

College of Sciences
School of Earth, Environmental and Marine Sciences
Faculty Annual Review Guidelines, Policies, Criteria, and Procedures

1. PURPOSE, GUIDELINES AND POLICIES

The College of Sciences (COS) 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 for the purpose of improvement of faculty performance, promotion and merit considerations. All tenure-track and tenured COS 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.

Each COS department/school should establish a formal, metrics-based, basic performance criteria for faculty annual evaluation that will be reviewed by the Department Chair/School Director, the Dean, and the Provost to ensure consistency with current COS policies and expectations, UTRGV HOP policies and UT System Regent's Rules. In cases where a department/school does not have an approved metrics-based annual basic performance criteria, the COS performance criteria and requirements will be used for faculty annual evaluations.

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 calendar for personnel actions, each full time-faculty member must submit his/her Faculty Review Dossier (FRD), which is composed of 1) an up-to-date curriculum vitae, 2) a brief summary (maximum of two pages) of accomplishments/impacts in context of their responsibilities, 3) copies of all 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.

Each faculty member is required to submit his/her completed FRD to the appropriate department chair/school director no later than the due date each year. Faculty holding joint appointments shall submit their FRDs to the chairs/directors of both departments/schools 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 FRD.

Faculty members may include additional material in support of their application. The material to be included and the organization of the FRD should conform to the Instructions for Preparation of Faculty Review Dossiers (i.e. [the institutional format guide available here: \[http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-format-for-faculty-review-dossier.pdf\]\(http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-format-for-faculty-review-dossier.pdf\)](http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-format-for-faculty-review-dossier.pdf)).

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) department/school Annual Review Committee and (b) department chair/school director. The department/school Annual Review Committee will include a majority of full-time tenured faculty members elected each fall by the voting members of the department/school faculty. Each review level must include a written narrative highlighting strengths and weaknesses, as well as, recommendations for improvement. After the department chair/school director's review, the file will be forwarded to the dean for review and approval, and to address any discrepancies between the two 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

All departments/schools should use the standard metrics-based criteria listed below for determining the performance level of the faculty member in *teaching, research and scholarship, and service*. Faculty activities/impacts are to be judged on the basis of quantity, quality, and impact on the profession and the department, college, and university. Departments/schools may develop additional evaluation metrics to suit their specific goals and missions consistent with the College, the University, and the UT System Regents' rules. New faculty in their first year are expected to make progress in areas of teaching, research and service. A review of the faculty's workload, CV, and committee assignments will be reviewed in the first Annual evaluation by the SEEMS Annual Evaluation committee.

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.

The goals of the peer review of teaching are to improve teaching and student learning while serving as a tool for mentoring. The outcome of the faculty peer observation process shall be a reflective summary by the faculty member describing any steps taken or changes made towards the enhancement of teaching and improvement of student learning. The guidelines for peer review of teaching can be found at <http://www.utrgv.edu/provost/files/documents/faculty-resources/utrgv-guidelines-for-faculty-peer-observation%20of%20teaching.pdf>

To meet expectations in teaching faculty member or lecturer will have met the criteria consistent with his/her % teaching appointment level as outlined below:

For 20-60% Teaching commitment all of the following are met:

- Taught assigned workload consistent with workload distribution
- 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/school director 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 significantly 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 regularly
- Assigned grades based solely on performance of students on quantitative 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. the faculty member strives to achieve at least 80% on the agree and/or strongly agree category on average in all classes)
- Received satisfactory peer review of teaching on the most recent evaluation and evidence of reflection and incorporation of any suggestions made in the peer reviews into his/her teaching practice
- Demonstrated evidence of genuine effort to engage students in learning in and outside the classroom
- Mentored a graduate, undergraduate or a high school student(s) in research

For 70-80% Teaching commitment all of the following are met:

- Taught assigned workload consistent with workload distribution
- Attended assigned courses on time, arranged for a replacement or notified the class if unable to meet a scheduled class, notified the department chair/school director 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 significantly 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 quantitative 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. the faculty member strives to achieve at least 80% on the agree and/or strongly agree category on average in all classes)
- Received satisfactory peer review of teaching on the most recent evaluation and evidence of reflection and incorporation of any suggestions made in the peer reviews into his/her teaching practice
- Demonstrated evidence of genuine effort to engage students in learning in and outside the classroom

To *exceed expectations in teaching* faculty member or lecturer will have met the *meets expectations* criteria consistent with his/her % teaching appointment as outlined above AND additional activities as stipulated below:

For 20-60% *teaching* commitment any *two* of the following additional activities are achieved:

- Received student evaluations of 90% or more in the agree and/or strongly agree category on average in all classes
- Developed a new course, revised an existing course, or contributed to some curriculum development activity
- Published a text book or a book chapter on pedagogy
- Developed or implemented an innovative pedagogy method such as inquiry-based learning, challenge-based instruction, flipped classroom, or other methods
- Mentored three or more graduate, undergraduate or high school students in research
- Received external grant funding for student/teacher training
- Won a significant teaching/mentoring award.

For 70-80% *teaching* commitment any *two* of the following additional activities are achieved:

- Received student evaluations of 90% or more in the agree and/or strongly agree category on average in all classes
- Developed a new course, revised an existing course, or contributed to some curriculum development activity
- Published a text book or a book chapter on pedagogy

- Developed or implemented an innovative pedagogy method such as inquiry-based learning, challenge-based instruction, flipped classroom, or other methods
- Taught one or more graduate courses
- Mentored a graduate, undergraduate or high school student in research
- Received external grant funding for student/teacher training
- Won a significant teaching/mentoring award

Research & Scholarship

Metrics for *research & scholarship* effectiveness include peer-reviewed research publications (including pedagogy research) 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.

A *meets expectations* rating in *research & scholarship* requires that the following conditions are met annually depending upon the faculty member's appointment. Lecturers have no research expectation so they automatically *meet expectations* in the research category.

For 10% research appointment (i.e. 24 LHE teaching workload per academic year) one of the following activity is achieved:

- One new research paper submitted for publication in a refereed journal.
- One external research grant proposal submitted as a PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and a budget for research), unless already a PI or Co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research) on a funded grant
- A scholarly presentation delivered by the faculty member at a local, state, national or international conference, or delivered a seminar/colloquium at another university **or** a co-authored research paper presented by a high school, undergraduate, or graduate student mentored by the faculty member

For 20% research appointment (i.e. 21 LHE teaching workload per academic year) two of the following activities are achieved:

- One new research paper submitted for publication in a refereed journal.
- One external research grant proposal submitted as a PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and a budget for research), unless already a PI or Co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research) on a funded grant
- A scholarly presentation delivered by the faculty member at a local, state, national or international conference, or delivered a seminar/colloquium at another university **or** a co-authored research paper presented by a high school, undergraduate, or graduate student mentored by the faculty member

For 30% research appointment (i.e. 18 LHE teaching workload per academic year) a reasonable combination of three of the following (subject to the maxima for each category that may count towards this total) are achieved:

- Submitted a research paper for publication in a refereed journal (2 maximum)
- Accepted or published a research paper in a refereed journal (no maximum)
- A scholarly presentation delivered by the faculty member at a local, state, national or international conference, or delivered a seminar/colloquium at another university **or** a co-authored research paper presented by a high school, undergraduate, or graduate student mentored by the faculty member (2 maximum)
- One external research grant proposal submitted as a PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and a budget for research) in a large grant, unless already a PI or Co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and a budget for research) on a significant externally funded research grant (2 maximum)

For 40% research appointment (i.e. 15 LHE teaching workload per academic year) a reasonable combination of four of the following (subject to the maxima for each category that may count towards this total) are achieved:

- Submitted a research paper for publication in a refereed journal (2 maximum)
- Accepted or published a research paper in a refereed journal (no maximum)
- A scholarly presentation delivered by the faculty member at a local, state, national or international conference, or delivered a seminar/colloquium at another university **or** a co-authored research paper presented by a high school, undergraduate, or graduate student mentored by the faculty member (2 maximum)
- One external research grant submitted as principal investigator (PI) or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and a budget for research) in a grant, unless already a PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and a budget for research) on an externally funded research grant (2 maximum)

For 50% research appointment (i.e. 12 LHE teaching workload per academic year) a reasonable combination of five of the following (subject to the maxima for each category that may count towards this total) are achieved:

- Submitted a research paper for publication in refereed journals (2 maximum)
- Accepted or published one research paper in a refereed journal (no maximum)
- One scholarly presentation made by the faculty member in a state, national or international conference (2 maximum)
- One presentation made by high school/undergraduate/graduate students mentored by the faculty member in a local, state, national or international conference (1 maximum)
- One external research grant **obtained** as principal investigator (PI) or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and a budget for research) in a grant, unless already a PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a definite substantial role and budget for research) on an externally funded research grant. (no maximum)

For 60% research appointment (i.e. 9 LHE teaching workload per academic year) a reasonable combination of six of the following (subject to the maxima for each category that may count towards this total) are achieved:

- Submitted a research paper for publication in refereed journals (3 maximum)
- Accepted or published one research paper in a refereed journal (no maximum)
- One scholarly presentation made by the faculty member in a state, national or international conference (2 maximum)
- One presentation made by high school/undergraduate/graduate students mentored by the faculty member in a local, state, national or international conference (1 maximum)
- One external research grant **obtained** as principal investigator (PI) or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research) in a grant, unless already a PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research) on an externally funded research grant. (no maximum)

For 70% research appointment (i.e. 6 LHE teaching workload per academic year; minimum possible teaching load for tenure-track/tenured faculty member) a reasonable combination of seven of the following (subject to the maxima for each category that may count towards this total) are achieved:

- Submitted a research paper for publication in refereed journals (3 maximum)
- Accepted or published one research paper in a refereed journal (no maximum)
- One scholarly presentation made by the faculty member in a state, national or international conference (2 maximum)
- One presentation made by high school/undergraduate/graduate students mentored by the faculty member in a local, state, national or international conference (2 maximum)
- One external research grant **obtained** as principal investigator (PI) or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research) in a grant, unless already a PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research) on an externally funded research grant. (no maximum)

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

Lecturers may earn an *exceeds expectations* in the research category as follows:

1. Has one of the following: a peer reviewed original research publication (based on work done while at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley), obtained external competitive research funding as PI or Co-PI or a substantive research/administrative role as senior personnel, talk or poster presentation (based on work done while at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley), at a professional or academic conference (State, National or International level).
2. Show evidence of seeking external support to sustain an active research program. Either by submitting a grant proposal as PI or Co-PI or a substantive research/administrative role as senior personnel.

3. Have a research program that demonstrates a sustained level of productivity (i.e. involves undergraduate or graduate students, collaborates with other institutions, produces data that can be incorporated into grants and scientific manuscripts, etc).

For 10% research appointment produce at least *one additional* activity from the list below:

- A new research paper submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal
- One external research grant proposal submitted, unless already has a funded grant as a PI/Co-PI/Senior Person with a budget
- A scholarly presentation delivered by the faculty member at a local, state, national or international conference, or delivered a seminar/colloquium at another university **or** a co-authored research paper presented by a high school, undergraduate, or graduate student mentored by the faculty member

For 20% research appointment produce any *one additional* activity from the list below:

- A new research paper submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal
- A paper published in a refereed, quality journals within the field
- One external research grant proposal submitted, unless already has a funded grant as a PI/Co-PI/Senior Person with a budget
- Obtained a new external research grant
- A scholarly presentation delivered at a state, national or international conference or a seminar/colloquium at another university
- A co-authored research presentation delivered by a high school/undergraduate/graduate student mentored by the faculty member at a local, state, national or international conference
- Filed an invention disclosure with the university

For 30% research appointment produce any *one additional* activity from the list below:

- Published a refereed research paper in a peer-reviewed within the field as one of the lead/corresponding authors
- Received external grant funding as a PI or as a co-PI or Senior Person with significant allocated budget for research expenditure
- A major invited scholarly presentation made by the faculty member in national or international conference
- An award won for a research presentation by the high school/undergraduate/graduate student mentored by the faculty member in a state, national or international conference
- Won a significant research-related award by the faculty member
- Has been granted a patent or licensed his/her own patented technology to a company

For 40%-70% research appointments, any *one additional* activity from the list below are achieved:

- Published a refereed research paper in a peer-reviewed journal within the field as one of the lead/corresponding authors

- Received external grant funding as a PI or as a co-PI, or Senior Person with significant allocated budget for research expenditure
- A invited scholarly presentation made by the faculty member in national or international conference
- An award won for a research presentation by the high school/undergraduate/graduate student mentored by the faculty member in a regional, state, national or international conference
- Won a significant research-related award by the faculty member
- Has been granted a patent or licensed his/her own patented technology to a company

Service

Metrics for *service* effectiveness should include 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, vision and commitment, impact, and relevant recognitions and awards received.

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

A meets expectations rating in *service* requires that all of the following have been completed annually:

- Positive contribution to at least one committee at any level within the university,
- Positive contribution to at least one student or faculty success activity,
- Positive contribution to at least one professional and/or community service activity

An exceeds expectations rating in *service* requires at least one of the following activities have been completed in addition to meeting expectations annually:

- Positive contribution to at least three committees at any level within the university
- Served as an effective committee chair of a significant committee at any level within the university,
- Leadership of a student or faculty success activity,
- Leadership of an impactful professional service or 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 and Post-Tenure Review Committee (TPPTRC). 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 faculty member with >10% service appointment 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 faculty member with >10% service appointment should fulfill all the requirements for the *meets expectations* outlined above AND *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

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/school director 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.

Service appointment in excess of 10% with a corresponding decrease in teaching load must be approved by the department chair/school director and the Dean of the college. Such appointments include service as an associate department chair/associate school director, undergraduate or graduate coordinator, program director or co-director (e.g. UTeach), 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. 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/school Annual Review Committee (ARC) and Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review Committee (TPPTRC).

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 his/her 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 must meet with the department chair/school director 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 the annual performance review is *unsatisfactory* in any of the three competency areas, the dean in consultation with the department chair may recommend a change in the faculty member's workload or recommend additional actions to the Provost. This may result in an additional review by the Provost, or designee to determine if good cause exists for termination under Regents' Rules 31008 and 31102. 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.

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. Each department/school that specifies the standards for exceeding, meeting, and failing to meet expectations should also specify the criteria for performance that is unsatisfactory.

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.