



SAP 12.99.99.T0.01 Performance Development and Evaluation of Faculty

New: June 1, 2011
Revised: October 15, 2019
Revised: November 17, 2025
Next Scheduled Review: November 17, 2030

Procedure Statement

The process for evaluation of employee job performance is based on objective criteria that are directly related to the identified job standards and established goals.

Reason for Procedures

This Standard Administration Procedure (SAP) provides processes at Tarleton State University for performance evaluation of faculty and academic administrators with faculty oversight.

Procedures and Responsibilities

1. GENERAL

- 1.1 Evaluation of employee job performance is based on objective criteria that are directly related to the identified job standards and established goals.
- 1.2 The major objectives of the performance appraisal process are:
 - Inform faculty related to meeting job expectations and standards for the review period;
 - Identify areas for improvement;
 - Set specific objectives and goals for the next review period;
 - Provide employees an opportunity to discuss career goals and support needed to meet goals;
 - Aid in identifying employee potential; and
 - Establish priorities for training, education, and reward.

- 1.3 Performance development is an on-going process. Evaluations may be conducted more frequently than specified in this procedure. Faculty evaluations are normally conducted once every 12 months.
- 1.4 Positions for which student status is a requirement for employment are not evaluated under this procedure.
- 1.5 This procedure provides guidance for the conduct of faculty performance evaluations including promotion and tenure related evaluations. However, this procedure does not address the promotion and tenure processes (see [Tarleton Rule 12.01.01.T1, Implementing Tenure and Promotion](#)).
- 1.6 Faculty members with staff or administrative appointments will be evaluated on the duties associated with the joint appointment during the annual performance review period.
- 1.7 In accordance with [System Regulation 31.01.01 Compensation Administration](#) and [Tarleton Rule 31.01.08.T1 Merit Salary Increases](#), a current evaluation is required before a merit increase may be recommended.
- 1.8 Notification of the annual evaluation period is sent to all faculty members by Employee Services prior to the start of the review period.
- 1.9 Annual evaluations should be completed no later than the annual date established by Employee Services, with the actual review period designated by the provost. Exceptions to the approved evaluation period for an overall department or division must be approved by the provost or designee prior to the start of the period.
- 1.10 The supervisor and employee must hold an evaluation meeting to review and discuss the employee's performance evaluation, supervisor expectations, goals and areas for improvement.
- 1.11 Annual evaluations, tenure track probationary evaluations, and post tenure performance evaluations are documented and submitted in the university's performance management program.
- 1.12 Evaluation documentation is available to the faculty member, the department head, the dean, and Academic Affairs. Post tenure evaluations are provided to Academic Affairs by May 30 of the year of evaluation.

2. FIXED TERM FACULTY EVALUATIONS

- 2.1 The designated supervisor will conduct an annual evaluation of faculty members with fixed term appointments.
- 2.2 Fixed term faculty members will be evaluated as appropriate for their appointment

in teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activities, and service as established in the original letter of appointment, the official job description and other requirements added during the annual review period, as well as progress toward professional growth.

3. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

- 3.1 A formal written evaluation of tenure track faculty will be conducted annually by the supervisor. The evaluation will assess the faculty's teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activities, service, progress toward professional growth, and other areas determined appropriate by the institution, discipline and/or academic college.
- 3.2 Tenure track faculty will have a tenure-related evaluation during the first year, second year, and mid-point of the probationary period. Academic Affairs will notify each department at the beginning of the annual review period of faculty members requiring a tenure track probationary evaluation.
- 3.3 Tenure track faculty will also have an in-depth tenure review during the fourth year of probationary service. The fourth year review may be used in lieu of a detailed annual review; however, annual goals must still be established.
- 3.4 If performance of a faculty member seeking tenure does not show progress toward meeting institutional expectations, action should be taken to non-reappoint the individual on the basis of annual performance reviews prior to the final tenure review in section 3.3. This decision is communicated to the faculty member by the appropriate department head.

4. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR TENURED FACULTY

- 4.1 A formal written evaluation of tenured faculty will be conducted annually by the supervisor. The evaluation will assess the faculty's teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activities, service, progress toward professional growth, and other areas determined appropriate by the institution, discipline and/or academic college.
- 4.2 Post Tenure Review of tenured faculty will be conducted in accordance with [System Policy 12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure](#). A successful review for promotion within the five-year post-tenure review cycle will satisfy post-tenure review and reset the five-year review process. An unsuccessful review for promotion submitted as post-tenure review will trigger the post-tenure review process designated by the appropriate academic college's published guidelines.
- 4.3 Tenured faculty members who are not assigned to regular faculty duties (i.e.: with administrative assignments outside their academic department) are evaluated annually based on their professional responsibilities. Upon returning to regular

faculty duties within an academic department, they are subject to post tenure review requirements in accordance with System Policy 12.01.

5. EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

5.1 Provost Review

5.1.1 The president will conduct a provost review every four years. The review will include input from the faculty, deans, and, at a minimum, the Faculty Advisory Council officers. The provost review may be conducted in conjunction with or separate from the annual performance evaluation required by [System Regulation 33.99.03, Performance Evaluations for Nonfaculty Employees](#).

5.2 Academic Dean Review

5.2.1 The provost will conduct a formal review of each dean annually. The academic dean review may be conducted in conjunction with or separate from the required annual performance evaluation required by [System Regulation 33.99.03, Performance Evaluations for Nonfaculty Employees](#).

5.2.2 Faculty and department head input is collected in even-numbered years to assess faculty perceptions of the deans, gather useful ideas and advice from the faculty, establish or redefine goals and priorities for the colleges, and foster continuous improvement in the colleges. The review may also include input from appropriate offices, agencies, and staff members as determined necessary by the provost or dean.

5.2.2.1 Prior to the biennial review, a committee, appointed by the provost and consisting of the deans, college faculty and an employee services representative, shall review the Faculty Review Survey to determine if any changes need to be made.

5.2.2.2 Reviews shall be electronically administered. Dates for the biennial review are announced to all faculty prior to electronic publication. Electronically administered reviews should occur over a period of at least five working days and provide a method of allowing faculty members who will not be available during that time the means to participate (e.g., absentee review).

5.2.2.3 Responses collected electronically must use a method that ensures each faculty member provides only one response and that all responses remain anonymous.

5.2.2.4 Faculty assessment of the dean is reported to the dean and the provost.

5.2.2.5 Input will be submitted to the provost, who will review with the Faculty Advisory Council officers. All discussions between the provost and the Faculty Advisory Council presiding officer are strictly confidential.

5.2.2.6 Problems or inconsistencies in the implementation of the evaluation process should be reported to the Faculty Advisory Council and provost.

5.3 Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Administrators with Faculty Oversight

5.3.1 The dean will conduct a formal evaluation of each administrator annually. The overall evaluation will be made up of a combination of the annual performance evaluation by the immediate supervisor and feedback received from the faculty review survey.

5.3.2 Faculty input of administrator effectiveness is collected in even-numbered years as part of the overall evaluation.

5.3.3 Reviews shall be electronically administered. Dates for review are announced to all faculty prior to electronic publication. Electronically administered reviews should occur over a period of at least five working days and provide a method for allowing faculty members who will not be available during that time a means to participate (e.g., absentee assessment).

5.3.4 Responses collected electronically must use a method that ensures each faculty member provides only one response and that all responses remain anonymous.

5.3.5 If performance falls below expectations, faculty input will be solicited annually until performance meets expectations. If performance falls below expectations for two consecutive reviews, reassignment may be considered. If the administrator is not reassigned, the dean will provide an explanation to the affected faculty.

5.3.6 Faculty review of administrators is reported to the administrator, the dean, and the provost.

5.3.7 Problems or inconsistencies in the implementation of the review should be reported to the Faculty Advisory Council and provost.

6. ADJUNCT FACULTY EVALUATIONS

6.1 Adjunct faculty should be made aware of important university policies as well as departmental duties and expectations. This may be accomplished through orientation meetings, checklists, or other methods determined appropriate by the department head.

- 6.2 The department head, or designee, will monitor adjunct faculty performance through student evaluation, feedback from students and other faculty members, and other methods as appropriate.
 - 6.3 The university-adopted student evaluation of instruction will be administered in all classes taught by adjunct faculty.
7. RESOURCES AND TRAINING
- 7.1 Resources, training and instructions for entering, reviewing and approving performance evaluation information will be provided by Employee Services.

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

[System Policy 12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure](#)

[System Regulation 33.99.03, Performance Evaluations for Nonfaculty Employees](#)

[System Regulation 31.01.01 Compensation Administration](#)

[Tarleton Rule 31.01.08.T1 Merit Salary Increases](#)

[Tarleton Rule 12.01.01.T1, Implementing Tenure and Promotion](#)

[Tarleton SAP 12.07.99.T0.01, Fixed Term Faculty Appointments](#)

Contact Office

Division of Academic Affairs; Office of Curriculum, Assessment and Faculty Affairs
254.968.9598