

College of Sciences
School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
Faculty Annual Evaluation
Review Criteria, Policies and Procedures

Approved by:



COS Dean

5/20/2022

Date



08/15/2022

Date

1 Preamble

The purpose of the Annual Faculty Evaluation is to provide:

1. Faculty members with fair academic performance appraisals and a concrete basis for professional growth and development in the areas of Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service, commensurate with assigned responsibilities and duties
2. An overall evaluation rating that can serve as a basis for merit salary increases or salary adjustments
3. Information for making post-tenure review decisions for tenured faculty and promotion or reappointment decisions for Lecturers.
4. Provide a venue for faculty who have received prior “Does Not Meet Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” rating at any level to document progress toward fulfilling action plans and receiving feedback on their progress at all levels.

The measures herein are effective upon a vote of the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the School.

2 Procedural policies

2.1 Administrative calendar

The EVP and Provost of The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley provides the annual faculty evaluation calendar to the School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences (hereafter SMSS) by the beginning of the fall semester of the academic year on the Office of the EVP and Provost’s website, which includes dates by which faculty submit annual evaluation folders, the independent evaluators present results to the faculty, and faculty appeals are submitted.

2.2 Responsibilities of the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty

The elected SMSS Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty will evaluate all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the School for whom annual evaluation is required, and will review school-level appeals. Each committee member will evaluate all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. 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 whether or not to revise his or her evaluation. The individual committee member evaluations are combined into a committee decision on the overall rating and overall score according to Section 3.4. The evaluation narratives should be approved by the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty.

2.3 Responsibilities of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers

The elected SMSS Annual Review Committee for Lecturers will evaluate all Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the School for whom annual evaluation is required, and will review School level appeals by Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. Each committee member will evaluate all Lecturers and Senior 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 and overall score according to Section 3.4. The evaluation narratives should be approved by the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.

2.4 Annual evaluation of faculty submitting a tenure/promotion/post-tenure/reappointment dossier

According to the UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures ADM 06-502: *“Tenure-track faculty and those applying for tenure or promotion or post-tenure review do not need to submit an annual evaluation dossier. Their tenure-track and tenure/promotion dossiers will also be used for the purpose of the annual review.”* Tenure-track faculty and those applying for tenure or promotion or post-tenure review and Lecturers applying for reappointment and/or promotion must include the cover sheet, faculty activity report, and optional appendices to the faculty activity report, as detailed in Section 2.6, in their tenure/promotion and/or post-tenure review and/or reappointment/promotion dossier. However, they do not have to submit the complete annual evaluation dossier as indicated in policy ADM 06-502.

2.5 Committee structure and selection

The School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences will elect its Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure - track Faculty and its Annual Review Committee for Lecturers in accordance with HOP 06-502 and the following conditions:

1. The School Director and any Associate Deans are excluded from membership on the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty and the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.
2. Only SMSS tenured, tenure-track faculty members (including the School Director) are eligible to vote during the election of the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty.
3. Only full-time SMSS Lecturers and/or Senior Lecturers are eligible to vote during the election of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.
4. The Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty will be composed of six elected members. Only SMSS tenured or tenure-track faculty with at least three academic years of full-time employment in the School at the time of the election are eligible for membership on the committee. At least four elected members must be tenured faculty members 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.
5. The Annual Review Committee for Lecturers will be composed of six elected members. All tenured or tenure-track faculty or 3-year Lecturers with at least three academic years of full-time employment in the School 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 tenured or tenure-track faculty member, and at least two additional committee members must be 3-year Lecturers or Senior 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.
6. The School Director shall call a meeting of the tenured, tenure-track faculty to elect the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty and a meeting of all full-time faculty to elect the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers during the Spring semester. Nominations may be submitted to the School Director 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 faculty during the meeting. Eligible voters that are not able to attend the meeting will be given a reasonable time window 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 School Director. The votes for the membership of the committee are to be counted and the results reported to the School.

7. After the membership of the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty and the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers has been constituted, the Committee members will elect a tenured faculty member of the Committee to chair each Committee for a 1-year term. The Chair of the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty will represent the School on the College Annual Evaluation Committee, unless there is an appeal from an SMSS Lecturer, in which case, the Chair of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers will represent SMSS during discussion of SMSS Lecturer appeals.

Guidelines for preparing and submitting annual Faculty Evaluation dossiers

Faculty must upload their course syllabi to the Faculty Portfolio Tool and update their professional contributions to be in compliance with state law (HB 2504 from 2009). In addition, SMSS annual evaluation policy requires faculty to submit a Faculty Activity Report, and relevant Appendices. The Faculty Activity Report will be submitted through the Faculty Portfolio Tool (FPT) as a distinct PDF file, with filename Lastname-Firstname.pdf. Other documents that are required by UTRGV HOP policy ADM 06-502 (e.g. peer evaluations of teaching, an action plan for the next academic year, etc.) will be submitted as a separate supplementary PDF file with filename Lastname-Firstname-documents.pdf. Faculty are encouraged to itemize and briefly describe contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service contributions in the Faculty Activity Report. Tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty applying for promotion and/or post-tenure review are strongly encouraged to attach the Faculty Activity Report to their FPT dossier, summarizing their activities during the previous academic year.

A template for the Faculty Activity Report is included on page 15 of this document. The following are requirements for the Faculty Activity Report:

COVER SHEET: The cover sheet must indicate, the name, rank, evaluation period, workload assignment information, and faculty date and signature.

FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT: This report consists of three sections: Teaching, Research and Scholarship, Service. Each section can be at maximum 2 pages and must follow the format indicated in Appendix A.

QUALITY OF PUBLICATIONS: Hardcopy evidence from the website www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php or other evidence of journal quality should be attached to the Faculty Activity Report to document the quality of refereed research journals for all papers claimed during the evaluation period.

APPENDICES. If certain items have a very large number of contributions, these should be summarized in the main report, and more detailed information can be provided in appendices to the Faculty Activity Report.

DUAL/MULTIPLE LISTING: Contributions may not be listed in more than one category or subcategory of a major category. The evaluator may attempt to ensure that incorrectly listed contributions are counted appropriately, but is not obligated to do so.

OLDER FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORTS: All faculty, who are reporting published or accepted papers in their current Faculty Activity Report, should also submit a copy of the Faculty Activity Report for the previous Academic Year. All faculty, that claim at least one research paper published during the last three academic years, should submit a copy of the Faculty Activity Reports for the previous two academic years.

2.6 Reporting Evaluation Results

The respective Annual Review Committee will use the standard forms provided by the Office of the EVP and Provost to prepare individual annual faculty evaluation reports that include narrative descriptions of the faculty accomplishments in the categories of teaching, research and scholarship, professional service, and an overall rating that is one of: Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Does not Meet Expectations (2), Unsatisfactory (1). If the overall rating is Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory, then the narrative should also include suggestions for improvement.

2.7 Appeals

The overall rating, overall score, and narrative statements are all subject to appeal. Submission and processing of appeals will be done according to time limits set in the administrative calendar. Appealing faculty must state grounds for the appeal and provide supporting materials. The outcome of the appeal may either uphold the original review or accede to some or all requests stated in the appeal. Appeals are submitted through FPT. Faculty may request reconsideration and are provided an area to write their appeal and provide supporting documentation in the file upload section of their review dossier.

2.8 Document review, revisions/amendments

The Annual Evaluation document may be reviewed when and if deemed necessary by a petition supported by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. The Annual Evaluation document will be reviewed by an elected faculty Committee. The size and structure of the Committee will be decided by the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The revised document will be approved by the majority vote of the tenured, tenure-track faculty (including formerly tenured faculty undergoing phased retirement) and the 3-year Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. All faculty will be afforded a reasonable time window during which they can cast their vote to ratify the document. The document will then be

ratified by all other review levels in accordance with UTRGV HOP. If any changes are introduced to the document during the approval process by upper levels of review, the revised document must be approved by the School faculty again by majority vote, in accordance to the continuing faculty consultation principle of shared governance.

Upon approval of a revised document, each faculty member may opt to use either the revised version or the preceding version of the document for the evaluation of the academic year in which the revised document has been officially approved by all levels of review.

3 Evaluation Criteria

3.1 Overall score

The *overall score* is used to determine the *overall rating* according to the procedures detailed in Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 and it is based on the teaching, research, and service scores, calculated according to Sections 3.5, 3.6, 3.7. It is calculated, in accordance to faculty focus, from the *score sum* obtained by adding the teaching score, research score, and service score, as follows:

Faculty workload	Overall score
T/TT faculty with research-track workload	(overall score) = $\min\{4, (\text{score sum})/3\}$
Teaching-track tenured faculty	(overall score) = $\min\{4, (\text{score sum})/2\}$
Lecturers with service expectation	(overallscore) = $\min\{4, (\text{scoresum})/1.5\}$
Lecturers without service expectation	(overall score) = $\min\{4, (\text{score sum})\}$
Score sum= teaching score+ research score+ service score	

The *research-track workload* for tenured and tenure-track faculty is a 60% teaching assignment (with 20% research + 20% service OR 30% research + 10% service), typically teaching 18 SCHs during a 9-month academic year, and may include teaching equivalencies for activities related to teaching, research, service, or administration, according to UTRGV HOP.

Teaching-track tenured faculty are faculty that transitioned into an 80% teaching assignment (with 10% research + 10% service), typically teaching 24 SCHs during a 9-month academic year.

Lecturers have no research expectations. They have service expectations when they are given an 80% teaching assignment (typically 3-year Lecturers; 24 SCHs during 9-month academic year). They have no service expectations when they are given a 100% teaching assignment (typically 1-year Lecturers; 30 SCHs during 9-month academic year).

Research-intensive workloads: In addition to the above workload distributions, only when requested by the faculty, the School Director may assign faculty that are highly active in research a research-intensive workload of 40% to 70%. The overall score for such faculty, used to determine whether they overall meet expectations, will be calculated by the same formula used for T/TT faculty with research-track workload. Faculty with research-intensive workload should strive to achieve a research score of 5 and secure external funding. Research-intensive workload distributions will be negotiated between the faculty member and the School Director in accordance with standing workload policies. Tenured faculty will be free to retreat to the research-track workload (20% or 30% research) from a research-intensive workload, or to a teaching-track workload (10% research) from a research-track workload, whenever they wish to do so.

Other workload distributions: Faculty may be assigned workload distributions that include administrative workload and/or buy-out or cost-sharing effort on an external grant. For the purposes of this document, the research workload percentage assignment does not include effort corresponding to external funding buy-out or cost share. Furthermore, tenured or tenure-track faculty (or former tenured faculty under phased retirement) will be treated as: teaching-track faculty when the research workload is 10%, T/TT faculty with research-track workload when the research workload is 20% or 30%, and the provision above for research-intensive workloads will apply for research workloads of 40% to 70%.

Postdocs: Research Associates are hired and supervised in the area of research by their postdoctoral advisor. According to ADM 06-401, Research Associates are under the classified personnel system, and thus not subject to the Faculty Annual Evaluation process.

3.2 Determination of overall rating for each independent evaluator

- **Exceed Expectations:** This rating is given if faculty member qualifies for Meets Expectations rating and satisfies the additional requirements listed in Section 3.8.
- **Meet Expectations:** This rating is given if the overall score is above or equal to 3 AND, for faculty with at least 10% research workload, the research score is above or equal to 1, without satisfying the conditions for Exceeds Expectations listed in Section 3.8.

- **Does not Meet Expectations:** This is given if the overall score is below 3 OR if the faculty has at least 10% research workload and the research score is 0, without satisfying the conditions for the Unsatisfactory rating.
- **Unsatisfactory:** This rating is warranted only when both the submitted academic record has serious across the board deficiencies and if it is additionally determined that these deficiencies cannot be subject to correction by continuing support, remediation, or workload reassignment. Consequently, an Unsatisfactory rating will be assigned if the overall score is below 1.5 and evaluator concludes that future faculty performance is not subject to correction with continuing remediation, workload reassignments, or continuing support (see definition of Unsatisfactory rating in ADM 06-502).

3.3 Post-Tenure Review action plans

As per ADM 06-504, if a faculty member is asked to develop an action plan, progress towards the goals of the action plan will be monitored in the annual evaluation narratives, and a copy of the action plan should be attached to the annual evaluation dossier.

In order for action plans to impact the overall annual evaluation rating, the following necessary but not sufficient conditions must be satisfied: (1) the expectations defined in the action plan must not exceed the expectations defined in the School's Post-Tenure Review criteria for the corresponding workload assignment; (2) the options to resolve the underlying problem with an amended action plan and a workload adjustment have been exhausted. (3) Deadlines have been attached only to tasks whose completion is entirely under the control of the faculty member.

If the annual evaluation determines that the goals promised in the action plan have not been achieved, and the action plan follows the aforementioned necessary but not sufficient requirements, then the annual evaluation rating may be downgraded up to "Does Not Meet Expectations", at the discretion of the evaluator. Alternatively, a recommendation can be made to adjust the faculty member's workload and/or to amend the action plan. Extenuating circumstances will be considered when implementing this policy.

3.4 Overall Committee Rating

When the evaluator is a committee, then the committee score is the average of the committee members' scores. The committee determines that the criteria for exceeding expectations (see Section 3.8) are satisfied if a majority of committee members votes accordingly. The committee determines that faculty performance reflected by a low overall committee score is not subject to correction if a majority of committee members votes accordingly. Then the overall rating of the committee as a whole is determined as described above.

3.5 Teaching Score

PREAMBLE: It is the intention of this review to encourage high academic standards and promote faculty academic freedom or faculty autonomy in terms of pedagogy, curriculum, and student assessment. The School's excellence in teaching depends on the passion and personal investment of faculty in pedagogies informed by the faculty's teaching philosophy. It also depends on giving special consideration to faculty who pursue innovative or iconoclastic pedagogies, invest valuable time in the development of teaching-related resources, teach online or blended courses, contribute to our graduate and undergraduate degree programs by teaching advanced undergraduate or graduate courses or by leading undergraduate or graduate student research, or provide leadership in major teaching-related projects, all with student success at the forefront.

Faculty are expected to meet all teaching-related responsibilities outlined in policy ADM 06-106. In particular, compliant syllabi are required to satisfy state requirements.

The teaching score ranges from 0 to 5, to one decimal point, and is based on the student opinion course evaluations and additional contributions listed below as minor, major, or distinguished contributions.

- **Student opinion course evaluations [0,2.5]:** They contribute to the teaching score points ranging from 0 to 2.5, rounded to one decimal, and calculated as follows:
 1. Currently, the *h score* for each course is calculated and reported on your student evaluation table (under the Avg column) by Assist as the average score over the mandated questions¹.

¹ Assist calculates the h-score as follows: $(5a + 4b + 3c + 2d + e) / (a + b + c + d + e)$ with a = all strongly agree responses, b = all agree responses, c = all neutral responses, d = all disagree responses, e = all strongly disagree responses.

2. The *overall h score* is the average, weighted by number of responding students for each course section, of all *h* scores for all courses taught during the fall and spring semesters (summer semesters may be optionally included), rounded to one decimal. Points are awarded based on the *overall h score* as follows:
 - (a) If the *overall h score* is at least 3.5, the faculty member is to be awarded 2.5 points.
 - (b) If the *overall h score* is less than 3.5, the faculty member is to be awarded the prorated amount given by the formula: $\min\{2.5, (2.5(h-1)/(3.5-1))\}$, rounded to one decimal.

- **Other teaching contributions [0,2.5]:** Additional points (in 0.5 multiples) will be awarded based on the number of minor, major, and distinguished contributions, according to the following table:

<i>additional points</i>	<i>Requirement</i>
0	No contributions reported
0.5	Only 1 minor contribution
1	Only 2 or 3 minor contributions
1.5	At least 4 or more minor contributions or at least 1 major
2	2 major contributions with no distinguished contributions
2.5	At least 1 distinguished contribution or at least 3 major

Contributions are categorized as minor, major, or distinguished as listed below. *The evaluator has the discretion to upgrade minor contributions to major, and major contributions to distinguished, if there is an explicit justification in the Faculty Activities Report, in accordance with the principles of the above preamble.*

- **Minor contributions:** Multiple instances count multiple times.

1. Taught upper-level undergraduate courses or graduate courses (count each distinct course as separate activity).
2. Taught an interactive television (ITV) course or a course accommodating students at multiple locations.
3. Used at least 3 major midterm examinations along with additional graded assessments (such as multiple quizzes, multiple homeworks, projects) to assess student learning in the majority of courses taught. [Reported under Pedagogy]
4. Taught more than 4 distinct courses during the academic year.
5. Use of technology to enhance teaching and learning [Reported under Pedagogy]
6. Making minor changes in an existing course
7. Participated in minor professional development workshop. (one day event and no travel outside of the RGV)
8. Classroom teaching was observed by Colleagues according to department policy.
9. Member of an MS or PhD thesis committee (internal or external).
10. Taught courses gratis (e.g. substitute teaching for another faculty member) -- may be reported as a service contribution instead. (can be counted only once)
11. Served as instructor of record and actually participated in the professional development of the GTA or instructor teaching the course. (one contribution per course)
12. Teaching large classes with at least 50 registered students and less than 75 registered students on census day

- **Major contributions:** Multiple instances count multiple times.

1. Taught *for the first time* an upper-level undergraduate or graduate course. (count each distinct course as separate activity)
2. Taught at least 3 distinct courses during the same semester and provides evidence of quality and student engagement.
3. Making major changes to an existing course to increase student engagement.
4. Graded homework², course projects, student presentations, or very frequent formative assessments (e.g. quizzes) [Reported under Pedagogy]
5. Substantive participation as member of an MS or PhD thesis committee (internal or external).
6. Supervised undergraduate or graduate research or independent study outside of class activities
7. Supervised a senior-level capstone undergraduate math project.
8. Student (undergraduate or graduate) research presentations under supervision by the faculty.
9. Supervised a master's project, or ongoing supervision of an MS or Ph.D. thesis as the main advisor (or one of two co-advisors) (can be claimed in the area of research but not in both teaching and research areas)

² grading should be done manually by the instructor and include written feedback to the student in order to count as a major contribution,

10. Developed or adopted an innovative pedagogy for a given course such as: flipped classrooms, inquiry based learning, Moore method, Challenge Based Instruction, hands-on-learning with manipulatives, student involvement in outreach community projects, online community of learning, major course projects, frequently used instructor-made discussion handouts for lectures, or other methods involving student engagement. [Reported under Pedagogy]
 11. Participated in major professional development workshop. (event spanning across more than one day or requiring travel outside of the RGV)
 12. Development or continuing implementation of significant curricular materials (e.g. development/preparation of new online or blended course, new online lecture notes, open source textbooks, new online homework or exam problems)
 13. Publishing solutions to teaching related mathematics problems in professional journals
 14. Teaching to peers or approved groups by way of seminars, courses, mini-courses, project workshops, or content presentations at area schools.
 15. Proposed a new course, approved by all levels of review.
 16. Teaching very large classes with at least 85 registered students on census day
- **Distinguished contributions:** Multiple instances count multiple times.
 1. Main Advisor (or one of two main co-advisors) of a successfully completed MS or PhD thesis project, including projects beyond our University. (can be claimed in the area of research but not in both teaching and research areas)
 2. Leadership in a major teaching project
 3. Publication of a teaching-related book.
 4. PI or co-PI of funded or continuing external funding for instructional pedagogical development – may be listed under Research and Scholarship if the grant contributed to the research mission or reputation of the university
 5. Outstanding average student evaluations score equal or greater than 4.5.
 6. Served the School with a teaching workload assignment greater than 80%.
 7. Developed a complete LMS shell blueprint for a new online course that has passed the Quality Matters review or has been positively reviewed with respect to quality and completeness of learning materials **by a detailed peer observation report that should be attached to faculty dossier.**
 8. Award or recognition for teaching-related accomplishments at the college, university, national, or international level.
 - Any contributions that do not fall under the above categories will be judged by the committee relative to the standard implied by the above rubric.
 - Efforts to improve student success, without grade inflation, are strongly encouraged and should be recognized by the Faculty Annual Evaluation. However grade inflation is strongly discouraged, as it impacts learning in subsequent courses.

3.6 Research and Scholarship Score

Preamble: It is not the intention of this review to provoke faculty members to forego long-term research plans in favor of short-term results. The excellence of the School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences depends on the academic freedom of all faculty to freely pursue their research agenda, which may include long-term and/or iconoclastic research, time invested in the development of complex mathematical software, or shifts in emphasis that require a period of learning or retraining.

The *research score* is an integer ranging from 0 to 5 based on the reported contributions, as follows:

<i>research score</i>	<i>Requirement</i>
0	No contributions reported
1	Only 1 minor contribution
2	Only 2 or 3 minor contributions
3	At least 4 minor contributions or 1 major contribution, but no distinguished
4	2 major contributions reported, but no distinguished contributions.
5	At least 1 distinguished contribution or at least 3 major contributions reported.

Contributions are categorized as minor, major, or distinguished as follows:

- **Minor contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
 1. Active research program evidenced by at least 2 peer reviewed publications during the last 5 academic years.
 2. Paper submission or resubmission to refereed research journal
 3. Conference presentation at local or state level or colloquium or seminar presentation at non-Ph.D. granting department or school..
 4. Submitted or funded internal grant (may be elevated to major if funded and more than \$10,000)
 5. Submitted external travel grant proposal to conference.
 6. Submitted book proposal.
 7. Technical reports or other research-related non-refereed publications.
 8. Development of research-related software or software library [May be elevated to major, if software is designed for general use, and released under an open source license, and has significant scientific value]
 9. Advised one undergraduate/high school student toward completion of a research project³, a presentation, or a research paper. (can be claimed in the area of teaching but not in both teaching and research areas)
- **Major contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
 1. External grant (PI or co-PI) or fellowship submissions with total budget of at least \$10,000 or multi-year duration (any external grant submission that does not meet these conditions will count as a minor contribution)
 2. Refereed paper published or accepted in refereed journal not classified as Q1, Q2 (Evaluator may elevate this contribution to distinguished, if convincing evidence is given of journal quality)
 3. Book review published in a refereed research journal.
 4. Refereed conference proceedings paper or book chapters
 5. Book or book revision under contract. (documentation required)
 6. Conference/congress/symposium at the national/international level or colloquium or seminar presentation at a Ph.D. granting Department or School or national or international research lab or institute. (First one is major, subsequent ones are counted as minors).
 7. Supervised a master's project, or ongoing supervision of an MS or Ph.D. thesis as the main advisor (or one of two co-advisors). (can be claimed in the area of teaching but not in both teaching and research areas) Co-advising can be documented by a letter from the thesis Committee Chair.
 8. Funded external travel grant or other funded external grant with 1 year duration or total budget of at least \$1,500 (teaching and service grants can be reported in this category, if the grant contributed to the research mission or reputation of the university, or they may be reported in teaching or service correspondingly instead).
 9. Senior personnel or similar effort on external funded grant (other than PI or co-PI)
- **Distinguished contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
 1. Paper published or accepted in Q1 or Q2 journals or any other journal deemed as high quality by the evaluator.
 2. PI or co-PI of a funded or continuing external grant or fellowship with duration greater than 1 year or total budget of at least \$10,000 (any funded or continuing external grant that does not meet these conditions will count as a major contribution; teaching and service grants can be reported in this category, if the grant contributed to the research mission or reputation of the university, or they may be reported under teaching or service correspondingly)
 3. Main Advisor (or one of two main co-advisors) of a successfully completed MS or PhD thesis/project, including projects beyond our University. (can be claimed in the area of teaching but not in both teaching and research areas)
 4. Book published
 5. Plenary or keynote presentation in a recognized national or international conference, congress, or symposium.
 6. Research-related award at the college or university or national or international level.
 7. Invited visiting position in research-focused institution.

Other contributions will be deemed minor, major, or distinguished by the committee relative to the standard implied by the above rubric.

³ Research here can be interpreted broadly to include research of various types and not necessarily engaging students in the solving of "unsolved" mathematical problems. Students can engage in independent study of research interests, or a capstone project, or a pedagogical research project.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS:

1. The ranking of journals as Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4 is given by the website www.scimagojr.com. Because ranking may change from year to year or may be discipline dependent, the relevant ranking is the one during the year of the paper's publication or acceptance (or the nearest year where journal ranking is available) in the same research area as the paper's content. Faculty members may also reference other indicators or metrics to argue in support of journal quality.
2. Publications can be claimed if published or accepted during the previous three academic years, including the evaluation period's academic year and the two academic years preceding that, but each publication can be claimed only once. Faculty are **required** to attach the faculty activity reports from the previous two academic years when exercising this option. If all claimed papers were published or accepted during the evaluation period, then faculty are still required to attach the Faculty Activity Report from the previous academic year.
3. The credit given for external grants under the category of research and scholarship accounts for all activities relating to the administration of the grant. Consequently, the administration of the grant cannot be claimed as service. However all teaching and research/scholarship activities that result from the grant can be clearly counted as separate activities. For grants that propose the making of service contributions (e.g. conference grants, purchases of equipment), that service contribution can be counted as a separate contribution. In general terms, deliverables promised by the corresponding grant proposal can be counted as separate contributions, but not activities related to the administration of the grant itself.
4. Peer reviewed publications may be published in the areas of pure or applied mathematics, mathematics education, statistics, or interdisciplinary research fields.
5. For virtual conferences, conducted via videoconferencing technology, if there is any ambiguity about whether they are at the national or international level, a determination will be made at the discretion of the evaluators.

3.7 Service Score

PREAMBLE: The School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences values service at the School, College, or University level, as such service is essential for creating an institutional culture of shared governance. Other forms of service are also valued as they can promote the well-being of our discipline, our community, or be indicative of an outstanding faculty reputation and recognition. Because we expect faculty to focus mainly on teaching, research and scholarship, we appreciate all service contributions made by all faculty, regardless of the focus of these contributions. Service contributions are considered major or distinguished depending on the extent that they involve leadership roles, substantial responsibility or recognition, or a substantial time investment.

The *service score* is an integer ranging from 0 to 5 based on the reported contributions, as follows:

<i>service score</i>	<i>requirement</i>
0	No contributions reported
1	Only 1 minor contribution
2	Only 2 or 3 minor contributions
3	At least 4 minor contributions or 1 major contribution, but no distinguished
4	2 major contributions reported, but no distinguished contributions.
5	At least 1 distinguished contribution or at least 3 major contributions reported.

Contributions are categorized as minor, major, or distinguished as listed below. Due to the subjective nature of service, *the evaluator has the discretion to upgrade minor contributions to major, and major contributions to distinguished, if there is an explicit justification in the Faculty Activities Report, in accordance with the principles of the above preamble.*

- **Minor contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.

1. Being an actively contributing member in a school committee. The evaluator has the discretion to count committee membership as a major contribution, based on information provided by the Faculty Activity Report in accordance with the general principles stated in the above preamble, in addition to the more obvious situations listed below.
2. Active participation in preparation of common final examinations, core or major or other assessment, etc.
3. Refereeing a manuscript submitted to a journal or conference presentation proposal submitted to a conference.
4. Participating in community engagement activities related to academic activities or outreach

5. Writing recommendation letters.
 6. Conducting a peer review of teaching for a colleague.
 7. Serving on an editorial board or scientific committee for a conference or editorial board of refereed research journals not classified as Q1 or Q2 journals, provided that manuscripts were handled during evaluation period.
 8. Teaching courses gratis – may be reported as a teaching contribution instead (can be counted only once)
 9. Providing or organizing workshop or presentations for students
 10. Mentoring faculty or students. (may be elevated to major contribution when mentoring results in significant positive outcomes that should be explained in the Faculty Activity Report.)
- **Major contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times. Note that quality of the work as well as quantity is expected and distinguishes it from a minor contribution.
 1. Reviewing external grant proposals for a program associated with a funding agency
 2. External review of a Tenure and Promotion application.
 3. External review of another Department, for accreditation purposes.
 4. Directing a Center at the Department, College, or University level.
 5. Serving as Undergraduate or Graduate Program Coordinator or Building Manager or Course Scheduler, Core Course Coordinator, or similar level of responsibility. When Undergraduate or Graduate Program Coordinator mentoring responsibilities are delegated to the respective undergraduate or graduate curriculum committee members, then the committee members can also claim their work as a major contribution.
 6. Organizing a special session or serving on a conference Scientific Committee.
 7. Serving on Editorial Board of refereed research journals classified as Q1 or Q2 journals, provided that manuscripts were handled during evaluation period.
 8. Editor of a peer reviewed book or peer reviewed conference proceedings.
 9. Chair of any major committee, such as tenure and promotion committee, post-tenure review committee, etc. Note that Chair of a Search Committee or Annual Evaluation Committee is listed below as a distinguished contribution.
 10. Member of a search committee (including Equity and Diversity Advocates), annual evaluation committee.
 11. Member of the School's annual evaluation committee.
 12. Service in College or University Committees or Councils or Faculty Senate. Service on other Senate related committees (e.g. the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) or task-forces will count as separate major contributions.
 13. Reviewing a book. (private communication to author and/or editor; published reviews are reported in research)
 14. Administration of placement examinations for core mathematics courses
 15. Maintaining the School web page, given documentation of sufficient work.
 16. Major outreach activity.
 17. Active participation in advising a student club or organization (explanation needed)
 18. Supervising student travel to conferences or workshops
 19. Any administration appointments at any level.
 - **Distinguished contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
 1. Main organizer of a conference at the state, national, or international level.
 2. Service as Faculty Senate President or President Elect
 3. Chair of a Search Committee or of the Annual Evaluation Committee.
 4. Chairing a College or University Committee or Council
 5. Member of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee
 6. Service as the School Course Scheduler.
 7. Leadership in professional societies, or in federal, state, or local government committee, panel, or commission.
 8. Serving on an NSF or NIH proposal review panel or similar review panel for an external funding agency.
 9. Serving as School Director
 10. PI or co-PI of funded or continuing service-related external grant – may be reported under Research and Scholarship if the grant contributed to the research mission or reputation of the university
 11. College, University, National, or International Awards for outstanding service-related accomplishments, including student mentoring or faculty mentoring awards.

Any other service contributions will be classified as distinguished or major or minor by the committee relative to the standard implied by the above rubric.

3.8 Additional criteria for the Exceeds Expectations rating

As indicated in Section 3.2, in order for faculty to get an Exceeds Expectations overall rating they must satisfy the criteria for the Meet Expectations overall rating and also satisfy the criteria presented in this section.

Exceeds Expectations criteria for T/TT faculty with research-track workload: One can exceed expectations by winning a teaching, research, or service award at the University, state, national, or international level. Otherwise, a rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if (a) there is at least one peer reviewed publication in a Q3 or higher venue, or equivalent, or a currently active external grant; and (b) at least one of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. The aforementioned publication is of exceptionally high quality.
2. Have a total of at least 1 distinguished contribution and 10 other major contributions from any category.
3. Have a total of at least 2 distinguished contributions from any category.
4. Authored or co-authored (not just edited) book, monograph or textbook published by well-recognized publisher.
5. Funded external grant award as PI (or co-PI with significant contributions) from a prestigious funding agency (in the first year of its receipt).
6. Plenary or keynote conference presentation at a distinguished national or international conference.
7. Significant administrative or leadership position outside the University.
8. Main organizer of a conference at state, national, or international levels.
9. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.

Exceeds Expectations criteria for teaching-track tenured faculty: One can exceed expectations by winning a teaching, research, or service award at the University, state, national, or international level. Otherwise, a rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if at least one of the following statements is true:

1. Authored or co-authored a peer reviewed publication, book, monograph, or textbook.
2. Funded external grant award as PI (or co-PI with significant contributions) from a prestigious funding agency (in the first year of its receipt).
3. Have a total of at least 1 distinguished contribution and 7 other major or distinguished contributions from any category.
4. Have a total of at least 2 distinguished contributions from any category
5. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.

Exceeds Expectations criteria for T/TT faculty with 40% research workload: One can exceed expectations by winning a teaching, research, or service award at the University, state, national, or international level. Otherwise, a rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if (a) there is at least one peer reviewed publication in high quality Q1 or Q2 journal or equivalent, or a currently active external grant; and (b) at least one of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. They have a total of at least 1 distinguished contributions in research and 1 distinguished contribution in any category.
2. They have a total of at least 1 distinguished contribution in research and 10 major contributions from any category.
3. Main organizer of a conference at state, national, or international levels.
4. Authored or co-authored a peer reviewed research book or a research monograph.
5. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.

Exceeds Expectations criteria for T/TT faculty with 50% research workload: One can exceed expectations by winning a teaching, research, or service award at the University, state, national, or international level. Otherwise, a rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if (a) there is at least two peer reviewed publications, with at least one in a high quality Q1 or Q2 journal or equivalent and the other in Q3 journal or equivalent, or a currently active external grant; and (b) at least one of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. They have a total of at least 2 distinguished contributions in research.
2. They have a total of at least 1 distinguished contribution in research and 2 distinguished contributions from any area.
3. They have a total of at least 1 distinguished contribution in research and 1 distinguished contribution from any area and 10 major contributions from any area.
4. Authored or co-authored a peer reviewed research book or a research monograph.
5. Main organizer of a conference at state, national, or international levels.
6. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.

Exceeds Expectations criteria for T/TT faculty with 60% research workload: One can exceed expectations by winning a

teaching, research, or service award at the University, state, national, or international level. Otherwise, a rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if (a) there is at least two peer reviewed publications in high quality Q1 or Q2 journal or equivalent, or a currently active external grant; and (b) at least one of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. They have a total of at least 3 distinguished contributions in research.
2. They have a total of at least 2 distinguished contribution in research and 2 distinguished contributions from any area.
3. They have a total of at least 2 distinguished contribution in research and 1 distinguished contributions from any area and 10 major contributions from any area.
4. Authored or co-authored a peer reviewed research book or a research monograph.
5. Main organizer of a conference at state, national, or international levels.
6. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.

Exceeds Expectations criteria for T/TT faculty with 70% research workload: One can exceed expectations by winning a teaching, research, or service award at the University, state, national, or international level. Otherwise, a rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if (a) there is at least two peer reviewed publications in high quality Q1 or Q2 journal or equivalent or a currently active external grant; and (b) at least one of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. They have a total of at least 4 distinguished contributions in research.
2. They have a total of at least 3 distinguished contribution in research and 2 distinguished contributions from any area.
3. They have a total of at least 3 distinguished contribution in research and 1 distinguished contributions from any area and 10 major contributions from any area.
4. Authored or co-authored a peer reviewed research book or a research monograph.
5. Main organizer of a conference at state, national, or international levels.
6. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.

Exceeds Expectations criteria for Lecturers: The evaluation committee should consider significant contributions such as those given in the following list of criteria when awarding the Exceeds Expectations rating. A rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if at least one of the following statements is true:

1. Have a total of at least 1 distinguished contribution and 3 major contributions from any category
2. Have a total of at least 2 distinguished contributions from any category.
3. Leadership or Coordinating activities in Mathematics programs related to teaching or student success. (e.g. Math and Science Academy, mathematics competitions, etc)
4. Receipt of award or other high-level recognition, or other evidence of outstanding accomplishment.
5. Delivery of teaching-related colloquium, presenting in faculty development workshop, conference, or research presentation at state, national, or international level or multiple such contributions at the local level.
6. Publication in a mathematics teaching practitioner journal or research publication (article, book, conference proceedings, etc.)
7. Significant mentoring of other departmental faculty, lecturers, or pre- or in-service mathematics teachers in local districts in the work of mathematics teaching.
8. Completion of significant “Action Research” project or other systematic investigation of one’s own teaching, such as a “Scholarship of Learning and Teaching” project, usually leading to presentation or publication.
9. Significant service at the university, municipality, or state level.
10. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.

A Format of Faculty Activity Report

This appendix provides a template for the Faculty Activity Report. Bullet points where there is no activity should be edited out. A response to suggestions for improvement on the prior year’s annual evaluation should be included, with appropriate documentation included in the appendix. Faculty are strongly encouraged to attach the faculty activity reports from the previous two academic years when claiming publications from the previous two academic years. The committee has the discretion to request faculty to resubmit the Faculty Activity Report, if it does not comply with the required format. The committee may also request additional documentation for claimed accomplishments, as needed.

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION FOLDER

School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences College of Sciences The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Evaluation Period: September 1, 20xx through August 31, 20yy

Name: First name Last name

Rank: Assistant/Associate/Full Professor or Lecturer I, II, II, or Senior Lecturer

Faculty workload: (See section 3.1)

Tenure Status: Tenured or Tenure-track or non-tenure track

Signed Statement: To the best of my knowledge the material included in this folder is correct for the current evaluation period and provides a true and accurate account of my professional productivity and job performance for evaluating and assigning merit.

Signature: First name Last name

Date Signed: December 4, 2016

Response to suggested improvements

Below is my report on actions taken on the suggested improvements from each level: of review:

- **TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

- 1.

- **PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT**

- 1.

- **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

- 1.

Workload Assignment

Self-Evaluation

Teaching Effectiveness

I. COURSE EVALUATIONS

<i>Course</i>	<i>Semester</i>	<i>h score</i>	number of responses
Mathxxxx.xx	Fall 20xx	x.xx	xx
Mathxxxx.xx	Spring 20xx	x.xx	xx
Overall <i>h</i> score: x.xx			

II. COURSE-RELATED CONTRIBUTIONS

- Pedagogy used in teaching
- Developing new courses
- Teaching of graduate and upper-division courses
- Teaching arranged courses gratis, teaching a wide variety of courses, or teaching large lecture courses
- Reporting of course-related academic dishonesty

III. DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES

- Books of teaching nature
- Development of significant instructional or curricular materials
- Publishing solutions to teaching related mathematics problems in professional journals

IV. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Classroom teaching peer observation by colleague
- Delivering/attending teaching-related workshops

V. MENTORING ACTIVITIES

- Chair/Member of Ph.D Dissertation, Master's Thesis, Masters Project, Senior Project, or Honors Thesis completed
- Supervising students' research, projects, or presentations other than dissertations or theses
- Teaching to peers or approved groups by way of seminars, courses, minicourses, project workshops, or content presentations at area schools

VI. OTHER TEACHING CONTRIBUTIONS

- Leadership in major teaching project
- Awards or recognition received for excellent teaching at the college, university, state, national, or international level

Research and scholarship

I. RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS CLAIMED FOR CURRENT EVALUATION PERIOD

- Classification of research journals referenced below as Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4
- Refereed publications in a research journal
- Books of a research nature
- Book reviews published in refereed research journals
- Refereed proceedings and book chapters of a research nature

II. OTHER SCHOLARLY/RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS

- Two representative research publications during the last 5 academic years
- Conference, or colloquium, or seminar presentations
- Books under contract
- Submission of book proposal
- Submission of research publications
- Other research-related published works
- Student advising
- Development, minor or major release, or maintenance of research-related software
- Research-related award or recognition at the college, university, state, national, or inter- national level
- Invited visiting position in research-focused institution

III. GRANTS

- Funded external peer-reviewed grants.
- Other research grants funded.
- Submission of a proposal to a funding agency.

Professional Service

I. DEPARTMENTAL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE

- Departmental Service
- College Service
- University Service
- Administrative appointments

II. OTHER SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS

- Editorial board membership for professional publication
- Professional Organization Officer or Board Member
- Referee, or reviewer of papers and books, panel member of grant proposals.
- Community or professional service related to mathematics
- Service-related awards or recognition at the college, university, state, national, or inter- national levels