

College of Sciences
Department of Physics
Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty Annual
Review Criteria, Policies and Procedures

1. PURPOSE, GUIDELINES AND POLICIES

The Department of Physics, in accordance with the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV) policy and UT Regents Rules, supports a system of annual evaluation for *all* full-time faculty members for the purpose of improvement of faculty performance, promotion and merit considerations. All tenure-track and tenured physics faculty members 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 annual evaluations will serve as the tenure-track reviews.

The faculty annual evaluation at the departmental 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 workload assignment and responsibilities within the department, the college, and the university during the year of evaluation. For this purpose, the basic faculty appointment is defined as 18 lecture-hour-equivalents [LHE, see Appendix at the end of the document] per nine-month academic year; in addition to appropriate proportion of *research & scholarship*, and *service*. However, faculty may hold alternative workload assignments pre-approved by the Department Chair and the Dean. Each faculty member will schedule a workload conference annually with the Department Chair and the Dean during early spring semester (no later than March 10) to reach an agreement about their percentage workload appointment for the next academic year. Faculty will be evaluated based on the actual proportional commitment in each of the three competency areas.

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
- ┆ Unsatisfactory

The annual evaluation will be used to provide support or a remediation plan (e.g., but not limited to, teaching development workshops, grant writing workshops, counseling, or mentoring in research or service activities) to faculty who may benefit from such support. Faculty members whose performance is *unsatisfactory* in any competency area may be subject to further review. 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) Up-to-date curriculum vitae,
- 2) Brief summary of accomplishments/impacts in context of their responsibilities,
- 3) Required forms with copies of classroom peer-observation, teaching evaluations for the current evaluation period and syllabi,
- 4) Any additional forms required by the faculty member's department or the University, as well as any other material relevant to the review that is permitted by the department, college, and the University.

Please refer to the website: <https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm> required to submit his/her completed FRD to the department chair/school director no later than the due date each year. Faculty holding joint appointments shall submit their FRDs to the chair/director of the department/school in which they hold a majority (>50%) appointment as per departmental/school and college policies. The chair of the majority-appointment department/school will share the FRD with the chair of the minority-appointment department/school. 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 the faculty member's performance from the minority appointment department and include it in their FRD.

According to the UTRGV HOP Policy on Faculty Annual Reviews (ADM-06-502) all annual reviews should include at least two *independent* levels of reviews: (a) Department Annual Review Committee and (b) Department chair.

The departmental Annual Review Committee (ARC) will include a majority of full-time tenured faculty members elected each fall by the voting members of the department 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's Office for review and approval, and to

address any discrepancies between the two levels. Per University policy, faculty can appeal the departmental level outcomes, and if not satisfied, may request a review by a college annual review committee, which will make a recommendation to the dean. As per HOP, the dean's decision is final.

3. DOCUMENT REVISION

The current criteria can be revised as necessitated by submitting a request to the Dean. The Dean will review and forward the revised document for consideration of the upper administration. The departmental bylaws may also be consulted with as appropriate.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

This section provides guidelines for evaluation in the form of criteria that may be used for judging faculty performance. The department recognizes that the qualitative nature of these criteria and the objectivity of evaluation are not mutually exclusive. While quantification sets a goal to achieve the department's mission and vision, categorically pre-set numbers may disincentivize self-driven achievement and hinder recognition of true excellence. To this end, the document provides *typical expectations* for each level of performance. The department chair and the departmental annual evaluation committee will make a judicious decision of the overall productivity by taking variations around these typical expectations into account on a case-by-case basis while ensuring that these variations are never below the standards expected across the department.

Varying workload choice: In case of different levels of workload choices over the period of evaluation, a weighted sum of the expected outcome consistent with the workload level will be used.

4.1. Teaching

Criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness should include, but are not limited to, 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 success, advising and mentoring activities and student/teacher training grant funding.

To *meet expectations* in teaching, a faculty member will typically achieve *all* of the following annually:

- ┆ Taught assigned teaching load consistent with workload choice.
- ┆ Received satisfactory student evaluations.
- ┆ Received satisfactory peer review of teaching in the latest review; addressed comments and suggestions therein.

To *exceed expectations* in teaching, a faculty member will meet expectations and demonstrate one other significant accomplishment. Examples of these accomplishments are given below.

- ┆ Received external grant funding for student/teacher training.
- ┆ Mentored high school, undergraduate or graduate students.
- ┆ Won a significant teaching/mentoring award.
- ┆ Developed innovative teaching and other significant pedagogy.
- ┆ Published textbook or a book chapter related to teaching.
- ┆ Created a new course.
- ┆ Received $\geq 80\%$ average student evaluation over all the courses taught where the average student evaluation score is calculated as follows: E-score = (Number of students who participated in evaluations*overall rating) for each class taught; Final score = [(Total E-score over all classes)/(Total number of students who participated in evaluations over all classes)]*100

4.2. Research & Scholarship

Criteria for evaluating *research & scholarship* effectiveness include, but are not limited to, peer reviewed research publications (including pedagogy research) in quality journals in the field and other acceptable forms of scholarly output such as book chapters and books, patents, invited and contributed presentations at professional meetings/conferences and seminars, research grant proposals submitted and funded, number and performance of high school, undergraduate, and graduate students mentored in research, and relevant awards and honors.

4.2.1. Nature and quality of publications: The committee members will reflect upon quality of papers published, impact of research, and submitted grants in their review. In case of large collaborations, individual contributions may be supported by indicators such as MOU review reports, corresponding author status, etc.

To *meet expectations* in research & scholarship, a faculty member will typically achieve the following, with specific numbers depending upon the faculty member's workload choice.

- ┆ Progress toward maintaining peer-reviewed research publications in quality journals in the field at the rate of X/year averaged over a 4-year period.
- ┆ Y externally-funded research grant proposals submitted or already a PI or co-PI on an existing externally funded grant or a senior person with a definite budget on an existing significant externally funded research grant.

- ┆ Z scholarly presentations made by the faculty member or by high-school, undergraduate, and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member at conferences or invited talks at major institutions. (Faculty members may request substitution of scholarly presentations with additional publications and/or conference proceedings.)

The X, Y, Z numbers are given below for each level of research percentage.

24 LHE per academic year, only *one* of X=1, Y=1 and Z=1.

21 LHE per academic year, only *two* of X=1, Y=1 and Z=1.

18 LHE per academic year, *all* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=1, Y=1 and Z=1 at national level or higher or invited presentations.

15 LHE per academic year, *all* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=1.5, Y=1 and Z=1 at national level or higher or invited presentations.

12 LHE per academic year, *all* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=2, Y=1 and Z=1 at national level or higher or invited presentations.

9 LHE per academic year, *all* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=2.5, Y=1 and Z=2 at national level or higher or invited presentations.

6 LHE per academic year, *all* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=3, Y=1 and Z=2 at national level or higher or invited presentations.

To *exceed expectations* in research & scholarship, a faculty member should meet expectations in research & scholarship and demonstrated one other significant accomplishment, including (but not limited to) those from the list below.

- ┆ Published 1 or more paper(s) in quality journals.
- ┆ Received external grant funding as a PI or as a co-PI/senior person with significant allocated budget for research expenditure.
- ┆ Won a significant research-related award.
- ┆ Was granted a patent.
- ┆ Mentored one or more graduate student(s) successfully through completion of a Master's or Ph.D. thesis or undergraduates through an Honors thesis.

4.2.2. *Scholarship recognition:* Publication(s) in exceptional top tier journals (e.g. Nature, Science, Physical Review Letters or other high impact journals), obtaining patents, receiving significant grants as PI or co-PI, publication of a book and equivalent achievements will be recognized by the departmental annual evaluation committee and the Department Chair by possible waiver of other evaluation criteria and by recommending for ‘exceeds expectation.’

4.3. Service

Criteria for evaluating service effectiveness should include, but not limited to, both the quantitative and qualitative assessments of the 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, journal articles reviewed, grants reviewed, editorships of journals, etc. Qualitative metrics of service effectiveness should describe the faculty member’s initiatives and contributions, leadership roles, mentorships and development of junior faculty, impact, and relevant recognitions and awards received.

Faculty members will be evaluated based on their service commitment. Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are assigned a basic service commitment unless otherwise approved by the Department Chair and the Dean.

To *meet expectations* in service with basic service appointment faculty member will typically achieve *all* the following:

- ┆ Compliance with all departmental, college, university, and UT System policies
 - ┆ Positive contribution to one committee at any level, including approved ad hoc ones, in the university per year and positive contribution to at least one professional or community service activity per year
- Or
- ┆ Positive contribution to more than one committee at any level, including approved ad hoc ones, in the university per year

Overall, faculty members at the basic service appointment are expected to have positive contributions to at least two service activities per year

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

- ┆ Significant achievement in leadership of a committee at any level within the university
- ┆ Significant achievement in leadership of an uncompensated professional service activity

- ┆ Significant achievement in leadership of an uncompensated community service activity

The departmental annual evaluation committee and the department chair will decide about the impact and significance of these activities. Moreover, the evaluation committee may place a faculty member in the area of 'exceeds expectations' in Service if the faculty has a positive contribution to a number of University committees and/or professional service activities and/or community service activities, which clearly exceeds the basic service commitment.

Service appointments that are in excess of the basic level as defined above (with a corresponding decrease in teaching load) must be approved by the Department Chair and the Dean. 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. These faculty members also maintain a basic service commitment, with a 12 LHE per academic year teaching commitment, and a research and scholarship commitment corresponding to 9-hour workload per academic year. Annual expectations for the additional *service* 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. These faculty members also maintain a basic service commitment, with a 6 LHE per academic year teaching commitment, and a research and scholarship commitment corresponding to 9-hour workload per academic year.

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 and the Department Chair, 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 commitment above the basic, a faculty member typically should produce *all* the following:

- ┆ Satisfactory accomplishment of all the tasks of the appointment
- ┆ 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 commitment above the basic, a faculty member should fulfill all the requirements for the *meets expectations* outlined above and demonstrate *any one* 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

5. FACULTY WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENT AND ANNUAL EVALUATION

Deviations in workload commitment in *teaching, research & scholarship*, and *service* may occur annually and must be pre-approved by the Department Chair and the Dean.

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 at the beginning of the semester. Such upfront course releases are limited to one course release per semester. In the event a faculty member does not fulfill obligations required by release, this privilege will be taken away and the faculty member will receive a *does not meet expectations* rating in the category in which release was requested on the annual review evaluation.

Faculty may request a course release for the following activities through prior approval by the department chair and the college dean:

- ┆ Setting up a new lab or moving the existing lab to a new location.
- ┆ Major upgrade or repair of existing lab.
- ┆ Acquisition/installation/fine-tuning of major new equipment.
- ┆ Design and building of new experimental setups including custom-made components and tools.
- ┆ Maintenance of the large-scale lab provided the lab produces publications or generates grants at a steady rate.
- ┆ Device fabrication and sample preparation at off-site facilities or National Labs.

6. OVERALL RATING

An *overall exceeds expectations* rating on the annual review can be earned by receiving *exceeds expectations* rating in one of the two lead competency areas (*teaching, research & scholarship* and *service*) and at least *meets expectations* rating in the other two. An *overall meets expectations* rating is earned by receiving a *meets expectations* rating in all three competency areas. An *overall does-not-meet expectations* rating will be assigned when a faculty member receives *does not meet expectations* in any one of the lead competency areas. In such cases a future remedial plan should be provided.

A faculty member who receives *does not meet expectations* in two lead competency areas will receive an *overall unsatisfactory* rating. *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.

7. APPEALS

Faculty can appeal the departmental level outcomes, and if not satisfied, may request a review by the college annual review committee that 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.

8. APPENDIX

LHE=3 for 3 credit undergraduate classes with ≥ 10 students

LHE=4.5 for 3 credit graduate classes with ≥ 5 students

LHE=2 for a 1 credit 3 contact hour lab

LHE= 3 for a 2 credit 3 contact hour lab

LHE=0.6 per graduate student supervision or independent study

LHE=0.3 per 3-credit undergraduate student research or independent study

LHE= 0.5 per 3 credit graduate thesis class

LHE=1.0 per 3 credit doctoral thesis class