ANNUAL REVIEW POLICY

1. Purpose

The university conducts annual reviews of faculty in accordance with Regents’ Rules 31102 and 30501. Annual reviews should focus primarily individual merit in relation to the performance of assigned duties. The primary purpose of the review is to compare that performance to university and unit expectations, and provide guidance to the faculty member accordingly.

If merit increases are recommended, the recommendations should be consistent with these evaluations.

2. Categories of Evaluation.

Evaluations will be made in the same areas of activity as are considered in promotion and tenure: namely, (1) creative productivity and professional achievement, (2) teaching effectiveness and (3) university citizenship. If the faculty member has administrative duties, these should also be included. Guidelines for what should be considered under each of these headings and the standards to be applied should be articulated by the faculty of each school and included in the school bylaws. The guidelines should state the standards, the philosophy or purpose behind them, and the school officers responsible for preparing the evaluation. Such evaluations will make use of directly known and objective information, ignoring hearsay and anonymous inputs. Faculty members are encouraged to call the attention of the Dean of their School to accomplishments or activities which they believe might be overlooked in order to assure that the information about these contributions will be complete.

3. Standards of Evaluation

Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories: a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; d. unsatisfactory. Expectations shall be set by each school according to the faculty member’s rank and discipline, in accordance with the following general principles.

A. “Exceeds expectations” should be reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the discipline and unit. Generally speaking, an administrator should not judge half or more of their faculty to have exceeded expectations, and it is possible that none would. A judgment that a person exceeds expectations in creative productivity could reflect an usually important publication, external recognition for scholarly or creative achievement, or other such activity that brings notable recognition
or honor to the university. A judgment that a person exceeds expectations in teaching could be based on special accomplishments of a person’s students or winning a local, system, or award for outstanding teaching. “Exceeds expectations” in service could reflect election or appointment to particularly noteworthy positions in the university or other organizations, or special commendations for service on university, governmental, or scholarly organizations.

B. “Meets expectations.” In any given year, most faculty should meet expectations. Since it should be understood that there is some year to year variation in all faculty activities, the range of performances considered to meet expectations can should be wider than the range judged to meet or fail to meet expectations.

C. “Fails to meet expectations” should indicate a failure 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. Indications of failure to meet expectations in scholarly productivity would be no or nearly no publications or other creative productivity for that year, and no compensating production under way. Indications of failure to meet expectations in teaching would be an exceptional level of complaints, failure to meet classes, failure to update material for classes as needed, unfavorable peer evaluation of teaching if the unit arranged for such evaluation, or failure to carry a normal teaching load. Indications of failure to meet expectations in service would be refusal to accept appointments or failure to exercise diligence and responsibility in carrying out appointments.

D. “Unsatisfactory.” Would involve failing to meet expectations in one or more areas, and doing so in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct or dereliction of duty.

4. Evaluation Process

4.A. Preparation of file by faculty member

Each February, each faculty member will prepare an annual report with information under the following headings. Further details for preparing the report, including suggested templates for different entries, will be posted on the website of the Academic Vice President and Provost.

I. Name, School, Program or Field, Date of Submission

II. A narrative of one page or less, giving your professional history, principal current professional interests, and most noteworthy accomplishments. This brief biographic profile should communicate the significance of what you do, what you have accomplished, and what you are planning to do in the future, to a varied audience, including prospective
graduate students, new faculty colleagues, or outsiders searching for a prospective employee, consultant, expert commentator, guest columnist, speaker to a professional or non-professional group, etc. In composite, these profiles constitute the portrait of the University.

III. Scholarly and creative activity, categorized and sequenced as follows:

(PLEASE FOLLOW THE ATTACHED FORMATTING GUIDELINES)

a) authored books
b) edited books
c) refereed publications
d) complete articles in edited volumes
e) refereed conference publications or abstracts
f) juried exhibitions
g) invited performances, colloquia presentations or exhibitions
h) unrefereed publications
i) unrefereed abstracts
j) self-initiated exhibitions, lectures or performances
k) submitted manuscripts, including when submitted and to whom
l) U.S. Patents awarded
m) other activities: lectures, speeches, presentations not documented in a publication

IV. Proposal and Grant Activity

a) Proposals submitted: title, agency submitted, time duration, total requested.
b) Grants received: title, agency granting, total requested, amount granted if different from total amount, start date, and time duration.
c) Names of doctoral students (≥30 graduate hours) and stipend amounts (does not include tuition or benefits) whom you supported on contracts and grants, e.g., Jane Smith $20,000.

V. Teaching activities: list for each term, e.g.

a) Organized courses
   Semester Prefix Number Course Name Enrollment

b) Individual instruction supervised

c) Calendar year: names of graduated students upon whose dissertation committees you served.
d) Calendar year: names of masters and doctoral students who graduated under your supervision.
e) Calendar year: employer and position for doctoral students who graduated under your supervision in 2010.
f) Calendar year: for each doctoral student (≥30 graduate hours) by name under your supervision.

aa) number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, e.g., Jane Smith 2
bb) number of juried creative/performance accomplishments
cc) number of book chapters
dd) number of books
e) number of external presentations

VI. Learning Assessment Activities:
a) narrative of assessment activities undertaken in 2010 based on learning objectives of organized courses
b) brief description of factors that may have influenced the results of those activities
c) actions you intend to take to improve student learning, i.e. “closing the loop”

VII. Professional service activities:
a) UTD administrative duties
b) school committees
c) university committees
d) outside Chair appointed by Graduate Studies for doctoral final oral exam
e) special service contributions to program, school, or university
f) service contributions external to UTD, e.g., professional society officer, journal editor, conference organizer, etc.
g) consultant activities

VIII. Special professional recognition: internal and external honors, awards, citations, prizes, etc.

4.B. Evaluations will be made by the administrative officers responsible for developing the university budget. The primary evaluation will be prepared by the program or departmental administrator immediately responsible for the faculty member under review. School guidelines will specify who this is. The recommendation to be sent to the Provost for the school will be prepared by the School Dean, taking into account program or departmental evaluations as well as considerations of equity and need across the school as a whole and the advice of other members of the Dean's administrative structure as might be appropriate in that School.

4.C. Provision for corrections and objections. School guidelines should provide at least
one opportunity for the faculty member being evaluated to see the draft evaluation and offer responses or corrections. The School Dean’s evaluation will be shown to the faculty member evaluated, in writing. The faculty member will countersign to show that he or she has read the evaluation. If the faculty member objects to the evaluation, he or she may describe that objection in writing within a period of one week (seven days). The Dean’s evaluation will then be forwarded to the provost with the faculty member’s objection, if any.

School guidelines may also include provision for review of the recommendations by a faculty committee, such as a school Executive Committee or a peer review committee.

5. Uses of the evaluations.

Evaluations should be used to determine merit for merit raises.

One or more evaluations of “exceeds expectations” may also provide a basis for recommendation for special honors or for initiating consideration for more rapid or extraordinary promotion following the processes provided for in the university policy on promotion and tenure. This would require much more complete and comprehensive documentation than is required for the annual review.

An evaluation of “fails to meet expectations” or “unsatisfactory” may be used to determine recommended remedial actions, such as teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues or service expectations. Remedial actions may include adjustments of assigned duties. Remediation efforts should be described in a written plan. Such plan may include provisions for monitoring progress.

A tenured faculty member whose evaluation is “unsatisfactory” for two consecutive years may be subject to a comprehensive periodic performance evaluation (post-tenure review), as provided for in the policy on periodic performance evaluations. The decision to undertake a comprehensive period performance evaluation shall be made by the university Provost in consultation with the Dean of the School.

6. Clarifications and complaints.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek clarification of their salary increases whenever they have questions or dissatisfactions concerning them. Pursuit of such questions or complaints fosters better internal University communications and improves operation of the mechanisms for setting salary increases. Queries should be lodged with the School Dean. In Schools where Department Heads provide an initial merit increase recommendation for the Dean, a preliminary discussion should be held with the Department Head. If the matter remains unresolved fifteen days after discussion with the Dean, it may properly be taken to the Provost and, if unresolved there within fifteen days, to the President.

The university grievance policy is applicable.
1. Title

Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

2. Rule and Regulation

Sec. 4 Institutional Policies. Each institution of The University of Texas System shall have an institutional policy and plan consistent with the following guidelines for the periodic (annual and comprehensive) performance evaluation of tenured faculty. Institutional policies that are in accordance with the model policy [LINK] shall be developed with appropriate faculty input, including consultation with and guidance from faculty governance organizations, and shall be included in each institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures after review and appropriate administrative approval and submission to the Board of Regents for review and final approval. Periodic evaluations, while distinct from the annual evaluation process required of all employees, may be integrated with the annual evaluation process to form a single comprehensive faculty development and evaluation process. Nothing in these guidelines or the application of institutional evaluation policies shall be interpreted or applied to infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights nor to establish new term-tenure systems or to require faculty to reestablish their credentials for tenure.

Sec. 5 Minimum Elements. Institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures policies should include the following minimum elements for periodic evaluation:

5.1 Annual Reviews. Annual reviews are not the comprehensive periodic evaluations required under Texas Education Code Section 51.942. Annual reviews should focus on individual merit relative to assigned responsibilities in accordance with Regents' Rule 30501.

(a) Review Categories. Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories: a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory. Expectations shall be set by institutional policy according to the faculty member's rank, discipline, and institution.
(b) Scheduled Reviews. Evaluation of tenured faculty shall be performed annually with a comprehensive periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty performed every six years. The evaluation may not be waived for any tenured faculty member but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period will coincide with approved leave, comprehensive review for tenure or promotion, or appointment to an endowed position. No deferral of review of an active faculty member may extend beyond one year from the scheduled review. Institutional policy may specify that periods when a faculty member is on leave need not be counted in calculating when the comprehensive evaluation is required. The requirement of periodic review does not imply that individuals with unsatisfactory annual evaluations may not be subject to further review and/or appropriate administrative action.

5.2(c) Responsibilities Reviewed. The evaluation shall include review of the faculty member’s professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service, patient care, and administration. Institutional policies shall spell out the criteria and factors to be evaluated.

5.3 Notice of Evaluation. Reasonable individual notice of at least six months of intent to review will be provided to a faculty member.

5.4(d) Material Submitted. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit a résumé curriculum vita, including a summary statement of professional accomplishments, and shall submit or arrange for the submission of annual reports and teaching evaluations. The faculty member may provide copies of a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other additional materials the faculty member deems appropriate.

5.5(e) Review of Evaluation. In accordance with institutional policy, initial evaluation of the faculty member’s performance may be carried out by the department, department chair (or equivalent), dean, or peer review panel committee, but in any event must be reported to the chair (or equivalent) and dean for review. Evaluation shall include review of the current résumé curriculum vita.
vita, student and any peer evaluations of teaching for the review period, annual reports for the review period, and all materials submitted by the faculty member.

5.6 Peer Review. If peer review is not required by institutional policy, the peer review process may be initiated by the faculty member, department chair (or equivalent), or dean. If peer committees are involved, the members shall be representative of the college/school and will be appointed, on the basis of their objectivity and academic strength, by the dean in consultation with the tenured faculty in the college/school or pursuant to other process as defined in institutional policies. If peer review is involved, the faculty member will be provided with an opportunity to meet with the committee or committees:

5.7(f) Communication of Results. Results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty member, the department chair/dean, the chief academic officer, and the president for review and appropriate action.

(g) Uses. Possible uses of the information contained in the report should include the following:

(a1) For individuals found to be performing well, the evaluation may be used to determine salary recommendations, nomination for awards, or other forms of performance recognition.

(b2) For individuals whose performance indicates they would benefit from additional institutional support or a remediation plan, the evaluation may be used to provide such support or a remediation plan (e.g., teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues/service expectations). Schools/colleges and/or departments, in consultation with a peer committee, shall monitor individuals receiving such support for evidence of improvement and, if there is insufficient improvement, shall take action under (4) or Section 5.3, below, if appropriate.

(3) Individuals whose performance is unsatisfactory for two consecutive annual reviews may be subject to a comprehensive review (Section 5.2,
below) or action under (4) or Section 5.3 below, if appropriate.

(4) Individuals whose performance is unsatisfactory may be subject to further review and/or to appropriate administrative action. Campus policies shall provide procedures for appeals.

(5) If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action may be taken under Section 5.3 below.

(e) For individuals found to be performing unsatisfactorily, review to determine if good cause exists for termination under the current Regents' Rules and Regulations may be considered. All proceedings for termination of tenured faculty on the basis of periodic performance evaluation shall be only for incompetency, neglect of duty, or other good cause shown and must be conducted in accordance with the due process procedures of the Regents' Rules and Regulations, Rule 31008, including an opportunity for referral of the matter to alternative dispute resolution. Such proceedings must also include a list of specific charges by the president and an opportunity for a hearing before a faculty tribunal. In all such cases, the burden of proof shall be on the institution, and the rights of a faculty member to due process and academic freedom shall be protected.

5.2 Comprehensive Periodic Evaluations. Comprehensive periodic evaluations are required in compliance with Texas Education Code Section 51.942.

(a) Review Categories. Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories: a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory. Expectations shall be set by institutional policy according to the faculty member’s rank, discipline, and institution.

(b) Scheduled Reviews. Comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall be performed no less often than every six years. The evaluation may
not be waived for any tenured faculty member but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period will coincide with approved leave, comprehensive review promotion, or appointment to an endowed position. No deferral of review of an active faculty member may extend beyond one year from the scheduled review. Institutional policy may specify that periods when a faculty member is on leave need not be counted in calculating when the comprehensive evaluation is required.

(c) Responsibilities Reviewed. The evaluation shall include review of the faculty member's professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service, patient care, and administration. Institutional policies shall spell out the criteria and factors to be evaluated.

(d) Notice of Evaluation. Reasonable individual notice of at least six months of intent to review shall be provided to a faculty member.

(e) Material Submitted. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit a curriculum vita, including a summary statement of professional accomplishments, and shall submit or arrange for the submission of annual reports and teaching evaluations. The faculty member may provide copies of a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other additional materials the faculty member deems appropriate.

(f) Review of Evaluation. In accordance with institutional policy, initial evaluation of the faculty member's performance may be carried out by the department, department chair (or equivalent), dean, or peer review committee, but in any event must be reported to the chair (or equivalent) and dean for review. Evaluation shall include review of the current curriculum vita, student and any peer evaluations of teaching for the review period, annual reports for the review period, and all materials submitted by the faculty member.

(g) Peer Review. Comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall include peer review. The
members of peer review committees shall include representatives of the college/school or department and will be appointed, on the basis of their objectivity and academic strength, by the dean or chair in consultation with the tenured faculty in the college/school or department or pursuant to other process as defined in institutional policies. The faculty member shall be provided with an opportunity to meet with the committee or committees.

(h) Communication of Results. Results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty member, the department chair/dean, the chief academic officer, and the president for review and appropriate action.

(i) Uses. Possible uses of the information contained in the report include the following:

(1) The evaluation may be used to determine salary recommendations, nomination for awards, or other forms of performance recognition.

(2) For individuals whose performance indicates they would benefit from additional institutional support or a remediation plan, the evaluation may be used to provide such support or a remediation plan (e.g., teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues/service expectations). Schools/colleges and/or departments, in consultation with a peer committee, shall monitor individuals receiving such support for evidence of improvement and, if there is insufficient improvement, shall take action under (3) or Section 5.3, below, if appropriate.

(3) Individuals whose performance is unsatisfactory may be subject to further review and/or to appropriate administrative action. Such individuals may appeal through their institutional grievance procedures.

(4) If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate
disciplinary action may be taken under Section 5.3 below.

5.3 Termination or Other Appropriate Disciplinary Action.

For tenured faculty members for whom incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is found, review to determine if good cause exists for termination under the current Regents’ Rules and Regulations shall be considered, in accordance with the due process procedures of the Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 31008. If disciplinary action other than termination is considered appropriate, such faculty members shall have access to procedures that include notice of the specific charges and a hearing prior to the imposition of disciplinary action.

Sec. 6 Follow-up Review. The acceptance and success of periodic evaluation for tenured faculty will be dependent upon a well-executed, critical process and an institutional commitment to assist and support faculty development. Thus, remediation and follow-up review for faculty, who would benefit from such support, as well as the designation of an academic administrator with primary responsibility for monitoring such needed follow-up activities, are essential.