

College of Sciences
Department of Physics and Astronomy
Lecturer Rank Annual Review
Criteria, Policies, and Procedures

1. PURPOSE, GUIDELINES AND POLICIES

The Department of Physics and Astronomy, in accordance with the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV) policy and UT Regents Rules supports a system of annual evaluation for all full-time faculty members for the purpose of improvement of faculty performance, promotion and merit considerations. All faculty members in Lecturer rank are evaluated annually, with a comprehensive review occurring every 3 years following the last successful comprehensive review for extension of contract and, if applicable, promotion.

The faculty annual evaluation at the departmental and college levels include two basic areas of competency – teaching and service. The appointment is 80% teaching and 20% service. For one year lecturers, the appointment is 100% teaching.

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. Faculty receiving either a does not meet expectations or unsatisfactory rating in any competency area will be subject to corrective action according to UTRGV policies.

To earn an overall exceeds expectations rating, a faculty member must receive an exceeds expectations rating in teaching and at least a meets expectations rating in service. Scholarship is not a requirement for annual evaluation of faculty members in Lecturer rank, but is encouraged and a significant scholarship contribution (as defined later in this document) can lead to an exceeds expectation rating if the other two areas have at least a meets expectation.

The annual evaluation will be used to provide support or a remediation plan (e.g., teaching development workshops, counseling or service activities) to faculty who may benefit from such support. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in any competency area may be subject to further review 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 lecturer 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 department or the University, as well as any other material relevant to the review that is permitted by the department, college, and the University.

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 Annual Review Committee and
- (b) department chair.

The department Annual Review Committee will include a majority of full-time tenured faculty members. Each review level must include a written narrative highlighting strengths and weaknesses, as well as, recommendations for improvement. After the department chair's review, the file will be forwarded to the dean for review and approval, and to address any discrepancies between the two levels. Per University policy, faculty can appeal the departmental level outcomes, and if not satisfied, may request a review by a college annual review committee which will make a recommendation to the dean. As per HOP, the dean's decision is final.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA

(1) Teaching

Metrics for teaching effectiveness should include, but not limited to, student evaluations and [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.

A meets expectations rating in teaching competency area requires that all the following criteria are met by the faculty member annually:

- Taught assigned workload
- Received satisfactory student evaluations
- Received satisfactory [peer review of teaching](#)
- Demonstrated genuine effort to engage students in learning such as (but not limited to) the use of innovative technology, flipped classrooms, experiential learning, etc.
- Demonstrated how the student learning outcomes (SLO)'s are incorporated into the lessons.

An exceeds expectations rating in teaching requires that in addition to the criteria described in meets expectation section above the faculty member achieves any one out of the following:

- Received external grant funding for student/teacher training
- Won a significant teaching award
- Created and taught a new course
- Received excellent student evaluations (>=80%) averaged (see calculation below) over all courses taught

*E-score=(Number of students*overall rating) for each class taught*

*Final score =[(Total E-score over all classes)/(Total number of students over all classes)]*100*

- Published innovative pedagogic material on appropriate platform
- Written a textbook or book chapter.

(2) Research & Scholarship (Not mandatory, but encouraged)

Research and scholarship is not a required evaluation criterion for faculty members in the rank of lecturers, but demonstration of scholarship each year through any 1 of the following may be counted towards exceeds expectation along with satisfactory achievements in the teaching category.

- Publication of one or more paper(s) in quality peer reviewed journals,
- Presentation at a national and international conferences
- Mentoring 1 or more undergraduate students with demonstrated outcome (e.g. student presentation at conferences),
- External grant applications as PI, co-PI or senior person with clear project description

(3) Service (Only applicable to 3-year lecturers)

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.

A meets expectation rating in service requires that the faculty member with a 20% service appointment meets all the following:

- Positive contribution to two or more committees at any level within the university,
- Positive contribution to at least one professional and/or community service activity, and
- Compliance with all departmental, college, university, and UT System policies.

An exceeds expectations rating in service requires that the faculty member fulfills all the requirements for the meets expectations rating and demonstrates at least 1 of the following:

- Serves as an effective committee chair of a significant committee at any level within the university,
- Leadership of an impactful professional service activity
- Leadership of an impactful community service activity.

4. OVERALL RATING

An overall exceeds expectations rating on the annual review can be earned by receiving exceeds expectations rating in the lead competency area (teaching) and at least meets expectations rating in service. A meets expectation in both teaching and service coupled with accomplishments listed under Scholarship will also earn an overall exceeds expectation. An overall meets expectations rating is earned by receiving a meets expectations rating in teaching and service. An overall does-not-meet expectations rating will be assigned when a faculty member receives does not meet expectations in any one of the two competency areas.

5. UNSATISFACTORY RATING

Unsatisfactory rating means failing to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, or contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. Unsatisfactory rating is assigned to lecturers if they receive does not meet expectations rating in teaching for two consecutive years

6. APPEALS

Faculty can appeal the departmental 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.