head. Advisory to the Head for this purpose are three committees - the Advisory Committee; the Promotion, Tenure and Appointments Committee; and the Performance Evaluation Committee.

Promotion and Tenure: The Promotion, Tenure and Appointments Committee is responsible for advising the Head on promotion and tenure decisions. See Promotion, Tenure and Appointments Committee in Section VI, C of these bylaws.

Post Tenure Review: The Performance Evaluation Committee is responsible for advising the Head on Post Tenure Review in accordance with the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion. In the annual review of all faculty for salary increases the committee will include a Post Tenure Review and recommend a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory for each. The committee shall focus on the preceding year's performance but will take into account achievements over a longer period and also work in progress. For any faculty receiving an unsatisfactory recommendation the Department Head will request that the Advisory Committee review the recommendation and advise the Head on the unsatisfactory recommendation of the Performance Evaluation Committee.

If both committees find the faculty member at an unsatisfactory level the Head will meet with the faculty member and inform him/her of the evaluation and discuss the necessary steps that must be taken to bring the performance to a satisfactory level for the following year. If either the faculty member or the Department Head wishes, a third physics faculty member shall be present at this

meeting. The Head will follow this meeting with a written evaluation and include the steps that must be taken to improve the performance to that level.

If a faculty member receives unsatisfactory evaluations for three consecutive years the individual will be subject to professional review as specified in Policy and Procedures Manual of the University.

B. Categories of Performance

Teaching

This category includes, among other things, classroom instruction; development of new courses and teaching methods; publication of innovative pedagogical approaches or instructional materials, including textbooks; and supervision of graduate students in research.

Scholarly Activities

This category will normally involve original scientific research and publication of the results of such research. In all cases it consists of creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities.

Service

This includes service to the institution—to students, colleagues, department, college, and the University—as well as service beyond the campus including service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

Other evaluation criteria

Evaluations of research, teaching-learning, and engagement will incorporate, as appropriate, interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaboration, work that enhances diversity, and international activities

C. Levels of Performance

The following factors may be used to judge the level of performance of faculty in each category.

Teaching

Indicators of Excellence:

- Selection for a University, college, or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by, e.g., outstanding teaching evaluations or outstanding direction of graduate student research
- Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Extraordinary service on graduate student advisory committees
- Publication in refereed education journals

Indicators of Effectiveness:

- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Coordination of multi-section courses
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness

Scholarly Activities

Indicators of Excellence:

- Publications in leading refereed journals
- Receiving major fellowship or research award
- Frequent citation of publications
- Publication of scholarly books
- Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Member of review panel for national research organizations
- Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research
- Publications and funding resulting from collaborative effort with researchers in other fields
- An established reputation as verified through review by leading experts in the field

Indicators of Effectiveness:

- Publications in refereed journals
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
- Presentation of papers at national meetings
- Publications in proceeding of conferences and professional meetings
- Significant self-development activities, such a Faculty Development Leave, that leads to increased research and publication effectiveness
- Publications and funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields

Service

Indicators of Excellence:

- Officer in a national professional organization
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
- Administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University

- Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Member of review panel for national research organization
- Program chair or similar chair at a national meeting
- Officer in Faculty Senate
- Chair of major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
- Committee chair of national professional organization
- Outstanding performance in some of the positions outlined as indicator of effectiveness

Indicators of Effectiveness:

- Officer in regional or state professional organization
- Program or committee chair for regional or state professional meeting
- Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Service on University, college, and departmental committees and task forces
- Service as consultant to business or governmental agencies
- Advisor to student organizations
- Administrative roles within the department
- Directing the Department's consulting, continuing education, and outreach industry efforts