

12.99.99.R0.13 **Annual Evaluation of Faculty**

Revised June 5, 2026

Next Scheduled Review: June 5, 2031



Procedure Summary

The Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) process has two primary goals: (1) to establish clear expectations with faculty regarding their assigned duties as outlined in their individual employment letters, and (2) to provide a criterion-based evaluation of faculty contributions to inform employment decisions, including eligibility for merit pay, retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. The AFE is distinct from tenure and promotion reviews; a positive AFE rating does not guarantee that a faculty member is meeting the minimum standards for tenure or promotion.

Procedures and Responsibilities

1 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORES

The Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) is grounded in university-wide and departmental criteria. Faculty are evaluated on duties and expectations outlined in their appointment letters, position type (tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure-track per University Procedure 12.07.R0.01), and annual goals developed with their department head that build on previous evaluations and reflect departmental expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service.

1.1 University-wide Criteria

- 1.1.1 Teaching and Contribution to Student Learning. Teaching is the cornerstone of the University's mission and a foundational priority in faculty evaluation. Assessment draws on multiple indicators, including: course syllabi aligned with university standards; sustained engagement across delivery modalities; adherence to university and departmental policies; peer observations and instructional materials review; professional development participation; teaching portfolios; technology integration and high-impact strategies; mentorship of early-career faculty; evidence of student learning, including feedback from students, graduates, and employers; and demonstrated improvement from prior evaluations.

- 1.1.2 Student Evaluation of Teaching. Course evaluations are administered in compliance with Texas Education Code 51.974 and are designed to gather student feedback on their course experience. This evaluation instrument includes both quantitative and qualitative items that allow students to reflect on various aspects of the course and instruction at the end of the semester. Responses are collected directly from the students and managed by the Office of Academic Technology. Evaluation results are used to provide faculty with feedback on teaching effectiveness and course management and to inform personnel decisions such as merit, promotion, and tenure. Faculty should include course evaluations for each class taught, along with the number of students enrolled, the number of completed evaluations, and the average total score, course score, and instructor score in their AFE
- 1.1.3 Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA). Research, scholarship, and creative activities are core responsibilities of tenured and tenure-track faculty at the University. Producing new knowledge and engaging in creative or professional work are essential components of faculty roles. Expectations are defined in departmental and college tenure and promotion guidelines, which apply equally to the AFE. Assessment draws on multiple indicators, including publications, presentations, and creative works in peer-reviewed or juried venues, external funding and grants, graduate student supervision, disciplinary conference participation and professional activities, and other scholarly or creative activities identified in department or college criteria.
- 1.1.4 Service. Service is a vital component of faculty responsibility at the University and encompasses contributions to the department, college, university, profession, and broader community. The AFE will assess the quality, impact, and significance of service activities in relation to institutional and disciplinary goals. Specific expectations are defined in departmental and college tenure and promotion guidelines, and those definitions and standards apply equally to the annual evaluation. Faculty should provide documentation that clearly describes the scope, outcomes, and impact of their service. When appropriate, statements of support from committee or task force chairs may be included to verify contributions, particularly for exceptional service or leadership. Assessment indicators of service may include, but are not limited to: active participation and leadership in committees or task forces; student mentoring, advising, and extracurricular support; community engagement utilizing professional expertise; professional organization membership or leadership; editorial, advisory, or review board participation; and other activities consistent with departmental and college expectations. Credit for service will be based on substantive roles, completed tasks, and documented outcomes, not lists of affiliations.

- 1.1.5 Professional Conduct. Collegiality and ethical behavior are fundamental expectations embedded within Teaching, RSCA, and Service, though neither is evaluated as a separate criterion. Faculty are expected to engage professionally with the university community and adhere to System Policy 07.01, Ethics, which establishes standards for honesty, integrity, accountability, and respect. Ethical violations are addressed through existing System policies.

1.2 Departmental Criteria

Departments must develop, adopt, and maintain evaluation criteria reflecting disciplinary context while remaining consistent with university-wide criteria. Departmental criteria must

- 1.2.1 Describe department-specific criteria for Teaching, RSCA, and Service, allowing for disciplinary specificity and faculty roles.
- 1.2.2 Be comprehensive and consistent with university-wide criteria, ensuring coherence across departments while honoring disciplinary norms.
- 1.2.3 Clarify the relationship between annual evaluation and tenure-promotion criteria (tenure-track faculty can use annual evaluations to demonstrate continuous growth; non-tenure-track faculty are not held to tenure standards).
- 1.2.4 Explain how evaluation criteria translate into scores and how scores inform subsequent actions (e.g., merit pay eligibility, professional development plans).
- 1.2.5 Include workload guidance to assist faculty in determining appropriate percentages for Teaching, RSCA, and Service based on departmental workload policies and individual appointments.
- 1.2.6 Be reviewed and updated at least every five years to ensure accuracy, relevance, and alignment with institutional expectations.

1.3 Annual Evaluation Scores

Annual evaluation scores reflect how well a faculty member's performance aligns with clearly defined criteria and expectations. Scores are not percentages and should not be calculated as such. Each score represents the degree to which a faculty member's work meets or exceeds established departmental and university expectations as outlined in the appointment letter, departmental criteria, and university-wide standards.

- 1.3.1 (5) Significantly Exceeds Expectations. A score of 5 reflects exceptional and consistently high-quality performance that substantially surpasses departmental and university expectations. A score of 5 is not a mathematical indicator of perfection; it recognizes extraordinary contributions that serve as aspirational

models for the department and the university. This score is expected to be rare and reserved for work that goes well beyond standard expectations.

- 1.3.2 (4) Exceeds Expectations. A score of 4 reflects regular, high-quality performance that goes beyond standard expectations across all required evaluation criteria. A score of 4 demonstrates sustained, meaningful contributions that advance the mission of their department, college, and the University. This score affirms that the faculty member is exceeding expectations.
- 1.3.3 (3) Meets Expectations. A score of 3 is the normative, expected outcome for faculty who fulfill all assigned responsibilities. It indicates consistent, competent performance aligned with departmental and university criteria and with the faculty member's appointment letter. A score of 3 reflects steady progress, effectiveness, and a solid foundation for continued development.
- 1.3.4 (2) Partially Meets Expectations. A score of 2 indicates that the faculty member fulfills many assigned responsibilities but exhibits notable gaps in quality, consistency, or timeliness. This score signals the need for support and improvement. A score of 2 in any single area results in a composite score no higher than 2 and requires the development of a Professional Development Plan (PDP). Failure to meet the expectations of the PDP may result in additional review or personnel actions consistent with System Policy 12.01 (Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure).
- 1.3.5 (1) Does Not Meet Expectations. A score of 1 reflects serious deficiencies, including failure to meet core responsibilities or failure to submit required documentation. A score of 1 in any single area results in a maximum composite score of 2 and requires a PDP. Ongoing failure to meet expectations may result in actions consistent with System Policy 12.01 (Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure).

2 EVALUATION TIMELINE AND PROCESS STEPS

2.1 Timeline

- 2.1.1 The University will transition to a new annual review cycle running from June 1 to May 31. To facilitate this shift, there will be one extended evaluation period covering January 1, 2026, through May 31, 2027.
- 2.1.2 Beginning June 1, 2027, the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) will align with the academic year (June 1 – May 31). Annual deadlines will be established by the Provost's Office and communicated to faculty and administrators by April 1 of the evaluation year, or as needed.

2.2 Process Steps:

2.2.1 Department head or designee conducts classroom observation (or LMS review for online courses), generally during the fall semester; documents observation with a summary of strengths and areas for improvement; provides written feedback to faculty within 2 weeks. "Designee" refers to a faculty member or administrator authorized by the department head to conduct observations or evaluation activities.

2.2.2 Mid-cycle check-ins. Department heads are strongly encouraged to conduct informal mid-cycle check-ins with faculty approximately 6-8 months into the evaluation period. These conversations provide an opportunity to review progress toward goals, address emerging challenges, and adjust expectations if circumstances have changed. Mid-cycle check-ins are particularly valuable for:

2.2.2.1 Tenure-track faculty in their first three years

2.2.2.2 All faculty new to the institution or department

2.2.2.3 Faculty with Professional Development Plans

2.2.2.4 Faculty transitioning to new roles or responsibilities

These check-ins are developmental in nature and do not result in formal ratings or documentation, though department heads may choose to provide brief written summaries to faculty to confirm mutual understanding

2.2.3 Faculty submit annual report by deadline. First-year faculty hired mid-year will be evaluated only for the period of their appointment during the calendar year.

2.2.4 Department head assigns scores and meets with faculty to review evaluation and establish goals/percentages for next year, prior to the second week of the fall semester.

2.2.5 Dean, Provost, and President review and sign.

3 PERCENTAGES AND WEIGHTS

Faculty and department heads establish annual percentage weights for Teaching, RSCA, and Service through consultation. Weights must be whole numbers totaling 100%, align with the faculty member's appointment letter and departmental workload policy, and remain fixed during the review cycle unless significant duty changes occur:

3.1 Typical percentage ranges (departments may establish specific guidelines):

3.1.1 4-4 teaching load: Teaching 70-80%, RSCA 10-20%, Service 10%.

3.1.2 3-3 teaching load: Teaching 60%, RSCA 30-40%, Service 10-20%.

3.1.3 Non-tenure track faculty: Typically, 100% teaching; RSCA/Service by prior approval only.

3.1.4 Split appointments: Percentages reflect duties in each unit; evaluations are weighted proportionally.

3.1.5 Significant duty changes: Reassigned time, administrative assignments, or other contractual changes adjust percentages accordingly.

If the faculty member and the department head cannot agree on the percentages, the dean will review the appointment letter and the workload policy to make a determination.

3.2 Composite Score Calculation

At the conclusion of the review period, a composite score will be calculated using the following formula:

Teaching score _____ x _____ (%) = _____ [T] Teaching Percentage Score

RSCA score _____ x _____ (%) = _____ [R] RSCA Percentage Score

Service score _____ x _____ (%) = _____ [S] Service Percentage Score

Composite score _____ = T + R + S

4 OUTCOMES

4.1 Merit Eligibility

Faculty with a composite score of 3.0 or higher are eligible to be considered for merit pay increases when available. In years without merit funding, evaluations are conducted, and results may inform future merit distributions.

4.2 Professional Development Plan

Faculty with a composite score below 3.0 or any individual area score of 2 or 1 are ineligible for merit pay and, in consultation with their department head, must develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP). The PDP is a collaborative agreement including:

4.2.1 Specific, measurable improvement goals

4.2.2 Timeline (typically one year; research-related may extend to two years)

4.2.3 Support resources and check-in schedule

Department heads will meet with faculty on PDPs at least semi-annually to review progress. After one year, faculty who meet PDP goals exit the plan without penalty. Failure to meet goals initiates a formal review process consistent with System Policy 12.01 (Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure).

4.3 Acknowledgment and Appeals

Faculty are required to sign the evaluation form in Workday to acknowledge its receipt. Their signature does not indicate agreement with scores or findings. Faculty may appeal their evaluation in writing to their dean by the first day of the fourth week of the following fall semester. The dean will resolve the appeal within 30 calendar days. Faculty may also file a formal appeal following University Procedure 32.01.01.R1.01 (Grievance and Appeal Process).

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

System Policy [*12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure*](#)

System Policy [*12.01.01 Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure*](#)

System Policy [*12.03 Faculty Academic Workload and Reporting Requirements*](#)

System Policy [*12.06 Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*](#)

System Policy [*12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty*](#)

Suspends University Procedure *12.01.99.R0.02 Annual Evaluation of Faculty*

Appendix

[Faculty Evaluation Forms are located on the Provost's website](#)

Revision History

Approved February 1, 2016
Revised March 15, 2019

Revised November 7, 2024 (University Name Update)

Contact Office

Academic Affairs and Provost
903-886-5439