



*College of Education & P-16 Integration  
Department of Teaching & Learning*

**Tenured & 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.

**Comprehensive Periodic Evaluations of Tenured Faculty**

In accordance with UT System's Board of Regents' Rule 31102, UTRGV requires tenured faculty to undergo Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (CPE) no less often than every six years. For the period under review, departments/schools must require that tenured faculty provide the same information for CPE as they do for annual review in addition to furnishing the evaluations from the previous years that are under review. Department/school guidelines should seek as much detail and documentation as needed to apply the standards of judgment, but not so much as to impose additional burdens.

CPE shall result in the following overall evaluation ratings: Exceed Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory. Department/School guidelines must indicate clearly how previous annual evaluation ratings from the years under review are combined to issue an overall rating for CPE. Department/School guidelines must identify if there are any cumulative benchmarks in the categories of evaluation that tenured faculty must meet to demonstrate the successful, high-quality record of sustained productivity and professionalism that is required of tenured faculty at UTRGV.



### **Minimum Criteria in Teaching – Annual Review**

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.

Faculty will complete the following actions:

- Describe their teaching workload, course modalities (face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, blended....), and course designations (service learning, structured field, accelerated graduate course, etc.).
- Update their CV.
- Ensure all student course evaluations and student comments are uploaded within FPT. Faculty should reflect on student course evaluations and discuss specific actions, where needed, for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns.
- Submit peer observations of teaching as necessary.

Faculty should also summarize other professional accomplishments in teaching, including **but not limited to** the following examples:

- Self-improvement, study, or professional development to advance teaching.
- Teaching awards
- Blueprinting courses
- Innovation in instructional approaches and/or use of technology
- Supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.
- Teaching overloads
- Mentoring
- Program and/or course development or revision
- Broader impacts on the field, such as through publishing textbooks or other instructional resources (scholarship specifically related to teaching and learning may also be mentioned to further develop a case for quality in teaching)

Faculty may also (but are not required to unless otherwise indicated) provide a statement of professional goals, a professional development plan, as well as any other additional materials they deem appropriate.

Ratings: Faculty teaching will be evaluated holistically. Ratings will not be based mainly on student course evaluations, but rather on a range of evidence demonstrating teaching effectiveness and impact.

*To meet expectations, faculty:*

- Document professional accomplishments that contribute to maintaining the quality of academic programs.
- Reflect meaningfully on student course evaluations in relation to student learning.
- Maintain an average overall student course evaluation score of at least 4.0.

*To exceed expectations, faculty:*

- Document significant accomplishments that demonstrably enhance program quality or teaching effectiveness.
- Attach a brief but clear teaching philosophy through a well-developed pedagogy statement.
- Reflect on both student course evaluations and peer feedback, focusing on student learning, instructional growth, and overall impact.
- Maintain an average overall student course evaluation score of at least 4.5.

*To not meet expectations, faculty:*

- Provide no evidence of engagement in professional activities that support or enhance teaching.
- Fail to reflect on student course evaluations in relation to student learning.
- Have an average overall student course evaluation score below 4.0.

*To receive a rating of unsatisfactory, faculty:*

- Provide no evidence of professional accomplishments related to teaching.
- Fail to reflect on student course evaluations in relation to student learning
- Have an average overall student course evaluation score below 3.5.



### **Minimum Criteria in Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works – Annual Review**

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.

#### **Research workload:**

*Meet expectations:* Provide evidence of being able to produce the required minimum number of quality Category 1 publications for the next decision point (promotion or CPE), i.e. publications, IRB proposals, book contracts, etc. Publications should articulate scholarly independence and leadership in author order. See CEP workload documents for approximate benchmark of 2 quality publications per year.

*Exceed expectations:* Faculty clearly exceed the yearly average number of Category 1 and 2 publications required for the next decision point (tenure, promotion, or CPE). For Category 1 publications, faculty may meet this standard through a combination of publications, significant external grants, or research awards. Publications should articulate scholarly independence and leadership in author order, including one publication as lead or sole author.

*Does not meet expectations:* Produce evidence of scholarly activity, but not enough to suggest meeting minimum production at the end of the review period.

*Unsatisfactory:* Provide no evidence of scholarly productivity.

#### **Balanced workload (only applies to tenured faculty):**

*Meet expectations:* Provide evidence of being able to produce the required minimum number of Category 1 publications for the next decision point (promotion or CPE). See CEP workload documents for approximate benchmark of 1 quality publications per year. While research production may not “hit” in the form of deliverables each year, faculty can still show evidence of productivity towards deliverables, including but not limited to items such as publications, IRB proposals, book contracts, qualitative accounts of research projects, etc. Publications should articulate scholarly independence and prominence in author order.

*Exceed expectations:* Faculty clearly exceed the yearly average number of Category 1 and 2 publications required for the next decision point (promotion or CPE). For Category 1 publications, faculty may meet this standard through a combination of publications, significant external grants, or research awards. Publications should articulate scholarly independence and leadership in author order.

*Does not meet expectations:* Produce evidence of scholarly activity, but not enough to suggest meeting minimum production at the end of the review period.

*Unsatisfactory:* Provide no evidence of scholarly productivity.

#### **Teaching workload (only applies to tenured or professional track faculty with a research component)**

*Meet expectations:* Provide evidence of being able to produce the required minimum number of Category 1 publications for the next decision point (promotion or CPE). While research production may not “hit” in the form of deliverables each year, faculty can still show evidence of productivity towards deliverables, including but not limited to items such as publications, IRB proposals, book contracts, qualitative accounts of research projects, etc.

*Exceed expectations:* Faculty clearly exceed the yearly average number of Category 1 and 2 publications required for the next decision point (promotion or CPE). For Category 1 publications, faculty may meet this standard through a combination of publications, significant external grants, or research awards.

*Does not meet expectations:* Produce evidence of scholarly activity, but not enough to suggest meeting minimum production at the end of the review period.

*Unsatisfactory:* Provide no evidence of scholarly productivity.

---

**\*Note:** *Category 1* consists of peer-reviewed journal articles, books (both authored and edited), and book chapters. *Category 2* consists of scholarship such as conference presentations and proceedings; practitioner journal publications; or grant writing activity (internal grants, nonfunded grant applications, etc.). See tenure, promotion, or CPE standards for more detailed explanations of *Category 1* and *Category 2* scholarly products. Further, faculty may count for annual evaluation manuscripts in different stages of publication (accepted, in press, forthcoming, and published). However, for accepted/in press/published publications, faculty may not count for evaluation the same manuscript in multiple academic years. For example, if faculty count an accepted manuscript for one academic year, they may not count again in a subsequent academic year that same manuscript for annual evaluation when it later becomes published.



### **Minimum Criteria in Service and Shared Governance – Annual Review**

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.

Faculty are expected to perform service across 5 different possible areas: department, college, university, professional, and community. As faculty advance in their careers, they are expected to perform service in increasing numbers of areas, to assume leadership roles in their service, and to develop a theme or purpose for their service. Faculty are not expected to perform service randomly or haphazardly, but instead must develop a coherent service trajectory through which they might gain useful experience and contribute expertise through their service. Faculty narratives should emphasize quality of service rather than a simple tallying of activities. Effort in service matters, but expertise, significance, and leadership provide more sustained benefit.

#### *To meet expectations in service, faculty:*

- Provide evidence of meaningful service in at least two distinct areas (e.g., department, college, university, professional, or community service).
- Clearly describe their contributions, including specific roles and the impact of their involvement.
- Demonstrate a coherent theme or purpose across their service activities.

#### *To exceed expectations in service, faculty:*

- Provide evidence of impactful service in at least two areas.
- Show evidence of leadership roles in service activities.
- Demonstrate a clear theme or purposeful alignment within their service work.
- Exhibit emerging leadership in a professional field, with a demonstrated trajectory toward national-level engagement.
- Describe the significance and impact of their contributions and roles in service.
- Document service that has improved programs or enhanced departmental, college, or university operations.

#### *To not meet expectations in service, faculty:*

- Provide only minimal or superficial evidence of service.
- Fail to demonstrate a clear theme or purpose in their service activities.

#### *To receive a rating of unsatisfactory in service, faculty:*

- Provide no evidence of service.



### **Minimum Criteria in Teaching – Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation**

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.

Faculty will complete the following actions:

- Describe their teaching workload, course modalities (i.e. face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, blended....), and course designations (service learning, structured field, accelerated graduate course, etc.).
- Update their CV.
- Ensure all student course evaluations and student comments are uploaded within FPT. Faculty should reflect on student course evaluations and discuss specific actions, where needed, for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns.
- Submit two peer observations of teaching.

Faculty should also summarize other professional accomplishments in teaching, including but not limited to the following examples:

- Self-improvement, study, or professional development to advance teaching.
- Teaching awards
- Blueprinting courses
- Innovation in instructional approaches and/or use of technology
- Supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.
- Teaching overloads
- Mentoring
- Program and/or course development or revision
- Broader impacts on the field, such as through publishing textbooks or other instructional resources (scholarship specifically related to teaching and learning may also be mentioned to further develop a case for quality in teaching)

Faculty may also (but are not required to) provide a statement of professional goals, a professional development plan, as well as any other additional materials they deem appropriate.

Ratings: The evaluation of faculty teaching is intended to be holistic. Ratings should not be based solely on student course evaluations, but rather on a range of evidence demonstrating teaching effectiveness and impact.

*To meet expectations in teaching, faculty:*

- Document professional accomplishments that contribute to maintaining the quality of academic programs.
- Reflect meaningfully on student course evaluations in relation to student learning.
- Maintain an average overall student course evaluation score of at least 4.0.

*To exceed expectations in teaching, faculty:*

- Consistently exceed expectations over the review period.
- Document significant accomplishments that demonstrably enhance program quality or teaching effectiveness.
- Articulate a clear teaching philosophy through a well-developed pedagogy statement.
- Reflect on both student course evaluations and peer feedback, focusing on student learning, instructional growth, and overall impact.
- Maintain an average overall student course evaluation score of at least 4.5.

*To not meet expectations in teaching, faculty:*

- Provide no evidence of engagement in professional activities that support or enhance teaching.
- Fail to reflect on student course evaluations in relation to student learning.
- Have an average overall student course evaluation score below 4.0.

*To receive a rating of unsatisfactory in teaching, faculty:*

- Provide no evidence of professional accomplishments related to teaching.
- Fail to reflect on student course evaluations in relation to student learning.
- Have an average overall student course evaluation score below 3.5.



### **Minimum Criteria in Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works – Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation**

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.

#### **Productivity**

Faculty will produce scholarship in two broad categories during the 5-year period preceding applying for comprehensive periodic evaluation. This productivity is differentiated according to faculty workload.

*Category 1* consists of peer-reviewed journal articles, books (both authored and edited), and book chapters.

If published on prestigious and established academic presses, the following provide examples of how authored and edited books are counted. Single-authored books count for three Category 1 publications. Lead or second editor on edited books will count for two Category 1 publications, and third editor position will count for one Category 1 publication.

*Category 2* consists of “other” scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conference presentations; peer-reviewed conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journal publications; regional, state, and local conference presentations; or grant writing activity (internal grants, nonfunded grant applications, etc.).

When applying for CPE, to meet expectations, faculty are expected to have published the corresponding minimum number of publications per workload:

Research workload: 7-8 Category 1 publications plus 7-8 Category 2 products

Balanced workload: 4-5 Category 1 publications plus 4-5 Category 2 products

Teaching workload: 1-2 Category 1 publications plus 1-2 Category 2 products

#### **Quality**

Faculty may also show quality, impact, and significance in several ways, such as through research awards, citations of their work, major funded external research grants, practical effects in their field, significance of publication forums, publishing with students, and other such indicators.

#### **Leadership**

Faculty demonstrate leadership in research through activities **such as, but not limited to**, lead and single authored publications, coherent and sustained lines of inquiry in their field, publishing with students, collaborating with colleagues in research, and/or leading scholarly efforts in their field.

#### **Grant Activity**

Evidence of grant activity is valued, including participation in internal and external grants, integration into grant writing teams in the department or college, or solicitation of grants as PI or Co-PI.

#### **Culture of Research**

Faculty contribute to a culture of research by collaborating with students on research projects, guiding research with students, serving on dissertation committees, or chairing dissertations.

#### **Ratings:**

- To meet expectations in research, faculty will maintain the standards at their particular workload.
- To exceed expectations in research, faculty must make the case that they have significantly surpassed the standards for meeting expectations, and they must consistently exceed expectations for the period under review.
- To not meet expectations in research, faculty show some research productivity, but not enough to meet the minimum standards.
- To warrant a rating of unsatisfactory in research, faculty show no research productivity.



**Minimum Criteria in Service and Shared Governance – Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation**

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.

The Teaching & Learning Department divides service into five different areas: (1) department, (2) college, (3) university, (4) professional field, and (5) community. For comprehensive periodic evaluation, tenured faculty are expected to provide, in their narratives, *clear sustained evidence* of service in at least *three of the five areas*, one of which must include service to the department. This does not mean that tenured faculty are required to provide evidence of service in all three areas every year. Instead, these multiple areas of service should be developed across and throughout the review period. Tenured faculty are expected to provide evidence of a theme or purpose to their service (much like faculty develop a theme or thread to their research), as well as provide evidence of the impact and level of engagement in their service. Further, tenured faculty must present *sustained evidence of leadership* in service activities.

*To meet expectations in service, faculty:*

- Provide evidence of meaningful service in at least three distinct areas (e.g., department, college, university, professional, or community service).
- Clearly describe their contributions, including specific roles and the impact of their involvement.
- Demonstrate a coherent theme or purpose across their service activities.

*To exceed expectations in service, faculty:*

- Consistently exceed expectations over the review period.
- Provide evidence of impactful service in at least three distinct areas (e.g., department, college, university, professional, or community service).
- Show evidence of leadership roles in service activities.
- Demonstrate a clear theme or purposeful alignment within their service work.
- Exhibit emerging leadership in a professional field, with a demonstrated trajectory toward national-level engagement.
- Describe the significance and impact of their contributions and roles in service.
- Document service that has improved programs or enhanced departmental, college, or university operations.

*To not meet expectations in service, faculty:*

- Provide only minimal or superficial evidence of service within three areas.
- Fail to demonstrate evidence of leadership in service.
- Fail to demonstrate a clear theme or purpose in their service activities.

*To receive a rating of unsatisfactory in service, faculty:*

- Provide no evidence of service.