

College of Sciences  
Department of Chemistry  
Faculty Annual Review Guidelines, Policies, Criteria and Procedures

## 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 for the purpose of improvement of faculty performance, promotion and merit considerations. All tenure-track and tenured Department of Chemistry faculty are evaluated annually, with a comprehensive post-tenure review occurring every six years following the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure. Under special circumstances, such as approved leave, the annual review may be delayed with the approval of the Provost. All new faculty will be evaluated for their first review no later than six months after their hire with subsequent reviews occurring annually; however, minimum expectations will only be enforced from the third annual review to allow time for faculty to establish their research and teaching programs.

The faculty annual evaluation at the departmental/school and college levels must include three basic areas of competency – *teaching, research & scholarship*, and *service* – which must be evaluated in accordance with the faculty member's assignment (% appointment in the three competency areas) and responsibilities within the department/school, the college, and the university during the year of evaluation. For this purpose, the basic faculty appointment is defined as 60% *teaching* (consisting of 18 lecture-hour-equivalents (LHE) per nine-month academic year), 30% *research & scholarship*, and 10% *service*.

In accordance with UTRGV policies and UT System Regent's Rules, the following four performance levels are used to evaluate each competency area: *exceeds expectations*, *meets expectations*, *does not meet expectations*, and *unsatisfactory*. To earn an *overall exceeds expectations* rating, a faculty member must receive an *exceeds expectations* rating in two of the three competency areas and at least a *meets expectations* rating in the third.

The annual evaluation will be used to provide support or a remediation plan (e.g., teaching development workshops, grant writing workshops, counseling, or mentoring in research or service activities) to faculty receiving a *does not meet expectations* rating in any competency area. Faculty members whose performance is *unsatisfactory* in any competency area may be subject to further review and/or to appropriate administrative action. Faculty members whose *overall* performance is *unsatisfactory* for two consecutive annual reviews will be subject to a comprehensive review and appropriate action.

## 2. PROCEDURES

Following the UTRGV Pathways for Review Deadlines available on the Provost's website, each full time-faculty member must submit his/her Faculty Review Dossier (FRD), which is composed of:

- 1) an up-to-date curriculum vita,

- 2) a brief self-evaluation summary (maximum of two pages) of accomplishments/impacts in context of their responsibilities in teaching, research & scholarship, and service,
- 3) required forms with copies of classroom peer-observation, teaching evaluations for the current evaluation period and syllabi, and
- 4) any additional forms required by the faculty member's department/school or the University, as well as any other material relevant to the review that is permitted by the department/school, college, and the University.

Please refer to the [Provost's website](#) for format and other details.

Each faculty member is required to submit his/her completed FRD to the department chair each year no later than the due date listed in the UTRGV Pathways for Review Deadlines. Faculty holding joint appointments shall submit their FRDs to the chairs/directors of the department/school in which they hold a majority (>50%) appointment as per departmental/school and college policies. In such cases it is the responsibility of the chair/director of the department/school in which the faculty member holds a majority (>50%) appointment to obtain input on faculty's performance from the minority appointment department and include it in their FRDs.

According to the UTRGV HOP Policy on Faculty Annual Reviews (ADM-06-502) all annual reviews should include at least two (2) independent levels of reviews: (a) Departmental Annual Review Committee and (b) department chair. The Departmental Annual Review Committee will include a majority of full-time tenured faculty members elected each fall by the voting members of the departmental faculty. Each review level must include a written narrative highlighting strengths and weaknesses, as well as, recommendations for improvement. After the department chair's review, the file will be forwarded to the dean for his/her own independent review and to address any discrepancies between the two departmental levels. Per University policy, faculty can appeal the departmental/school level outcomes, and if not satisfied, may request a review by a college annual review committee which will make a recommendation to the dean. The dean's decision is final.

### **3. EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Faculty activities/impacts are to be judged on the basis of quantity, quality, and impact on the profession, department, college, and university.

#### **3.1. Teaching**

Metrics for *teaching* effectiveness may include student evaluations of teaching, peer-review of teaching, teaching awards and honors, curriculum and course development (including online, hybrid, and distance education classes), activities that promote student learning, 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 semester 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 dismiss classes more than 10 minutes early,
- Provided a clear, concise course syllabus no later than the end of the first week of classes,
- Used tests or other quantitative evaluation procedures,
- 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. close to 80% of the students agree and/or strongly agree with the assigned evaluation questions on average in all classes 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,

To *exceed expectations* in *teaching* requires that in addition to the criteria described in *meets expectation* section above the faculty member achieves *at least three (3)* out of the following annually:

- Instructed two or more class sections at the 3000 level with over 50 students
- Instructed a 2000 or 1000 level class section with over 75 students
- Taught one or more graduate courses
- Developed and/or delivered a new course
- Mentored at least one graduate student through the completion of a Masters thesis OR three (3) undergraduate research students through the completion of an Honors thesis/project report/poster presentation/peer reviewed publication
- Received external grant funding for student/teacher training
- Won a significant teaching/mentoring award

### **3.2. Research & Scholarship**

Metrics for *research & scholarship* effectiveness must include peer-reviewed research publications (including pedagogy research). Other acceptable forms of scholarly output include book chapters and books, patents, software, invited and contributed presentations at professional meetings and conferences, seminars, research grant funding, numbers and performances of high-school, undergraduate and graduate students mentored, relevant awards and honors received, or other outputs can also be recognized if a faculty member makes a case for it. The Department recognizes that collaboration is necessary and encouraged, especially when involving students. The Department values the training of its students and highly values publications which include student authors.

A *meets expectations* in *research & scholarship* requires that the following are met *annually* depending upon the faculty member's % research appointment:

- For 10% research appointment [i.e. 24 LHE teaching per academic year] at least one (1) of the following scholarly activity is achieved: (i) published a research paper in a refereed journal; (ii) submitted an external research grant proposal; (iii) delivered a scholarly presentation or co-authorship on a scholarly presentation made at regional, national or international scientific meeting by the faculty member or by high-school/undergraduate/graduate student, postdoctoral fellow, or visiting scholar mentored by the faculty member;
- For 20% research appointment [i.e. 21 LHE teaching per academic year] at least two (2) of the following activities are achieved: (i) submitted a research paper for publication in a refereed journal; (ii) published a research paper in a refereed journal; (iii) submitted an external research grant proposal; (iv) received an external research grant; (v) delivered a scholarly presentation or co-authorship on a presentation made at regional, national or international scientific meetings by the faculty member or by high-school/undergraduate/graduate student, postdoctoral fellow, or visiting scholar mentored by the faculty member;
- For 30% research appointment [i.e. 18 LHE teaching per academic year] at least three (3) of the following are achieved: (i) published one research paper in a refereed journal; (ii) submitted one research paper for publication in refereed journal; (iii) delivered two scholarly presentations and/or co-authorship on presentations made at regional, national or international scientific meetings by the faculty member or by high-school/undergraduate/graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, or visiting scholars mentored by the faculty member; (iv) submitted an external research grant proposal as a principal investigator (PI)/co-principal investigator (co-PI)/Senior Personnel with significant budget, or (v) worked as a PI/co-PI on an externally-funded research grant.
- For 40% research appointment [i.e. 15 LHE teaching per academic year] at least four (4) of the following are achieved: (i) published a research paper in a quality refereed journal, (ii) submitted one research paper for publication in refereed journal; (iii) delivered one scholarly presentation at regional, national or international scientific meetings and co-authorship on two or more presentations made at regional, national or international scientific meetings by the faculty member and/or by high-school/undergraduate/graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, or visiting scholars mentored by the faculty member; (iv) submitted an external research grant proposal as a principal investigator (PI)/co-principal investigator (co-PI)/Senior Personnel with significant budget, or (v) worked as a PI/co-PI on an externally-funded research grant.
- For 50% research appointment [i.e. 12 LHE teaching per academic year] *all* the following are achieved: (i) published 2 research papers in quality refereed journals, (ii) submitted two new research papers for publication in quality refereed journals, (iii) delivered two scholarly presentations at national or international conferences and co-authorship on two or more presentations made at regional, national or international scientific meetings by the faculty member or by high-school/undergraduate/graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, or visiting scholars mentored by the faculty member; (iv) submitted an external research grant proposal as a principal investigator (PI)/co-principal investigator (co-PI)/Senior Personnel with significant responsibility, unless worked as a PI/co-PI on an externally-funded research grant.

- For 60% research appointment [i.e. 9 LHE teaching per academic year] *all* the following are achieved: (i) published 2 research papers in quality refereed journals, (ii) submitted three new research papers for publication in quality refereed journals, (iii) delivered two scholarly presentations at national or international conferences and co-authorship on three or more presentation made at regional, national or international scientific meetings by the faculty member or by high-school/undergraduate/graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, or visiting scholars mentored by the faculty member; (iv) submitted an external research grant proposal as a principal investigator (PI)/co-principal investigator (co-PI)/Senior Personnel with significant responsibility, unless worked as a PI/co-PI on a major externally-funded research grant.
- For 70% research appointment [i.e. 6 LHE teaching per academic year] *all* the following are achieved: (i) published 3 research papers in quality refereed journals, (ii) submitted three new research papers for publication in quality refereed journals, (iii) delivered three scholarly presentations at national or international conferences and co-authorship on four or more presentations made at regional, national or international scientific meetings by the faculty member or by high-school/undergraduate/graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, or visiting scholars mentored by the faculty member; (iv) submitted an external research grant proposal as a principal investigator (PI)/co-principal investigator (co-PI)/Senior Personnel with significant responsibility, unless worked as a PI/co-PI on a major externally-funded research grant.

To receive an *exceeds expectations in research & scholarship* faculty member will have met the *meets expectations* criteria consistent with his/her % research appointment level as outlined above AND additional accomplishments as stipulated below annually:

- For 10% research appointment produce at least one (1) additional scholarly activities from the list below:
  - a refereed research publication,
  - an external research grant proposal submitted or funded,
  - a scholarly research presentation delivered, or
  - a scholarly research presentation made by a high-school, undergraduate or graduate student mentored by the faculty member.
- For 20% research appointment produce at least two (2) additional scholarly activities from the list below:
  - a refereed research publication,
  - an external research grant proposal submitted or funded,
  - a scholarly research presentation delivered, or
  - a scholarly research presentation made by a high-school, undergraduate or graduate student mentored by the faculty member.
- For 30% research appointment produce at least three (3) *additional* scholarly activities from the list below:
  - One refereed research publications in quality journals in the field
  - Submitted or received external grant funding as a lead PI or as a co-PI with significant allocated budget for research expenditure,

- Delivered an invited scholarly presentation in a significant symposium, conference, or departmental/college-level seminar,
  - Co-authorship on a winning or formally commended research presentation made by a high-school/undergraduate/graduate student mentored by the faculty member,
  - Won a significant research-related award, or
  - Have been granted a patent.
- For 40% research appointment produce at least three (3) *additional* scholarly activities from the list below:
    - Two refereed research publications in quality journals in the field
    - Submitted or received external grant funding as a lead PI or as a co-PI with significant allocated budget for research expenditure,
    - Delivered an invited scholarly presentation in significant symposium, conference, or departmental/college-level seminars,
    - Co-authorship on a winning or formally commended research presentation made by a high-school/undergraduate/graduate student mentored by the faculty member,
    - Won a significant research-related award, or
    - Have been granted a patent.
- For 50% research appointment produce at least three (3) *additional* scholarly activities from the list below:
    - Two additional refereed research publication in a quality journal in the field
    - Received external grant funding as a lead PI or as a co-PI with significant allocated budget for research expenditure,
    - Delivered an invited scholarly presentation in a significant symposium, conference, or departmental/college-level seminar,
    - Co-authorship on a winning or formally commended research presentation made by a high-school/undergraduate/graduate student mentored by the faculty member,
    - Won a significant research-related award, or
    - Have been granted a patent.
- For 60% research appointment produce at least three (3) additional scholarly activities from the list below:
    - Two additional refereed research publications in quality journals in the field
    - Received external grant funding as a lead PI or as a co-PI with significant allocated budget for research expenditure,
    - Delivered two invited scholarly presentations in significant symposia, conferences, or departmental/college-level seminars,
    - Co-authorship on a winning or formally commended research presentation made by a high-school/undergraduate/graduate student mentored by the faculty member,
    - Won a significant research-related award, or

- Have been granted a patent.
- For 70% research appointment produce at least three (3) additional scholarly activities from the list below:
  - Two additional refereed research publications in quality journals in the field
  - Received external grant funding as a lead PI or as a co-PI with significant allocated budget for research expenditure,
  - Delivered two invited scholarly presentations in significant symposia, conferences, or departmental/college-level seminars,
  - Co-authorship on a winning or formally commended research presentation made by a high-school/undergraduate/graduate student mentored by the faculty member, or
  - Won a significant research-related award or have been granted a patent.

Faculty may make a case with the Departmental Annual Review Committee, Chair and Dean for the recognition of other forms of professional achievement which may be substituted for a peer-reviewed article, presentation or grant.

### **3.3. Service**

Metrics for *service* effectiveness should include both the quantitative and qualitative assessments of faculty member's 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, reference letter writing, journal articles reviewed, grants reviewed, editorships of journals, etc. Qualitative metrics of service effectiveness should describe the faculty member's initiatives, leadership roles, mentorships and development of junior faculty, vision and commitment, impact, and relevant recognitions and awards received.

To *meet expectations* in *service* with a 10% Service appointment requires that *all* the following are met annually over the last four-years of the review period:

- Positive contribution to at least one committee per year at any level within the university,
- Positive contribution to at least one student or faculty success activity per year,
- Compliance with all departmental, college, university, and UT System policies.

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

Faculty members must be evaluated based on their % Service commitment. Assistant Professors and Associate Professors should only be assigned a 10% basic Service commitment unless otherwise approved by the Department Chair, the Dean and or the Provost.

To *exceed expectations* in service with 10% basic service appointment faculty member should fulfill all the requirements for the *meets expectations* outlined above AND demonstrate any one of the following:

- Leadership of a significant committee at any level within the university
- Leadership of an impactful uncompensated professional service activity
- Leadership of an uncompensated impactful community service activity

Service appointments that are in excess of 10% (with a corresponding decrease in teaching load) must be approved by the department chair, the dean, and the provost. Such appointments include service as associate department chair, undergraduate or graduate coordinator, director of a formally recognized center, etc. Such service appointees receive a maximum of one course release per semester depending upon the scope of the work and therefore could carry up to 20% additional *service* appointment/commitment. These faculty members also maintain a 10% base service appointment, a 40% teaching appointment, and a 30% research and scholarship appointment. Annual expectations for the additional *service* appointment/commitment must be clearly defined and communicated to the appointee prior to making such an appointment and to the departmental Annual Review Committee (ARC), Tenure & Promotion Review Committee (TPRC), and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC). Administrative appointments are also considered service appointments. Appointments including Associate Deans, Department Chairs and School Directors are given two course releases per semester and therefore carry a 40% administrative appointment. These faculty members also maintain a 10% base service appointment, a 20% teaching appointment, and a 30% research and scholarship appointment. The relative percentage of teaching and research appointment may be negotiated at the time of acceptance of these well-recognized administrative appointments. Faculty members holding these extra service/administrative appointments are evaluated by the department committees (for the 10% basic service) and the department chair (for both the 10% basic service and for any departmental committee service assignments), and by the Dean. Faculty holding college or university level administrative/service appointments are evaluated by the Dean and/or faculty member's immediate supervisor with respect to their service.

To *meet expectations* in service with >10% service appointment faculty member should produce *all* the following:

- Satisfactory accomplishment of all the tasks of the appointment provided that institutional resources were available
- Timeliness of responses and reporting
- Positive impact of the activities on the students, faculty, department/school, college, university and/or the community

To *exceed expectations* in service with >10% service appointment faculty member should fulfill all the requirements for the *meets expectations* outlined above AND demonstrate any *two* of the following:

- Conducted a comprehensive review of tasks/processes/procedures and improved and/or established new procedures/processes to accomplish tasks more efficiently

- Provided extraordinary/visionary/servient leadership in the administrative position/service activity that galvanized students, faculty, staff, administrators and/or community members to work together and/or perform at a higher level.
- Obtained extraordinary results such as, but not limited to, substantially increasing the size of the graduate program, undergraduate enrollment, number students engaged in experiential learning, student success in bottle neck courses, etc.
- Won a service award related to the appointment/service activity
- Faculty may make a case with the Chair and Dean for the recognition of other forms of service (such as to the profession) which may be substituted for the activities given above.

#### **4. FACULTY WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENT AND ANNUAL EVALUATION**

Deviations in % appointment in *teaching, research & scholarship*, and *service* may occur annually and must be pre-approved by the department chair and the dean of the college. For example, a faculty member may choose a “teaching-track” appointment in which they would be required to teach a 24 LHE per academic year (i.e. 80% teaching) with a corresponding reduction in research appointment to 10%.

Faculty may also request upfront course releases under the Presidential Workload Credit but they must achieve the extra committed productivity to receive the *meets expectations* rating on their annual review for that year. Faculty requesting upfront course releases will clearly identify quantifiable deliverables in the beginning of the semester. Such upfront course releases are limited to one course release per semester. In the event a faculty member defaults, this privilege will be taken away and the faculty member will receive a *does not meet expectations* rating in Research and Scholarship on the annual review evaluation unless the faculty member can make a clear case as to why the deliverable could not be met.

Service appointment in excess of 10% with a corresponding decrease in teaching load must be approved by the department chair and the dean of the college. Such appointments include service as an associate department chair, undergraduate or graduate coordinator, program director or co-director (e.g. APRIME and UTeach), director of a formally-recognized center, etc. Such service appointees usually receive up to one course release per semester depending upon the scope of the work and therefore could carry up to 20% additional *service* appointment. These faculty also maintain a 10% base service appointment, a 40% teaching appointment, and a 30% research and scholarship appointment. Annual expectations for the additional *service* appointment must be clearly defined and communicated to the appointee prior to making such an appointment and to the Departmental Annual Review Committee (ARC) and Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC).

Administrative appointments are also considered service appointments. Appointments including Associate Deans, Department Chairs and School Directors are given two course releases per semester and therefore carry a 40% administrative appointment. These faculty also maintain a 10% base service appointment, a 20% teaching appointment, and a 30% research and Scholarship appointment. The relative percentage of teaching and research appointment may be negotiated at the time of acceptance of the administrative appointment. Faculty holding these service/administrative appointments are also evaluated by the department/school committees and the department chairs/school directors except for the 40% administrative appointment, which is evaluated by the Dean, or faculty member’s immediate supervisor.

## 5. OVERALL RATING

An *overall exceeds expectations* rating on the annual review can be earned by receiving *exceeds expectations* rating in any two of the three competency areas (*teaching, research & scholarship* and *service*) and at least a *meets expectations* rating in the third area. An *overall meets expectations* rating is earned by receiving a *meets expectations* rating in all three competency areas or an *exceeds expectations* rating in any one and a *meets expectations* rating in the other two competency areas. An *overall does-not-meet expectations* or *unsatisfactory* rating will be assigned when a faculty member receives *does not meet expectations* or *unsatisfactory* rating in any one or more of the three competency areas, respectively.

## 6. OUTCOMES OF THE ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual review is used for identifying any needs for improvement of faculty performance and for consideration of merit. If a faculty member receives a rating of *does not meet expectations* in any of the three competency areas at any level of review, the faculty member will be assigned an *overall does not meet expectations* rating. Such faculty must meet with the department chair and the dean to develop an action plan to address any weaknesses or concerns. The action plan may include teaching development workshops, grant writing workshops, counseling, mentoring in research or service activities, etc. to faculty who may benefit from such support. In case of tenured faculty, a change in percent appointment in different competency areas may be considered, if appropriate. The faculty member'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.

If a faculty member receives *does-not meet expectations* rating in two or more of the competency areas, the annual performance review will be marked *unsatisfactory*. Such faculty 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 Provost. 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 faculty member'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 Provost, or designee will be conducted to determine if good cause exists for termination under Regents' Rules 31008 and 31102.

## 7. APPEALS

Faculty 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.