I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The quality of the programs and curricula in the M. J. Neeley School of Business depend significantly on faculty development and performance. Although a faculty evaluation system involves subjective judgments, guidelines are necessary. The following principles should characterize the development of these guidelines:

A. The evaluation and systematic development of faculty should be consistent with the school's stated needs and priorities while still allowing for individual faculty differences.

B. Each department, unit, or program may have individualized needs and objectives, recognizing that all should be generally consistent with the objectives of the school.

C. No individual faculty member should be expected to conform in an exact manner to a uniform a priori profile of activities or accomplishments.

D. Faculty efforts should result in high quality teaching, research and professional service.

E. Professional ethics are of the utmost importance. Faculty members are expected to comply with the Statement on Professional Ethics adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 4, 1993 and found in the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff.

II. KEY CONCEPTS

The faculty evaluation system in the school is based upon a guiding philosophy. The evaluation guidelines are based upon the following key concepts:

A. An effective and fair evaluation system requires the active involvement and cooperative efforts of both faculty and administration in the evaluation process.

B. The academic efforts of the faculty must be viewed comprehensively and include the five components of teaching, research, professional service, academic and career advising, and professional development.

C. Allocation of faculty effort will allow for individual differences, thereby resulting in individualized profiles, but these efforts must be related to the needs and goals of the department, school, and university. In other words, faculty are expected to integrate their own objectives with overall organizational needs and objectives. Appropriate guidance should be provided by the dean and the department chair in order to
assist faculty in seeing that their activities and accomplishments are congruent with the needs and goals of the organizational unit.

D. Evaluation and constructive feedback to tenure-track faculty should occur shortly after the start of employment at TCU and continue throughout the faculty member's entire career at the university. Refer to Appendix 2 for a typical feedback schedule for a new faculty member.

E. A faculty member is expected to demonstrate acceptable performance and notable accomplishments in all five activities (viz., teaching, research, professional service, academic and career advising, and professional development.) The relative weights of these five activities in determining a faculty member's overall contribution to the school, the university and the profession may vary somewhat depending on the faculty member's professional rank and specific job responsibilities. Allocation of efforts are to be determined by the faculty member and department chair with the concurrence of the dean and are to be consistent with the overall needs and objectives of the department, college, and university.

F. Performance in each activity must be documented systematically, and written feedback provided periodically to the individual professor. The individual professor bears the primary responsibility to assure appropriate documentation of performance and presentation of accomplishments for each activity. Department chairs are expected to provide guidance and advice to faculty members in the selection, collection, and presentation of evidence. Performance evaluations are to be communicated to the individual professor as specified later in this document.

G. A fair and comprehensive evaluation of faculty accomplishments is the responsibility of both the department chair and peer faculty colleagues within each department. It is expected that both department chairs and department faculty will periodically review past performance and provide constructive feedback and counsel to faculty colleagues. The review processes and feedback procedures are detailed in Part IV of this document.

H. In all areas, emphasis will be placed more on quality than on quantity; results will be emphasized more heavily than efforts; and peer review (internal and/or external) will be used to assess quality in each of the five performance activities.

I. The evaluation system recognizes and reinforces selective and sensible courses of action as well as innovative and risk-taking behavior (e.g., development of a new course.)
J. Promotions are awarded to recognize significant past accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, professional service, advising, and professional development, whereas tenure decisions reflect a professional assessment of the faculty's future worth and potential contributions to the overall goals and needs of the university. Consequently, while promotion and tenure decisions are conceptually related, they are, in practice, separate and distinct decisions. Extraordinary accomplishments by a faculty member may merit promotion to a higher rank prior to the tenure evaluation.

K. Promotion to the rank of associate and/or full professor will be based on notable accomplishments and contributions recognized not only by the immediate TCU community but also by the broader academic and professional community at the national and/or international level. Promotion to in these ranks as well as the granting of tenure generally requires demonstrated competence teaching at the graduate level. Faculty promoted to the rank of full professor have normally achieved national recognition as outstanding educators and authorities in their field while continuing to contribute to the mission of TCU, in all ways consistent with the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff.

L. In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non-tenured faculty member's performance, which may or may not include a leave covered by the Family Medical Leave Act, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent child birth. Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence, the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted. In making a request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to de facto tenure. Refer to the guidelines set forth in section (II i) of the Tenure Policy in the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff. Faculty members are encouraged to start this process in consultation with their department chairperson. The dean is encouraged to consult with the Advisory Committee.

M. Rewards (e.g., salary, promotion, tenure) should have a reasonable (but not necessarily an absolute one-to-one) linkage to performance. Salary adjustments, for example, should have a heavy merit basis.

N. It is important that faculty demonstrate competence and accomplishments in all five activities. Variations in emphasis should be consistent with the guidelines established later in this document for particular faculty ranks and job responsibilities. Emphasis on teaching, research, and professional
service may vary somewhat with respect to promotion and tenure career paths. A consistent record of effective and appropriate student advising and meaningful professional development activities is equally expected of all faculty.

O. A spirit of constructive cooperation is necessary to the successful functioning both of an evaluation system and of the academic units (department, school, university) of which a faculty member is a part. Because this personal characteristic applies to all of the activities considered in the evaluation process, it is included here as a key concept rather than being specifically referred to in each area of evaluation.

Each concept is embraced in the details of subsequent sections of these Guidelines.

III. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Major components of professional activities include:
- Teaching
- Research
- Professional Service
- Academic and Career Advising
- Professional Development

The five components are closely interrelated. Each component should be considered in terms of the important relationships with the other four components. For example, both advising and professional development affect the teaching component. The relevant interrelationships between the five components are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advising</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Priority Guidelines
The relative importance of the five professional areas may vary somewhat among faculty. Nevertheless, general priority guidelines regarding importance are provided to assist faculty in the allocation of their efforts.

For junior faculty, teaching and research are highest priority and considered equal in importance, ranking substantially higher than professional service. In any given year a junior faculty may put more or less emphasis on teaching vs. research, however, throughout their probationary period (non tenure status) the effort on teaching and research should be equal or nearly equal. Advising and professional development are important in terms of supporting quality teaching and research.

Senior faculty are expected to contribute to teaching, research, and professional service, and fulfill their responsibilities in advising and professional development. The relative priorities may vary somewhat depending on the faculty member, but no single area is to be completely deemphasized or excluded from the evaluation criteria.

Section VI of this document discusses career tracks available to faculty.

With reference to the evaluation criteria listed under B.2., C.2., and D.2. below, certain items may not apply to a particular faculty member. Faculty should discuss any criteria not considered applicable with the department chair. Also, in particular instances, criteria not listed may be appropriate.

B. Teaching Activities

1. Definition

As a facilitator of the learning process, the faculty member should demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively the most important ideas, concepts, theories, and applications in a discipline. An effective faculty member should demonstrate the ability to stimulate and challenge students to their intellectual capacity, be sensitive to differing educational needs of students, and utilize current course material and effective testing and other evaluation procedures and devices.

2. Evaluation Criteria

a. Classroom Effectiveness

Course objectives, grading bases, and the faculty member's expectations should be clearly communicated to students. Class lectures should be clearly presented, well organized,
and related to course assignments. Other examples of contributing factors that can be evaluated include course content, course syllabi, and value added to the student during the course.

b. **Instructional Materials**

Textbooks, readings, problems, cases, experiential learning exercises, educational technological products, and other instructional materials are to be appropriate to the course. The material is to be current and sufficiently rigorous relative to the course's contribution and placement in the overall curriculum.

c. **Student Evaluation**

Tests and other evaluation devices should be developed that are clear and understandable, thought provoking, fair, and clearly related to the course material.

d. **Personal Qualities**

Faculty should be: (1) motivated to arouse the interest of students and to challenge them to high effort; (2) accessible and helpful to students; and (3) poised in the classroom--exhibiting confidence, good preparation, skill in handling questions, and control of the class.

e. **Instructional Development**

Textbook writing (and supporting packages), development of new courses (and substantial revisions of existing ones) and programs, and instructional materials should represent sound contributions to the academic discipline. Also included in instructional development are preparation of cases and teaching notes, simulations, and computer learning and analysis packages.

f. **Research Supervision**

Faculty should demonstrate competence in the supervision of independent study courses and, when appropriate, direct and/or serve on dissertation and thesis committees.

3. **Data Sources** (Examples)

a. Student evaluations (including former students)
b. Peer evaluation of course materials, authored texts, tests, and other evaluation devices, also including classroom visits by invitation, and feedback on faculty presentation.

c. Faculty self-evaluation.

d. Written evaluations by faculty at other institutions.

e. Effective use and/or development of instructional material as evidenced by adoptions at other universities and reviews in the professional literature.

f. Teaching awards, internal and/or external.

4. Evaluation Process

Evidence of accomplishment should include peer evaluations of materials developed for classroom instructions, course outlines, and other relevant items. Instructional development items with accompanying explanation should also be provided by faculty. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to submit student evaluations from their classes and/or other objective evidence of their classroom effectiveness when appropriate. (Note that TCU requires evidence of effective classroom teaching.) Provision of self-development plans and activities is an integral part of the evaluation process for both junior and senior faculty.

5. Priority Statement

Quality teaching, rigorous yet fair grading standards, and a professional comportment with students both in and out of class are expected of all faculty members.

C. Research Activities

1. Definition

A faculty member should demonstrate the ability and willingness to enlarge the body of knowledge in one's discipline and to disseminate the results in a manner that indicates a contribution to the analytical and theoretical frontiers of business and related disciplines and/or the application of knowledge to solve important problems.

In general, the faculty are expected to articulate a program of research interests and objectives which specify the following: (a) a delineation
of the topic(s) to be pursued by the faculty member; (b) an evaluation of the importance of the area(s); (c) a statement of expected research accomplishments; and (d) a statement of expected time to completion, with stages of accomplishment. Obviously, such a program may change as advancements are made in one’s research area and/or as one’s personal interest varies over time. Consequently, it is expected that faculty would periodically revise or perhaps even completely reformulate their research strategies.

2. **Evaluation Criteria**

   **Research Program**

   a. Appropriate publications; paper presentations at appropriate meetings; follow-up studies; and citations in the literature.

   b. External references which attest to the faculty member's accomplishments in his/her research program are necessary evidence for tenure and promotion.

   c. Evidence of success in receiving internally and externally funded grants and contracts. Funded research involvement should lead to publication in scholarly publications and presentations.

   **Research Service**

   a. Faculty are expected to provide professional research service to their colleagues and to their profession. Professional service may include activities such as serving as: (1) a member of editorial boards, (2) a visiting scholar, (3) program or track chairs, (4) a workshop director, and (5) other applicable components of research service. Collegial service may include joint activities with students and faculty, both internally and externally.

3. **Data Sources** *(Examples)*

Each faculty member should provide a report of his/her research productivity and service, including the following:

a. **Publications**

   Refereed journal articles that are subject to a peer review process.

   Refereed proceedings.
Non-refereed journal articles and proceedings.

Original case studies.

Monographs and books (or chapters thereof) that represent theoretical, conceptual, and/or methodological advances in a field.

Working papers.

b. Presentations

Paper presentations at appropriate international, national and regional meetings and special workshops.

c. Research and grant proposals

Externally funded research and grant proposals accepted for funding (excluding consulting reports).

d. Research Service

Activities such as serving as a member of: (1) editorial boards, (2) a visiting scholar, (3) program or track chairs, (4) a workshop director, and (5) other applicable components of research service. Also, joint activities with students and faculty, both internally and externally.

4. Evaluation Process

Research productivity for annual performance reviews will be evaluated primarily through publication in refereed journals during the past two years. For tenure and promotion evaluations the faculty member’s total research record is considered.

While other research productivity would not normally take the place of refereed journal articles, consideration will be given to refereed proceedings, presentations, publications in non-refereed journals and proceedings; original case studies; grant reports; books; monographs; chapters in books; and working papers.

Research service will be evaluated primarily on the basis of quality and appropriateness of such activities rather than the quantity of such activities.
Multiple authorship is common practice in business disciplines. When faculty are evaluated, the department chairperson and other evaluators should consider the faculty member’s relative contribution in such situations, since the order of the authors’ names—which is often alphabetical—does not necessarily reflect relative contributions.

5. **Priority Statement**

Junior faculty members are expected to devote major research efforts to conducting studies that will be published in refereed journals that are considered as leading journals in the individuals’ academic areas. Section VI which discusses career tracks suggests that all junior faculty should be on a research or balanced track in order to allow them time to develop a strong research record.

Senior faculty are expected to demonstrate a progression of externally recognized accomplishments in their research programs as well as productivity in leading publications. Senior faculty are also expected to provide research service to their colleagues and profession. However, as indicated in Section VI senior faculty can pursue a teaching emphasis career track if this is consistent with departmental and school needs.

D. **Service Activities**

1. **Definition**

The university is dependent upon faculty participation in university, school, and department committees, task forces and other service activities. The service function also includes professional activities for external publics such as service to business firms and other groups, service to professional organizations, and participation in management and professional development activities.

2. **Evaluation Criteria**

   a. **Internal Service** (Examples)

      1. Election to the Faculty Senate, the School's or University's Faculty Advisory Committees, the Graduate Council, etc.

      2. Appointment by dean to school committees, task forces, etc.

      3. Appointment by department chair to departmental committees, service roles, etc.
4. Appointment by Vice Chancellors and Chancellor to university committees, task forces, etc.
5. Election by students to student-related committees, task forces, etc.
6. Special service as mentor to colleagues, student groups, and others.

b. **External Service** (Examples)

1. Liaison with other universities
2. Professional societies (offices held, committee assignments, editorships, membership on education boards, etc.)
3. Use of faculty member's expertise in business, government and community-related activities
4. Professional consultation using faculty member's expertise, particularly in areas that support research and teaching programs.
5. Active participation in alumni associations
6. Service on government commissions, boards, or task forces

c. **Management & Professional Education** (Examples)

1. Faculty leader for university and/or corporate-sponsored management training programs, executive development programs, and professional programs.
2. Program director for management, executive development, and/or professional programs.
3. Marketing and/or supervision of above types of programs

3. **Data Sources** (Examples)

a. Self-reports and evaluation
b. Peer evaluation
c. Evaluation by university or external committee chair.
d. Reports from officials of organizations served
e. Participant evaluation
4. **Evaluation Process**
   Faculty members should be evaluated on service activities by means appropriate to the type of service activity. The quality and appropriateness of such activities are more important than the quantity of such activities.

5. **Priority Statement**
   It is anticipated that junior faculty will maintain a minimum involvement in service activities. Greater involvement is expected of senior faculty, although service is generally considered to have a lower priority compared to teaching, research, academic and career advising, and professional development.

E. **Academic and Career Advising Activities**

1. **Definition**
   Student advising is an important faculty function which encompasses both academic and career counseling. Advising activities include but are not limited to helping plan academic programs, clarifying degree requirements, suggesting electives and complementary majors and minors, assisting students in course selection, monitoring student progress toward graduation, supporting students with academic difficulties, suggesting possible post-graduate education, making appropriate referrals, and assisting in career counseling.

2. **Evaluation Criteria**
   Quality advising is reflected in a faculty member's understanding of the University "core," major, minor and related requirements--from probationary status through credit by examination to the Honors Program. The faculty advisor must also have a thorough knowledge of advising materials and registration procedures. Evidence of a faculty member's quality performance in advising should include a review of not only the accuracy and value of the information disseminated, but also the advising technique reflected in the student/faculty advisor interactions. The following factors may also be considered when reviewing these areas: participation as a University premajor advisor, attendance at and participation in advising workshops, and the amount of time spent not only at scheduled advising periods, but spent in informal advising throughout the school year.
3. **Data Sources** (Examples)
   
   a. Solicited and unsolicited feedback from students.
   
   b. Peer evaluation.
   
   c. Feedback from alumni.
   
   d. Feedback from employers.
   
   e. Feedback from faculty at other institutions.

4. **Evaluation Process**

   The results of advising are difficult to evaluate in the short run, unless negligence occurs. Accordingly, evaluation emphasis will be placed upon accomplishment of advising activities. Nevertheless, whenever possible efforts should be made to obtain measures of the results of advising efforts.

5. **Priority Statement**

   A major commitment to advising responsibilities is expected of every faculty member. While the time requirements of fulfilling this responsibility may be substantially less than other professional activities, effective execution of the advising task is an important and essential faculty activity.

6. **Professional Development**

   1. **Definition**

      Developing and enhancing professional capabilities are essential responsibilities of every faculty member. Faculty members are expected to keep themselves abreast of their profession by expanding their knowledge and skills within their discipline and fields of specialization. Faculty should engage in on-going self-development activities including self-study projects, appropriate workshops, professional seminars and meetings, internships, and other professional development activities.

   2. **Evaluation Criteria**

      Faculty are expected to pursue a continuing professional development program, concentrating efforts in areas of primary support of teaching and
research activities. Annual plans should be prepared and implemented in development areas of greatest need and benefit.

Evidence includes, but is not limited to, certification in appropriate fields, attendance at seminars and workshops, auditing courses, participation in appropriate work-related experiences, receipt of developmental teaching grants, and receipt of post-doctoral fellowships.

3. **Data Sources (Examples)**

   a. Professional certification records.

   b. Teaching and research results involving professional development activities.

   c. Written evaluation by seminar and workshop leaders.

   d. Peer evaluation.

   e. Internship reports.

   f. Faculty self-evaluation.

4. **Evaluation Process**

   Evidence of accomplishment should include reporting of planned and completed professional development activities. These activities will be evaluated primarily on the bases of quality and appropriateness rather than quantity.

5. **Priority Statement**

   All faculty members should seek to add value to their capabilities through professional development. Completion of professional development activities are essential to performing this component of professional activity.

G. **Primacy of Teaching**

   According to the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff, the instruction of students is the first purpose of the University and the prime responsibility of every faculty member.

H. **Professional Ethics**
Faculty members are expected to comply with the Statement on Professional Ethics adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 4, 1993 and found in the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff.

IV. EVALUATION PROCESSES

A. Protocols

Faculty evaluation should be an ongoing process. The format and content of the reporting protocols for promotion and tenure reviews and salary adjustments should incorporate the annual activity reports currently prepared by each faculty member. A complete record of the candidate’s annual reports, the chairman’s annual progress letters, and the annual spring evaluations greatly facilitate the deliberation of the promotion and tenure advisory committee.

B. Timing

Faculty evaluation and constructive feedback from appropriate administrators and colleagues on matters related to nontenured progress, tenure and promotion should start at the beginning of the second year of employment and continue through the faculty member's entire career. Guidelines for review processes should be in conformity with the deadline dates and sequence of procedures established at the university level. (See Appendix 1) In addition, a faculty peer review, as described in D, is an important dimension of the evaluation process.

C. Annual Evaluation Process

- Annual faculty evaluation is the joint responsibility of the department chair, faculty evaluation committee, and Dean. The faculty evaluation committee is composed of four tenure track faculty members elected by the tenure track faculty to serve three-year terms.

- Faculty should complete an annual faculty report by January 15. Faculty are encouraged to submit supporting materials that can be used to help assess performance. Faculty members should update their resumes annually and submit them with their annual reports. Finally, the faculty member should submit a cover memo indicating the career track selected for the year: research, balanced, teaching. The career track selected
should be consistent with the relative efforts devoted to the areas of teaching, research, and service. This memo should indicate the percent effort for teaching, research and service for the calendar year. This percent effort allocation should be consistent with the guidelines in VI (Career Tracks). The cover memo accompanied with a copy of the faculty annual report and current resume should be submitted simultaneously to the department chair and dean.

- The department chair should rate each faculty member in teaching, research and service. A rating of: (1) greatly exceeding expectations, (2) exceeding expectations, (3) meeting expectations, (4) below expectations, (5) greatly below expectations will be provided for the areas of teaching, research and service. These ratings should capture the quality of performance in each of the respective areas. It is the expectation at the Neeley School that standard performance should meet the good quality standard. We expect good quality teaching, research, and service. Consequently good quality performance is equivalent to “meeting expectations.”

- The department chair, faculty evaluation committee and dean will meet to form a consensus evaluation. After the department chair and dean reach a consensus evaluation written results should be reported to each faculty member in a personal meeting with the department chair. The purpose of these meetings should be to not only report the results of the evaluation but to coach and advise the faculty member on areas that require addressing and improvement if needed. This process should generally be completed during March.

- Faculty members wishing to appeal their annual evaluation should follow the appeal process outlined in Appendix 3.

- The dean will use the rankings to allocate the majority of the salary adjustment funds for merit-based performance (based on the preceding annual evaluations). The dean will use a less than majority of the salary adjustment funds to allocate to faculty for reasons of long term performance, equity, market related factors, compression, inversion factors and special merit. Before the dean makes a final decision on salary adjustments he or she should meet with each individual department chairperson to obtain their input.

- It is not unusual for annual salary increase pools that are available to vary significantly year to year. In years where there is an especially large salary increase pool available and this is preceded by several years of lean or no raise pools it is important that salary increases be allocated based on several years of performance. The salary adjustment pool should be allocated as follows: merit money for annual performance and
other factors including equity adjustments, inversion, compression and extraordinary contribution to the School’s mission. The dean should seek input from the department chairs and associate deans on the allocation of these funds.

- The department chairs will be evaluated by this same process but the dean and associate deans will meet as a committee to evaluate each department chair. A process should be developed to gather faculty input. The dean will counsel with each department chair and provide feedback regarding performance.

- The associate deans will be evaluated by this same process but the dean will serve as the primary evaluator for their administrative role and the faculty evaluation committee will evaluate their teaching and research. However, the department chairs will be asked to provide written feedback on the performance of each associate dean and the dean will use this to help evaluate their annual administrative performance. The dean will provide the associate deans with feedback on their annual performance.

D. Faculty Annual Review and 4th Year Review of Nontenured Tenure Track Faculty

All nontenured tenure track faculty members should be annually reviewed as required by TCU faculty policy.

1. After the first year the chairperson and tenured faculty members will review annually the progress of the nontenured tenure track faculty within the department. This review occurs during the Fall semester. The four-year review of the nontenured faculty will be similar in nature to the annual review of progress toward tenure for all nontenured faculty except that the review will be more comprehensive. The review will consist of four parts. First, the review will begin by the nontenured faculty member under review submitting a written report by September 30 that provides their self-assessment of their progress toward tenure. The report should address teaching, research, professional service, academic and career advising, and professional development activities, accomplishments, and plans. Second, using this report as a basis and prior to October 15 the faculty member will make a presentation to the tenured and nontenured tenured track faculty of their department. Third, the faculty member under review will leave the room and both the tenured and nontenured tenure track faculty should provide input and participate in discussions regarding the progress toward tenure. Fourth, the nontenured faculty will leave the room and the tenured faculty will engage in further discussion if necessary. This review will include an in-depth analysis of the nontenured faculty
member’s achievements. Particular attention will be given to teaching and research. Evidence of quality teaching and research productivity as measured by quality refereed journal articles published or accepted for publication will be considered during the review. Also, appropriate consideration should be given to invited revisions at quality refereed journals. The feedback report for the four-year review should include a statement reflecting the likelihood that the faculty member being reviewed will receive a favorable tenure and promotion decision in one or two years, whichever timing is appropriate. If a favorable decision is highly unlikely, the dean and department chair will determine if the faculty member’s probationary contract will be extended. This decision will be made after consulting with the School Advisory Committee. In situations where it is felt that several more months of performance is needed to make a sound decision the faculty member will receive an annual progress letter in the Fall, however, it will state that the letter will be amended based on additional evidence of performance during January or February of the forthcoming year.

E. Faculty Peer Review of Tenured Faculty

The faculty peer review process should involve all tenured and nontenured tenure track faculty in the department. All tenured faculty will be reviewed by the tenured and nontenured tenure-track faculty in the department every fifth year.

1. In October the faculty member to be reviewed should submit a report to the department chair listing teaching, research, professional service, academic and career advising, and professional development activities, accomplishments, and plans. The TCU Faculty Annual Reports plus other relevant information should be used as a basis for preparing the activity report.

2. By mid-November of each year the peer review meetings will have taken place in each department. All aspects of the peer review should include individual goals for the faculty member in each of the five review areas. This means that the presentation, discussion and feedback report should all include explicit statements about goals set by the faculty member for the coming review period. The review of these goals and their accomplishment should also be part of peer reviews in subsequent review cycles. The goals should be meaningful and involve more than completion of normal tasks.

3. Meetings will be chaired by a tenured faculty member (not the department chair) appointed by the chair of the department. Another faculty member appointed by the chair of the department will serve as Secretary and prepare a written feedback statement. The feedback report, advisory in
nature, is to be conveyed as soon as possible to the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean by the chair of the committee. The feedback report should be consistent with the guidelines noted in paragraphs 5 and 6 of section III, Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty, of the Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy in the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff with particular attention paid to the faculty development plan.

4. The faculty member will be expected to make an informal presentation regarding his/her accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, professional service, academic and career advising, and professional development, including future plans in those areas. The full-time, tenure-track faculty in the department will discuss these activities and plans with the faculty member and provide counsel and advice on future plans.

5. If the dean, department chair, the faculty member being reviewed, or other faculty involved in the review process disagree or have concerns with the results of the written review, that individual(s) should communicate in writing to the other parties the nature and scope of his/her concerns.

6. Peer review letters and any dissenting letters from the department chair and/or dean should be copied to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

F. Nontenured Progress, Tenure and Promotion Evaluations

Deadline dates procedures and sequence of procedures with regard to the review of nontenured progress, tenure and promotion will be in conformity with those established at the University level. For an example, see Appendices 1 and 2. In those years involving a tenure and/or promotion decision, the discussions between a faculty member and department chair normally should occur before August 1 to determine if a request for promotion and/or tenure is to be initiated. Faculty who want to be considered for promotion and/or tenure should consult the department chair.

The School Advisory Committee. The School Advisory Committee shall consist of four faculty members. Two shall be elected by the faculty of the school. Two shall be appointed by the dean. At times a department may be represented by more than one member of the committee, but never more than two members from the same department.

External Review. Reviews of the candidate by faculty at other universities are mandatory for promotion and/or tenure decisions. Normally the candidate and the department chair should each submit four names to the
dean near the start of the Fall semester. The dean will select two names from each list and will be responsible for initiating and coordinating the external review process. The external reviewers will be provided the candidate’s current resume, a personal statement that the candidate prepares commenting on his or her research program, and a copy of relevant publications to review and evaluate. The external reviewers will be asked to comment on the quality and impact of the publications and research record of the faculty member. They do not need to offer a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion because such decisions should include an assessment by the tenured faculty and the dean of the candidates overall performance. In short the purpose of the external reviews is to help better inform the tenured faculty on the research dimension of faculty performance. The dean will make available unmasked copies of all external letters received to the department chairs, tenured faculty and the School Advisory Committee for consideration in formulating the promotion and tenure recommendations made at both the department and college level.

V. USES OF FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS RESULTS

The results of the faculty evaluation process serve three major purposes:

A. The evaluations provide a basis for promotion and/or tenure decisions.

B. The evaluation information is a major basis for determining annual merit compensation. Allocation of merit compensation among faculty should be commensurate with the faculty accomplishments in teaching, research and service consistent with the priority weighing mutually determined by faculty and department chairs.

C. The evaluations provide useful guidelines for faculty development and career planning.

VI. CAREER TRACKS

Faculty can take on different roles in terms of teaching, research, and professional service. However, it is important that overall the M. J. Neeley School maintain a balance of 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Year to year variations from the norm may be expected and desirable, however, they should not be long term in nature.
There are three general career tracks. However, even these three career tracks do not represent the possibilities that may be pursued if the needs of the School and University warrant. The three general tracks are:

- **Balanced Track.** With this track teaching would generally include a 40-45% effort, research a 40-45% effort, and professional service a 10-20% effort.
- **Research Track.** This track would allow teaching effort to be 20-40%, research 50-70%, and professional service 10-25%.
- **Teaching Track.** With this track teaching is 60-80% of effort, research 10-15% of effort, and service 10-25% of effort.

Untenured regular faculty should be on a balanced track or research track for each year of their probationary period. Over their probationary period (untenured) they should place an equal or nearly equal emphasis on teaching and research. Determination of the specific track each year is related to departmental and school needs as well as the needs of the faculty member in making adequate progress toward tenure.

A regular three credit hour course should count at least 10% and not more than 15% of annual effort. The higher 15% effort can be used when the total effort is substantially higher due to very large class sizes, a graduate offering, very heavy writing or other requirements that require substantially higher effort on behalf of the faculty member.

**Annual Determination of Career Track**

1. During the Winter of each year the department chair and dean should review the faculty in each department and discuss teaching load expectations for the department and the individual faculty members. This should be accomplished by February 15.

2. No later than March 1 the department chair should meet with each regular faculty member and establish one of the following tracks: teaching emphasis, research emphasis, balanced emphasis. The primary difference will be the teaching responsibilities. In general a faculty member with a teaching emphasis will teach from 6 to 8 courses per academic year; a faculty member with a balanced emphasis will teach 4 to 5 courses per academic year; a faculty member with a research emphasis will teach 2 to 4 courses per academic year. The M.J. Neeley School Teaching Load Policy should be consulted for further guidelines on teaching loads. In considering the appropriate track and teaching workload the department chair needs to use professional and reasoned judgment and consider such issues as class size, level of preparation required, nature and scope of class assignments, advising and mentoring and so on. The department chair also should allow faculty to perform different roles throughout their career and thus contribute in different ways to the School’s mission. Nonetheless all regular untenured faculty should be on a research or balanced track.
3. Once the faculty member and department chair reach an agreement on the track to be pursued by a faculty member the outcome should be communicated to the dean. The dean will either approve or disapprove and disagreements or appeals will be made to the dean who will make the final decision. Appeals should be made in writing with an explanation of the nature of the disagreement and the logic behind the appeal and a statement of the desired outcome. This entire process should be designed to be completed by March 15 of each year.

4. The dean will set the teaching load for each department chair and associate dean. Generally a department chair or associate dean will have a teaching load that is consistent with their administrative responsibilities and research performance. Most department chairs will teach 2 to 3 courses per year. On the other hand the associate deans will be expected to generally teach 1 to 2 courses per year.

VII. AMENDMENTS/ADDITIONS

Should there be a conflict between statements in these Guidelines and in the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff, those found in the Handbook will be controlling.
## APPENDIX 1

### NONTENURED PROGRESS, TENURE AND PROMOTION

#### CALENDAR AND PROCEDURES (Example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates*</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Start of Fall Semester</td>
<td>The departmental chair will initiate the collection of appropriate materials for tenure review from all nontenured faculty in his/her department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortly After Start Of Fall Semester</td>
<td>The nontenured faculty member will submit to his/her department chair the materials requested and any other information he/she considers relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late October</td>
<td>The tenured faculty and departmental chair will review the materials submitted by nontenured faculty members. For faculty in their final probationary year, a written recommendation to grant or withhold tenure will be made to the dean on the behalf of the tenured faculty by the department chair. If the department chair or any of the tenured faculty involved in the review process disagree or have concerns with the results of the written review, that individual(s) should communicate in writing to the scope of his/her concerns. The chair will then issue a written tenure progress report to all nontenured faculty who are in at least their second year with copies to the dean to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This letter is to be sent even if a decision is to be made on tenure that year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the responsibility of the department chair to notify the faculty member of the department's promotion and/or tenure recommendation, in a timely manner.
Early December The dean will meet with the school advisory committee to present his/her written recommendation on tenure and promotion along with supporting evidence.

* Dates are provided only for illustrative purposes. Deadline dates established for each year will be in conformity with deadline dates established at the university level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid January</td>
<td>The school advisory committee will report in writing to the dean its judgment of the tenure/promotion recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early February</td>
<td>The dean will have conferred with each departmental chair and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Research and forwarded his/her written recommendations on tenure/promotion and evidence to the Vice Chancellor. It is the responsibility of the Dean to notify the faculty member of the promotion and/or tenure recommendation in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid February</td>
<td>The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will send his/her written recommendations on tenure and promotion along with supporting evidence to the University Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early March</td>
<td>The University Advisory Committee will report in writing to the Vice chancellor for Academic Affairs its judgment of the tenure/promotion recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid March</td>
<td>The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will have conferred with each dean and forwarded his/her written recommendations on tenure/promotion and supporting evidence to the Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late March</td>
<td>TCU Board of Trustees' meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

TYPICAL TIMING PATTERN OF FORMAL FEEDBACK TO UNTENURED FACULTY IN THE NEELEY SCHOOL

Assumptions:
Person starts at TCU in the fall semester.
Person has no prior credit for teaching; tenure decision in 6th year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year at TCU</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>PL AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PL CR</td>
<td>AE CR-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PL TD</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms:
PL  Annual progress letter from department chair after chair meets with department’s tenured faculty. This is evaluative in nature.
CR  The annual progress letter from department chair after chair meets with department’s tenured faculty. However in the 4th year it is considerably more comprehensive and weighed more heavily in determining if the faculty member’s probationary contract will be extended.

CR-A This is an amended letter issued during January or February of the 4th year if the Fall comprehensive review required several additional months of performance data.
AE  Annual evaluation representing consensus of department chair and dean. This is evaluative in nature.
TD  Tenure decision. Within the Neeley School: vote of tenured faculty of person’s department, tenured faculty of the Neeley School, input from
Neeley advisory committee, decision of dean. The application then goes to the TCU Promotion and Tenure Committee.

New faculty members are urged to become familiar with the specifics of the Neeley School document “Criteria for Promotion & Tenure and Faculty Evaluation Guidelines” as well as the applicable sections of the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff.
Appendix 3
M.J. Neeley School of Business
Faculty Evaluation Committee Appeal Procedures:
Annual Tenure Track Faculty Evaluation Process

1. Any faculty member who wishes to appeal their annual tenure track Faculty Committee evaluation shall:
   a) First meet with their department chair to determine if he or she can adequately explain the evaluation before proceeding to the next step;
   b) Submit a written appeal to the Dean within 15 working days of receiving their annual evaluation letter from their respective Department Chair or Dean.

2. Within 5 working days of receiving the written appeal from the faculty member, the Dean will designate a chair of the Appeal Committee and notify the Appeal Committee of the written appeal. The Dean will appoint one member from among the three at-large, elected members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee to chair an Appeal Committee. The member selected to chair the appeal should not be from the department of the Appellant. The Appeal Committee will be composed of the three at-large, elected members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee plus one department chair appointed by the Dean. The appointed department chair will represent a department outside of the Appellant’s department. The Dean will notify the Appeal Committee in writing of the faculty appeal and share the written appeal with all Appeal Committee members. Correspondence and discussions related to the appeal process are to be treated in a confidential fashion and should not be discussed with others that are not on the committee.

3. Within 10 working days of receiving written notification from the Dean, the Chair of the Appeal Committee shall schedule a hearing with the faculty member.

4. The appeal hearing shall be conducted within 10 working days of the receipt of written notification from the Dean. The Appellant may submit additional documentation to the Appeal Committee Chair or the Chair may request additional documentation from the Appellant. The format of the hearing is informal. The faculty member may invite a representative to the hearing, but that person shall serve in an advisory capacity only and not as a spokesperson for the faculty member. If the faculty member desires, s/he may request other faculty members or administrative staff to attend the hearing and provide information to the Appeal Committee. The 10-day calendar deadline recommended at this step, upon mutual agreement of the Appeal Committee Chair and Appellant, may be modified if circumstances warrant.

5. Within 5 days of conducting the Appeal Committee hearing, the Chair of the Appeal Committee shall submit a written recommendation to the Dean containing the recommendations of the Appeal Committee.

6. Within 10 working days of receipt of the Appeal Committee recommendations, the Dean shall issue a final ruling in writing on the appeal. The final ruling will be shared
in writing with the appellant (faculty member) and respective Department Chair. The Dean’s office will also retain one copy of the appeal in the faculty member’s personnel file.

7. Any faculty member who wishes to appeal the Dean’s final decision may do so by filing a grievance through the TCU Faculty Grievance Policy within five working days of receiving the Dean’s final decision (See pages 32-37 of the 2001-2002 Handbook of Faculty & Staff.).

DEFINITIONS

Appeal Committee: This committee consists of the three at-large, elected faculty members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and one appointed member from among the Neeley School Department Chairs.

Appellant: The faculty member seeking appeal of the Faculty Evaluation Committee rating as communicated by their respective department chair in their annual evaluation letter.

Chair of the Appeal Committee: Appointed by the Dean from one of the three at-large, elected faculty members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Chair cannot be from the Appellant’s department.

Faculty Evaluation Committee: This committee consists of the three at-large, elected faculty members, department chairs, and the Dean. Please note the Associate Deans are not included. Associate Deans, however, can be invited to provide comments on teaching performance. They are not regular members of the committee but may serve as a resource.

Notification: Where the appeal policy calls for a written notification, this may be accomplished by hard copy, e-mail, e-mail attachment, fax, or any other electronic means that conveys the communication in written form.

Tenure Track Faculty: Tenured faculty and untenured faculty who are on appointments that allow them to apply for tenure at some point in the future.

Working Days: Monday through Friday of the week, excluding recognized University holidays.

Policy Dated: May 25, 2002