

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

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.

Teaching and student success are central to the mission of the School of Art and Design, and all faculty are expected to demonstrate strong teaching effectiveness and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at their highest potential. Teaching will be evaluated through demonstrated student success and engagement, and development of both courses and teaching skills through self-assessment, reflection on student and peer feedback, and professional development. In the annual review, faculty must include a summary of teaching activities addressing the criteria below, with accompanying summative statements and documentation as necessary for context.

To meet annual expectations for Teaching, School of Art and Design faculty are expected to:

- Providing and posting up-to-date and clear syllabi in compliance with UTRGV policies.
- Course evaluations of 80% average or higher Agree/Strongly Agree answers on the five state-mandated questions, or a score of 4.0/5.0 weighted average for the year is an appropriate target.
 - Course evaluations are only one component of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness, and scores below this benchmark should be considered in the context of other evidence of success and improvement in other aspects of teaching. Low or outlying scores must be evaluated in the context of the entire teaching portfolio.
 - Faculty are encouraged to include all substantive student comments in the supporting documents for Teaching. Faculty should take steps to ensure that course evaluations are reported, and should note any reasons (low enrollment, for example) course evaluations are not available.
- Demonstrating a commitment to maintaining a safe and effective laboratory teaching environment.

Demonstrate student success and engagement, including (as applicable):

- Successful advisement and mentorship of students towards completion of their degree.
- Student success in supervised research, exhibitions, and other scholarship and learning.
- Development and implementation of experiential learning activities.
- It is expected that not all faculty will engage in all of these activities, and activities will vary from year to year.

Demonstrate self-assessment and use of peer and student feedback to improve teaching, and address issues and new demands, including:

- Submitting a peer observation of teaching and a faculty report reflecting on the observer's feedback and addressing any suggestions and concerns. Professional Track Faculty must submit one peer observation every year. Tenured faculty submit one peer observation every three years.
- Addressing any current or prior concerns in student course evaluations or peer observations and documenting successful improvements and/or plans for improvement based on this feedback.

Demonstrate investment in improvement by engaging in Professional Development activities through UTRGV or other professional associations to develop teaching skills and stay current in the field.

Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Teaching:

Faculty must demonstrate significant achievements in student success, course/curriculum design, and/or student and peer mentorship that notably exceed the above criteria for meeting expectations. Qualifying activities may include teaching a significant or continuous uncompensated overload, mentoring student research/creative activity, student successes at exhibitions, competitive evaluations or conferences, and other activities that contribute to student success and to the School of Art and Design curriculum. Faculty must document how and why their activities exceed the stated expectations, and reviewers must detail their reasons for awarding a rating of exceeds expectations in their review.

Teaching Criteria for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Tenured Faculty)

To meet expectations, faculty must have met or exceeded expectations in teaching for each year under review, or satisfactorily addressed any ratings of "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory" through plans for remediation and/or in subsequent reviews. In addition, faculty should demonstrate a consistent record of student success, course/studio development, commitment to staying current on pedagogical trends, innovations, and knowledge in their field, and be active in advisement and recruitment.

To exceed expectations, tenured faculty must demonstrate evidence of growth through activities such as exceptional student successes, course/curriculum innovations, contributions to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and/or leadership in evaluating/updating curriculum. A record of consistently exceeding expectations in most annual reviews strongly supports a rating of exceeds expectations for the CPE.

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.

Research and Creative Activity includes a variety of scholarly and artistic/performance activities depending upon the specialization and the interests of the faculty member. Activities in will be evaluated by their Quality, Impact, and Significance (see below). It is up to the faculty member to provide evidence for the significance and merit of activities under review. For annual review, faculty must include a summary of research and scholarship activities addressing the criteria below, with accompanying summative statements and documentation as necessary for context.

Evaluation Criteria:

- **Quality:** Describe the nature, scope, and depth of your work, including solo and collaborative contributions (faculty should clarify their role in the collaboration), and provide evidence of the reputation of the venue or publication, describe the peer-review/audition/invitation process (if any), the size/nature of the audience/readership, the size/selectiveness of funding award, and/or the size or location of a performance or conference. Digital or live-streamed performances and presentations will also be considered using the same criteria.
- **Impact:** Articulate the impact of activities within and outside the local community. Evidence may include relevant metrics (citation indices, journal acceptance rates, downloads/views, audience, conference or performance venue sizes, etc.), qualitative explanations/documentation, engagement through scholarly outreach, public performances, community-university collaborations, and/or the creation of accessible materials (e.g. open access publications) and alignment with the broader mission of UTRGV.
- **Significance:** Show how the venues for publication, performance, or presentation support the significance of your work. This can include detailing the peer-reviewed exhibition process, reputation of the venue, nature of the audience, selectiveness of funding awards, and other evidence establishing the value of their activities to local, academic, and professional communities.

Criteria to Meet Expectations for Research/Creative Activity is differentiated by the following allocations:

- **30% - Faculty must engage in research and creative activity at a high level.** Evidence may include peer-reviewed/invited publications, presentations, and/or exhibitions or performances in reputable venues and/or other research and creative activity. Faculty should demonstrate the high quality of their activities, the impact and significance of their contributions to the community and the profession, the time and effort invested in the activity, the quantity of activity, and/or how their activities perpetuate and expand their national reputation or as available an international reputation.
- **20% - Faculty must engage in regional, local, and/or national research and creative activity, including publications, presentations, and/or exhibitions or performance in reputable venues, and/or other activities specific to their discipline.** Faculty should demonstrate the quality of their activities, how their activities are relevant to their discipline in significance and impact, and how their activities maintain and enhance their visibility and reputation as scholars and/or artists/designers.
- **10% - Faculty are expected to engage in presentations and performances in reputable local, regional, and as available national venues as teaching responsibilities allow, and are encouraged to pursue peer-reviewed publication, exhibitions, performance, and other creative activity.** Faculty on this allocation should be able to demonstrate the quality of their scholarly and creative contributions (by peer-review, performance links, or other documentation), and their continued activity, scholarly presence, and relevance in their discipline as well as maintaining a strong scholarly/exhibiting presence at UTRGV.

Criteria for Exceeding Expectations in Research/Creative Activity

Faculty must demonstrate activities, and/or a trajectory of achievement, that are exceptional in quality, impact, and scope, and/or quantity far exceeding the minimum requirements indicated above for their research allocation. Faculty must document how and why their activities exceed the stated expectations, and reviewers must detail their reasons for awarding a rating of exceeds expectations in their review.

Criteria for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation

Faculty must have met or exceeded expectations in research/creative activity for each year under review, or satisfactorily addressed any ratings of "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory" through plans for remediation and/or in subsequent reviews. Activities should demonstrate maintenance of their reputation and relevance in the field over the review period. Note that faculty specializations may shift in emphasis and focus over time.

To exceed expectations, faculty must demonstrate a consistent level of activities, and/or a trajectory of achievement, that exceed annual expectation, are exceptional in quality, impact, and scope, and/or quantity, and increase the prestige and reputation of the faculty member and the university at a national level. A record of consistently exceeding expectations in most annual reviews supports a rating of exceeds expectations for the CPE.



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.

Service is an essential element of all full-time faculty in the School of Art and Design. For annual review, faculty must include a summary of service activities addressing the criteria below, with accompanying narratives and documentation as necessary to detail the quality, impact, and significance of their service activities. Faculty with administrative workload allocations should clearly delineate faculty service activities from administrative duties.

Criteria to Meet Expectations in Service (All Allocations)

All School of Art and Design full-time faculty are expected to participate in School of Art and Design governance and operations by attending faculty meetings, advising students (as applicable), and collaborating with colleagues to fulfill the School of Art and Design mission and responsibilities through recruitment, assessment procedures, committee service, curriculum review, area of study initiatives, and other essential services along with shared governance procedures.

Criteria to Meet Expectations for Service is differentiated by the following Service allocations:

10% Allocation Tenured Faculty: In addition to the above, faculty are expected to serve as needed in the following roles:

- Chair/member of standing or ad hoc school, college, and/or university committees (including graduate thesis committees).
- Organizational work such as laboratory, classroom, technical, and shared studio maintenance for a safe and effective learning environment.
- Mentoring or serving as faculty sponsor of a student organization or community organization.
- Serving as an active participant in the profession/professional organizations, including as a professional reviewer for a journal or other publication.
- Leadership/active participation in community engagement and public-facing events with demonstrable benefits to the community and the connection between the university and the broader public.

20% Allocation Tenured Faculty: Appropriate for faculty who have taken on expansive, time intensive service/leadership roles in addition to the above activities. The following activities are appropriate to faculty with this allocation:

- Service as chair/member of a school, college, or university standing or ad hoc committee with a large scope or deliverable and demonstrated effort and impact.
- Officer or other leadership/major organizational role in a highly impactful professional organization.
- Service on multiple committees or in multiple organizational roles or other service activities with demonstrable deliverables, impact, and effort equivalent to the roles listed above.

Not all tenured faculty will participate in all of these activities every year, however, demonstrated contribution to the functioning and governance of the School, College, University, Profession, and/or Community through some combination of these activities is expected in each annual review.

10% Allocation Non-Tenured (Professional) Faculty: In addition to the above, faculty are expected to serve as needed in the following roles:

- Member of a standing or ad hoc school, or college, committee.
- Organizational work such as laboratory, classroom, technical, and shared studio maintenance for a safe and effective learning environment.
- Mentoring or serving as faculty sponsor of a student organization or community organization.
- Leadership/active participation in community engagement and public-facing events with demonstrable benefits to the community and the connection between the university and the broader public.

20% Allocation Non-Tenured (Professional) Faculty: The following activities are appropriate to faculty with this allocation:

- Member of a standing or ad hoc school, college, and/or university committees (including graduate thesis committees).
- Serving as an active participant in the profession/professional organizations, including as a professional reviewer for a journal or other publication.
- Service as chair/member of a school, college, or university committee.
- Officer or other leadership/major organizational role in a highly impactful professional organization.
- Service on multiple committees or in multiple organizational roles or other service activities.

Not all professional faculty will participate in all of these activities every year, however, demonstrated contribution to the functioning and governance of the School, College, University, Profession, and/or Community through some combination of these activities is expected in each annual review.

Criteria to Exceed Expectations in Service

Faculty must demonstrate that they have contributed to service of high quality, impact, and significance far exceeding the minimum requirements outlined above, and document how and why their activities exceed expectations. Reviewers must detail their reasons for awarding a rating of exceeds expectations in their review.

Service Criteria for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Tenured Faculty)

Meets Expectations: Faculty must have met or exceeded expectations in service for each year under review, or satisfactorily addressed any ratings below "Meets Expectations" through plans for remediation and/or in subsequent reviews. Activities over the period of review should demonstrate consistent service and leadership to the School of Art and Design, the institution, and the profession as appropriate to the faculty member's chosen field.

Exceeds Expectations: Faculty must demonstrate a consistent level of activities, and/or a trajectory of service and leadership, that exceed annual expectation and are exceptional in quality, impact, scope, and benefit to the university, profession, and/or community. A record of consistently exceeding expectations in most annual reviews supports a rating of exceeds expectations.



Overall Rating – Annual Review

Indicate how faculty workload percentages and agreements link with the work/accomplishments completed during the academic year under review to produce one of the following overall evaluation ratings: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.

Area ratings are represented by the following numbers:

4=Exceeds Expectations; 3=Meets Expectations; 2=Does Not Meet Expectations; 1=Unsatisfactory

3 areas of review (Tenured Faculty) – Assuming workload allocations in Teaching, Research and Service

Overall ratings will be determined by an average of the area ratings plus the conditions detailed below.

- Meets Expectations = A rating of 3 in at least two areas of review, an average of 2.66 or higher.
- Exceeds Expectations = A rating of 4 in at least two areas of review, an average of 3.66 or higher.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: A rating of at least 2 two areas of review, and an average of 2.33 or higher.

Faculty will receive an Unsatisfactory rating if combined ratings do not qualify for any of the above overall ratings.

2 areas of review (Professional Faculty) – Assuming workload allocations of Teaching and Service

- Meet Expectations = A rating of 3 or higher in both areas of review.
- Exceed Expectations = A rating of 4 in Teaching and a 3 or higher in Service.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: A rating of 2 in one or both areas of evaluation, with no ratings below 2.

Faculty will receive an Unsatisfactory rating if combined ratings do not qualify for any of the above overall ratings.

Overall Rating – Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation

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.

Area ratings are represented by the following numbers:

4=Exceeds Expectations; 3=Meets Expectations; 2=Does Not Meet Expectations; 1=Unsatisfactory

3 areas of review – Assuming workload allocations in Teaching, Research and Service

Overall ratings will be determined by an average of the area ratings plus the conditions detailed below.

- Meets Expectations = A rating of 3 in at least two areas of review, an average of 2.66 or higher.
- Exceeds Expectations = A rating of 4 in at least two areas of review, an average of 3.66 or higher.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: A rating of at least 2 two areas of review, and an average of 2.33 or higher

Faculty will receive an Unsatisfactory rating if combined ratings do not qualify for any of the above overall ratings.