**College of Science and Engineering Annual Evaluation Templates**

***(Updated February 2017)***

College of S&E Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 1

**Annual Evaluation**

**College of Science and Engineering**

**Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi**

Name: Date:

Academic Rank: Date of Employment:

Department: Evaluator:

Period of Review:

Effort Allocation % Evaluation\*

Teaching

Research

Service

\* 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Standard, 3 - High, 4 - Excellent

**Overall**

Comments:

Recommendations:

Acknowledgement of Evaluation

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(*FACULTY NAME*)Evaluator

(Signature does not signify

agreement, only that you have

read this evaluation) Title

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature DateSignature Date

College of S&E Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 2

**Effort Allocation for Next Year**

Name:

Effort Allocation (%) Faculty Proposed Chair Approved

Teaching

Research

Service

Comments on effort allocation as appropriate:

***Nominal effort allocation:*** *(See also Table 1 on p. 23 of the S&E College Handbook)*

\*Based on 3-SCH teaching load per course

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(*FACULTY NAME*)Chair/Director Dean

(Signature does not signify

agreement, only that you have

read this evaluation)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature DateSignature Date Signature Date

College of S&E Annual Evaluation Templates: Form 3

**Data from Digital Measures**

**Faculty Performance Evaluations: Clarification and Descriptions of Rating Terminology.**

The three areas of evaluation include teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service/department citizenship and other duties as defined in University Statement 12.01.99.C1.03 “Responsibilities of Full-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members” which can be found at <http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/rules_procedures/assets/12.01.99.C0.03_responsibilities_of_full-time_faculty_members.pdf>. Faculty members will be evaluated only in terms of areas that are part of their job duties. Evaluations must be based on the data provided in Digital Measures.

Scores will then be weighted based on the workload profiles and/or ranking systems developed by each college.

Faculty evaluation letters will include a rating for each area, as well as an overall rating for the review period.

Descriptions of rating terminology (University Rules and Procedures 33.99.99.C0.02 Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members):

1. **Unsatisfactory**: performance is below minimum expectations. The faculty member must improve performance in this area and should be given a written set of expectations for improvement.
2. **Standard**: meets expectations for faculty performance as established by the department and/or college.
3. **High**: above expectations for full-time faculty members in the department and/or college, but does not rise to the level of Excellent.
4. **Excellent**: well above normal expectations for full-time faculty in the department and/or college, but does not rise to the level of exemplary. A faculty member must significantly exceed the minimum expectations to receive this rating.