



*College of Education & P-16 Integration
Department of Counseling*

Professional (Non-Tenure) Track Annual Review Guidelines

In accordance with the Board of Regents [Rule 30501](#) and [31102](#), the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV) requires faculty to undergo annual evaluations that follow the schedule in Pathways. These annual evaluations result in the following overall evaluation ratings: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.

Department/School annual review guidelines must:

1. Indicate clearly how (a) faculty workload percentages and agreements link with (b) the work/accomplishments completed during the academic year under review to produce (c) an overall evaluation rating.
2. Require faculty to provide a CV
3. Require faculty to provide a summary statement of professional accomplishments (including teaching, research, service, university-related patient care, and/or administration)
4. Require the disclosure of faculty teaching evaluations
5. Require faculty to provide the requisite peer observation of teaching (if necessary)
6. Allow (not require) faculty to provide a statement of professional goals
7. Allow (not require) faculty to provide a professional development plan
8. Allow (not require) faculty to provide any other additional materials they deem appropriate

UTRGV recommends that guidelines reward work that departments/schools value and work that is necessary to complete during the academic year. Departments/Schools may choose to write guidelines that are quantitative (e.g., point based), only require a summary narrative of professional accomplishments, and that require only minimum levels of documentation to help ensure that annual review can be conducted efficiently.



Minimum Criteria in Teaching

The following minimum criteria helps guide faculty to understanding their progress toward attaining the principles and standards in Teaching delineated above. The minimum criteria pertain to their development of pedagogy, development of teaching skills, use of peer feedback on teaching, alignment of curricular practices to student needs, engagement with student learning outside the classroom, and their participation in the development of curricula.

Criteria below reflect a 4-4 teaching workload. Criteria will be adjusted proportionally for a faculty member's teaching workload. Teaching narrative for annual review is limited to 500 words. The annual review dossier will be scored and evaluated with a point system/rubric.

Exceeds Expectations: Faculty member provides evidence of criteria 1-6 described below with strong evidence of the impact of teaching practices on student learning. Exceeds Expectations "reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty, rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit." To exceed expectations in teaching, faculty must demonstrate leadership in teaching and learning as well as evidence of teaching practices on student learning.

1. **Pedagogy statement** – Professional track faculty should articulate a philosophy of teaching that communicates their approach to teaching and describes their primary goals as a teacher, advisor, and mentor. Professional track faculty should illustrate their pedagogy statement with concrete examples from their teaching practices.
2. **Continued development of teaching skills** – The faculty member documents self-improvement efforts (minimum 6 hours) with rationale for choice of professional development and alignment of participation with continuous improvement in teaching and/or innovation in preparation of course materials. Faculty must explain the quality of the activity or other self-improvement methods to improve teaching, reflect on what they learned, how they used what they learned to improve their teaching practices, and describe impact of changes on student learning.
3. **Leadership in teaching and learning:** Faculty leads/co-leads 3 hours of professional development on teaching and learning.
4. **Use of peer and student feedback on teaching:** Faculty must obtain at least one peer observation each year (see [UTRGV guidelines](#)). Peer observations of teaching should provide constructive feedback oriented to supporting faculty members' continuous growth in teaching. Faculty must reflect on what they learned in this process, how they used their peers' feedback to improve their pedagogical practices, and the impact on student learning. Additionally, faculty need to reflect and use student feedback to improve their teaching practices. Faculty must reflect on student feedback through a growth mindset approach by specifying teaching and learning practices that have been revised and the overall impact of revised teaching practices on student learning.
5. **Participation in development and alignment of curricula to student needs:** Faculty analyze, reflect, and/or describe how his/her efforts improve curriculum impact on student learning supported by data on key performance indicators and student performance trends over time;
6. **Engagement with students:** Faculty provide evidence of engagement with students outside of classroom and identifies the impact of these endeavors on student learning. This engagement may take many different forms and include but is not limited to supporting students' participation in service learning and/or community engagement activities, supervising clinical or field experiences, and/or mentoring students in career exploration and development

Meets Expectations: Faculty meet a minimum of 4 criteria described above excluding #3 and absent evidence of teaching practices on student learning.

Does Not Meet Expectations: Faculty member meets less than 4 criteria above.

Unsatisfactory: Faculty member does not meet any criteria above.



Minimum Criteria in Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works

The following minimum criteria helps guide faculty to understanding their progress toward attaining the principles and standards in Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works delineated above. The minimum criteria pertain to the existence of a national reputation, their consistent record of accomplishment with increasing significance and impact, the sustainability and trajectory of their research/creative agenda, their scholarly independence, and the quality and impact of their work.

Criteria below reflect a minimal research/scholarship/creative works workload. *****These criteria are only applicable for professional track faculty members who have research expectations in their workload.*** Criteria will be adjusted proportionally for a faculty member's research/scholarship/creative works workload. Research narrative for annual review is limited to 500 words.

Exceeds Expectations: Faculty will demonstrate evidence of criteria 1-5 below. Exceeds Expectations "reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty, rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit." To exceed expectations, faculty members must demonstrate quality, impact, and significance, as well as scholarly independence.

1. Research Agenda: Faculty will have at least one research/scholarly strand and briefly explain how their peer-reviewed publications and external research grants connect to this agenda;

2. Consistent Record of Achievement: Faculty produce approximately 1 peer-reviewed research material (e.g., journal articles, external grants, book chapters, or books) every year. Faculty will have an average of one supplemental activity per year (e.g., presentations, internal grants, community engaged scholarship without a clear product, or an additional peer-reviewed publication or external grant).

3. Scholarly Independence: Faculty must establish their independence as a scholar. Research conducted as teams is valuable, but faculty must demonstrate their discrete contributions to that work and how the completed work has greater impact than if authored individually. Faculty will be first or second author on 1 peer-reviewed product and 1 supplemental activity;

4. Quality, Impact, and Significance: The quality and impact of a faculty member's scholarship shall not rely on any one metric and should be balanced with qualitative evidence and professional judgment. To help ensure responsible use, faculty must not solely rely on quantifiable metrics as substitutes for narrative explanations of the steps taken to produce quality and significant work. Faculty document the quality of their scholarly work and explain how its significance leads to disciplinary, community and societal impact;

5. Sustainability of Agenda and Trajectory: Faculty demonstrate that their research productivity is sustainable by documenting their ability to secure external grant funding for their research and/or by showing the systematic accumulation of a body of work that builds from their earlier research.

Meets Expectations: Faculty demonstrate evidence of criteria 1-5 above with the following differentiation:

Criterion 2: Faculty produce 1 quality peer-reviewed product every other year.

Criterion 3: Faculty are not lead or second author on 1 peer-reviewed product.

Does Not Meet Expectations: Faculty member does not meet criteria 2 and 3 above. Three annual reviews of Does Not Meet Expectations will result in a reduced research workload.

Unsatisfactory: Faculty does not meet criteria 1-5 above.

Minimum Criteria in Service and Shared Governance

The following minimum criteria helps guide faculty to understanding their progress toward attaining the principles and standards in Service and Shared Governance delineated above. The minimum criteria pertain to their participation and leadership in service to student success, to university operations and shared governance, and to their profession and community.

Criteria below assumes a service workload of an estimated 240 hours of service. Criteria will be adjusted proportionately to a faculty member's service workload. Faculty will provide service in three areas: 1) student success; 2) department, college, and university operations as well as shared governance; and 3) the profession and the community. Faculty must provide approximately 50% of service effort to UTRGV. Documentation of effort must include a description of the quality, impact, and significance of the activity, outputs and outcomes, level of commitment (high, medium, or low), and the estimated amount of time for each activity (e.g., 20 hours – search committee). Service narrative for annual review is limited to 500 words.

Exceeds Expectations: Exceeds Expectations “reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty, rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.” To exceed expectations, faculty members must have examples of leadership in service.

1. Department, College and University Operations: Faculty contribute to the department, college, and university by serving as members of committees and leading significant committees or activities. The development, implementation, evaluation, and ongoing refinement of departmental programs and college processes is highly valued. Preference is given to participation at the department level.

2. Student Success: Faculty contribute as members and leaders in student organizations, international experience, and recruitment events for the department, college, and/or university;

3. Service to the Profession and Community: Faculty provide leadership to the community and profession. Documentation must include the quality, impact, and significance of each activity as well as the estimated time of each activity. Faculty strive to maintain their core faculty status through (1) sustained memberships in professional organizations; (2) relevant counseling credentials; and (3) sustained professional engagement through professional development and renewal activities in counseling, professional service, and advocacy in counseling (CACREP, 2024).

Meets Expectations

1. Department, College, and University Operations: Faculty contribute to the department, college, and university by serving on committees in a membership role.

2. Student Success: Faculty contribute as members in student organizations, international experience, and recruitment events for the department, college, and/or university;

3. Service to the Profession and Community: Faculty provide services to the community and profession.

Does Not Meet Expectations: Faculty only provide service in area 1) student success OR area 2) department, college, and university operations as well as shared governance AND area 3) the profession and community. Additionally, documentation of the activities' quality, impact, and significance of the activity, outputs and outcomes, level of commitment, and the estimated amount of time for each activity (e.g., 20 hours – search committee) may be missing.

Unsatisfactory: Faculty do not provide service in areas 1) student success and 2) department, college, and university operations or shared governance.