

College of Sciences
Department of Biology

Faculty Annual Review Guidelines, Policies, Criteria, and Procedures

1. PURPOSE, GUIDELINES AND POLICIES

The Department of Biology 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. Under special circumstances, such as approved leave, the annual review may be delayed with the approval of the EVPAA. All new faculty will be evaluated for their first review no later than six months after their hire with subsequent reviews occurring annually, however, minimum expectations will only be enforced from the third annual review to allow time for faculty to establish their research and teaching programs.

The faculty annual evaluation at the departmental and college levels must include three basic areas of competency – *teaching, research & scholarship*, and *service* – which must be evaluated in accordance with the faculty member’s 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. The material to be included and the organization of the FRD should conform to the Instructions for Preparation of Faculty Review Dossiers

Each faculty member is required to submit his/her completed FRD to the department chair no later than the due date each year. Faculty holding joint appointments shall submit their FRDs to the chairs/directors of the department/school in which they hold a majority (>50%) appointment 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/school chair/director and include it in their FRDs.

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'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 committee and chair/director 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. CRITERIA

A. Teaching (Faculty and Lecturers):

Meets Expectations Rating:

To attain a Meets Expectations Rating in Teaching, a Faculty member or Lecturer must achieve *all* of the following:

1. Meets classes on time. Uses all of class period; i.e. does not regularly dismiss classes more than 10 minutes early. Meets all classes or arranges for a replacement instructor; does not arbitrarily cancel classes. Gives class syllabus not later than the end of the first week of classes. Uses tests or other quantitative evaluation procedures. Assigns grades based solely on performance of students on quantitative evaluations. Demonstrates comprehensive and current knowledge of course contents. Maintains an acceptable level of professionalism in the classroom. Maintains office hours and encourages students to use this time to get help and to resolve questions.
2. There is not a "magic number" to the overall ratings on student course evaluations as they may vary across course student population (e.g. class size, majors, undergraduate vs graduate, and grade distributions). With this in mind, faculty member is responsive to concerns expressed in student evaluations of teaching and strives to maintain a student evaluation score of at least 80% agree and/or strongly agree (average of all courses combined over probationary period). Other measures of teaching effectiveness, such as,

pre-post testing of concepts or competencies, peer evaluation of teaching, student self-assessment of learning, and faculty self-assessment should also be considered to assess overall faculty performance in teaching.

3. Performance on faculty peer evaluations of teaching must be positive. Must have at least a Meets Expectations rating in the majority of categories on the peer review of teaching evaluation sheet. (1 review per year for Lecturers and Tenure Track Faculty, 1 review per 3 years for Associate Professors and Professors).
4. Make documented efforts to address teaching weaknesses identified in peer and student teaching evaluations.
5. Expected to mentor undergraduate and/or graduate students in a research program. (This is not required for Lecturers as they have no research performance expectation)
6. Involve technology, and/or innovative teaching pedagogy techniques in the classroom.

Exceeds Expectations:

To attain an Exceeds Expectations Rating in Teaching a Faculty Member must have *one* of the following in addition to all the criteria that Meets Expectations:

1. On student evaluations of teaching, the sum of the agree and strongly agree categories is at least 90% averaged across all classes during the review year.
2. Performance on faculty peer evaluations of teaching must be positive. Must have at least an Exceeds Expectations rating in the majority of categories on the peer review of teaching evaluation sheet.
3. Develop a new course in the area of expertise of the faculty member.
4. Significantly enhance a course that the faculty member teaches.
5. Train and coordinate teaching assistants or class room instruction for multiple sections of a course.
6. Lecturers who mentor undergraduate or graduate students in research or serve on thesis committees.
7. Receive a teaching award at the College, University, State, National or International level.
8. Develop and implement a new teaching technology, pedagogy, or innovative teaching techniques in the classroom.
9. Demonstrate that mentoring a student in research has led to student success (i.e. student receives an award for a research presentation or is an author on a published manuscript)

B. Research: (Faculty)

Meets expectations:

To attain a Meets Expectations Rating in Research, a Faculty member must achieve *all* of the following:

1. Has one of the following: a refereed 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, having an active funded grant 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 professional or academic conference meetings at the 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. Or by having an active funded grant 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, graduate or postdoctoral research students; or collaborates with other institutions, produces data that can be incorporated into grants and scientific manuscripts, etc.).

Exceeds Expectations:

To attain an Exceeds Expectations Rating in Research a Faculty Member must have *one* of the following in addition to all the criteria that Meets Expectations:

1. An additional peer reviewed publication or a publication in a top journal such as: Science, Nature, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences or equivalent level determined by department evaluation committee.
2. Have more than one active external grant as PI or Co-PI or a substantive research/administrative role as senior personnel.
3. Have an invited talk or poster presentation at a professional or academic conference at the State, National or International level.
4. Receive a research award at the College, University, State, National, or International level.

Lecturers have no research expectation so they automatically meet expectations in the research category. 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, graduate and postdoctoral research students, collaborates with other institutions, produces data that can be incorporated into grants and scientific manuscripts, etc).

NOTE: Faculty must still pay attention to the overall tenure and promotion or post tenure review requirements in the Department of Biology. As not all of the achievements listed in point #1 above are required in any one year (only one achievement per year is required), faculty must still achieve the standards to meet expectations for the overall review period for tenure and promotion or post tenure review in order to be tenured, promoted, or retained in good standing post tenure. Therefore, the possibility exists that in any one year faculty may be given a “meets expectations” rating after the annual review period and for the tenure and promotion or post tenure review period be given a “does not meet expectations” or “unacceptable” rating for tenure and promotion or post tenure review as the faculty has not achieved the standards for a “meets expectations with regard to tenure and promotion or post tenure review during the review period for these processes.

C. Service: (Faculty and Lecturers)

Meets expectations:

To attain a Meets Expectations Rating in Service, a Faculty member or Lecturer must achieve *all* of the following:

1. Attends departmental, school, and university meetings.
2. In addition to any committees where all faculty are automatically members, it is expected that a Tenure Track and Tenured Associate Professor faculty will serve on average on one committee per year at either the department, college or university level. It is expected that a Professor faculty member will serve on average on one committee per year in a leadership role at either the department, college or university level.
3. Provides service to their profession such as, but not limited to: membership in professional societies, serving on committees within professional societies, reviewing grants and scientific manuscripts etc.
4. Provides service to the community such as, but not limited to, high school student mentoring, seminars to lay persons, and volunteering in the local community.

Exceeds Expectations:

To attain an Exceeds Expectations Rating in Service a Faculty Member must have *one* of the following in addition to all the criteria that Meets Expectations:

1. Serve as the chair of two committees at either the department, college or university level.
2. Serve on an additional committee per year at the department, college or university level in addition to the requirements for Meets Expectations.
3. Serve as an officer within a professional society or as an editor or associate editor of a peer reviewed journal or serving as a grant panel review manager or as a program director for a granting agency.
4. Additional engagement in the local community as a leader in a community organization or giving invited seminars to lay people or mentoring more than one high school student in research.
5. Receive a service award at the College, University, State, National, or International level.

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 EVPAA. 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) 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 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 with >10% service appointment faculty member should produce *all* the following:

- Satisfactory accomplishment of all the tasks of the appointment provided that institutional resources were available
- 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 with >10% service appointment faculty member should fulfill all the requirements for the *meets expectations* outlined above AND demonstrate 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
- Faculty may make a case with the Chair and Dean for the recognition of other forms of service (such as to the profession) which may be substituted for the activities given above.

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 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 unless the faculty member can make a clear case as to why the deliverable could not be met.

Service appointment in excess of 10% with a corresponding decrease in teaching load must be approved by the department chair and the dean of the college. Such appointments include service as an associate department chair, undergraduate or graduate coordinator, program director or co-director (e.g. APRIME and UTeach), director of a formally-recognized center, etc. Such service appointees usually receive up to 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 Annual Review Committee (ARC) and Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC).

Administrative appointments are also considered service appointments. Appointments including Associate Deans, Department Chairs and School Directors are given two course releases per semester 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 faculty member's immediate supervisor.

5. OVERALL SCORE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION:

Exceeds Expectations in all 3 categories = Exceeds Expectations for the year.

Exceeds Expectations in 2 of 3 categories = Exceeds Expectations for the year.

Exceeds Expectations in 1 of 3 categories = Meets Expectations for the year.

Meets Expectations in all 3 categories = Meets Expectations for the year.

If any one category is rated Does Not Meet Expectations, this will result in a Does Not Meet Expectations rating for the year.

If any one category is rated Unsatisfactory, this will result in in an Unsatisfactory rating for the year.