

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

**Contents**

<b>1 Preamble</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2 Procedural policies</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Administrative calendar	2
2.2 Responsibilities of the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty	2
2.3 Responsibilities of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers	2
2.4 Annual evaluation of faculty submitting a tenure/promotion/post-tenure/reappointment dossier	2
2.5 Committee structure and selection	3
2.6 Guidelines for preparing and submitting annual Faculty Evaluation folders	4
2.7 Reporting Evaluation Results	4
2.8 Appeals	4
2.9 Document review, revisions/amendments	4
<b>3 Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Overall score	5
3.2 Determination of overall rating for each independent evaluator	5
3.3 Overall Committee Rating	5
3.4 Teaching Score	5
3.5 Research and Scholarship Score	8
3.6 Service Score	9
3.7 Criteria for the Exceeds Expectations rating	11
<b>A Format of Faculty Activity Report</b>	<b>12</b>

## **1 Preamble**

The purpose of the Annual Faculty Evaluation is to provide:

1. Faculty members with fair academic performance appraisals and a concrete basis for professional growth and development in the areas of Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service, commensurate with assigned responsibilities and duties
2. An overall evaluation rating that can serve as a basis for merit salary increases or salary adjustments
3. Information for making post-tenure review decisions for tenured faculty and promotion or reappointment decisions for Lecturers.

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

## **2 Procedural policies**

### **2.1 Administrative calendar**

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

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

The elected SMSS Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty will evaluate all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the School for whom annual evaluation is required, and will review school-level appeals. Each committee member will evaluate all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The committee will then discuss cases where there is substantial deviation in the individual evaluations, and at the end of the discussions each committee member will decide whether or not to revise his or her evaluation. The individual committee member evaluations are combined into a committee decision on the overall rating and overall score according to Section 3.3. The evaluation narratives should be approved by the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty.

### **2.3 Responsibilities of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers**

The elected SMSS Annual Review Committee for Lecturers will evaluate all Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the School for whom annual evaluation is required, and will review School level appeals by Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. Each committee member will evaluate all Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. The committee will then discuss cases where there is substantial deviation in the individual evaluations, and at the end of the discussions each committee member will decide independently whether or not to revise his or her evaluation. The individual committee member evaluations are combined into a committee decision on the overall rating and overall score according to Section 3.3. The evaluation narratives should be approved by the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.

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

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

## 2.5 Committee structure and selection

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

1. The School Director and any Associate Deans are excluded from membership on the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty and the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.
2. Only SMSS tenured, tenure-track faculty members (including the School Director) are eligible to vote during the election of the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty.
3. Only full-time SMSS Lecturers and/or Senior Lecturers are eligible to vote during the election of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers.
4. The Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty will be composed of six elected members. Only SMSS tenured or tenure-track faculty with at least three academic years of full-time employment in the School at the time of the election are eligible for membership on the committee. At least four elected members must be tenured faculty members at the time of the election. Each year three new members will be elected to serve throughout two consecutive academic years. At the end of a two-year term, the committee member will be eligible for reelection after one year. In the event of any vacancy the tenured and tenure-track faculty will vote to fill the vacated position.
5. The Annual Review Committee for Lecturers will be composed of six elected members. All tenured or tenure-track faculty or 3-year Lecturers with at least three academic year of full-time employment in the School at the time of the election are eligible for membership on the committee. At least one committee member must be a tenured faculty member, at least one other committee member must be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member, and at least two additional committee members must be 3-year Lecturers or Senior Lecturers, at the time of the election. Each year three new members will be elected to serve throughout two consecutive academic years. At the end of a two-year term, the committee member will be eligible for reelection after one year. In the event of any vacancy the tenured and tenure-track faculty will vote to fill the vacated position.
6. The School Director shall call a meeting of the tenured, tenure-track faculty to elect the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty and a meeting of all full-time faculty to elect the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers during the Spring semester. Nominations may be submitted to the School Director in writing before the meeting or from the floor. Nominations must have the approval of the nominee. The voting method will be decided by the faculty during the meeting. Eligible voters that are not able to attend the meeting will be given a reasonable time window during which they can also cast their vote. Voting will be done by secret ballot. If there are any tied votes, they will be resolved by a runoff election. If the runoff election does not resolve the tie, then it will be resolved by the School Director. The votes for the membership of the committee are to be counted and the results reported to the School.
7. After the membership of the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty and the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers has been constituted, the Committee members will elect a tenured faculty member of the Committee to chair each Committee for a 1-year term. The Chair of the Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty will represent the School on the College Annual Evaluation Committee, unless there is an appeal from an SMSS Lecturer, in which case, the Chair of the Annual Review Committee for Lecturers will represent SMSS during discussion of SMSS Lecturer appeals.
8. Due to the transition to UTRGV, on the first year that this UTRGV document goes in effect, Committee Members will be elected as follows: From the 6 elected faculty the 3 faculty with the most votes will serve a 2-year term and the other 3 faculty will serve for a 1-year term. Any ties will be resolved during a faculty meeting.

## **2.6 Guidelines for preparing and submitting annual Faculty Evaluation folders**

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

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

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

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

**REMARK:** The Cover Sheet, Faculty Activity Report, and Appendices to the Faculty Activity Report will be submitted as a distinct PDF file, with filename Lastname-Firstname.pdf. Other documents that are required by UTRGV HOP policy ADM 06-502, Section 3a (e.g. updated CV, peer evaluation of teaching, etc.) will be submitted as a separate supplementary PDF file with filename Lastname- Firstname-documents.pdf.

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

## **2.7 Reporting Evaluation Results**

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

The overall score calculated according to section 3.1 may be used internally at the College level. This additional information will be reported to the evaluated faculty member in the “Evaluative Summary” narrative box in the standard form.

## **2.8 Appeals**

The overall rating, overall score, and narrative statements are all subject to appeal. Submission and processing of appeals will be done according to time limits set in the administrative calendar. Appealing faculty must state grounds for the appeal and provide supporting materials. The outcome of the appeal may either uphold the original review or accede to some or all requests stated in the appeal.

## **2.9 Document review, revisions/amendments**

The Annual Evaluation document will be reviewed when deemed necessary by the respective Annual Review Committee, the School Director, petition supported by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, or upper levels of authority. The Annual Evaluation document will be reviewed by an elected faculty committee. The size and structure of the committee will be decided by the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The revised document will be approved by the majority vote of the tenured, tenure-track faculty and the 3-year Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. All faculty will be afforded a reasonable time window during which they can cast their vote to ratify the document. The document will then be ratified by all other review levels in accordance with UTRGV HOP. If any changes are introduced to the document during the approval process by upper levels of review, the revised document must be approved by the School faculty again by majority vote, in accordance to the continuing faculty consultation principle of shared governance.

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

### 3 Evaluation Criteria

#### 3.1 Overall score

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

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

The standard teaching workload for tenured and tenure-track faculty is a 60% teaching assignment, typically teaching 18 SCHs during a 9-month academic year, and may include teaching equivalencies for activities related to teaching, research, service, or administration, according to UTRGV HOP. Teaching-track tenured faculty are faculty that transitioned into an 80% teaching assignment, typically teaching 24 SCHs during a 9-month academic year. Lecturers have no research expectations. They have service expectations when they are given an 80% teaching assignment (typically 3-year Lecturers; 24 SCHs during 9-month academic year). They have no service expectations when they are given a 100% teaching assignment (typically 1-year Lecturers; 30 SCHs during 9-month academic year).

#### 3.2 Determination of overall rating for each independent evaluator

- **Exceed Expectations:** This rating is given if faculty member qualifies for Meets Expectations rating and satisfies the additional requirements listed in Section 3.7.
- **Meet Expectations:** This rating is given if the overall score is above or equal to 3 without satisfying the conditions for Exceeds Expectations listed in Section 3.7.
- **Does not Meet Expectations:** This rating is given if the overall score is below 3 without satisfying the conditions for the Unsatisfactory rating.
- **Unsatisfactory:** This rating is warranted only when both the submitted academic record has serious across the board deficiencies and if it is additionally determined that these deficiencies cannot be subject to correction by continuing support, remediation, or workload reassignment. Consequently, an Unsatisfactory rating will be assigned if the overall score is below 1.5 and evaluator concludes that future faculty performance is not subject to correction with continuing remediation, workload reassignments, or continuing support (see definition of Unsatisfactory rating in ADM06-502).

#### 3.3 Overall Committee Rating

When the evaluator is a committee, then the committee score is the average of the committee members' scores. The committee determines that the criteria for exceeding expectations (see Section 3.7) are satisfied if a majority of committee members votes accordingly. The committee determines that faculty performance reflected by a low overall committee score is not subject to correction if a majority of committee members votes accordingly. Then the overall rating of the committee as a whole is determined as described above.

#### 3.4 Teaching Score

PREAMBLE: It is the intention of this review to encourage high academic standards and promote faculty academic freedom or faculty autonomy in terms of pedagogy, curriculum, and student assessment. The School's excellence in teaching depends on the passion and personal investment of faculty in pedagogies informed by the faculty's teaching philosophy. It also depends on giving special consideration to faculty who pursue innovative or iconoclastic pedagogies, invest valuable time in the development of teaching-related resources, teach online or blended courses,

contribute to our graduate and undergraduate degree programs by teaching advanced undergraduate or graduate courses or by leading undergraduate or graduate student research, or provide leadership in major teaching-related projects.

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

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

- **Student opinion course evaluations [0,2.5]:** They contribute to the teaching score points ranging from 0 to 2.5, rounded to one decimal, and calculated as follows:

1. Currently, the *h score* for each course is calculated and reported on your student evaluation table (under the Avg column) by Assist as the average score over the mandated questions.<sup>1</sup>
2. The *overall h score* is the average, weighted by number of responding students for each course section, of all *h scores* for all courses taught during the fall and spring semesters (summer semesters may be optionally included), rounded to one decimal. Points are awarded based on the *overall h score* as follows:
  - (a) If the *overall h score* is at least 3.5, the faculty member is to be awarded 2.5 points.
  - (b) If the *overall h score* is less than 3.5, the faculty member is to be awarded the prorated amount given by the formula

$$\min \left\{ 2.5, \frac{2.5(h - 1)}{3.5 - 1} \right\}$$

rounded to one decimal.

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

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

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

- **Minor contributions:** Multiple instances count multiple times.
  1. Taught upper-level undergraduate courses or graduate courses (count each distinct course as separate activity).
  2. Taught an interactive television (ITV) course.
  3. Used at least 3 major midterm examinations to assess student learning in the majority of courses taught. [Reported under Pedagogy]
  4. Taught more than 4 distinct courses during the academic year.
  5. Use of technology to enhance teaching and learning [Reported under Pedagogy]
  6. Making minor changes in an existing course
  7. Participated in minor professional development workshop. (one day event and no travel outside of the RGV)
  8. Classroom teaching was observed by Colleagues according to department policy.
  9. Member of an MS or PhD thesis committee (internal or external).

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

10. Taught courses gratis (e.g substitute teaching for another faculty member) -- may be reported as a service contribution instead. (can be counted only once)
11. Served as instructor of record and actually participated in the professional development of the GTA or instructor teaching the course. (one contribution per course)
12. Teaching large classes with at least 50 registered students and less than 75 registered students on census day

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

1. Taught *for the first time* an upper-level undergraduate or graduate course. (count each distinct course as separate activity)
2. Taught at least 3 distinct courses during the same semester.
3. Making major changes to an existing course.
4. Graded homework<sup>2</sup>, course projects, student presentations, or very frequent formative assessments (e.g. quizzes) [Reported under Pedagogy]
5. Substantive participation as member of an MS or PhD thesis committee (internal or external).
6. Supervised undergraduate or graduate research or independent study outside of class activities
7. Supervised a senior-level capstone undergraduate math project.
8. Student (undergraduate or graduate) research presentations under supervision by the faculty.
9. Supervised a master's project, or ongoing supervision of an MS or Ph.D. thesis as the main advisor (or one of two co-advisors)
10. Developed or adopted an innovative pedagogy for a given course such as: flipped classrooms, inquiry based learning, Moore method, Challenge Based Instruction, hands-on-learning with manipulatives, student involvement in outreach community projects, online community of learning, major course projects, frequently used instructor-made discussion handouts for lectures, or other methods involving student engagement. [Reported under Pedagogy]
11. Participated in major professional development workshop. (event spanning across more than one day or requiring travel outside of the RGV)
12. Development or continuing implementation of significant curricular materials (e.g. development/preparation of new online or blended course, new online lecture notes, open source textbooks, new online homework or exam problems)
13. Publishing solutions to teaching related mathematics problems in professional journals
14. Teaching to peers or approved groups by way of seminars, courses, mini-courses, project workshops, or content presentations at area schools.
15. Proposed a new course, approved by all levels of review.
16. Teaching very large classes with at least 75 registered students on census day

• **Distinguished contributions:** Multiple instances count multiple times.

1. Main Advisor (or one of two main co-advisors) of a successfully completed MS or PhD thesis project, including projects beyond our University.
2. Leadership in a major teaching project
3. Publication of a teaching-related book.
4. PI or co-PI of funded or continuing external funding for instructional pedagogical development – may be listed under Research and Scholarship if the grant contributed to the research mission or reputation of the university
5. Award or recognition for teaching-related accomplishments at the college, university, national, or international level.

- Any contributions that do not fall under the above categories will be judged by the committee relative to the standard implied by the above rubric.

---

<sup>2</sup>grading may be done manually by the instructor, or automatically via an online homework or system, or via a GTA, etc, and should be documented on the course syllabus as part of the overall grade

### 3.5 Research and Scholarship Score

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

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

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

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

- **Minor contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
  1. Active research program evidenced by at least 2 peer reviewed publications during the last 5 academic years.
  2. Paper submission or resubmission to refereed research journal
  3. Conference presentation at local or state level or colloquium or seminar presentation at non-Ph.D. granting department or school..
  4. Submitted external grant proposal (may be elevated to major if substantial preparation effort is reported)
  5. Submitted or funded internal grant (may be elevated to major if funded and more than \$4,000)
  6. Submitted external travel grant proposal to conference.
  7. Submitted book proposal.
  8. Technical reports or other research-related non-refereed publications.
  9. Development of research-related software or software library [May be elevated to major, if software is designed for general use, and released under an open source license, and has significant scientific value]
- **Major contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
  1. Refereed paper published or accepted in refereed journal not classified as Q1, Q2 (Evaluator may elevate this contribution to distinguished, if convincing evidence is given of journal quality)
  2. Book review published in a refereed research journal.
  3. Refereed conference proceedings paper or book chapters
  4. Book or book revision under contract. (documentation required)
  5. Conference/congress/symposium at the national/international level or colloquium or seminar presentation at a Ph.D granting Department or School or national or international research lab or institute. (First one is major, subsequent ones are counted as minors).
  6. Funded external travel grant or other funded external grant with 1 year duration. (teaching and service grants can be reported in this category, if the grant contributed to the research mission or reputation of the university, or they may be reported in teaching or service correspondingly instead)
  7. Senior personnel or similar effort on external funded grant (other than PI or co-PI)
- **Distinguished contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
  1. Paper published or accepted in Q1 or Q2 journals or any other journal deemed as high quality by the evaluator.
  2. PI or co-PI of a funded or continuing external grant with duration greater than 1 year. (teaching and service grants can be reported in this category, if the grant contributed to the research mission or

reputation of the university, or they may be reported in teaching or service correspondingly instead)

3. Book published
4. Plenary or keynote presentation in a recognized national or international conference, congress, or symposium.
5. Research-related award at the college or university or national or international level.
6. Invited visiting position in research-focused institution.

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

**ADDITIONAL REMARKS:**

1. The ranking of journals as Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4 is given by the website [www.scimagojr.com](http://www.scimagojr.com). Because ranking may change from year to year or may be discipline dependent, the relevant ranking is the one during the year of the paper's publication or acceptance (or the nearest year where journal ranking is available) in the same research area as the paper's content. Faculty members may also reference other indicators or metrics to argue in support of journal quality.
2. Publications can be claimed if published or finally accepted during the evaluation period, but each publication can be claimed only once.
3. The credit given for external grants under the category of research and scholarship accounts for all activities relating to the administration of the grant. Consequently, the administration of the grant cannot be claimed as service. However all teaching and research/scholarship activities that result from the grant can be clearly counted as separate activities. For grants that propose the making of service contributions (e.g. conference grants, purchases of equipment), that service contribution can be counted as a separate contribution. In general terms, deliverables promised by the corresponding grant proposal can be counted as separate contributions, but not activities related to the administration of the grant itself.
4. Peer reviewed publications may be published in pure or applied mathematics or mathematics education journals, or statistics journals, or interdisciplinary journals, as long as the research area falls under the AMS Mathematics Subject Classification database of 2010 or 2000, or any more recent databases that may be released in the future (see [www.ams.org/mathscinet/msc/msc2010.html](http://www.ams.org/mathscinet/msc/msc2010.html)).

### 3.6 Service Score

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

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

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

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

- **Minor contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
  1. Being an actively contributing member in a school committee. The evaluator has the discretion to count committee membership as a major contribution, based on information provided by the Faculty Activity Report in accordance with the general principles stated in the above preamble, in addition to the more obvious situations listed below.
  2. Active participation in preparation of common final examinations, core or major or other assessment, etc.
  3. Refereeing a manuscript submitted to a journal or conference presentation proposal submitted to a conference.
  4. Participating in community engagement activities related to academic activities or outreach
  5. Writing recommendation letters.
  6. Conducting a peer review of teaching for a colleague.
  7. Serving on an editorial board or scientific committee for a conference or editorial board of refereed research journals not classified as Q1 or Q2 journals, provided that manuscripts were handled during evaluation period.
  8. teaching courses gratis – may be reported as a teaching contribution instead (can be counted only once)
  9. Providing or organizing workshop or presentations for students
- **Major contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
  1. Reviewing an external grant proposal for a funding agency
  2. External review of a Tenure and Promotion application.
  3. External review of another Department, for accreditation purposes.
  4. Directing a Center at the Department, College, or University level.
  5. Serving as Undergraduate or Graduate Program Coordinator or Building Manager or Course Scheduler, Core Course Coordinator, or similar level of responsibility.
  6. Organizing a special session or serving on a conference Scientific Committee.
  7. Serving on Editorial Board of refereed research journals classified as Q1 or Q2 journals, provided that manuscripts were handled during evaluation period.
  8. Editor of a book or conference proceedings.
  9. Chair of any major committee, such as tenure and promotion committee, post-tenure review committee, etc. Note that Chair of a Search Committee or Annual Evaluation Committee is listed below as a distinguished contribution.
  10. Member of a search committee (including Equity and Diversity Advocates), annual evaluation committee.
  11. Service in College or University Committees or Councils or Faculty Senate. Service on other Senate related committees (e.g. the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) or task-forces will count as separate major contributions.
  12. Reviewing a book. (private communication to author and/or editor; published reviews are reported in research)
  13. Administration of placement examinations for core mathematics courses
  14. Maintaining the School web page.
  15. Major outreach activity.
  16. Active participation in advising a student club or organization (explanation needed)
  17. Supervising student travel to conferences or workshops
  18. Any administration appointments at any level.
- **Distinguished contributions:** Multiple instances of each item will count multiple times.
  1. Main organizer of a conference at the state, national, or international level.
  2. Service as Faculty Senate President or President Elect
  3. Chair of a Search Committee or of the Annual Evaluation Committee.

4. Leadership in professional societies, or in federal, state, or local government committee, panel, or commission.
5. Serving as School Director
6. PI or co-PI of funded or continuing service-related external grant – may be reported under Research and Scholarship if the grant contributed to the research mission or reputation of the university
7. College, University, National, or International Awards for outstanding service-related accomplishments

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

### 3.7 Criteria for the Exceeds Expectations rating

- Exceeds Expectations criteria for T/TT faculty with standard teaching workload: One can exceed expectations by winning a teaching, research, or service award at the University, state, national, or international level. Otherwise, a rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if there is at least one peer reviewed publication or a currently active external grant and in addition at least one of the following statements is true:
  1. The aforementioned publication is of exceptionally high quality.
  2. At least 1 distinguished contribution and 10 other major contributions from any category.
  3. At least 2 distinguished contributions from any category.
  4. Authored or co-authored (not just edited) book, monograph or textbook published by well-recognized publisher.
  5. Funded external grant award as PI (or co-PI with significant contributions) from a prestigious funding agency (in the first year of its receipt).
  6. Plenary or keynote conference presentation at a distinguished national or international conference.
  7. Significant administrative or leadership position outside the University.
  8. Main organizer of a conference at state, national, or international levels.
  9. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.
- Exceeds Expectations criteria for Teaching-track tenured faculty: One can exceed expectations by winning a teaching, research, or service award at the University, state, national, or international level. Otherwise, a rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if at least one of the following statements is true:
  1. Authored or co-authored a peer reviewed publication, book, monograph, or textbook.
  2. Funded external grant award as PI (or co-PI with significant contributions) from a prestigious funding agency (in the first year of its receipt).
  3. At least 1 distinguished contribution and 7 other major or distinguished contributions from any category
  4. At least 10 major or distinguished contributions from any category.
- Exceeds Expectations criteria for Lecturers: The evaluation committee should consider significant contributions such as those given in the following list of criteria when awarding the Exceeds Expectations rating. A rating of Exceeds Expectations may be awarded if at least one of the following statements is true.
  1. Leadership or Coordinating activities in Mathematics programs related to teaching or student success (e.g. Math and Science Academy, mathematics competitions, etc)
  2. Receipt of award or other high-level recognition for teaching, or other evidence of outstanding accomplishment in teaching
  3. Delivery of teaching-related colloquium, presenting in faculty development workshop, conference, or research presentation at state, national, or international level or multiple such contributions at the local level.
  4. Publication in a mathematics teaching practitioner journal or research publication (article, book, conference proceedings, etc.)
  5. Significant mentoring of other departmental faculty, lecturers, or pre- or in-service mathematics teachers in local districts in the work of mathematics teaching

6. Completion of significant “Action Research” project or other systematic investigation of one’s own teaching, such as a “Scholarship of Learning and Teaching” project, usually leading to presentation or publication
7. Significant service at the university, municipality, or state level
8. Other exceptional contributions to the profession, in the judgement of the evaluator.

## **A Format of Faculty Activity Report**

This appendix provides a template for the Faculty Activity Report. Bullet points where there is no activity should be edited out. The committee has the discretion to request faculty to resubmit the Faculty Activity Report, if it does not comply with the required format. The committee may also request additional documentation for claimed accomplishments, as needed.

# ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION FOLDER

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

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

**Name:** Firstname Lastname

**Rank:** Assistant/Associate/FullProfessor orLecturer I, II, II, or Senior Lecturer

---

**Faculty workload:** (See section 3.1)

**Tenure Status:** TenuredorTenuretrack ornon-tenuretrack

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

Signature: Firstname Lastname

Date Signed: December 4, 2016

## **:Response to suggested improvements**

Below is my report on actions taken on the suggested improvements by the Committee.

- **TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

- 1.

- **PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT**

- 1.

- **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

- 1.

# Teaching Effectiveness

## I. COURSE EVALUATIONS

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

## II. COURSE-RELATED CONTRIBUTIONS

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

## III. DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES

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

## IV. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

## V. MENTORING ACTIVITIES

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

## VI. OTHER TEACHING CONTRIBUTIONS

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

## **Research and scholarship**

### **I. RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS/GRANTS**

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

### **II. OTHER SCHOLARLY/RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS**

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

### **III. GRANTS**

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

## **Professional Service**

### **I. DEPARTMENTAL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE**

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

### **II. OTHER SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS**

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