

**DEPARTMENT OF  
MATHEMATICS**

**ANNUAL FACULTY  
EVALUATION  
CRITERIA, PROCESSES, AND  
GUIDELINES**

Acknowledgement: This is to acknowledge those who worked over the three-year span from 2003 to 2006 to produce this document. Contributors noted are: Department of Mathematics Chairman Lokenath Debnath and the members of the Mathematics Annual Faculty Evaluation Review Committee (MAFE Committee) - - John Bernard (Chairman), Andras Balogh, Bao-Feng, Feng, Roger Knobel, Janet Olsen, Olga Ramirez, Monty Taylor, Cristina Villalobos, and Lee N Von Kuster.

# Content and Structure

- i. COVER PAGE
- ii. CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE
  - 1 PREAMBLE . . . . . PAGE 3
  - 2 ADMINISTRATIVE CALENDAR . . . . . PAGE 3
  - 3 ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEES RESPONSIBILITIES . . . . . PAGE 3
  - 4 COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND ELECTION . . . . . PAGE 4
  - 5 GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION FOLDERS . . . . . PAGE 5
  - 6 EVALUATION OF THE FOLDERS . . . . . PAGE 7
  - 7 EVALUATION CRITERIA . . . . . PAGE 8
    - TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS . . . . . PAGE 8
      - COURSE EVALUATIONS
      - EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE
      - SCORING RUBRICS
      - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE
      - SCORING RUBRICS
      - OTHER TEACHING CONTRIBUTIONS TO COURSE, CURRICULUM, AND PEER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
      - SCORING RUBRICS
    - PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT . . . . . PAGE 12
      - PUBLICATIONS
      - STANDARDS
      - EVALUATION SCALE
      - PRESENTATIONS
      - STANDARDS
      - EVALUATION SCALE
      - GRANTS
      - STANDARDS
      - EVALUATION SCALE
    - PROFESSIONAL SERVICE . . . . . PAGE 14
      - UNIVERSITY AND/OR COLLEGE LEVEL
      - STANDARDS
      - EVALUATION SCALE
      - DEPARTMENT LEVEL
      - STANDARDS
      - EVALUATION SCALE
      - PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION AND/OR COMMUNITY LEVEL
      - STANDARDS
      - EVALUATION SCALE
  - 8 DEPARTMENT CHAIR INPUT . . . . . PAGE 17
  - 9 REPORT EVALUATION RESULTS . . . . . PAGE 18
  - 10 APPEALS . . . . . PAGE 19
  - 11 DOCUMENT REVIEW, REVISIONS, AMENDMENTS . . . . . PAGE 19

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS**  
**ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION**  
**CRITERIA, PROCESSES, AND GUIDELINES**

**1. PREAMBLE:** All Department of Mathematics faculty members are to be evaluated on an annual basis as specified in HOP 6.2.2 and in accordance with the faculty duties and responsibilities in HOP 6.5.4, the compliance criteria regarding laws, regulations, contractual obligations, and policies in HOP 2.4.1 and other pertaining standards for ethical and professional conduct and performance. The purpose of the Annual Faculty Evaluation is to provide:

- ❖ Full-time faculty members with fair job performance appraisals and a concrete basis for professional growth and development in the areas of Teaching, Professional Achievement, and Professional Service commensurate with assigned responsibilities and duties,
- ❖ Valid and reliable merit ratings consistent with the quality and quantity standards of excellence set by the department to serve as a basis for merit salary increases, if available,
- ❖ Information for making tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions, and
- ❖ A basis for recommending or nominating department faculty for honors or awards, such as the university wide outstanding faculty excellence awards.

This document defines the department-level policies and procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation in a manner that is consistent with the specifications appearing in The University of Texas – Pan American Handbook of Operating Procedures and subject to approval at the College level. No portion of this document is to be interpreted in a manner that is inconsistent with higher levels of review. The measures herein are effective upon a vote of the majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department.

**2. CALENDAR:** The Provost of The University of Texas - Pan American and Dean of the College provide the annual faculty evaluation calendar to the department by the beginning of the fall semester of the academic year, which includes dates by which faculty submit annual evaluation folders, the annual evaluation committee presents results to the faculty, and faculty appeals are submitted.

**3. ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEES RESPONSIBILITIES:** The elected Department of Mathematics Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee will evaluate all full-time faculty in the Department of Mathematics for whom annual evaluation is required and review department level appeals. In addition, the Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee will conduct reviews of this document and present modifications, revisions, or amendments for approval by majority vote of the tenured, tenure-track faculty.

**4. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND ELECTION:** Regarding the stipulations of HOP 6.2.2.C.1 for an elected faculty committee for peer review, the department will elect its Annual Faculty Evaluation Committees in accord with the following conditions.

- a) The Department Chair is excluded from membership on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee.
- b) Only Department of Mathematics tenured, tenure-track faculty members (including the Department Chair) are eligible to vote.
- c) The Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee will be composed of five elected members.
  - i. Only Department of Mathematics tenured, tenure-track faculty with at least two academic years of full-time employment in the department<sup>1</sup> are eligible for membership on the committee;
  - ii. At least three elected members must be tenured faculty members<sup>2</sup>;
  - iii. During even numbered calendar years (based on the fall semester; ex: Fall 2006), two (2) new members will be elected to serve throughout two consecutive academic years and during odd numbered calendar years (based on the fall semester; ex: Fall 2005), three (3) new members will be elected to serve throughout two consecutive academic years<sup>3</sup>; and
  - iv. In the event of any vacancy occurring prior to the commencement of the business of the committee, the tenured, tenure-track faculty will vote to fill the vacated position(s) for the completion of the unexpired term.
- d) The Department Chair shall call a meeting of the tenured, tenure-track faculty to elect the Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee.
  - i. This meeting will be called in the fall semester for the term of service or in the preceding spring semester, but no later than a time that is consistent with the administrative calendar set for Annual Faculty Evaluation.
  - ii. Nominations may be submitted to the Department Chair in writing before the meeting or from the floor. Nominations must have the approval of the nominee and a second.
  - iii. Each eligible voter will be allowed to cast as many votes as the number of positions available, but only one vote per position. Voting will be by secret ballot.
  - iv. The votes for the membership of the committee are to be counted and the results reported to the Department.
  - v. In the event of any vacancy occurring prior to the commencement of the business of the committee, the tenured, tenure-track faculty will follow the process enumerated in this section d, steps 1 to 4 in order to fill the vacated position(s).
- e) After the membership of the Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee has been constituted, the Committee members will meet to elect a tenured faculty member of the Committee to

---

<sup>1</sup> By the start of the fall semester for the term of service

<sup>2</sup> Same as footnote 1

<sup>3</sup> Only in Fall 2005, a special election will be conducted where first, three (3) members will be elected for 2-year terms using the process enumerated in section d above. This will be followed by an election for two (2) committee members for one-year terms using the same process in section d.

Chair the Committee for a 1-year term noting that this same individual represents the Department on the College level Appeals Committee.

- i. This meeting will be called and facilitated by the Department Chair.
- ii. Committee members may submit nominations to the Department Chair in writing before or at the meeting. Nominations must have the approval of the nominee and a second.
- iii. Each eligible voter will be allowed to cast one vote by secret ballot.
- iv. The votes for the chair of the committee are to be counted and the results reported to the Department.

## 5. GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING AND SUBMITTING ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION FOLDERS

Each faculty member being evaluated is responsible for preparing and submitting an Annual Evaluation Folder according to the date set in the annual faculty evaluation calendar. The folder must include a cover sheet, job assignment information, and the Faculty Activity Report (See sections that follow.)

**COVER SHEET:** A cover sheet with the following format and information must be completed and placed at the beginning of the folder.

<p>ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION FOLDER</p> <p>Department of Mathematics College of Science and Engineering The University of Texas-Pan American</p> <p><b>Evaluation Period:</b> September 1, _____ through August 31, _____</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Rank: _____ Lecturer, Visiting Professor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor (OTHER: _____)</p> <p>Tenure Status: _____ Non Tenure-Track, Tenure-Track, Tenured (OTHER: _____)</p> <p>Signed Statement: To the best of my knowledge the material included in this folder is correct for the current evaluation period and provides a true and accurate account of my professional productivity and job performance for evaluating and assigning merit.</p> <p>Signature: _____</p> <p>Date Signed: _____</p>
---

**JOB ASSIGNMENT, DUTIES, & RESPONSIBILITIES:** The folder must include a description (limit one page) of the faculty member's FTE assigned duties and responsibilities (courses and reassignment/releases for grants and/or research for each term within the evaluation period).

**FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT:** The Faculty Activity Report consists of three one-page summaries describing and/or explaining activities, documentation, and support evidence for each of the areas – Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement, and Professional Service. Actual documentation and support evidence should be submitted via attachments (i.e., in appendices after the Student Evaluation Summary Sheets and Course Syllabi).

**STUDENT EVALUATION SUMMARY SHEETS:** In accordance with HOP section 6.2.1.B.2, the Department of Mathematics **REQUIRES** that **ALL** full-time faculty member administer student evaluations for **ALL** classes taught each fall and spring semester. Furthermore, **ALL** tabulation summary sheets for **ALL** classes taught **MUST** be submitted for annual faculty evaluation, tenure, promotion, and post tenure review.<sup>4</sup>

This section contains the Student Evaluation Summary sheets, one printout for each course, grouped chronologically as listed in the table by academic term and by course prefix and number within terms.

**COURSE SYLLABI:** A copy of the syllabus should be included for each section of each course taught during each term during the evaluation period. All required information<sup>5</sup> for syllabi **MUST** be included – e.g., handicap information. Generally speaking, there should be one syllabus for each Course Section – if indeed the same syllabus is used for several sections, a single copy may be submitted but its use for multiple sections should be so noted with a clear indication of which sections it covers. As with the Student Evaluations, the syllabi should be organized by academic term and by course prefix and number within terms.

**DUAL/MULTIPLE LISTING:** Contributions may be listed in more than one category or subcategory of a major category provided that cross-references are given indicating such and the case of relevance can be made for the placement. Thus, such entries should be accompanied by appropriate justification.

**DOCUMENTATION, SUPPORT EVIDENCE, AND APPENDICES:** Faculty should be prepared to make additional clarifying or pertinent support information available upon request from the committee or department chair.

---

<sup>4</sup> This policy was approved by a vote of the Department of Mathematics Faculty in the Spring semester 2005.

<sup>5</sup> Faculty are encouraged to include other forms of information such as attendance, drop, and grading policies, citing relevant UTPA catalog and/or H.O.P. sections.

## 6. EVALUATION OF THE FOLDERS

The overall structure of the evaluation is presented in the following table.

Teaching Effectiveness [0, 4]	Professional Achievement [0, 4]	Professional Service [0, 4]	
Course Evaluations [0, 2]	Publications [0, 4]	University &/or College [0, 4]	
Teaching Excellence [0, 2]	Presentations [0, 2]	Department [0, 4]	
Professional Development [0, 2]	Grants [0, 4]	Organizations &/or Community [0, 4]	
Other Teaching Contributions [0, 2]			
CATEGORY SCORE	CATEGORY SCORE	CATEGORY SCORE	POINT TOTAL
OVERALL SCORE = ROUND(MIN(INT(4*POINT TOTAL)/10, 4),1)			

Each of the three main categories (Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement, and Professional Service) is partitioned into three or four subcategories, each having its own particular scoring rubrics. The numbers in square brackets, e.g., [0, 2], indicate the range of points that may be awarded for performance in the corresponding subcategory. The preliminary number of points awarded for a category is the sum of points across the subcategories of the category, accumulated to a maximum of 4 points, i.e.,  $\text{MIN}(a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4, 4)$ , where  $a_i$  represents the number of awarded points in its respective subcategory. The evaluation committee is REQUIRED, through discussion and appropriate decision making procedures (see the later section regarding PROCEDURAL RULES), to map the preliminary score to the most appropriate scale value calibrated in terms of half-points, this is then referred to as the CATEGORY SCORE for that category. This discussion and decision making is intended to provide qualitative and quantitative evaluative information to be used in individual report narratives.

The total across the three categories, referred to as the POINT TOTAL, is then converted to the OVERALL SCORE using the formula given above. The first of the two given tables illustrates the formula output that is in tenths. The second table provides the scheme for mapping these resulting Overall Scores to the corresponding qualitative descriptors that are to be used in writing the individual report narratives.

POINT TOTAL	10-12	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
OVERALL SCORE	4	3.6	3.2	2.8	2.4	2.0	1.6	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.0

OVERALL SCORE	QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTOR
[3.5, 4]	Truly Outstanding
[2.5, 3.5)	Excellent
[1.5, 2.5)	Average to Good
[0, 1.5)	Poor to Fair

The Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee will perform its preliminary evaluation of each faculty member on the basis of the submitted folder according to the evaluation Standards and Scoring Rubrics that follow. Specialized norms and standards are provided to determine the number of points to be awarded for each subcategory within each major category. Committees are directed to come to a decision on half-point scores for these categories.

**PROCEDURAL RULES:** Reaching an informed decision on faculty scores is a multi-step process subject to proper rules of order and standards for valid and reliability evaluations. Committees may adopt or modify the following recommended procedures in accordance with the aforementioned principle. Recommended Procedures: 1) Excluding his/her own folder, each committee member independently evaluates faculty folders and computes and submits corresponding tentative OVERALL SCORES to the full committee for review. 2) The committee prepares a worksheet listing the proposed OVERALL SCORES from each committee member, the corresponding means<sup>6</sup> and standard deviations<sup>7</sup> of the tentative OVERALL SCORES across committee members, and rank orders the data from highest to lowest according to the means of the submitted OVERALL SCORES. 3) The committee discusses the quantity and quality of the work of each faculty member to determine which, if any, of the rankings are out of place and require adjustment or reevaluation: this is done via motions and voting, with the committee coming to a decision on number scores to the nearest half point for subcategories as directed above. 4) The preceding step is done as much as necessary to arrive at the finalized preliminary scores (subcategory, CATEGORY, POINT TOTAL, OVERALL) forwarded to the Department Chair. At this same time, the committee is advised to construct the preliminary versions of the narratives that will be sent to individual faculty. This concludes with a motion and vote by the committee to accept the ratings as a slate to forward to the Department Chair. [See section 8. DEPARTMENT CHAIR INPUT.]

## **7. EVALUATION CRITERIA**

### **TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

Teaching effectiveness is primarily concerned with faculty contributions toward providing high quality graduate and undergraduate programs and courses for the instructional part of the Department's mission. It includes 1.) Contributions to the design of programs and courses through the formulation of appropriate educational aims, goals, and objectives, 2.) Selection and/or development of appropriate curriculum materials and instructional strategies, 3.) Thorough and proper delivery of course content, and 4.) Selection and/or development and use of appropriate assessment instruments and evaluation policies that measure, validate, and support attainment of the targeted knowledge and skills.

---

<sup>6</sup> The intent here is to directly use the arithmetic mean across all of the submitted scores without discarding any scores as in computing a trimmed mean. Each resulting score is thus based upon the best judgment of the maximum number of committee members; five when evaluating non-committee members and four when evaluating members of the evaluation committee.

<sup>7</sup> Standard deviations are to be used heuristically to guide the building of a consensus in the decision making process.

**I. COURSE EVALUATIONS [0, 2]**

All faculty are to submit Course Evaluation Summary information for ALL classes taught (including overloads) during the Fall and Spring semesters/terms.<sup>8</sup> A summary table should be provided in the following format with attached copies of the computer center generated course summary reports. [Only the responses to the designated Mathematics Teaching related questions are to be counted. {Nursing or other such questions are to be excluded.}]

**Course Evaluation Summary Table of Student Opinions**

Provide the following summary information for ALL classes for BOTH Fall and Spring semesters.

Course Section, Term	# Excellent	# Good	# Average	# Fair	# Poor	Totals
"	"	"	"	"	"	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Total Across All Classes and Terms	# Excellent	# Good	# Average	# Fair	# Poor	"
	% (Excellent & Good)		% Average	% Fair	% Poor	"

Points are awarded as follows:

- 1.) If the proportion of responses in the combined Excellent and Good categories is at least 75%, the faculty is to be awarded two (2) points.
- 2.) If the proportion of responses in the combined Excellent and Good categories is less than 75%, the faculty is to be awarded the prorated amount equal to the quotient of two times the proportion divided by 75%, rounded to the nearest tenth of a point. That is,

$$\text{Points} = \text{MINIMUM} (2, \text{ROUND} (\text{Proportion of Excellent or Good} * 2 / 0.75, 1))$$

**II. EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE: [0, 2]**

This subcategory is not to overlap those things covered by Student Opinion Course Evaluations. This subcategory examines the quality of the following types of evidence:

- A. Developing new courses, new content for an existing course, or changes in content or emphasis for an existing course. [Sufficient information/documentation/testimony is required to determine the appropriate level (major or minor) of the contributions.]
- B. Development of supplemental workbooks, labs, computer-based materials, test-banks of questions, or other innovative instructional or assessment methods or procedures for use with courses or program
- C. Teaching of graduate and upper-division courses.
- D. Chairing Master's Thesis, Doctoral Dissertation, or Honors Thesis Committees
- E. Awards and honors received for excellent teaching
- F. Documented evidence of student success in subsequent courses and/or careers
- G. Formal observation and evaluation of teaching practices associated with classroom instructional, presentation, and/or assessment methods resulting in excellent rating.

---

<sup>8</sup> Note: This makes use of the HOP option (HOP 7.2.1.B.2) and the Department voted on policy.

#### SCORING RUBRICS:

- ❖ Score up to one point for high quality teaching of graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses if the faculty member has taught at least one graduate course, or at least two upper-division undergraduate courses, or some comparable combination of teaching effort during the annual evaluation period.
- ❖ Score up to one point if the faculty member chaired a master's thesis, doctoral dissertation, or honors thesis committees with the student successfully completing the thesis or dissertation during the annual evaluation period.
- ❖ Score up to one point if the faculty member received an excellence in teaching award at the department level during the annual evaluation period; more points may be given for higher level excellence in teaching awards.
- ❖ Other contributions listed in this subcategory should be weighted comparably in proportion to those given above, taking into consideration the work involved, the quality of the contributions, the effectiveness, and the long-range or long-lasting influences.
- ❖ Giving a point for the development of supplemental workbooks, labs, computer-based materials, test-banks of questions, or other innovative instructional or assessment methods or procedures for use with courses or program should be reserved for major contributions with long-term and positive outcomes and/or far reaching influences.

### III. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE [0, 2]

Entries must be teaching related. Evidence for this subcategory includes:

- A. Evidence of improving teaching performance by applying ideas gained from teaching professional development and advanced mathematics content courses, mini-courses, seminars, conferences, workshops, independent readings (on pedagogical practices & research; mathematics content, applications, or models), or other teaching enhancement programs.
- B. Publishing solutions to professional journal posted teaching related mathematics problems such as those in *SSMA* or *College Mathematics* journals.
- C. Serving as textbook and/or curriculum materials referee for a publisher/developer.

#### SCORING RUBRICS:

The focus of this subcategory is on the professional development of faculty members. (Teaching or presenting professional development sessions to others goes in subsection IV that follows.) Standing alone, most of the items listed in this section are minor contributions.

- ❖ Awarding of two full points must be reserved for those having the equivalent of four major contributions recognized both qualitatively and quantitatively, looking for contributions with long-lasting positive outcomes and far-reaching influences.

- ❖ One example of a major contribution might be sitting in on a course throughout a term in preparation to teaching it; if the teaching were to take place during the annual evaluation period, the combination could earn up to one point given sufficient evidence of successful implementation.
- ❖ Published solutions to professional journal posted teaching related mathematics problems may be considered minor contributions. As a guide, four such minor contributions combined might be equated to one major contribution.
- ❖ Other professional development activities and/or accomplishments in this subcategory should be scored proportionately.

#### IV. OTHER TEACHING CONTRIBUTIONS TO COURSE, CURRICULUM, AND PEER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT [0, 2]

Evidence for this subcategory includes:

- A. Teaching to peers or approved groups by way of seminars, courses, mini-courses, project workshops, or content presentations at area schools
- B. Serving on master's thesis committees, doctoral dissertation committees, or honors thesis committees (this excludes chairing a committee, see subcategory II above.)
- C. Delivery of workshops (e.g. TExES/ExCET), review sessions, tutoring, etc. to groups of individual students in UTPA related programs.  
[To be counted only once in this subcategory rather than in service.]
- D. Supervising students' research, projects, or presentations other than dissertations or theses
- E. Teaching arranged courses gratis, teaching a wide variety of courses, or teaching large lecture courses

SCORING RUBRICS: This subcategory is on academic program improvements by way of curriculum, course, and instructional delivery developments, including presenting professional development sessions to foster improvements among faculty and staff in the department. Standing alone, most of the items listed in this section are minor contributions.

- ❖ Awarding of two full points must be reserved for those having the equivalent of four major contributions recognizing both qualitatively and quantitatively, and looking for long-term contributions with long-lasting positive outcomes and far-reaching influences.
- ❖ A major contribution in this area would be conducting a series of four professional development program workshops/seminars for graduate teaching assistants. If this were coupled with evaluation of the effects on participants such as classroom observations and/or reviews of lectures and assessments instruments, the combination, with sufficient evidence, might be awarded one point in this subcategory.
- ❖ Serving on a combination of four Master's Thesis, Doctoral Dissertation, or Honors Thesis Committees (not as chair during the completion phase as above) may be sufficient to award up to one point given evidence that it involved a substantial amount of work.

- ❖ Other professional development activities and/or accomplishments in this subcategory should be scored proportionately.

## PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

Professional achievement is primarily concerned with the advancement of knowledge in the academic disciplines of the department: mathematics, mathematics education, and statistics. It also includes grant work in support of developing, disseminating, or applying knowledge and principles from these disciplines, particularly when the activities and accomplishments have a sense of professional advancement and accomplishment. The evaluation reviews faculty professional achievements in terms of both quality and quantity; judgments of quality should be sensitive to academic, scholarly, or range of importance – local, regional, national, or international. Evidence of professional achievement is based primarily on publications, presentations, and grant activity.

### I. PUBLICATIONS [0, 4]

The focus of this subcategory is on advancing and disseminating knowledge in the academic disciplines of the department (mathematics, mathematics education, statistics) by way of published scholarly works. Evidence of scholarly activity in this area, is based primarily upon

- A. Books: publications at various levels – undergraduate, advanced undergraduate, graduate, research or professional practitioner area.
- B. Papers: mathematics, mathematics education, or statistics related publications at research or professional practitioner levels.
- C. Technical reports and proceedings.
- D. Other published works such as audiovisual or software media.

The above-mentioned activities should be accompanied by information such as whether the published work was refereed, the status of the publication (submitted, accepted for publication, in press, etc.); journal name and number of pages of published work.

STANDARDS (MAJOR): A peer reviewed or refereed article published in a mainstream journal with a national audience (such as journals included in the AMS Mathematical Reviews) is a major accomplishment in this subcategory. Other publication activities and accomplishments should be assigned credit in proportion to this standard.

ADDITIONAL CREDIT MAY BE GIVEN FOR THE STATURE OF THE PUBLICATIONS IN TERMS OF THEORETICAL IMPORTANCE, IMPACT RATING, OR COMPARABLE QUALITY FACTORS.

EVALUATION SCALE

<b>Max Score</b>	<b>General Description</b>
0	Evidence and/or activities insufficient to warrant score greater than zero.
1	Evidence of research or scholarly activities consistent with the production of research or scholarly articles, or research activities undertaken in order to learn additional subject areas and expand research topics.
2	Productive research or scholarly work indicated by one or two major accomplishments.
3	Substantial research or scholarly work indicated by three or four major accomplishments.
4	Extensive publication activity indicated by more than four major accomplishments.

**II. PRESENTATIONS [0, 2]**

The focus of this subcategory is on research or scholarly presentations to professional peers. Evidence of scholarly activity in this area is based primarily upon

- A. Presentations at research, professional, or association meetings, conferences, or congresses.
- B. Seminar and colloquia presentations.
- C. Other presentations to research or scholarly peers.

STANDARDS (MAJOR): A contributed presentation of research or scholarly work at a national research or professional association meeting is a major accomplishment in this subcategory. Other presentation activities and accomplishments should be assigned credit in proportion to this standard.

EVALUATION SCALE

<b>Max Score</b>	<b>General Description</b>
0	Evidence and/or activities insufficient to warrant score greater than zero.
1	The delivery of one or more research or scholarly presentations to professional peers, including Departmental colloquia or seminars, or local or regional conferences.
2	The delivery of three or more research or scholarly presentations to professional peers, of which at least two presentations are major accomplishments.

**III. GRANTS [0, 4]**

The focus of this subcategory is on research or scholarly grant activities and accomplishments that advance and disseminate knowledge in the academic disciplines of the department. This subcategory is reserved for grantsmanship activities and accomplishments; thus, grant supported teaching, service, and/or research should be reported in their appropriated areas. Evidence of grantsmanship activities in this area is based primarily upon

- A. Submission of a proposal to a funding agency. [This includes being on grant-writing teams responsible for developing and submitting proposals.]
- B. Successful funding of a grant proposal.

- C. Successful continuation of multi-year grants.
- D. Administration of a grant. (activities of a professional achievement related to a grant, such as writing reports, serving on panels, etc., not listed elsewhere (teaching, publications, or service.)

For grants/proposals provide information associated with the funding agency, the amount and duration of the grant, your association/role with the grant, the type of grant (teaching, service, research, etc) and impact or any other relevant information.

STANDARDS (MAJOR): A proposal accepted for funding in a state or nationally competitive program is a major accomplishment in this subcategory. Other grant activities and accomplishments should be assigned credit in proportion to this standard.

ADDITIONAL CREDIT MAY BE GIVEN TO MAJOR GRANT ACTIVITY OF OUTSTANDING QUALITY BY NATIONAL STANDARDS AS INDICATED BY AMOUNT (MULTI-MILLION DOLLAR), DURATION (MULTI-YEAR, THREE OR MORE), OR IMPACT.

**EVALUATION SCALE**

<b>Max Score</b>	<b>General Description</b>
0	Evidence and/or activities insufficient to warrant score greater than zero.
1	The submission of a research or scholarly grant proposal to a state or nationally competitive grant, or successful funding from a local or UTPA funding source, or successful continuation of a state or national grant.
2	Productive grant activity indicated by one major accomplishment.
3	Substantial grant activity indicated by two major accomplishments.
4	Extensive grant activity indicated by three or more major accomplishments.

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

Professional Service is primarily concerned with participation in activities that implement, facilitate, and/or otherwise carry out the missions of the department, college, university, university system, and academic disciplines. The evaluation reviews faculty professional service in terms of quality, quantity, and significance; judgments of quality should be sensitive to the range of importance across the various organizational units served and respective missions. Activities should briefly be described; indicate such things as the number of meetings, the duration or accumulated number of hours of work, whether working individually or via a committee, the faculty member’s role (chair/member) and contributions.

**I. UNIVERSITY AND/OR COLLEGE LEVEL [0, 4]**

This subcategory is for service activities related to carrying out the mission of the university and/or college. Evidence for entries in this subcategory should supply information relative to the following attributes:

- A. University Committees
- B. College level Committees

- C. Administrative, Officer Role  
(including grant management/administrative activities)
- D. Faculty Senate
- E. Other University &/or College Level Activities – Specify

STANDARDS (MAJOR/MINOR): An example of a major contribution requiring substantial work/effort is serving as Chair of University/College level committees, such as the Faculty Senate, Faculty Development Council, or search committees or its equivalent. Serving on a University/College level committee is considered a minor contribution unless the member’s work/effort is equivalent to a major contribution. Other service activities and/or accomplishments in this subcategory should be scored with credits in proportion to the standards set for major and minor contributions.

EVALUATION SCALE

Max Score	General Description
0	Evidence and/or activities insufficient to warrant score greater than zero.
1	Evidence of at least two minor contributions in University/College service activities.
2	Evidence of a major contribution in at least one University/College service activity.
3	Substantial service activity indicated by major contributions in at least two University/College level service activities.
4	Extensive service activity of outstanding quality indicated by major contributions in three or more University/College level service activities.

II. DEPARTMENT LEVEL [0, 4]

This subcategory is for service activities related to carrying out the department’s mission. Evidence for entries in this subcategory should supply information relative to the following attributes:

- A. Administrative Officer, Coordinator, or other managerial roles,
- B. Committee Work
- C. Student Services (e.g., Advising, Sponsor of approved organization)
- D. Administrative Duties related to Grants

STANDARDS (MAJOR/MINOR): Examples of major contributions include high quality and significant work when involved in roles such as in being the chair a faculty search committee, a department coordinator (such as class scheduler, program coordinator), department advisor, or its equivalent. Mere membership on a typical committee such as the mathematics education committee is considered a minor contribution. Several minor contributions by themselves need not be equated to a major contribution. Other service activities and/or accomplishments in this subcategory should be scored with credits in proportion to the standards set for major and minor contributions.

EVALUATION SCALE

<b>Max Score</b>	<b>General Description</b>
0	Evidence and/or activities insufficient to warrant score greater than zero.
1	Evidence of at least two minor contributions in departmental level service activities.
2	Evidence of a major contribution in at least one service activity and minor contributions in at least four departmental level service activities.
3	Substantial service activity indicated by major contributions in at least two departmental level service activities.
4	Extensive service activity of high quality indicated by major contributions in at least three activities, and minor contributions in at least two departmental level service activities.

**III. PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION &/OR COMMUNITY LEVEL [0, 4]**

This subcategory is for other professional service activities carrying out the mission of a professional organization and/or for providing professional service to such organizations, and/or the regional community. Evidence for entries in this subcategory should supply information relative to the following attributes:

- A. Professional Organization Officer or Board Member
- B. Professional Publication Editorial Board or Editorship
- C. Professional Advisory Council
- D. Referee, Judge, or Reviewer
- E. Government Agency Advisor, Consultant
- F. Professional Organization Membership
- G. Other Professional Academic and Professional Association Services – Specify
- H. Professional Services to the Community
- I. Grant Activity

STANDARDS (MAJOR/MINOR): Examples of major contributions include A-C above, followed by minor contributions in D-F, unless evidenced otherwise. Other service activities and/or accomplishments in this subcategory should be scored with credits in proportion to the standards set for major and minor contributions above.

EVALUATION SCALE

<b>Max Score</b>	<b>General Description</b>
0	Evidence and/or activities insufficient to warrant score greater than zero.
1	Evidence of at least two minor contributions in professional/community activities.
2	Evidence of a major contribution in at least one activity requiring regular/substantial work.
3	Substantial service activity indicated by major contributions in at least two activities.
4	Extensive service activity of outstanding quality at the national level.

**8. DEPARTMENT CHAIR INPUT<sup>9</sup>:** The procedures for the Department Chair's input in determining ultimate annual faculty evaluation scores and written reports are as follows:

1. The Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee will establish tentative faculty evaluation category scores for teaching, professional achievement, professional service<sup>10</sup> and written reports on individual job performance, including recommendations for maintaining or improving performance. This information and the faculty folders are then to be forwarded to the Department Chair for review and input.
2. The Department Chair has seven full working days to review the faculty folders, the Committee's tentative scores and written recommendations and to respond with any recommended changes of either category scores (teaching, professional achievement, professional service) and/or written recommendations.
  - a. Regarding adjusting category scores, the Department Chair is to recommend specific scores for each of the three areas of evaluation (teaching, professional achievement, professional service) and provide the rationale for each change together with any relevant admissible supporting evidence.
  - b. Regarding modifying written reports:
    - 1.) The Department Chair has the option to indicate edits, additions, deletions, and/or provide recommended statements. The chair should provide a rationale and relevant admissible evidence for substantive changes consistent with federal and state laws, University of Texas System and UTPA codes and policies.
    - 2.) The Department Chair has the option to write individual job performance evaluations and recommendations for any or all faculty. When this option is exercised, the Department Chair's comments and recommendations will be included verbatim following the Committee's written report for each faculty; these will be labeled respectively as the Department Chair's Comments and Recommendations and the Committee's Comments and Recommendations.
3. The Department Chair's input is to be forwarded in writing to the Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee along with the folders. If mutually agreed upon, the Department Chair and Committee may meet to discuss the Department Chair's input. Following this, the Committee has three full working days to make adjustments and/or revisions to produce its final scores and written reports. For cases where there is a difference between the Committee's category score and that of the Department Chair, these should be resolved using the sum of 0.75 times the Committee's score plus 0.25 times the Department Chair's score: this option should only be exercised after all other means have been exhausted.

---

<sup>9</sup> The H.O.P. requires provisions for input into the annual evaluation process from the department chair.

<sup>10</sup> The overall scores are to be computed from the category scores using the prescribed formula.

## 9. REPORTING EVALUATION RESULTS

The Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee will prepare individual annual faculty evaluation reports that include category and overall descriptors and scores together with narrative comments explaining and/or advising the faculty member relative to interrelating and using the evaluation results for future professional growth and development; sample forms for these follow. Individual reports will be sent to each evaluated faculty member according to the evaluation calendar.

### INDIVIDUAL ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION REPORT COVER SHEET

Dear Department of Mathematics Faculty Member,

This cover sheet provided along with your individual annual faculty evaluation report includes LEVEL SCORE-DESCRIPTOR CORRESPONDENCES and DEPARTMENT LEVEL SUMMARY STATISTICS to assist you in understanding and interpreting your individual results. Information on appeals is also included.

#### LEVEL SCORE-DESCRIPTOR CORRESPONDENCES

OVERALL SCORE	QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTOR
[3.5, 4]	Truly Outstanding
[2.5, 3.5)	Excellent
[1.5, 2.5)	Average to Good
[0, 1.5)	Poor to Fair

#### DEPARTMENT LEVEL SUMMARY STATISTICS

Statistic	Teaching Effectiveness	Professional Achievement	Professional Service	Overall Score
Count				
Maximum				
Median				
Mean				
Minimum				
Standard Deviation				

APPEALS: Should you wish, you have ten working days from the date below to submit an appeal via the Department Chair. In appealing, you must specify the category or overall scores you are appealing give a succinct description and rationale for each score appealed. Detailed evidence may be submitted to support your appeal. The department level annual evaluation committee has 10 working days from the department level appeal submission deadline to review and respond to your request.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Chair  
Academic Year Department Annual Faculty Evaluation Committee

The University of Texas – Pan American  
 College of Science and Engineering  
 Department of Mathematics

**ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY**

	Person Evaluated	Rank	Period of Evaluation
<b>Area</b>	<b>Evaluation Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b> (Suggestions for improvement/change, if appropriate.)	
Teaching	Level: _____ Score: _____		
Professional Achievement	Level: _____ Score: _____		
Professional Service	Level: _____ Score: _____		
Overall	Level: _____ Score: _____		

**10. APPEALS**

Submission and processing of appeals will be done according to time limits set in the administrative calendar. Faculty must specify by subcategory, category, or overall score which scores they are appealing. A faculty member should give a short description and rationale for each score appealed. Detailed evidence may be submitted to support the appeal. At the department level, faculty members are to submit their appeals via the Department Chair within 10 working days from the evaluation report date on which the reports are released to the faculty. The committee shall have up to 10 working days from the submission deadline to review and respond to received appeals. Following the committee’s response, faculty wishing to do so may appeal at the college level by submitting their appeal by the to the Dean. Following this, appeals go to the Provost, which is the highest level of review.

**11. DOCUMENT REVIEW, REVISIONS/AMENDMENTS**

The Annual Faculty Evaluation document will be reviewed at least every two years from the last review, or when deemed necessary by the annual faculty evaluation committee, a petition from a majority of the tenured, tenure-track faculty, the department chair, or upper levels of authority.