

Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures

12.99.99.A0.02 | Center Director Performance Review

Revised: December 9, 2019

Next Scheduled Review: December 9, 2024



[Click Here to View Revision History](#)

PROCEDURE SUMMARY

A Texas A&M AgriLife Research (AgriLife Research) Center Director's performance review will be based on the unit's performance and his/her performance. In this context, it is believed that good performance can be sustained and improved if it is jointly reviewed and appraised.

This procedure establishes the AgriLife Research Center Director evaluation process and provides guidelines for conducting Center Director performance reviews.

PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1.0 CENTER DIRECTOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCEDURES

1.1 The Center Director performance review process is designed to provide information to the Director or designee regarding the job performance of Center Directors. The evaluation time periods are not to be construed as contract terms, implying guaranteed periods of employment.

1.2 The Center Director performance review process involves an annual evaluation, a probationary evaluation for newly appointed Center Directors after two years, and a comprehensive evaluation every four years.

1.3 Annual Evaluation

Any materials requested by the Director or designee for the annual evaluation should be provided in advance and in accordance with specific directions that may be communicated before the evaluation conference.

The Director or designee will use the evaluation guidelines in paragraph 2.2 and additional relevant information in evaluating the Center Director.

1.4 Probationary Evaluation for Newly Appointed Center Directors

The probationary evaluation will be broader than the annual evaluation and will utilize solicited input from faculty, staff, and additional relevant information. The probationary evaluation conference will be held at the completion of two years in the position.

1.5 Four-Year Evaluation

A comprehensive evaluation of the Center Director's performance will be held at least once every four years. The evaluation will include solicited opinions and related facts from faculty, staff, and peers concerning the unit's performance, and the Center Director's performance. The criteria are relevant for all administrative positions; however, they are not necessarily the only criteria on which a Center Director will be evaluated since there may be specific objectives or criteria for an individual position that are unique to that position or individual.

Faculty members and staff under the Center Director's supervision will be asked to present to the Director or designee, in confidence, their opinions and related facts on the Center Director's

performance and the reasons for them. AgriLife form AG-451, *Center Director Review Questionnaire*, will be used for the solicitation of this information and collected using an online survey tool.

The Director or designee may solicit performance feedback from individuals outside AgriLife Research who are in a position to evaluate the Center Director and/or the unit's achievements. This feedback may also be included as part of the comprehensive evaluation.

1.6 Evaluation Conference

The Director or designee will meet with the Center Director and discuss the performance of the unit and the Center Director as part of each annual, probationary, and four-year evaluation.

The conference will primarily focus on the documentation provided by the Center Director and relevant information obtained by, or available to, the Director or designee. Once the evaluation conference has been completed, the Director or designee will document the outcome of the evaluation and provide a copy to the Center Director. Documentation will be uploaded and stored in Workday by May 31st.

The written evaluation will document performance that significantly exceeds, exceeds, or meets expectations, as well as identifying areas where performance only partially meets expectations or does not meet expectations. The written evaluation will include a clear and concise summary statement of the overall evaluation.

2.0 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA

2.1 The criteria for the evaluation may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- research management
- teamwork/communication/collaboration/leadership
- administration
- summary and work plan for subsequent fiscal years

2.2 The following guidelines are provided as a reference for the Center Director's self-evaluation, and for the Director or designee in conducting the performance evaluation. The items listed under each of the evaluation criteria are designed to stimulate thought and are not all inclusive or exclusive. It is not to be used as a checklist.

- Research Management
 - Creativity and completeness of unit work plans
 - Research accomplishments of staff and self, such as:
 - Scientific excellence
 - Clientele use and acceptance
 - Patents
 - New varieties, plant introduction releases, software, etc.
 - Refereed publications
 - Service on state, national and/or international committees
 - Statewide integration and coordination of research (multidisciplinary initiatives, targeting of research program to regional needs, etc.).
 - Adequacy of unit strategic planning process, such as:

- Assessment of relationships between research needs, research programs, and research capabilities
 - Development of research priorities
 - Research program redirection
 - Management of change
- Research Direction and Focus, such as:
 - Accomplishment of strategic plan
 - Focus on emerging problems in the region served
 - Cohesion of research program
 - Program consistency with overall AgriLife Research and other goals
- Teamwork/Communication/Collaboration/Leadership
 - Establish/maintain effective relationships: internal organizational relationships; Center constituency; and clientele
 - Effectively partner with key leaders/organizations/System members
 - Communication and coordination of research priorities, goals, and significant unit initiatives with faculty, staff, clientele, regional leaders, public officials, and others
 - Responsiveness and follow-up on initiatives and/or problems
 - Coordination with disciplinary unit heads and others
 - Presents the organization to others in the best terms possible
- Administration
 - Human Resource Management
 - Growth in excellence of faculty and staff; i.e. faculty and staff recruitment, development, evaluation, and performance enhancement
 - Staffing—staff(s) ability to adequately perform research and provide the necessary administrative support
 - Commitment to diversity
 - Communication with staff: goals, policies, initiatives, etc.
 - Recognition programs to reward superior performance
 - Fiscal/Physical Resource Management
 - Resource allocation initiatives and priorities
 - Plans/programs for changing needs and opportunities
 - Contracts and Grants acquisitions
 - Equipment/facilities: planning, maintenance, repair and appearance
 - Management of allocated resources and compliance with fiscal policies
 - Results of audits by state, system and other audit teams, and appropriate responses
 - Responses to regulatory issues
 - Participation in task group(s), Center Director meetings, and other activities to serve the broader organization

- Summary and Work Plan for Subsequent Fiscal Years
 - Key accomplishments for this performance evaluation period (bullet format to encompass the annual, biennial, or four-year evaluation period)
 - Goals for next performance period and what is needed from administration to meet those goals

3.0 UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

3.1 Newly Appointed Center Director (Two-Year Probationary Evaluation)

- A. If the Center Director's performance is judged to be unsatisfactory during this period—as determined by the Director—the Center Director will be given up to one year to relocate, unless the termination results from falsification of information on which the employment decision was based, or other causes for which an individual would normally be terminated without notice. The Director has the discretion—but no obligation—to reassign an individual to other duties during the relocation period.
- B. If a newly appointed Center Director has an unsatisfactory performance review, but has retained a research project or has expertise in an area that is relevant to the AgriLife Research mission, the Director, at his or her discretion, may reassign the individual to a research position unless the cause for the unsatisfactory performance is an area that would be considered cause for termination regardless of one's position. However, AgriLife Research is under no obligation or requirement to reassign an administrator to another position.
- C. In those instances where an individual has tenure in an academic department, the applicable Texas A&M University policy should be followed by the individual who wishes to maintain tenure.

3.2 Center Directors (Four-Year/Intermediate Evaluation)

- A. In the event it becomes necessary to remove a Center Director because of unsatisfactory performance and the Center Director has retained a research project or has expertise in an area that is relevant to the AgriLife Research mission, the Director will have the discretion—but not an obligation—to reassign the individual to an appropriate position. If the Center Director has not retained research expertise, the Director has the discretion—but not an obligation—to reassign the individual for up to one year to permit him or her to secure another position. This practice will be followed unless the individual is terminated for a cause where notice is not ordinarily given. However, AgriLife Research is under no obligation or requirement to reassign an administrator to another position.
- B. In those instances where an individual has tenure in an academic department, the applicable Texas A&M University policy should be followed by the individual who wishes to maintain tenure.

RELATED STATUTES, POLICIES, OR REQUIREMENTS

AgriLife Form AG-451, [Center Director Review Questionnaire](#)

CONTACT OFFICE

Questions on this procedure should be referred to AgriLife Human Resources at 979-845-2423.

REVISION HISTORY

Approved: July 26, 2002
Revised: April 24, 2009
May 26, 2012
Reviewed: September 10, 2014
Revised: December 9, 2019

Next Scheduled Review: December 9, 2024