

## Handbook of Operating Procedures

### ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

---

#### A. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance for the annual evaluation of faculty at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV).

#### B. Persons Affected

This policy applies to non-tenure track faculty members of UTRGV. (UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures policies ADM 06-503, Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments and ADM 06-504 Tenured Faculty Evaluation, adopted on September 7, 2022, now address the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty, respectively, and replace this policy with respect to the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty.)

#### C. Policy

1. UTRGV is committed to retaining and promoting those faculty whose work achieves a high standard of excellence and who demonstrate, through the performance of their duties, a commitment to professionalism and to UTRGV's mission. To this end, full-time faculty members and continuing part-time faculty members at UTRGV will be evaluated annually. In evaluating a faculty member's performance in teaching, research, service, patient care, or administration (as applicable), reviewers are expected to provide faculty with an appraisal of their job performance compared to the standards/criteria set forth in or adopted under this policy. The objectives of this annual evaluation process include providing faculty with a more concrete understanding of ways to achieve professional growth, and providing a job performance basis for possible merit salary increases.
2. Reviewer assessments of a faculty member's professionalism should be guided, at a minimum, by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) [Statement on Professional Ethics](#), adopted in 1987, which discuss standards for professionalism. Individual departments or colleges may adopt more specific standards or principles of professionalism specific to their academic or practice disciplines, and evaluate their faculty on those standards or principles as well.

#### D. Procedures

1. Each Department shall develop its own evaluation standards or criteria for annual review.

- a. To the extent possible, these criteria should closely correspond to evaluation standards or criteria associated with promotion and tenure (See HOP ADM 6-505, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion).
- b. These criteria shall be approved by the Department faculty, Chair, College Dean, and the appropriate Executive Vice President (EVP).
- c. The following criteria, as well as additional criteria as specified in the Department guidelines, should be included in the annual evaluation standards or criteria:
  - i. Teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including mentoring and instructional innovation, development, improvement, service learning, student research (including community-based research), and internships/co-ops.
  - ii. Research, creative activities, and other scholarly efforts, including community-based scholarly/artistic activities, appropriate to the faculty member's academic discipline.
  - iii. Service to the profession or discipline; administrative and committee service within the University; and community and outreach engagement activities, including those which integrate social justice, civic responsibility, innovation, and sustainable development.
  - iv. Advising, mentoring, career counseling, asset building, leadership/professional development, and other contributions across the university and with community, government, business, and non-profit partners.
  - v. Special recognitions, such as fellowships, honors, and election to office in scholarly or professional organizations.
  - vi. Administration (for faculty with administrative appointments of 40% or higher), including promoting shared governance, fostering a positive and supportive climate, and developing leaders who will contribute to UTRGV's mission and vision.
- d. The weights assigned to the above-mentioned criteria for faculty with different workload distributions, such as three-year lecturers versus tenure-track faculty, or faculty who have administrative appointments, should be determined in the Department guidelines. (See HOP ADM 6-501, Faculty Workload.)

## 2. *Annual Review Dossier*

- a. Information to be submitted for the annual review includes:
  - i. A current curriculum vitae;
  - ii. Updated summaries of professional achievements (e.g., Summary of Teaching Evaluations, Summary of Teaching Achievement, Summary of Research/Scholarship, Summary of Service) for the previous academic year;

- iii. Student evaluations of teaching from the previous academic year;
  - iv. Peer evaluations of teaching as per the Department or College guidelines, or in the case of Departments and Colleges without such guidelines, the *University Guidelines*.
  - v. An action plan for next academic year that covers all three areas of review (Teaching, Research/Creative Activities, and Service) and corresponds to the Department's guidelines/criteria.
  - vi. Any other materials or supporting documentation as per the Department or College criteria.
- b. Faculty members appointed to part-time administrative positions will be reviewed with appropriate consideration given to the demands of administrative assignments and their impact on the level of research/creative activity, courses taught, and the extent of service contributions.
  - c. Tenure-track faculty and those applying for tenure or promotion or post-tenure review do not need to submit a separate annual evaluation dossier. Their tenure-track and tenure/promotion dossiers or post-tenure review documents will also be used for the purpose of the annual review.
3. *Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Standards, and Confidentiality:*
- a. All faculty and administrators involved in the annual review process are responsible for reading all annual review materials, reviewing and evaluating the applicant's performance on each of the performance criteria thoroughly, and participating in committee discussions, where appropriate, and formulating committee recommendations.
  - b. Abstentions should be exercised only in limited, unusual circumstances, such as a conflict of interest.
  - c. Absentee voting is not permitted.
  - d. All those involved in the annual review process shall adhere to the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct; shall focus on factual information; avoid practices that would conflict with the ability to be fair and unbiased; and shall guard against inaccuracies caused by either undue emphasis or omission of information.
  - e. All individuals involved in the annual review process are expected to maintain the confidentiality of the material under review, the substance of review committee discussions, and the final recommendation. Records related to the annual review process will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. Any person who knowingly and intentionally makes an unauthorized disclosure of confidential review information is subject to disciplinary action.

4. *Review Schedule*

- a. Each fall semester, all full-time faculty employed during the preceding year at UTRGV will be evaluated following the schedule set forth in the UTRGV “Pathways for Review Deadlines.” These “Pathways” shall be distributed each year prior to the fall by the appropriate EVP through the deans to Department Chairs; they will also be posted on the appropriate EVP division website.
- b. First year, full-time faculty will be evaluated in their second semester of employment following the schedule set forth in the aforementioned “Pathways for Review Deadlines.”
- c. Tenured faculty will also be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation every six years following the award of tenure. (See HOP ADM 6-504, Post-Tenure Review.) When they coincide, the comprehensive review will also include the annual review.

5. *Review Process:*

- a. All annual reviews should include at least two (2) independent levels of reviews: (1) Department Annual Review Committee, and (2) the Department Chair.
  - i. The Department Annual Review Committee will include at least three (3) full-time faculty members elected each fall by the voting members of the Department faculty.
  - ii. Faculty members with part-time administrative positions, with the exception of the Department Chair and Associate Deans, are eligible to serve on the Department Annual Review Committee.
- b. Each review level must include a written narrative highlighting strengths and weaknesses, as well as recommendations for improvement.
- c. Each review level shall also rank the faculty member in one of the following four (4) categories: “4” – Exceeds expectations; “3” – Meets expectations; “2” – Does not meet expectations; or “1” – Unsatisfactory.
- d. After the Department Chair’s review, the file will be forwarded to the Dean for review and approval, and to address any discrepancies between the two levels of review if any exist.
- e. Faculty can appeal at each Department level. Before the file is forwarded to the Dean, if faculty are not satisfied with the department level outcome, they may request a review by a College Annual Review Committee, who will make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean’s decision is final.

6. *Faculty on Approved Leave*

- a. A faculty member participating in the Faculty Development Leave Program is required to provide the information described above (See HOP ADM 6-109, Faculty Development Leave). Such faculty will also be eligible for merit.
- b. For other types of authorized leave, expectations for annual performance will be negotiated between the faculty member and Department Chair; these written expectations must be approved by the Dean and the appropriate EVP, and in compliance with existing HOP policies and any applicable *Regents' Rules* or state/federal laws. (See HOP ADM 4-600 Series of Leave Policies.)
- c. A faculty member who has missed time due to FMLA leave shall be reviewed only on the basis of actual time worked, without penalty for time on FMLA leave (See HOP ADM 4-608, Family and Medical Leave Act).

7. *Faculty with Joint Appointments*

- a. Faculty who have joint appointments in at least two academic units will have a majority or "home" Department for administrative purposes.
- b. The respective Department Annual Review Committees will engage in a joint review and each evaluation will be weighted according to the percentage of assignment in each Department found in Section D.2.
- c. The Department Annual Review Committee of the "home" Department will be responsible for the final Department evaluation of the faculty member and recommendations concerning merit (if applicable) with any merit payments to be distributed based on percentage assignment.

8. *Annual Performance Evaluation Outcomes*

- a. The outcome of each faculty member's annual performance evaluation will be used in determining the amount of merit awarded to the faculty member, should merit pay be available.
- b. To be eligible for merit, faculty must receive "exceeds" or "meets" expectations in the overall evaluation result. The annual evaluation outcome may also be used as the basis for nomination for awards or other forms of performance recognition.
- c. If the annual performance evaluation raises concerns about the faculty member's performance in one or more areas, as indicated by "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory," this may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional

support. The faculty member's progress in response to the additional support will be monitored through subsequent annual evaluation processes.

- d. A tenured faculty member whose overall annual performance evaluation is "Unsatisfactory" for two consecutive annual reviews may additionally be reviewed under the procedures described in HOP ADM 6-504, Post-Tenure Review. The decision to undertake a comprehensive performance evaluation outside of the normal time-frame of six years will be made by the appropriate EVP, in consultation with the Dean of the College.

#### **E. Definitions**

1. College – an academic unit organized within the university, which is usually comprised of many departments or provides programs in multiple academic specialties/professional instruction. This academic unit may be referred to as a college, or school, and is led by a dean reporting to a designated EVP.
2. Department – an academic unit organized within a college, usually devoted to a particular academic discipline. This academic unit may be referred to as a department, school, or center, and the unit's head (usually a chair or director) reports to the dean of the college.
3. Department Chair – administrative leader of an academic unit appointed by the dean with the concurrence of the appropriate Executive Vice President; may refer to the chair of a department, the director of a school, or other equivalent academic unit.
4. Does not meet expectations – indicates a failure as defined by the unit beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.
5. Exceeds expectations – reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
6. Full-time faculty – for the purpose of this policy, a full-time faculty member refers to one-year lecturers, three-year lecturers, and clinical faculty, professors in practice, and tenure-track and tenured faculty, including those with part-time administrative positions.
7. Meets expectations – reflects accomplishments commensurate with what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
8. Unsatisfactory – means failing to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, or contractual obligations in 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. The same units that specify the standards for exceeding, meeting, and failing to meet expectations should also specify the criteria for performance that is unsatisfactory.

**F. Related Statutes or Regulations, Rules, Policies, or Standards**

[AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#)

[University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31102, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)

[University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member](#)

[University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 30501, Employee Evaluations](#)

[Texas Education Code Section 51.942, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)

[Texas Government Code Section 552.102, Public Information Exception: Confidentiality of Certain Personnel Information](#)

**G. Dates Reviewed or Amended**

July 15, 2019 - Amended

September 7, 2022 – Amended Section B to reflect the adoption of ADM 06-503 Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments and ADM 06-504 Tenured Faculty Evaluation.