1. PURPOSE, GUIDELINES AND POLICIES

The Department of Chemistry in accordance with The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV) policies and UT System Regent’s Rules supports a system of annual evaluation for all full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty and lecturers for the purpose of improvement of faculty performance, promotion and merit considerations. All Department of Chemistry lecturers are evaluated annually, with a comprehensive review occurring every three years for 3-year Lecturers following the last successful comprehensive review. Under special circumstances, such as approved leave, the annual review may be delayed with the approval of the EVPAA.

2. Responsibilities of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers

The elected Department of Chemistry Annual Review Committee for Lecturers will evaluate all Lecturers in the department and will review department level appeals by Lecturers. Each committee member will evaluate all Lecturers. The committee will then discuss cases where there is substantial deviation in the individual evaluations, and at the end of the discussions each committee member will decide independently whether or not to revise his or her evaluation. The individual committee member evaluations are combined into a committee decision on the overall rating. The evaluation narratives should be approved by the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.

2.1 Committee structure and selection

The Department of Chemistry will elect its Annual Review Committee for Lecturers in accordance with the following conditions:

1. The Department Chair is excluded from membership on the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.

2. Only full-time Department of Chemistry tenured and tenure-track faculty and Lecturers are eligible to vote during the election of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.

3. The Annual Review Committee for Lecturers will be composed of six elected members. All tenured and tenure-track faculty and 3-year Lecturers with at least three academic years of full-time employment in the department at the time of the election are eligible for membership on the committee. At least one committee member must be a tenured faculty member, at least one other committee member must be a tenure-track faculty member, and at least two additional committee members must be 3-year Lecturers, at the time of the election. Each year three new members will be elected to serve throughout two consecutive academic years. At the end of a
two-year term, the committee member will be eligible for reelection after one year. In the event of any vacancy, the tenured and tenure-track faculty will vote to fill the vacated position.

4. The Department Chair shall call a meeting of all full-time faculty (including all tenured, tenure-track, three-year lecturers and one-year lecturers) to elect the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers during the Spring semester. Nominations may be submitted to the Department Chair in writing before the meeting or from the floor. Nominations must have the approval of the nominee. The voting method will be decided by the attending faculty during the meeting. Eligible voters that are not able to attend the meeting will be given two business days during which they can also cast their vote. Voting will be done by secret ballot. If there are any tied votes, they will be resolved by a runoff election. If the runoff election does not resolve the tie, then it will be resolved by the Department Chair. The votes for the membership of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers are to be counted and the results are to be reported to the Department.

5. After the membership of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers has been constituted, the Committee members will elect a tenured faculty member of the Committee to chair the Committee for a 1-year term.

6. On the first year that this Department of Chemistry at UTRGV document goes in effect, Committee Members will be elected as follows: From the 6 elected faculty, the 3 faculty with the most votes will serve a 2-year term and the other 3 faculty will serve for a 1-year term. Any ties will be resolved by a runoff election. If the runoff election does not resolve the tie, then it will be resolved by the Department Chair.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Lecturers have no research expectations. Three-year lecturers have 20% service expectations when they are given an 80% teaching assignment (typically for 3-year Lecturers: 24 SCHs during 9-month academic year). They have 10% service expectations when they are given a 90% teaching assignment (typically for 3-year Lecturers: 27 SCHs during 9-month academic year). They have no service expectations when they are given a 100% teaching assignment (typically for 1-year Lecturers and 3-year Lecturers: 30 SCHs during 9-month academic year).

3.1. Teaching

Metrics for teaching effectiveness should include both the quantitative and qualitative assessments of contributions to student, department, college, and university success, such as student evaluations of teaching, student learning outcome assessment, peer-review of teaching, teaching awards and honors, curriculum and course development (including online, hybrid, and distance education classes), activities that promote student learning, and advising and mentoring activities, and grant funding for student/teacher training.

A meets expectations in teaching requires that all the following are met by the faculty member annually:
• Instructed assigned workload consistent with percent appointment each academic year unless the faculty member obtains leave/approval from the Department Chair and or the Dean,
• Attended assigned courses on time, arranged for a replacement or notified the class if unable to meet on a scheduled class meeting, notified the Department Chair of a missed class meeting, or did not arbitrarily cancel classes without proper notification,
• Regularly utilized allotted course period; i.e. did not regularly late for classes for more than 5 minutes and dismiss classes more than 10 minutes early,
• Provided a clear, concise course syllabus no later than the beginning of the first class,
• Used tests or other quantitative evaluation procedures to assess student learning outcome,
• Assigned grades based solely on performance of students on evaluations,
• Demonstrated comprehensive and current knowledge of course content,
• Maintained a professional attitude and appearance in the classroom,
• Maintained regular office hours and encouraged students to use this time to seek help and to resolve questions or concerns,
• Received satisfactory student evaluations (i.e. a minimum of 80% average Good to Excellent categories in overall rating unless there are extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, a faculty member implementing a new pedagogical approach for the first time).
• Received satisfactory peer review of teaching on the most recent evaluation and evidence of faculty member’s reflection on the peer review recommendation(s),
• Demonstrated evidence of genuine effort to engage students in learning in and outside the classroom, and,
• Actively participate in department-wide student learning outcome assessment for each class taught.

To exceed expectations in teaching requires that in addition to the criteria described in meets expectation section above the faculty member achieves the following annually:
• Received satisfactory student evaluations (i.e. a minimum of 90% average Good to Excellent categories in overall rating)
• Scored in the top half in department-wide student learning outcome assessment for classes taught.

3.2. Service

Metrics for service effectiveness should include both the quantitative and qualitative assessments of contributions to student, staff, faculty, department, college, university, profession, and community success. Quantitative metrics of service activities may include numbers of committees, student recruitment events, judging events, community outreach and engagement events, etc. Acknowledgement/confirmation of such service activities should be included in the evaluation dossier. Qualitative metrics of service effectiveness should describe impact, relevant recognitions and awards received.
To meet expectations in service with a 10% service appointment requires that at least two (2) of the following are met annually:

- Active service to at least one committee per year at any level within the university,
- Participation in at least one community service activity, evidenced by e-mails or other appropriate mechanisms,
- Participation in at least one professional service activity, evidenced by e-mails or other appropriate mechanisms.

Lecturers may make a case with the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers, Lecturer Promotion and Evaluation Committee, Chair and Dean for the recognition of other forms of service which may be substituted for a university committee or student/faculty success activity.

To exceed expectations in service with 10% service appointment requires that the Lecturer should fulfill all the requirements for the meets expectations outlined above AND demonstrate any one (1) of the following:

- Leadership of a committee at any level within the university,
- Leadership of an impactful uncompensated community service activity,
- Leadership of an uncompensated impactful professional service activity,
- Leadership role in the professional development of tutors, teaching assistants, peer lecturers, etc.,
- Mentor at least one student in research for the duration of at least one semester or the summer equivalent.

To meet expectations in service with a 20% service appointment requires that all four (4) of the following are met annually:

- Actively service to at least one committee per year at any level within the university,
- Participation in at least one student recruitment events,
- Participation in at least one community service activity, evidenced by e-mails or other appropriate mechanisms,
- Participation in at least one professional service activity, evidenced by e-mails or other appropriate mechanisms.

Lecturers may make a case with the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers, Lecturer Promotion and Evaluation Committee, Chair, and Dean for the recognition of other forms of service which may be substituted for a committee or outreach/equivalent professional service activity.

To exceed expectations in service with 20% service appointment requires that the Lecturer should fulfill all the requirements for the meets expectations outlined above AND demonstrate any one (1) of the following:

- Leadership of a committee at any level within the university,
- Lead at least one student recruitment events,
- Leadership of an impactful uncompensated community service activity,
• Leadership of an uncompensated impactful professional service activity,
• Leadership role in the professional development of tutors, teaching assistants, peer lecturers, etc.,
• Mentor at least one student in research for the duration of at least one semester or the summer equivalent.

4. OVERALL RATING

An overall exceeds expectations rating on the annual review is earned by receiving exceeds expectations ratings in both teaching and service. An overall meets expectations rating is earned by receiving a meets expectations rating in both teaching and service, or by receiving a meets expectations in one area and an exceeds expectations in the other area. An overall does not meet expectations rating is earned by receiving a does not meet expectations rating in one area and a meets expectations or exceeds expectations rating in the other area. An overall unsatisfactory rating is earned by receiving a does not meet expectations rating in both teaching and service.

5. OUTCOMES OF THE ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual review is used for identifying any needs for improvement of lecturer performance. Any Lecturer receiving an overall rating of does not meet expectations must meet with the department chair and the dean to develop an action plan to address weaknesses and concerns. The action plan may include teaching development workshops, counseling, mentoring in service activities, etc. to Lecturers who may benefit from such support. The Lecturer’s progress towards meeting the goals of the plan will be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions.

Any Lecturer receiving an overall rating of unsatisfactory will meet with the dean, who in consultation with the department chair may recommend a change in the faculty member’s workload or recommend additional actions to the EVPAA. Faculty members whose overall performance is unsatisfactory for two consecutive annual reviews will be subject to a comprehensive review and appropriate action.

An unsatisfactory rating means failing to meet expectations for the Lecturer’s unit, rank, or contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. If the overall result of a comprehensive performance review is unsatisfactory due to the disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence, an additional review by the EVPAA, or designee will be conducted to determine if good cause exists for termination under Regents’ Rules 31008 and 31102.
6. APPEALS

Lecturers can appeal the departmental/school level outcomes, and if not satisfied, may request a review by the college annual review committee which will make a recommendation to the dean. The dean’s decision is final. All appeals are made by filing a written request for reconsideration within ten working days of receiving a written copy of the evaluation at that level.

This document may be subject to revision every 2-3 years.