To: Department Chairs and Directors of Schools

From: Shelley Payne, Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs

Date: September 24, 2012

Re: Changes in Annual Review of Faculty and Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty

There have been changes in Regents’ Rules pertaining to faculty reviews. The basic process has been established and is effective this fall. Some details of the post-review process are being finalized by the Provost’s office, and you will receive detailed guidelines once they are complete. In the meantime, I have included information about the annual reviews so that you may begin the transition to the new format. Major changes to the annual review are:

1. All faculty (tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure track) except as noted in 3b in the Guidelines will be reviewed each year and rated in one of the following categories, based on an aggregate rating of the overall performance:
   - Exceeds expectations
   - Meets expectations
   - Does not meet expectations
   - Unsatisfactory

2. Recommendation for merit increases should be consistent with the annual evaluation ratings. It would be appropriate to have the same committee review the faculty and recommend merit raises.

The review process:

- Collect assessment materials (See 3c. in the Guidelines)
- Budget Council or Executive Committee reviews the materials and determines the category for each faculty member
- Results are communicated to the Chair and Dean
- Chair communicates results to the faculty member in writing, stating the rating category and advising the faculty member of any areas that need improvement
- If the rating is unsatisfactory, a written development plan is established within 30 days. For CNS reviews, a development plan should also be prepared for faculty receiving a rating of “does not meet expectations”.
- The department will monitor progress on the development plan during the following year
3. The Comprehensive Periodic review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review) is similar to the current procedure but will also use the new rating categories.

The final version of the guidelines will have additional information, including rights of the faculty, appeals, development plans and faculty development support.

**Draft Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty**

1. **Introduction**

The annual evaluation of faculty is required by Regents’ Rules 30501, 31102, and Handbook of Operating Procedures 2-2150, all of which establish that the overriding purpose for faculty evaluation is to support tenure and promote faculty development. UT Austin is recognized for the outstanding quality of its faculty; therefore it is expected that the vast majority of faculty will be found to meet or exceed expectations as a result of annual review. The following guidelines are to be used in conducting the reviews.

2. **Purpose**

The annual evaluation is conducted to:

- provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development,
- assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals,
- refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate,
- provide assurance that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas,
- form the basis for determining merit raises, honors, awards, and other types of recognition.

3. **Responsibility and Scope**

   a. Annual evaluation shall be overseen by the departmental budget council, extended budget council, or executive committee. Copies of the evaluations will be forwarded to the Dean’s office.

   b. All active faculty members, tenured and non-tenured, shall be evaluated annually with the following exceptions:

   - faculty who are on approved, non-academic leave without pay for the entire academic year under review,
   - tenured faculty who are undergoing a six-year comprehensive review, and
   - faculty who are 100% in an administrative position.
c. Annual reviews should focus on individual merit relative to assigned responsibilities, and the basis of the review is the record of teaching, scholarship, and service. The following materials for the year under review are to be assessed:

- Annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR)
- Current curriculum vita
- Student evaluations of teaching, including all written student comments
- Additional materials as available, such as
  - peer teaching observations (peer review should be annual for assistant professors, since those evaluations will be needed for promotion and tenure. It is not essential to have annual peer reviews of more senior faculty, but these should be done periodically.)
  - any documentation directly relevant to the record of teaching, scholarship, or service
  - information submitted by the faculty member

4. Review Categories

a. Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories:

- **Exceeds expectations** – a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, discipline, or unit.
- **Meets expectations** – level of accomplishment normally expected.
- **Does not meet expectations** – 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.
- **Unsatisfactory** – failing to meet expectations in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

b. The rating assigned shall be an aggregate based on overall judgment of the faculty member's activities.

c. Recommendations for merit increases should be consistent with annual evaluation ratings.

5. Evaluation Results

a. The results of the evaluation shall be communicated to the faculty member by the department chair or dean in a non-departmentalized college or school and shall reflect the judgment of both the review committee and department chair or dean. The communication shall be in writing, state the rating category, and advise the faculty member of any areas that need improvement.

b. If the overall rating is unsatisfactory, the communication should also include a brief statement to identify the area(s) of unsatisfactory performance and basis for the evaluation. The statement should refrain from speculating on the reasons why the performance is unsatisfactory.
c. The faculty member may prepare a response and submit it to the department chair within ten (10) working days of receiving the written evaluation results. The response will be included with the permanent record of evaluation.