

COEHD ANNUAL REVIEW GUIDELINES

According to the University of Texas at San Antonio's (UTSA) *Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP)* [2.11](#), *Annual Faculty Performance Appraisal for Merit Consideration*, all Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Fixed-Term-Track (FTT) faculty members at UTSA are evaluated annually for the purpose of merit review for annual budget consideration and preparation.

PURPOSE OF ANNUAL REVIEW

Based on *Regents' Rule 30501, Employee Evaluations* and *Regents' Rule 31102, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty*, the purpose of this evaluation is to (1) provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, (2) assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals, (3) refocus academic and professional efforts, (4) provide institutional support for enhancing faculty performance, and (5) ensure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to UTSA and the State of Texas. These evaluations provide a basis for awarding merit and other recognition.

An Annual Report, as defined by the University, is a description of the faculty member's efforts in all relevant areas of performance during the period of September 1 to August 31. This policy applies to all faculty members. Fixed-Term-Track faculty members complete the sections of the Annual Report related to assigned activities.

The purpose of this document is to describe college level philosophy of performance across the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. These philosophy statements are meant to provide general guidelines of performance that serve the dual role of advising faculty on general values and expectations in COEHD while also maintaining respect for the diversity of work that occurs across departments. It is also a means by which to reward faculty whose excellence in teaching, research, creative work, community engagement, and service contribute to the mission of the COEHD and UTSA.

This document outlines the procedures departments follow along with general guidelines and college level expectations for annual review ratings across Research, Teaching, and Service performance areas. Importantly, these guidelines do not replace department level guidelines, but are meant to complement them. Faculty should familiarize themselves with their department guidelines as they serve as the primary review system.

To the extent there is any inconsistency between this document and the HOP and/or University of Texas System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.

PRINCIPLES GUIDING ANNUAL REVIEW

The COEHD principles for annual review are guided by the COEHD [Mission](#) that "we will be an international model for developing inclusive, transformative leaders guided by principles of community, integrity, equity, excellence, diversity, scholarship, and service. The COEHD will have a critical impact on the realization of human and community potential through its leadership

in education, health and wellness, human development, and policy studies. All programs of study include a focus on developing competencies for working effectively in multicultural and cross-national contexts.”

EVALUATION

Faculty within the COEHD are evaluated in relation to a predetermined Workload Agreement for that year. [Texas Education Code Section 51.402](#) outlines the principal elements of workload to include classroom teaching, basic and applied research, committee and public service, and professional development (see [HOP 2.11 IXA](#) for more information).

Departments identify metrics that represent suitable performance expectation guidelines. These guidelines vary by discipline and are best developed at the department level (HOP 2.11 IXB). The standards and criteria for evaluation within the COEHD are developed in accordance with COEHD bylaws and are reflected in the annual Workload Agreement. It is the department’s responsibility to specify the activities to be included in each of the three areas of effort. The department expectation guidelines must adhere to the workload policy established by the COEHD and must be approved by the Dean. According to the HOP, “departments should maintain ambitious performance expectation guidelines characteristic of a research university.”

Based on university policy, criteria for annual evaluation should align with standards and expectations related to promotion and tenure (See COEHD Tenure and Promotion Guidelines). It is, however, understood that performance expectations will vary in accordance with the Workload Agreement and that Annual Review is only one of several indicators for faculty tenure and promotion.

As outlined in Regent’s Rule 31102, each faculty member will be evaluated and assigned a rating for each area of research, teaching, and service using the evaluation rating categories of “Exceeds expectations”, “Meets expectations”, “Fails to meet expectations”, and “Unsatisfactory”. Only faculty members receiving an overall result of "meets expectations" or greater are eligible for merit. It is expected that department guidelines will specify which activities are included in each of the three areas and how faculty meet or exceed those expectations. Please see [HOP 2.11](#) for more information related to evaluation.

It is also expected that individuals will not be compared to one another or across departments in the evaluation process. Faculty are being evaluated based on the established criteria. For example, in the research category, it is possible for candidate A who has 3 publications in one year and candidate B who has 2 publications---but is engaged in a multi-year longitudinal ethnography to both receive a score of 5 based on a more holistic review tied to criteria.

COEHD FTTs may teach across departments or hold joint appointments within the College and/or across the University. These faculty will be evaluated upon an agreed upon process discussed with the associated department chairs. The FTT evaluation will follow the Workload Agreement to ensure equity in its distribution and evaluation.

ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

The evaluations as well as faculty curriculum vita and Annual Reports are prepared using the annual Evaluation Guidelines posted on the Provost's "Faculty Resources" website.

Overview of Review Procedures

For each review period, faculty members will submit into Digital Measures or a designated portal, a summary narrative of all their accomplishments for that time in the categories of Research, Teaching, and Service. Relevant activities are described in each department's annual review guidelines as well as the college level tenure and promotion guidelines. Faculty should describe in detail their work according to these documents.

Each department convenes a Department Review Committee (DRC) to review each faculty member's profile of work for the relevant review period. The materials reviewed include the faculty member's self-assessment, their curriculum vitae, their teaching report generated by digital measures, and any other relevant documents associated with that review period (e.g., COVID statement during relevant years). The DRC score for each area being reviewed is combined to form the weighted average performance score. The weighting for each area will be determined by the faculty member's workload distribution for the year under review.

DRC members follow protocols outlined by the HOP, but follow these steps:

- a. Members of the DRC review each faculty member's annual report materials independently.
- b. Each committee member assigns an evaluation rating in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service for each faculty member according to the most recently approved evaluation criteria.
- c. Committee members discuss rating decisions and provide a justification for that rating, regardless of positive or negative rating.
- d. DRC members establish a consensus in ratings before their advisory recommendations are sent to the department chair.
- e. DRC members **do not** participate in deliberations associated with their own annual performance.
- f. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair of the DRC writes an advisory memo (submitted through Digital Measures) which summarizes: (a) the recommended ratings for each faculty member in all areas of Teaching, Research, and Service and (b) any relevant information that describes challenges or confusions that may have emerged in the process.
- g. The department chair conducts an independent review of all faculty members in their department.
- h. The department chair may refine the DRC's evaluation. Both ratings should be shared with the faculty member before formally submitted to the Dean.
- i. The Dean reviews for consistency with COEHD standards and for consistency across and within departments. The Dean approves or modifies the recommended ratings. The Dean must articulate in writing the basis for any disagreement with the DRC's recommendation.
- j. The dean provides the faculty member with a written copy of the final annual evaluation (see HOP 2.11).

Overview of Criteria and Rating Assignments

Faculty will be assigned a value anywhere from 0-5 in the individual areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Values are linked to expectations in the following way according to the [HOP](#) Chapter 2.11.

Rating	Evaluation Rating Category	Description
3.5 to 5.0	Exceeds Expectations	Activities in area cumulatively exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department, unit, and discipline as outlined in the department guidelines.
2.0 to 3.4	Meets Expectations	Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department, unit, and discipline as specified in department guidelines.
1.0 to 1.9	Fails to Meet Expectations	Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations. This rating indicates a failure beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that is subject to correction.
0 to .9	Unsatisfactory	Activities in area cumulatively are considered unsatisfactory and indicate a failure to meet expectations as outlined in department guidelines for the faculty member's campus, unit, rank, and contractual obligations, 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 or incompetence.

COEHD Philosophy on Annual Review Evaluation Criteria—Teaching

Based on [HOP 2.12](#) UTSA uses evaluations of a faculty member's teaching as one element of the annual faculty performance evaluation process. Although a key component of teaching evaluation is the official UTSA student evaluation of teaching, annual reviews of teaching should be based on a holistic assessment of the faculty member's performance across a range of teaching activities as described by the faculty member in their narrative and on the teaching-related materials provided by the faculty member.

Teaching evaluations should be guided by the areas of performance outlined in the COEHD Promotion and Tenure guidelines and according to departmental annual review guidelines and expectations. Student course evaluations should be weighted according to departmental guidelines but should not exceed 40% of the overall rating. Departments may consider alternative uses of evaluation scores in cases where sample sizes are small and irregular, or when faculty do not have available scores. A narrative description of the entirety of the faculty member's teaching efforts and examples of teaching tools, products, and activities (e.g., syllabi, assessments, activities) should be uploaded for review.

Tenure and tenure track faculty are reviewed according to relevant department and COEHD Promotion and Tenure expectations, whereas FTT faculty are reviewed according to their workload agreement and any relevant department and COEHD promotion expectations.

COEHD Philosophy on Annual Review Evaluation Criteria—Research

Evaluation of scholarly productivity will include a comprehensive review of diverse types of scholarship, including publications, grants, paper/conference presentations, creative works, and any other contributions to one's field of inquiry as defined by department/program area norms.

Annual reviews represent a snapshot of the work faculty produce each year. Given the diversity of the COEHD and the many ways faculty can produce scholarship and/or creative activities, this section provides overall guidance for the college. Scholarly productivity should be guided by the areas of performance outlined in the COEHD Promotion and Tenure guidelines as well as departmental annual review guidelines and expectations.

The criteria to assess merit and merit scores are determined by the Departments' DRC and Chair. Because annual reviews evaluate yearly productivity, departmental criteria should include a recognition of the life cycle of scholarship and/or creative activities. Some examples include, but are not limited to, acknowledgment of advanced drafts of a book, journal articles, book chapters, demonstration of community-based research activities or creative activities progress. Moreover, evidence required to demonstrate departmental criteria will encompass a range of artifacts that may include but are not limited to publications and creative works, community engaged scholarship, grants, and professional presentations. Please see COEHD Tenure and Promotion document for additional examples.

COEHD Philosophy on Annual Review Evaluation Criteria—Service

Service is a direct link to our ultimate mission to nurture and promote continued development of human potential. This is done through the collaboration among our faculty, the university system, and the community. A consistent and engaged level of service is expected from faculty. This includes service within the community at large and the profession. A narrative description of the faculty member's service efforts and time commitments should be uploaded for review.

Tenure and tenure track faculty are reviewed according to relevant department and COEHD Promotion and Tenure expectations. FTT faculty are reviewed according to their workload agreement and any relevant department and COEHD promotion expectations. Moreover, evidence required to demonstrate departmental criteria will encompass a range of activity that may include but is not limited to departmental, college, and university committee work, service to the discipline, and service to the community. Please see COEHD Tenure and Promotion document for additional examples.

DRAFT