

Memo To: All UH-Downtown/PS Holders
From: Loren J. Blanchard, President
Subject: Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty
Performance Evaluations

UH-Downtown/PS 10.A.05
Issue No. 7
Effective date: 09/01/2022
Page 1 of 8

1. PURPOSE

This PS states the policy and procedures for tenured/tenure-track faculty performance evaluations. Evaluation of lecturers and adjuncts will be carried out according to standards determined by each department. Faculty performance evaluations promote the highest standards of professional performance, provide a record of individual achievement, promote professional development, allow for the recognition of meritorious performance, and increase the awareness on the part of University stakeholders of the professional activities of tenure, tenure-track, and non-tenured faculty. Moreover, this PS provides the policy and procedures for awarding merit-based salary increases consistent with state law and the expectations of the UHS Board of Regents. Probationary faculty members should be cognizant of the [PS 10.A.01 University Rank and Tenure policy](#). The annual performance reports assist chairs and departmental Rank and Tenure committees in assessing progress toward tenure.

2. DEFINITIONS

No applicable definitions available.

3. POLICY / PROCEDURES

3.1 Operating Details

3.1.1 The evaluation of each tenured/tenure-track faculty member's performance is based upon an assessment of activities in three areas:

3.1.1.1 teaching and instruction, 50% of the total evaluation calculation, or a weight factor of 0.50, and

3.1.1.2 scholarly/creative activities, 25%, or a weight factor of 0.25, and

3.1.1.3 service/professional activities, 25%, or a weight factor of 0.25.

Faculty members are responsible for providing sufficient evidence of activities in all three areas to allow for evaluation according to criteria detailed in departmental evaluation rubrics.

Faculty who took approved leave during the period covered by a performance evaluation will not be penalized in areas of scholarship,

service and teaching during the time in which they took the approved leave.

3.1.2 Development and Review of Departmental Evaluation Criteria and Rubrics

In each department, the department chair and all tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be involved in developing the criteria and corresponding rubrics used to assess performance in each of the three areas. Developed criteria and corresponding rubrics should be approved by a majority of tenured and tenure-track faculty within the department. Individual departments/colleges may decide whether or not lecturers may vote on evaluation criteria. In the annual self-evaluation process, a faculty member must clearly articulate activity in each of the three areas and provide supporting evidence of that activity to the chair and faculty reviewers.

To ensure consistency, each chair submits the department's criteria and determinations concerning the three areas to be used for the following year to the faculty of the department, to the appropriate dean, and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by December 15.

For example, in December 2015, the chair submits the criteria and the corresponding rubric that will be used to assess the performance of faculty for calendar year 2016; individual reports are submitted in January 2017. If such updated criteria and corresponding departmental rubrics have not been submitted, the faculty shall use the criteria and corresponding departmental rubric in effect the previous year.

3.1.3 Review Committee and Chair Review of Faculty Performance

The evaluation of each full-time faculty member's performance is based upon assessment of faculty activities in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service/professional activities according to criteria detailed in departmental evaluation rubrics. Each evaluation is carried out by the department chair and a review committee composed of department Rank and Tenure Committee members elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Review committees must consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members. Alternates to the elected members of the review committee will be chosen by the Department Chair to review the faculty performance of the elected members of the review committee. When necessary, the department chair may request multiple review committees be constituted to ease workload in departments with large numbers of faculty. When only one review committee is constituted, all members of the review committee, as well as the Department Chair, must evaluate each and every faculty member to ensure consistency and fairness in the appraisal process. In instances where multiple review committees are constituted, all members of a particular review committee, as well as the Department Chair, must evaluate each faculty member assigned to that review committee. In instances where a department does not have enough tenured faculty members to constitute the

minimum subcommittee, the department chair may constitute a review committee appropriate to the makeup and size of the department.

3.1.4 Assigning of Faculty Merit Rating Scores

The faculty evaluation subcommittee consults with the department chair concerning the performance of each faculty member, according to the evaluation criteria and rubrics created by the department. The department chair assigns whole-number numerical ratings ranging from 0 to 7 for each of the three areas of assessment. Scores for teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service/professional activities are based upon the criteria established by the individual departments, and articulated in evaluation rubrics. As noted in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, these scores must be based on detailed evidence submitted by the faculty member in each area of activity. The process of consultation between the department chair and the subcommittee will be determined by, and distributed to the department.

Ratings assigned for the three areas are combined using the weight factors specified in 3.1.1 to place each faculty member in merit-rating categories. A score of 7 is assigned for faculty significantly exceeding expectations; a score of 4-6 is assigned for faculty members who exceed expectations to varying degrees; a score of 3 is assigned for faculty members who meet expectations; a score of 2 is assigned for faculty members who are performing below expectations; a score of 1 is assigned for faculty members who are significantly below expectations; and a score of 0 is assigned for faculty members who have demonstrated professional misconduct, or for faculty members who are derelict in their duty. See [Merit Categories and Corresponding Ratings](#) for more information. Faculty who receive a rating of 2 or lower for teaching or whose overall evaluation is 2 or lower will begin the development plan specified in the [PS 10.A.16 Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#) Section 2.2.1.

Numerical scores in each of the three areas, and the faculty member's total merit rating are reported to the appropriate Dean. The Dean may review the scores to ensure that the scores are justified by, and consistent with, the department's criteria outlined in the departmental rubrics. When the Dean disagrees with the department's scores, the Dean will send the department's scores back to the department with written comments for further consideration. The department chair will consult with the subcommittee, determine the final score, and provide written justification of the final scores.

3.1.5 Awarding of Merit Raises to Meritorious Faculty

Merit raises are awarded in compliance with all applicable state laws and in accordance with the directives of the UH System Board of Regents (BOR). Specifically, faculty raises shall only be awarded based upon merit; cost-of-living adjustments are not awarded.

Merit raises are calculated from three-year arithmetic mean of annual merit

ratings for faculty.

In years when merit raises are to be awarded, the Provost and President shall determine the total pool of merit money available for award. The Provost will allocate a percentage of the total faculty salaries to each department as that department's merit pool. Each department will be allocated an equal percentage. For example, in a particular year, each department will be distributed 3% of the total faculty salaries in their respective department. This will ensure that departments that have faculty of higher salary are not appropriated a disproportionate amount of the total merit pool.

The chairs and Deans are responsible for ensuring that the distribution of merit is guided by the evaluation process and that the process of awarding merit is fair and transparent. The chairs and Deans will also address issues of equity in the Department and ensure that faculty with higher salaries are not appropriated a disproportionate amount of the total merit pool for the Department. Within 30 days of merit being assigned, the Provost will present to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee the non-identified relationship between merit raises and evaluation scores for each department.

The Department Chairs and Dean of each college will work with the Provost to determine the awarding of merit to individual faculty members within their college according to a three-year arithmetic mean of annual merit ratings from the three previous annual appraisals.

When faculty members do not have three continuous years of service for evaluation under the 7-point merit scale articulated in this policy, a pro-rated model will be used:

- a. For faculty members with only one year of service, that one year will be evaluated and merit scores assigned for each area and weighted according to section 3.1.
- b. For faculty members with two years of service, the awarding of merit will be determined according to the arithmetic mean of annual merit ratings from the two annual appraisals they have on record.

3.1.6 Merit Rating Categories and Example Merit Calculation

[Merit Categories and Corresponding Ratings](#) contains the specific merit categories.

3.1.7 Faculty Annual Reports

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members write an annual report detailing activities performed in the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activities,

and service/professional activities (see Sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and [Faculty Evaluation Reports](#) for report guidelines). The faculty member should consult the appropriate department chair for specific departmental guidelines for preparing the report. Faculty should articulate activities in these three areas in a manner consistent with the criteria established by the individual departments, and with evaluation rubrics in mind. Additional evidence for reported activities beyond what is provided in annual reports must be provided upon request to ensure that Chairs and departmental subcommittees can conduct an informed evaluation.

3.1.8 Department Chair Evaluation Reports to Faculty

The department chair will submit written reports to faculty members explaining the overall merit rating and scores assigned to them in all three areas according to the timeline specified in section 3.5. Reports to faculty should clearly articulate where deficiencies in performance and/or report preparation exist and where improvement is needed.

In the case of faculty undergoing two- and four- year review, Department Chairs and Review Committees shall review the evaluation report and write a letter so that candidates may have it by the first Monday in March.

3.1.9 Evaluation Meetings between Chairs and Faculty

The department chair schedules meetings with individual faculty members to discuss assigned evaluation scores, merit rating, and contents of the department chair report. Meetings between individual faculty members and department chairs may be waived by written, mutual consent. Probationary faculty members and chairs may discuss progress toward tenure at these meetings. Faculty that do not schedule a meeting or request to waive their meeting with the Chair within two weeks after receiving their report from the Chair are assumed to have waived their meeting with the Chair.

3.1.10 Appeal of Faculty Performance Evaluation

Any faculty member who is dissatisfied with the rating assigned by the chair, or believes that the evaluation criteria outlined in the departmental rubric(s) were not followed may request a performance review by an appeals committee of at least three tenured faculty members in the department. This appeals committee must exclude the members of the departmental Rank and Tenure Committee that served on the review committee for the initial review of that faculty member's performance. If a department has an insufficient number of tenured faculty members, then those eligible to serve on this committee must have a minimum of three years of tenure-track service at UH-Downtown. This appeals committee is elected by each department's tenured and tenure-track faculty excluding those with administrative ranks of chair or higher, with the election held prior to

December 15 in the semester before the evaluation process begins. This committee reviews the faculty member's performance and evaluation and makes its recommendation to the dean separate from that of the Department Chair. A faculty member dissatisfied with the dean's resolution of the issue, or who still believes that the evaluation criteria outlined in the departmental rubric(s) were not followed may undertake formal grievance procedures.

3.2 Evaluation of Teaching/Instructional Performance

All faculty members write a report detailing all teaching and instructional activities, including high impact teaching practices, for the evaluation period. These activities must be documented upon request. The report should consist of a brief list of activities. See [Faculty Evaluation Reports](#) for examples of teaching/instructional activities that might be included. In assessing teaching/instructional performance, the chair reviews evidence concerning the faculty member's performance in terms of the evaluation criteria developed by the department and articulated in the departmental rubrics.

3.3 Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activities

Faculty members' contributions to the development of knowledge and/or to the reputation of the university are important. All faculty members write a report detailing scholarly/creative activities that they undertook during the evaluation period. These activities must be documented. The report consists of a list of activities. See [Faculty Evaluation Reports](#) for a list of activities that might be included. In assessing scholarly and creative activities, the chair reviews evidence concerning the faculty member's performance in terms of the evaluation criteria developed by the department and articulated in the departmental rubrics.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

Because the mission of UH-Downtown is service as well as teaching, all faculty members include in their report specific details about their service activities for the university, the profession, and/or the community undertaken during the evaluation period. These activities must be documented. The report consists of a list of activities. See [Faculty Evaluation Reports](#) for a list of activities that might be included. In assessing service contributions, the chair reviews evidence concerning the faculty member's performance in terms of the evaluation criteria developed by the department and articulated in the departmental rubrics.

3.5 Timetable*

December 15 Elections of departmental review committees have been completed. Departments submit evaluation criteria and corresponding rubrics for the following calendar year to faculty of the department, the appropriate dean, and the VPAA/Provost.

- | | |
|------------|---|
| January 31 | Faculty members submit reports listing activities for the previous calendar year. |
| March 20 | Chairs submit preliminary ratings to their dean. |
| March 25 | Chairs submit written formal ratings and written reports for each of the three evaluation areas to their dean and to the individual faculty member (see paragraph 3.1.9).** |
| April 10 | Chairs have completed conferences with the faculty members in their department. |
| April 15 | Faculty members wishing a review of their rating(s) have notified their chair, their department appeals committee, and their dean. |
| May 10 | Department appeals committees have reported their recommendations to their department chair, to their dean, and to each individual faculty member requesting a review. |
| May 20 | Dean notifies individual faculty and department chair of decision regarding appeal of annual report. |

* Note: If a date falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is deferred until the next business day.

** Note: In the case of faculty undergoing two- and four- year review, Department Chairs and Review Committees shall review the evaluation report and write a letter so that candidates may have it by the first Monday in March.

4. PROCEDURES

See Section 3 for Procedures.

5. EXHIBITS

There are no exhibits associated with this policy.

6. REVIEW PROCESS

Responsible Party (Reviewer): Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Review: Every five years, or as necessary

Signed original on file in the Office of Human Resources

7. POLICY HISTORY

Issue #4: 01/01/2007

Issue #5: 12/18/2015

Issue #6: 06/22/2015

Issue dates for previous versions are not available.

8. REFERENCES

[PS 10.A.01 University Rank and Tenure policy](#)

[PS 10.A.16 Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)

[Merit Categories and Corresponding Ratings](#)

[Faculty Evaluation Reports](#)

Merit Categories and Corresponding Ratings

Significantly Exceeding Expectations **7 Points**

- Faculty member significantly exceeds expectations as determined by the departmental rubric and performs at the highest level.

Exceeding Expectations **4-6 Points**

- Faculty member exceeds expectations as determined by the departmental rubric, but not at the highest level.
- Faculty members exceed expectations at varying levels; therefore, this category allows for a 3-point range.

Meeting Expectations **3 Points**

- Faculty member meets expectations as determined by the departmental rubric, but does not exceed them.

Below Expectations **2 Points**

- Faculty member does not meet expectations as determined by the departmental rubric but performance appears to be subject to improvement.

Significantly Below Expectations **1 Point**

- Faculty member consistently fails to meet expectations as determined by the departmental rubric in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice for improvement.

Unacceptable Performance **0 Points**

- Faculty member acts in a way that involves professional misconduct.
- Faculty member is derelict of duty.

Notes:

- (1) Departmental rubrics should define benchmarks that must be met to earn a given rating.
- (2) Ratings for each area (teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activities) must be limited to whole numbers.

FACULTY EVALUATION REPORTS

Each faculty member should consult the appropriate department chair for specific departmental guidelines for preparing the report and the required documentation. The following list includes examples of items that might be reported in the evaluation.

I. The report of teaching/instructional activities might include items such as the following:

- Statement of student evaluations
- Statement of peer evaluations
- Development of new courses or programs
- Revision or refinement of existing courses or programs
- Development of improved teaching materials
- Additional formal training in one's teaching field or in a related area (both credit and non-credit courses)
- Samples of graded student work.
- Preparation of proposals for external funding for instructional materials or activities.
- Description of teaching practices that are high impact.
- Other teaching/instructional activities.

II. The report on scholarly/creative activities might include items such as the following:

- Scholarly publications
- Research and writing activities
- Presentation of papers at professional meetings
- Juried shows
- Performances
- Book reviews
- Textbooks
- Preparation of proposals for external funding for scholarly or creative activities.

III. The report on service activities might include items such as the following:

- Services to the institution
 - Activities involved in student advising and counseling

- Sponsorship of or participation in student activities or organizations
- Activities involved in student recruitment or retention
- Services to the division and/or department
 - Committee activities not previously addressed
 - Other
- University-wide services
 - Committee activities not previously addressed
 - Official institutional representation
 - Other
- Preparation of proposals for external funding for university-related activities and initiatives.
- Other services to the institution
- Services to the profession and the community
 - Membership in professional organizations
 - Panel appearances, program participation, and/or other activities in professional organizations
 - Committee assignments and offices held in professional organizations
 - Attendance at professional meetings
 - Professional consultation in one's role as a professional educator or in one's role as a specialist in a particular discipline
 - Presentations to community groups in one's role as a professional educator or in one's role as a specialist in a particular discipline
 - Service on civic committees, boards, etc., in one's role as a professional educator or in one's role as a specialist in a particular discipline
 - Other services to the profession or to the community