

The Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation

HPER Policy and Procedure Statement: 2.01

Revised: November 21, 2008

Review Cycle: December 1, every 3 years

Review Date: December 1, 2011

Reviewer: The HPER Voting Faculty

Employment of Faculty

Without Terminal Degrees

(10 paragraphs)

1. The Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER) policy and procedure statement on employment of faculty without terminal degrees, such as lecturers, is based on Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Comprehensive Standards 3.71 and Academic Affairs PPS 7.02.
2. To teach in the Department of HPER, faculty should hold a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. Examples of acceptable degrees include a doctorate in Health; Health Education; Public Health; Health Studies; Health Sciences; Health Promotion; Recreation; Recreational Administration; Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management; Travel, Tourism and Hospitality; Recreation Studies; Recreation and Leisure Studies; Therapeutic Recreation; Leisure Behavior; Adult, Professional, and Community Education; Exercise and Sports Science; Exercise Physiology; Kinesiology; Human Performance; Pedagogy; Physical Education; Adaptive Physical Education; Sport Management; Athletic Training; Nutrition; Sports Psychology; Developmental Psychology; Movement Sciences; Motor Behavior; Motor Learning; Motor Development; Veterinary Medicine, Sports Sociology; Exercise and Sports Nutrition; Translational Physiology; Physiotherapy; Physical Therapy; and Special Education.
3. Credentials of Graduate Faculty
 - 3.01 The SACS requires that faculty teaching graduate and post-baccalaureate course work must have an earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.
 - 3.02 In nearly every case, faculty who teach graduate courses in the Department of HPER must adhere to this guideline.
 - 3.03 Exceptions are rare and available only to faculty who have extraordinary teaching and research credentials, experience appropriate to the discipline, and an extensive record of publication. All exceptions must receive approval from the Dean of the College of Education, the Dean of the Graduate College, and the Provost.
4. Credentials of Undergraduate Faculty.
 - 4.01 SACS requires that faculty teaching baccalaureate courses *hold a doctoral or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline)*. Furthermore, *at least 25 percent of the*

discipline courses hours in each undergraduate major are taught by faculty holding the terminal degree-usually the earned doctorate-in the discipline.

- 4.02 Exceptions include individuals holding a nonterminal degree may be employed in the Department of HPER to teach undergraduates when they meet the SACS requirements and when one or more of the following conditions apply:
- a. Student demand surpasses the department supply of available faculty holding terminal degrees;
 - b. Program's need to offer specialized subjects when faculty with terminal degrees are not available;
 - c. Need for specialized instructional tasks (such as supervising internships or teachers seeking certifications) when faculty with terminal degrees are not available.

All exceptions must receive the approval of the departmental chair and Dean of the College of Education.

5. In the event that a qualified individual with an appropriate terminal degree is not available for a specific teaching assignment, the department chair, in consultation with a subcommittee, may hire individuals with appropriate credentials that qualify such individuals for specific teaching position(s). Specifically, the Department of HPER may hire individuals who do not have terminal degrees to teach undergraduate courses if all of the following conditions are met:
 - 5.01 The individual holds a Master's Degree in the academic discipline or a master's degree with a concentration in the academic discipline (i.e., at least 18 graduate credit hours completed in the academic discipline).
 - 5.02 The individual provides at least three letters of reference pertaining to knowledge and teaching skill in the area of assignment.
 - 5.03 The individual meets all other university criteria for faculty hiring.
 - 5.04 The Chair and a hiring subcommittee that includes at least two tenured faculty members with documented expertise in the study area of assignment approve the individual for hire.
6. In the event that criteria stated in paragraph 5.01 is not met, other qualifications may be considered. Consideration of employment may be given to individuals who have one or more of the following:
 - 6.01 Have demonstrated expertise in the area of assignment.
 - 6.02 Have received honors or awards for excellence in teaching or scholarly activity from health, physical education, and recreation state and national professional organizations/associations.
 - 6.03 Hold one or more national certifications, including, but not limited to, American College of Sports Medicine Health and Fitness Instructor, Certified Strength and Conditioning Specialist, Certified Health Education Specialist,

- Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialist, National Athletic Trainer's Association, and Certified Parks and Recreation Professional.
- 6.04 Have at least three years of K-16 teaching experience.
7. A faculty member without a terminal degree will be hired as a lecturer, will receive a probationary 9-month contract term, and will not be eligible for tenure. In addition, the faculty member must:
- 7.01 Teach a 12-credit hour load per semester.
 - 7.02 Provide evidence of teaching effectiveness each semester.
 - 7.03 Participate in service as appropriate to the teaching assignment and as approved by the Personnel Committee
 - 7.04 Participate in professional development related to the specific teaching assignment.
 - 7.05 Maintain his/her academic qualifications through various professional activities, such as attending and/or participating in local, state, regional, and/or national conferences.
8. A Lecturer may be promoted to Senior Lecturer if the individual meets the criteria stated in paragraph 2.01, and has:
- 8.01 A minimum of five years of full-time professional employment.
 - 8.02 Been employed in the Department of HPER for at least two years.
 - 8.03 Has a consistent record of quality teaching evaluations.
 - 8.04 Has supervised program activities and/or participated in program development.
 - 8.05 Has maintained his/her academic qualifications by staying active in scholarly/creative professionally recognized activities.
9. Senior Lecturers will be expected to:
- 9.01 Teach a 12-credit hour load per semester.
 - 9.02 Engage in service activities.
 - 9.03 Engage in professional activities.
10. Evaluation and Continued Employment: Departmental chairs, faculty review and personnel committees regularly evaluate all faculty who lack terminal degrees. Continuing employment requires the approval of the departmental chair and the Dean of the College of Education. For specifications refer to HPER PPS 3.02, Evaluation of Faculty.

Certification Statement

This HPER PPS has been approved by the reviewers listed below and represents the HPER Department policy and procedure from the date of the document until superseded.

Voting Faculty Representative: _____

Date: _____

Approve: _____
Chair of the HPER Department

Date: _____

The Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation

HPER Policy and Procedure Statement: 3.01

Personal Mentoring Committee

Developed: Fall, 2007

(32 paragraphs)

Revised: November 21, 2008

Review Cycle: December 1, every 3 years

Review Date: December 1, 2011

Reviewer: The HPER Voting Faculty

PERSONAL MENTORING COMMITTEE (PMC)

Scope

1. The scope of the mentoring process includes all new full-time faculty members in the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (HPER) regardless of rank. The focus of the mentoring committee may vary based on the roles and expectations of each faculty member. For the new faculty member, the mentoring process will begin with a department orientation workshop which will be presented during preparation week (i.e., the week before classes begin).

Definitions

2. Mentoring is a process in which a mentor provides support to a mentee. The mentor should be an experienced advisor that actively guides and socializes a colleague to a new work environment. In addition, the mentor provides advice on how the mentee can develop his or her skills, competencies, knowledge, and experience in order to progress along a successful career path.ⁱ

Role of the Personnel Committee (PC):

3. Establish guidelines for mentoring committee based upon the program, department, college and university requirements and expectations of performance, tenure and promotion.
4. Organize and conduct a new faculty workshop that orients all new faculty members to facilities, resources and policies and procedures in the Department of HPER.
5. Assign Personal Mentoring Committees (PMC) to new faculty.
6. Before the beginning of the academic school year, meet with PMC members to ensure that each PMC consistently and uniformly conveys to each mentee the established guidelines concerning the program, department, college and university requirements and expectations of performance, tenure and promotion.
7. Meet with the PMCs at the end of the academic school year to discuss specific issues related to teaching, service, and scholarship for each mentee. Also, at this time, will discuss changes for next school year and determine who will organize orientation workshop the following August for new faculty.

Composition of the PMC for Tenure Track Faculty

8. Each tenure track faculty member will be assigned a PMC comprised of three tenured faculty members and chaired by one of those members.
9. The Department Chair will attempt to contact each new faculty member prior to assigning a PMC to discuss the new faculty member's needs and research interests. The Department Chair and the PC will consider the mentee's scholarly agenda and research interests when developing a mentee's PMC.
10. The PMC should consist of one member from the mentee's academic area; one with strong research and grant writing skills; and one with either a strong record of teaching or from outside the department that may complement the mentee's scholarly agenda.
11. When possible, the chair of the committee should be from the mentee's academic area.
12. After year-1, the mentee will meet with the Department Chair to discuss the future make-up of the PMC.

Responsibilities for Tenure Track PMC

13. The purposes of the PMCs are to support, guide, and serve as an advocate to the mentee. Responsibilities are to give feedback about teaching, guide in research opportunities, and provide advice regarding service. The PMC will not officially evaluate their mentee. The role of evaluation remains with the PC.
14. The PMC will meet with the mentee formally at the beginning and end of each long semester to:
 - 14.01 Discuss topics such as student evaluations and other procedures;
 - 14.02 Provide feedback with regard to the mentee's progress, successes, and challenges; and
 - 14.03 Provide assistance with identifying research opportunities, setting goals for teaching, research and service and completing yearly reports (e.g., the Faculty Annual Reporting System or FARS).
15. The support and guidance offered by the PMC should parallel Academic Affairs PPS 8.01, Academic Affairs and College of Education PPS 8.10, and HPER PPS 3.02 and 3.03.
16. During year-1, the PMC should focus their attention equally on the mentee's teaching and research while providing guidance regarding the limited/targeted service required of first year tenure-track faculty.
 - 16.01 *Research:* Of consideration by the committee should be whether the new faculty member received start-up funds and a 2-course release each semester for the purposes of conducting research. According to Academic Affairs PPS 5.04, new faculty will be expected to obtain external funding which in turn will generate an amount at least equal to a specified amount in indirect cost

funding during the mentee's probationary period. This amount will be stated in the start-up clause of the new faculty member's contract. The PMC will be instrumental in helping the new faculty member in seeking external funding. In short, the PMC should assist the mentee with developing a scholarly agenda, initiating the research activities tied to the start-up funds and course releases for research, and submitting successful grant proposals.

- 16.02 *Teaching*: During the first year, members of the PMC should observe the new faculty member in the classroom on at least three different occasions. To ensure consistency, the PMC should use [Attachment A](#) to evaluate the mentee's teaching. After each observation, the member should meet with the mentee to provide feedback.
- 16.03 *Service*: Provide advice regarding appropriate limited/targeted service activities at the departmental level.
17. During the second and third years, the PMC should continue to monitor the mentee's progress through review of research activities and related expenditures (including expenditures of start-up funds), review of student teaching evaluations, at least one observation of classroom teaching (for second year tenure track faculty members only), continued guidance regarding targeted service at the departmental and college levels, and formal and informal meetings with the mentee. Additionally, the PMC will also help the mentee begin preparing for the tenure and promotion process (e.g., gathering materials for the mentee's tenure box).
18. During years four and five, the PMC will assist the mentee in maintaining excellence in teaching and scholarship, while assuming a more substantial service role.
19. During each year of the probationary period, the PMC will prepare and share with the PC a formative review of the mentee's progress. During the third and sixth year, the PMC will prepare and share with the PC a summative review of the mentee's progress. The reviews will consist of such information as the mentee's scholarly agenda and initial start-up funds, completion of research activities to date, grant proposals both submitted and awarded, a summary of student evaluations, PMC observations of teaching, and a summary of service activities.

Responsibilities of the Tenure Track PMC Chair

20. The chair of each mentee's PMC will organize all meetings and prepare formal reports at the end of each semester to chronicle each mentee's progress. Formal reports should be reviewed by the mentee for accuracy prior to submission to the PC.
21. These reports will be shared with the PC during each year of the mentee's probationary period.

Composition of PMC for Senior Lecturers

22. Each new Senior Lecturer will be assigned one mentor to advise them on issues related to teaching during their first year. The teaching mentor will be a Senior Lecturer or tenured faculty member who has been teaching in the department for two or more years. The new Senior Lecturer may also request a mentor for research; this mentor would be assigned from among the tenured faculty.

Responsibilities for Senior Lecturer PMC

23. The purposes of the PMC are to provide support and guidance to the mentee specifically regarding issues related to teaching. The mentor should observe the new faculty member in the classroom during their first semester. To ensure consistency, the PMC should use [Attachment A](#) to evaluate the mentee's teaching. After the observation, the mentor should meet with the mentee to provide feedback. The mentor may suggest appropriate workshops or training opportunities to assist the new Senior Lecturer in improving their teaching skills.
24. The mentor should also provide the Senior Lecturer advice for finding on-campus opportunities to enhance scholarship and departmental service opportunities.
25. The support and guidance offered by the PMC should parallel the HPER PPS 3.02, Evaluation of Faculty.
26. The PMC will meet with the mentee formally at the beginning and end of each long semester to:
 - 26.01 Discuss topics such as student evaluations and other procedures;
 - 26.02 Provide feedback with regard to the mentee's progress, successes, and challenges; and
 - 26.03 Provide assistance with identifying research opportunities (if applicable), setting goals for teaching, research and service, and completing yearly reports (e.g., FARS).

Composition of PMC for Lecturers

27. Each new Lecturer will be assigned one mentor to advise them on issues related to teaching during their first year. Ideally, the teaching mentor will be a faculty member who has been teaching in the Department for two or more years.

Responsibilities for Lecturer PMC

28. The purposes of the PMC are to provide support to the mentee specifically regarding issues related to teaching. The mentor should observe the new faculty member in the classroom during their first semester. To ensure consistency, the PMC should use Attachment A to evaluate the mentee's teaching. After the observation, the mentor should meet with the mentee to provide feedback. The mentor may suggest appropriate workshops or training opportunities to assist the new senior lecturer in improving their teaching skills.

- 29. The mentor should also provide the lecturer advice for finding on-campus opportunities to enhance scholarship and departmental service opportunities.
- 30. The support and guidance offered by the PMC should parallel the HPER PPS Evaluation of Faculty PPS 3.02.
- 31. The PMC will meet with the mentee formally at the beginning and end of each long semester to:
 - 31.01 Discuss topics such as student evaluations and other procedures;
 - 31.02 Provide feedback with regard to the mentee’s progress, successes, and challenges; and
 - 31.03 Provide assistance with identifying research opportunities (if applicable), setting goals for teaching, research and service and completing yearly reports (e.g., FARS).

HPER Departmental Orientation Workshop

32. A departmental orientation workshop will be held during preparation week each August for all new faculty members. Participants will receive a document detailing procedures to be followed within the Department. (See [Attachment B](#) for a list of suggested topics to include in the workshop and document). New faculty beginning in January will receive the document and will meet with the PC member who organized the August workshop.

Certification Statement

This HPER PPS has been approved by the reviewers listed below and represents the HPER policy and procedure from the date of the document until superceded.

Voting Faculty Representative: _____ Date: _____

Approve: _____ Date: _____
Chair of the HPER Department

Attachments:

- [Mentoring Committee - Attachment A](#)
- [Proposed Content of Workshop - Attachment B](#)

ⁱ Adapted from Heery, E. and Noon, M. (2001). A dictionary of human resource management. Oxford: Oxford University Press

The Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation

HPER Policy and Procedure Statement: 3.02
Review Cycle: March 1, E3Y
Review Date: March 1, 2012
Reviewer: The HPER Voting Faculty

Annual Faculty Evaluation
(62 paragraphs)

DEFINITIONS. For the purpose of this document, the following definitions apply:

1. The Department **Personnel Committee** (PC) is made up of tenured faculty who are paid at a rate of fifty percent or more from faculty salary dollars budgeted to the Department (VPAA/PPS 8.10.4a).
2. The **Department's recommendation** includes the recommendations of both the PC and the Chair.
3. A **College recommendation** includes the recommendation of the Dean.
4. **Annual Evaluations** are used to provide:
 - 4.01 Each faculty member with information about his/her strengths and growth areas that may be used for continuous professional development,
 - 4.02 The Department Chair and the PC with information that can be used in making recommendations for tenure and promotion, in awarding performance and merit raises, and/or in making decisions regarding the retention of faculty (VPAA/PPS 8.09).
5. **Performance** is defined as meeting departmental expectations as outlined in this document. When funds are available, performance salary adjustments will, to the extent possible, reflect cost of living increases. Performance salary adjustments are based on a faculty member's annual evaluation.
6. **Merit** is defined as additional salary adjustments in recognition of performance that is clearly exceptional during the preceding merit evaluation period. Merit salary adjustments are made every two years when funds are available. Merit salary adjustments are based on a faculty member's annual evaluations for the period defined by the President.

PURPOSE AND CORRESPONDING POLICIES

7. The Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER) Policy and Procedure Statement sets forth criteria and guidelines for annual evaluation in the Department of HPER. These criteria are based on the following sources:
 - 7.01 VPAA/PPS 7.10
 - 7.02 VPAA/PPS 7.22
 - 7.03 VPAA/PPS 8.09
 - 7.04 VPAA/PPS 8.10
 - 7.05 Faculty Handbook, Texas State University-San Marcos
 - 7.06 HPER PPS 3.03
8. The primary method for awarding salary raises at Texas State is based upon the annual evaluation for performance and merit salary adjustments (VPAA/PPS 7.10). In addition, reappointment decisions for faculty both non-tenure and tenure-track are based on the annual evaluation.
9. Faculty are evaluated annually for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and performance and merit salary adjustments.

CANDIDATES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

10. All faculty employed as percentage-contract faculty are evaluated annually and are, thus, required to complete an annual evaluation.

11. All faculty employed as percentage-contract faculty are eligible for performance and merit raises awarded through this process.
12. Because all per course faculty are hired for one semester at a time, they do not complete an annual evaluation. Instead, they are evaluated at the end of each semester (Refer to paragraph 62).
13. Graduate Teaching Assistants do not complete an annual evaluation, as they are evaluated each semester.

ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT

14. The Annual Activity Report is based on the previous calendar's year performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and leadership/service.
15. The Annual Activity Report will be completed on-line. This form can be found at <http://annualreview.education.txstate.edu/review.php>. Evidence of scholarship will be submitted to the Chair.
16. The Annual Activity form follows the Texas State Vita format VPAA/PPS 8.10, Form 1A, which may be found at http://www.txstate.edu/academicaffairs/pps/pps_toc.htm. In addition to submitting the report, faculty will also be required to upload their current curriculum vitae and teaching portfolio.
17. The Annual Activity report should document achievements that only apply to the time period of the annual evaluation.
18. Faculty should provide documentation that supports quality of teaching, scholarly/creative activity and leadership/service.

REVIEW PROCESS

19. Annually, in early January, the Chair will notify all faculty of the required electronic and hard copy materials to be submitted by February 1.
20. The PC and the Chair will make independent and separate recommendations on each faculty member for merit and performance salary adjustments.
21. After the Annual Activity Reports are due, the PC will have two weeks to review each faculty member's annual activity report, and to evaluate teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service, to make evaluative comments that provide a rationale for scoring and suggestions for professional growth and development.
22. After the individual PC comments have been submitted, the Program Coordinators will have one week to summarize the individual written comments and recommendations for each of the faculty within their division.
23. Each Program Coordinator will be assigned by the Chair to summarize the individual written comments and recommendations for a different Program Coordinator.
24. After the summary comments have been written by the Program Coordinators, the PC will have one week to review the summarized comments and recommendations. At the end of that week, the PC will meet to discuss and finalize each recommendation.
25. The faculty will be given an opportunity to review the recommendations made by both the Chair and the PC prior to the recommendations being forwarded to the Dean. At that time, they have the opportunity to add written comments to their own annual evaluation. Specifically, before making final merit recommendations, the Chair shall be required to indicate to each faculty member whether the Chair intends to recommend that specific faculty member for merit and the approximate level of merit determined for that specific faculty member (refer to paragraphs 56-61 for more information about merit). After receiving the Chair's preliminary recommendations, faculty who believe their accomplishments have been overlooked or undervalued may, within five working days, request a meeting with the Chair. At this meeting, the Chair shall explain the reasons for denying merit, and the faculty member may ask the Chair to reconsider the

preliminary decision on the basis of accomplishments or achievements that may have been initially overlooked or undervalued. After reconsidering the accomplishments of all faculty who have requested a review of their activities, the Chair will make final merit recommendations to the Dean.

26. If a faculty member on a tenure-track or extended-term contract fails to meet departmental expectations, the PC and the Chair will consider whether reappointment is warranted. If the Chair, in consultation with the PC, determines that a non-tenured faculty member is not to be retained, the Chair will give appropriate notice to the faculty member. If the faculty member is to be retained, the chair will provide the faculty member with specific written suggestions for improvement.
27. If a faculty member is tenured and fails to meet departmental expectations, the Chair will inform the faculty member in writing and invite the faculty member to meet and discuss the evaluation. This notice should be given within three class days from completion of the annual evaluation. If the faculty member would like to meet with the Chair, the faculty member has six class days (after the receipt of the Chair's written notification). If the faculty member chooses not to meet with the Chair, the faculty member should notify the Chair in writing within the six-day period. The faculty member's failure to respond does not prevent the process from moving forward.
 - 27.01 After discussing the evaluation with the faculty member, if the Chair still finds that the faculty member may have failed to meet departmental expectations, the Chair will notify the PC of this finding and call a special hearing of the PC. This hearing should take place no earlier than three and no later than six class days after the Chair's meeting with the faculty member.
 - 27.02 The Chair will present the evaluation and supporting documentation to the PC. The affected faculty member is allowed to be present, address the PC, and provide additional evidence related to his or her performance.
 - 27.03 The PC will discuss the evidence provided by the Chair and the faculty member. The faculty member will not be present during this discussion, and the Chair will preside in a non-voting capacity. The PC will choose a recorder who is responsible for minutes of the deliberations.
 - 27.04 The PC may decide to gather additional information before making a judgment on the faculty member's performance. Such additional information, if required by the PC, should be provided and the PC should reconvene and make its decision within ten class days after the first PC meeting regarding the issue.
 - 27.05 When it has gathered relevant information, the PC will vote by secret ballot as to whether the faculty member has performed to departmental standards. The affected faculty member will not be present for the vote. A finding of nonperformance requires the vote of a majority (fifty-one percent or greater) of the members of the PC present at the meeting excluding the Chair and affected faculty member. The Chair must concur in a finding of nonperformance.
 - 27.06 If the faculty member is judged to have performed below expectations, the Chair and faculty member, in consultation with the PC, will design a Professional Development Plan to help the faculty member meet departmental expectations in the future. The PC recorder will utilize VPAA/PPS 8.09, [Form No. 1](#), which includes a record of the vote and a list of the faculty voting for documentation. The PC will forward the form to the Chair upon completion. The Chair will forward the tracking form, the record of the vote, list of voters, the Chair's recommendation, and a copy of the Professional Development Plan to the Dean of the COE within ten class days of the vote.
 - 27.07 The Professional Development Plan will follow timelines and procedures prescribed in VPAA/PPS 8.09.
28. The Dean also makes an independent and separate recommendation on each annual evaluation.

Criteria for Evaluation

29. Faculty performance in the Department of HPER is evaluated on documentation of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Collegial contributions to the University community by the candidates are also important. Collegial faculty members are expected to contribute to the positive functioning of their respective program, department and the university.
30. Faculty are assigned different workloads based on a number of factors, including their year of employment, their scholarly productivity, and their administrative responsibilities (for more information, refer to HPER PPS 2.02), In light of the fact that faculty are assigned different workloads, the workload should be considered when evaluating teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.
31. For each area (teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service), points will be awarded.
- 1 point = Below Expectations
 - 2 points = Meets Expectations
 - 3 points = Exceeds Expectations
 - 4 points = Exemplary

Teaching

32. Documentation of Teaching Performance. Effective teachers bring the challenge of new, innovative, and/or stimulating ideas to students to help them increase their critical thinking skills and motivate them toward independent scholarly/creative activity. Evidence of teaching performance can be established through careful consideration of formative and summative teaching documentation. Teaching effectiveness will be established through multiple summative student evaluations. Teaching quality will be established through evidence presented in a teaching narrative.
33. Teaching Effectiveness. Evidence of effective teaching and student mentorship will be established through careful consideration of the quantitative scores obtained from student evaluations. Faculty will enter the quantitative scores for each class per semester in section 2J of FARS.
34. Teaching Quality. Evidence of teaching quality will be obtained by the evaluation of a teaching narrative and other evidence.
- 34.01 The teaching narrative:
- Will be inserted in section 2(I) of FARS;
 - Should be no longer than 2 pages in length; and
 - Should address the instructor's: 1) teaching goals and how the goals are consistent with the aims of his/her academic program, the HPER Department, and the University; 2) teaching methods; 3) professional development activities to enhance his/her teaching; and 4) goals for continued development (see Appendix A for more information).
- 34.02 Additional evidence of teaching quality will be entered into section 2 (A through J) of FARS. The Chair may also require examples of additional evidence of quality to be submitted in hard copy form. These may include but are not limited to:
- Class artifacts including a minimum of two but not to exceed four. Examples of class artifacts include course materials such as power point presentations, class assignments, classroom activities and discussion prompts.
 - Evidence of efforts to enhance teaching excellence. An example may include the participation in Office of Professional Development sponsored events focused on teaching enhancement.
 - College, university, or professional teaching awards.
 - Completed doctoral dissertations, master's theses, independent studies, and supervised research projects.

- The development and/or revision of programs, courses, seminars, and assessments.
- Accolades from students or colleagues including written comments from student end-of-semester evaluations.
- Acquisition of instructional grant(s) (e.g., instructional technology grants and academic computing committee grants).
- Peer evaluation: Peer evaluator(s) can include, but are not limited to, professionals from the office of instructional technology, a division coordinator or fellow HPER teaching faculty member from the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

35. Criteria for Teaching Assessment†. The dimensions of the teaching performance are weighted as follows: 50% for student evaluations and 50% for the teaching narrative (see appendix B for example). Each dimension is scored on a 1-5 scale. The quantitative portion of student evaluation is averaged for the year while the peer evaluation and teaching narrative are assessed using a rubric. All faculty, regardless of rank, are assessed on the same criteria.

	DIMENSIONS		VALUE RANGES
	Student Evaluation	Teaching Narrative	
Meets Expectations	Average score above a 4.0 on the quantitative portion of the student evaluations	Earns a narrative score between 3.0-4.0.	3.5-4.0
Exceeds Expectations	Average score above 4.5 on the quantitative portion of the student evaluations	Earns a narrative score between 4.1-4.5.	4.1-4.5
Exemplary	Average score above 4.7 on the quantitative portion of the student evaluations	Earns a narrative score between 4.6-5.0.	4.6-4.85

Scholarly/Creative Activity Criteria

36. Scholarly/creative activity is among the primary functions of the university. A faculty member's contribution will vary from one academic or professional field to another, but the general test to be applied is that the faculty member is engaged consistently and effectively in scholarly/creative activity of quality and distinction. Evidence of high quality and distinction can be established through careful consideration of productivity and quality. Collaboration with colleagues is viewed as a means of enhancing scholarly/creative activity. The quality of the results and the relative contributions of the participants must be weighed, and documentation of the role and contribution of the individual should be annotated in FARS system.
37. The HPER Department recognizes that faculty scholarly/creative activity enhances teaching and vice versa; therefore, an inclusive view of scholarly/creative activity is held that recognizes the importance of *discipline-based* (theoretical), *application-oriented* (action), and *pedagogical* (instructional) research and scholarship, among others.
38. Even though faculty members may publish in many venues, peer-reviewed works will receive greater emphasis when decisions are made related to appointment, tenure, promotion and merit. Venues should be sought that will result in the greatest recognition by colleagues; therefore as an example, more emphasis will be given to national/international works than to others.
39. Documentation of Criteria for Research and Scholarly Activity.
- 39.01 Greater emphasis will be placed on *Scholarly Products*, which include (but are not limited to) the following:
- Research-based articles published in high quality peer-reviewed publications*
 - Successful external grant proposals that support research*
 - Refereed books published;
 - Refereed edited books published;
 - Editor of edited books (chapters written by range of authors) published;
 - Refereed book chapters published; and
 - Refereed monographs published;

- Refereed, full-manuscript articles published in proceedings of professional presentations at national/state/regional meetings.

39.02 While still important, *Scholarly Activities* (including, but not limited to the following) will be assigned less weight:

- Manuscripts in review or in-press;
- Unsuccessful submission of external grant proposals ;*
- Successful internal grant proposals;*
- Juried and invited presentations at national/international levels;
- Development of tests and/or assessment instruments;
- Development of software and/or multimedia products;
- Development of internet products;
- Technical reports published;
- Abstracts in proceedings of professional presentations published; and
- Book reviews published.

39.03 Scholarly products and activities will be included in section 3 of FARS. In addition, evidence of scholarship (e.g., photocopies of articles) will be submitted to the Chair.

40. *Quality*. The quantity of published material is not sufficient evidence of scholarly/creative activity. The quality of each endeavor must be carefully documented and is often more important than quantity. Quality refers to the implications to the field, significance, and importance of the work to a degree indicated by the venue. When determining quality, such factors as journal impact factor, acceptance rate, index distribution, and readership should be considered. Documentation of the quality of venues is expected. In short, all peer-reviewed works are not considered equal.

41. Criteria Based on Research Release^{a,b,c}:

Research Release	0:0		1:1	2:1
	Lecturers	Senior Lecturers/Tenured	Tenured and Tenure-Track	
Meets Expectations		Engages in, at least, one <i>Professional Development Activity</i> ^c that supports maintenance and/or enhancement of academic qualifications.	At least two <i>Scholarly Activities</i> (refer to paragraph 39.02)	At least two <i>Scholarly Activities</i> (refer to paragraph 39.02) <u>AND</u> one <i>Scholarly Product</i> (refer to paragraph 39.02).
Exceeds Expectations	Engages in, at least, one <i>Professional Development Activity</i> ^c that supports maintenance and facilitation of academic qualifications.	Completes one <i>Scholarly Activity</i> as defined in paragraph 39.02 or engages in two <i>Professional Development Activities</i> . ^c	One <i>Scholarly Product</i> as defined in paragraph 39.01.	Two <i>Scholarly Products</i> as defined in paragraph 39.01.
Exemplary	Attends one state, regional, and/or national conference <u>OR</u> one Departmental, College, or University research-related workshop <u>AND</u> completes one scholarly activity as defined in paragraph 39.02.	At least two <i>Scholarly Activities</i> as defined in paragraph 39.02 <u>OR</u> At least one <i>Scholarly Product</i> as defined in paragraph 39.01 <u>OR</u> Engages in at least 3 <i>Professional Development Activities</i> . ^c	More than one <i>Scholarly Product</i> as defined in paragraph 39.01.	More than two <i>Scholarly Products</i> as defined in paragraph 39.01.

^aModification of these criteria will be considered for new tenure-track faculty members who have been on staff less than a year at the time of culmination of the first annual evaluation cycle since their hire.

^bResearch criteria for clinical faculty shall be based on the terms of their contract.

^c*Professional Development Activity* (e.g., attend a state, regional, or nation conference, or one department, college, or university workshop) support maintenance and/or enhancement of academic qualifications.

Leadership/Service

42. In addition to demonstrated excellence in teaching and scholarly/creative activity, faculty should have a commitment to the University and their professions through participation in leadership/service activities. Such participation may take several different forms, including: leadership/service to the University (leadership/service on committees charged by the TxState Faculty Senate or by an administrator at the Dean level or higher); leadership/service to the College (service on a committee charged by the Dean of the COE); leadership/service to the Department (service on a committee charged by the Chair of the Department); and leadership/service to the profession or to higher education in general (leadership/service appointments made by officials representing professional organizations, public schools, cities, states, or the nation).
43. Faculty members are expected to participate in the conduct of their department, college, and university; in appropriate professional organizations in their field; and in professional leadership/service to schools, colleges, universities, and other agencies in the community. Evidence of superior leadership/service may be established through careful consideration in the areas of productivity and quality. While leadership/service activity is expected of each faculty member, leadership/service shall not substitute for expectations in teaching or in scholarly/creative activity.
44. Service expectations will vary among ranks (See paragraph 48 for more information).
- 44.01 Lecturers are expected to perform limited service.
- 44.02 Seniors lectures are expected to perform expanded service.
- 44.03 Tenure track faculty are expected to perform targeted service.
- 44.04 Tenured faculty are expected to assume leadership roles and perform extensive service activities.
45. Documentation of Effective Leadership/Service. Service activities will be entered into section 4 of FARS. However, documentation of service may also be required by the Chair. Lists and descriptions of activities, copies of materials produced, letters from groups served, and any forms of recognition will be examples of supporting data for effective leadership/service. Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to:
- Letters of recognition from the chair of a committee
 - Examples of projects undertaken by the committees
 - College, University, or Professional Awards for Service
46. Productivity. Evidence of a faculty member's productivity is manifested by the extent of participation on departmental, college, and university committees; in professional organizations at the local, state, or national levels; in outreach activities related to student settings; and in service to scholarly/creative activity, such as serving as editor, reviewer, consultant, speaker, and panel member.
47. Quality. Leadership/service involves working creatively with others so that professional knowledge has an impact on the primary and secondary schools, colleges, professional organizations, community agencies, and other institutions. The impact of leadership/service on the group served is of critical importance in evaluating quality of leadership/service. Added value should be given for committees with significant impact and/or significant time commitments.
48. Criteria:^{a,b}

	Lecturers	Senior Lecturers	Tenure-Track	Tenured
Meet Expectations	Participate in a departmental, college, or university function, e.g., Awards Day, Alumni Banquet, or Bobcat Day.	Participate in a departmental or professional committee.	Participate in a departmental or professional committee.	Demonstrate active participation in at least four of the following: University, College, or Department Committees or Professional and Community Organizations.

Exceeds Expectations	Participate in one departmental committee.	Participate in two departmental or professional committees, <u>OR</u> co-sponsor a student organization, <u>OR</u> chair a departmental committee	Chair one departmental committee	Hold one chair/leadership position AND be an active participant in at least three more of the following: University, College, or Department Committees or Professional and Community Organizations. Recipient of service awards/honors.
Exemplary	Co-sponsor a student organization, chair a departmental committee, participate on or chair a college, university, or professional committee.	Participate in three departmental or professional committees, <u>OR</u> Chair a state committee	Chair one professional committee	Hold two chair/leadership positions AND be an active participant/member in at least two of the following: University, College, or Department committees or Professional and Community Organizations. Recipient of service awards/honors.

^aModification of these criteria will be considered for new tenure-track faculty members who have been on staff less than a year at the time of culmination of the first annual evaluation cycle since their hire.

^bResearch criteria for clinical faculty shall be based on the terms of their contract.

Faculty with Release

49. Faculty on 100% release for research and grant supervisors will be evaluated as meeting expectations based on fulfillment of the terms of the release contract. Evaluation will be made in consultation with the office in charge of or charged with overseeing the contract. Judgment on the criteria for research, *exceeds expectations* and *exemplary*, will be made on a case-by-case basis in accordance with interpretation of the contract. Judgment on the criteria for service will be based on criteria stated in paragraph 48.
50. Faculty on administrative release will be evaluated pro-rata on [proportion of] outstanding work load (as determined by department policy or contract) dedicated to research. Based on stated proration, equal merit will be awarded as is awarded to other tenure/tenure-track faculty.

Self-Evaluation

51. In the final section (i.e., section 5) of FARS, faculty will have the opportunity/option to self-evaluate. Specifically, they may identify whether (and explain why) they believe they were below expectations, met expectations, exceeded expectations, or were outstanding for teaching, scholarship, and service.
52. In their review of the faculty, the PC will explain why they agree or do not agree with the faculty member.

Relationship between Annual Review and Tenure/Promotion Review

53. While these two processes are not necessarily related, successful candidates for consideration of tenure and promotion typically have exceeded expectations during annual reviews.

Eligibility for Performance

54. A performance raise shall be defined as a salary awarded to faculty whose overall performance during the identified evaluation period meets or exceeds departmental expectations (VPAA/PPS 7.10).
55. Awarding faculty performance is a two step process at the departmental level. Each faculty member is evaluated by the PC. The chair will then carefully review the PC's evaluations as well as any other documents deemed necessary by the chair and nominate faculty members for performance salary increases (when performance resources are available). The chair will follow the same guidelines as the PC when making these decisions.

Eligibility For Merit

56. A merit raise shall be defined as additional salary to be awarded to faculty whose performance exceeds departmental expectations during the preceding merit evaluation period.
57. Each faculty member is evaluated by at least 5 members of the PC. The assigned PC members will:
 - a) score teaching, service, and scholarship based on the criteria stated in paragraphs 35, 41, and 48; and b) draft evaluative comments that provide a rationale for scoring and suggestions for professional growth and development. The scores in each category will be used to create a frequency distribution.
58. The Coordinator of each program is in charge of summarizing the individual PC evaluations for their program faculty. Specifically, the Coordinator will: a) determine an overall score for each category based on the frequency distribution; and b) summarize evaluative comments¹.
59. The Chair will then carefully review the summary scores and comments provided by the Coordinator as well as the documents provided by each faculty member for annual evaluation. The Chair will provide his/her own scores and evaluative comments.
60. The scores provided by the Coordinator and the Chair will be averaged across the three categories and used in the calculation of merit.
61. A faculty member will be considered for merit based upon the evaluation period of the previous three years for the areas of teaching, creative/scholarship, and service. For tenure-track and tenured faculty, the scores for these three areas for each of the previous three years will be summed and compared to the departmental average. For senior lecturers and tenured faculty teaching a 4:4, more weight will be given to teaching (1.5) and less weight will be given to service (1.0) and research (.50). The scores will be summed and compared to the departmental average. Merit will be awarded using the following formula: Percent salary increase = [% of eligible salaries allocated for merit raises x (faculty member's score/departmental average)] x 100. See Appendix C for an example.
 - 61.01 Faculty with a high score (i.e., an overall score that is above average) will receive a salary adjustment that is greater than the % of eligible salaries allocated for merit.
 - 61.02 Faculty with a medium score (i.e., an overall score that is average) will receive a salary adjustment that is equal to the % of eligible salaries allocated for merit.
 - 61.03 Faculty with a low score (i.e., an overall score that is below average) will receive a salary adjustment that is below the % of eligible salaries allocated for merit raises.
 - 61.04 Faculty who meet expectations or fail to meet expectations in all areas are not eligible for merit.

Evaluation of Per Course Faculty

62. The Department of HPER currently employs many per-course faculty, in large part, to broaden the range and increase the number of course offerings. Also, per-course faculty often bring a particular expertise to the classroom not possessed by full-time faculty. With this in mind, HPER realizes the importance of per-course faculty and will continue to employ the highest quality per-course faculty. To ensure that the teaching performances of the per-course faculty conform to the Department's standards of teaching quality, per-course faculty will be evaluated by the Department Chair, the appropriate Program Coordinator, and students. By the end of the first week of classes, per-course faculty should submit their course syllabi for review to both the Chair and the appropriate Program Coordinator. At the end of the semester, students of per-course

¹ The Chair will assign a member of the PC to summarize the Coordinator's individual review comments and scores for scholarship, service, and teaching.

faculty will complete course evaluations on the faculty member's teaching. These evaluations will be reviewed by both the Department Chair and the appropriate Program Coordinator. The Chair will draft a formal report. The report is based on a review of the course syllabus, feedback from the Program Coordinator, and review of both the qualitative and quantitative portions of the student evaluations. The per course faculty member will sign the evaluation, indicating that he/she has read the report, and may, if desired, add his/her own written comments. The evaluation will be entered into the per-course faculty member's permanent file and should be considered when determining whether the per-course faculty should be re-hired.

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This HPER PPS has been approved by the reviewers listed below and represents the HPER policy and procedure from the date of the document until superseded.

Faculty Representative: _____ Date: _____

Approver: _____ Date: _____
Chair of the HPER Department

Appendix A

Instructor: _____

TEACHING EVALUATION RUBRIC
Professional Reflection and Professional Development

Statement of Teaching Philosophy, Roles, Responsibilities, Methods (Source: Teaching Narrative)

- Are teaching goals consistent with the aims of the program, the Department, and the University?

Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Strong	Exceptional
1	2	3	4	5

Feedback:

- Does the teacher use a large repertoire of teaching methods?

Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Strong	Exceptional
1	2	3	4	5

Feedback:

Professional Development (Source: FARS and Teaching Narrative)

- Did the instructor thoroughly describe his/her strengths and weaknesses?

Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Strong	Exceptional
1	2	3	4	5

- During the previous year, did the instructor participate in meaningful professional development activities to enhance teaching?

Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Strong	Exceptional
1	2	3	4	5

- Has the teacher identified meaningful and effective goals for continued development?

Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Strong	Exceptional
1	2	3	4	5

Feedback:

- *Valued Added factors* include but are not limited to recipient of external or internal teaching-related grants and evidence of effort to develop professionally (e.g., integrated new teaching methods; attended conferences, participated in teaching workshops, acquired new professional certifications, maintained certifications, obtained continuing education credits, etc.), to participation in thesis or dissertation, recipient of Honors/Awards related to their teaching activities, developed and proposed new courses or degree programs, and innovative other teaching activities (1 point will be added to the average score for professional reflection).

Average Score: _____

Teaching Scoring System

Dimension	Rating	Weight	Score
Student Evaluations	_____	50%	_____ X .50 = _____
Portfolio	_____	50%	_____ X .50 = _____
TOTAL			_____

Each dimension is rated on a 1-5 scale with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest score.

Categories

	DIMENSIONS		VALUE RANGES
	Student Evaluation	Portfolio	
Meets Expectations “2”	Average score above a 4.0 on the quantitative portion of the student evaluations	Earns a portfolio score between 3.0-4.0.	3.5-4.0
Exceeds Expectations “3”	Average score above 4.5 on the quantitative portion of the student evaluations	Earns a portfolio score between 4.1-4.5.	4.25-4.5
Exemplary “4”	Average score above 4.7 on the quantitative portion of the student evaluations	Earns a portfolio score between 4.6-5.0.	4.6-5.0

Appendix B**Teaching Sample Scoring System**

Dimension	Rating	Weight	Score
Student Evaluations	4.0	50%	$4.0 \times .50 = 2.0$
Portfolio	3.8	50%	$3.8 \times .50 = 1.9$
TOTAL			3.9
Each dimension is rated on a 1-5 scale with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest score.			

Appendix C

Example of Merit Scoring System

Academic Year 2008/2009 For Faculty Member 1

Evaluative Scores from the Assigned PC Members

	Teaching	Service	Scholarship
PC Member 1	3	1	3
PC Member 2	2	2	3
PC Member 3	3	3	3
PC Member 4	3	3	4
PC Member 5	4	2	3

Overall Evaluative Score

	Teaching	Service	Scholarship	
Coordinator	3	2	3	
Chair	3	3	4	Total
Average	3	2.5	3.5	8

Average Scores for the Three Most Recent Years

	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	Average
Faculty Member 1	9	8	8	8.33
Faculty Member 2				
Etc.				
Departmental Average				9.35

Calculation of Merit²

Faculty Member 1's % Merit Raise = $.027 \times (8.33/9.35) \times 100 = 2.41\%$

² Assuming that 3% of eligible salaries is allocated for merit raises and the Dean holds back 10%, then the Department's % of eligible salaries allocated for merit raises given at the Departmental level is 2.7%.