

Texas Woman's University University Regulation and Procedure

Regulation and Procedure Name: Faculty Periodic Performance Review and Evaluation

**Regulation and Procedure
Number: URP: 02.346**

Policy Owner: Academic Affairs

POLICY STATEMENT

TWU recognizes faculty as a vital resource in achieving its mission through quality teaching, scholarship, and service. The primary purposes of conducting periodic faculty performance reviews that accurately identify and summarize past performance in a timely and comprehensive manner are:

1. Formative assessment – Evaluation which recognizes positive faculty contributions, provides a basis for improved performance in the future, and fosters professional growth and development.
2. Summative assessment – Evaluation which provides a basis for university decisions and/or reporting to various constituents. University employment decisions may include actions such as continuing faculty employment, promotion, or tenure.
3. Compliance – Evaluation which fulfills legislative or regulatory requirements created by the state or federal government or relevant regulatory and accrediting bodies.

This URP is intended to provide a consistent process for the review of faculty performance across the University while allowing each academic component (AC) to establish goals and performance criteria that are appropriate for the relevant disciplines and goals of the AC.

APPLICABILITY

This policy is applicable to TWU Faculty.

DEFINITIONS

1. “Academic Component (“AC”)” means an administrative unit of faculty within a discipline or a set of related disciplines; may be titled program, department, school, or a campus/center unit of a college.

2. "Academic Component Administrator ("ACA")" means the leader of an academic component; may be titled program director, chair, director, associate dean, or associate director.
3. "Faculty" means an individual who is employed by TWU as a member of the faculty and whose duties include teaching, research, service, and administration. Professional librarians and graduate assistant titles are excluded from the definition of faculty.
4. "Tenure" means the entitlement of a faculty member of TWU to continue in the faculty member's academic position unless dismissed by TWU for good cause in accordance with TWU's policies and procedures. The granting of tenure may not be construed to create a property interest in any attribute of a faculty position beyond a faculty member's continuing employment, including their regular annual salary and any privileges incident to their status as a tenured faculty.

REGULATION AND PROCEDURE

I. Schedule for Faculty Performance Review

- A. Periodic Performance Review (PPR) will be undertaken by each TWU faculty member and his/her AC on the following schedules:

Type of Faculty	Year of	Frequency of Review
Tenure-track	1-5	Annual Year 3 PPR will contain explicit statements regarding progress of the Faculty Member toward promotion and/or tenure.
Tenure-track	6	Tenure and/or promotion application; all prior years considered
Tenured	After Year 6	Every 3 years
Non-tenure-track (Clinical or Lecturer)	1-6	Annual Year 3 PPR will contain explicit statements regarding progress of the Faculty Member toward promotion.
Non-tenure-track (Clinical or Lecturer)*	After Year 6	Every 3 years

*Clinical and lecturer faculty are not required to apply for promotion. After Year 6, they are reviewed every 3 years.

B. TWU will schedule PPRs in accordance with the notice parameters established in the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) *Policy Documents and Reports* and will publish a calendar for the faculty performance review process annually. Except as noted below, the documentation of performance and its review will begin in the fall semester and proceed according to the published calendar. The time period under review will be the previous academic year.

1. The Year 1 PPR will be conducted in the fall semester and typically address only the first few months of the 1st academic year.
2. The Year 2 PPR will be conducted in the fall semester and typically address the entire 1st academic year plus the first few months of the 2nd academic year.
3. The Year 3 PPR will address the prior academic year. In addition, the Year 3 review will also contain an explicit statement regarding the progress of the faculty member in relation to the relevant criteria for promotion and/or tenure (see URP 02.342: *Faculty Promotion and Tenure*), as applicable. Preparation of a portfolio and external review are not required for this review.
4. The PPR for Years 4 and 5 reviews will highlight progress and areas that need improvement prior to the tenure and/or promotion review scheduled for Year 6.
5. The Year 6 PPR (or an alternate year specified in the employment letter of a faculty member) is typically replaced by the preparation and submission of a tenure and/or promotion application. The application process begins in Spring with a request for external reviewers. (See URP 02.342: *Faculty Promotion and Tenure*, and annual schedule for performance review.)
6. After Year 6, the PPR shifts from a 1-year interval to a 3-year interval. The review conducted every third year will address the previous three academic years of performance. Preparation of a portfolio and external review are not required for this review.

C. Exceptions in the 3-year interval are noted below:

1. The schedule for the PPR will be changed from the 3-year interval to annual as follows:
 - a. At the request of either the faculty member or the AC administrator. Should either party disagree that a change is needed, the dean will make a determination.

- b. When a PPR results in a rating of *Ineffective Performance* in any of the three subcomponents--teaching, scholarship, or service.
 - 2. A new 3-year periodic review cycle begins in the following situations:
 - a. Faculty member is promoted.
 - b. Successful completion of a professional development plan with an improved periodic review rating in any area of concern.
 - c. Mutual agreement of a faculty member and his/her AC administrator.
- D. In non-evaluation years, AC administrators are encouraged to meet with each faculty member at least annually to facilitate ongoing communication about performance expectations. Any actions to be taken by the faculty member or academic unit should be documented.

II. Criteria for Review of Performance

- A. A PPR will assess faculty performance in light of the performance criteria established by the university and each AC. The additional criteria established by an AC will include examples of performance appropriate to the discipline, be consistent with university criteria, and be approved by the appropriate university process, as defined in URP 02.342: *Faculty Promotion and Tenure*.
- B. On the basis of the mission of Texas Woman's University as a teaching and research institution and of the values placed on shared governance and service to the community and profession, each member of the faculty is expected to demonstrate and document high quality achievement in each of the domains of teaching, scholarship, and service (examples of documentation found in URP 02.342: *Faculty Promotion and Tenure*).
- C. In some situations, it may be appropriate for a tenured or tenure-track faculty, lecturer, or clinical faculty to be assigned to a position with heavier emphasis on teaching, research, or administration. The faculty member and AC administrator will discuss the rationale for and expectations of the assignment emphasis, and the AC administrator will provide a written description of the assignment emphasis and duration to the faculty member. Faculty should include documentation of the assignment emphasis and duration in their self-assessments.

III. Teaching

- A. The teaching role of university faculty is to promote the academic and professional growth of students. Teaching requires knowledge of the subject, ability to present information and materials clearly, and an ability to help motivate students to learn. The purpose of the review process for teaching is to recognize accomplishments and/or areas of deficiency and to aid the faculty member in professional development in the area of teaching.
- B. While all faculty members may not have the opportunity to participate in each of the following, teaching effectiveness generally refers to the competence of the instructor in:
 - 1. Classrooms (online, hybrid, or face-to-face);
 - 2. Laboratories;
 - 3. Studios;
 - 4. Clinics;
 - 5. Supervision of independent studies and/or internships;
 - 6. Supervision of projects, research and fieldwork;
 - 7. Guidance of student scholarly outputs (e.g., professional papers, artistic projects, capstone projects, thesis, and dissertation); and
 - 8. Student mentoring
- C. The review of teaching effectiveness may include a discussion of factors such as evaluation of teaching methodology, course development, course materials, course management, classroom management, student achievement of learning outcomes, and content expertise. University and AC criteria will be the primary means of evaluating teaching. To provide a comprehensive set of inputs, each review of teaching at a minimum must include all four types of input:
 - 1. Faculty self-reflection and evaluation, including appropriate supporting evidence;
 - 2. Student course evaluation feedback;
 - 3. Observation and feedback from other faculty; and
 - 4. Observation and feedback from the AC administrator.

- D. Faculty completing reviews in Years 1-5 must include input collected during the year under review. Faculty reviews after Year 6 of employment include observations from other faculty and the AC administrator collected at least once during the three-year period under review in addition to the required self-reflection/evaluation and student course evaluation feedback for the three-year period. Whenever possible, the input from any of the four sources listed above should include both quantitative and qualitative feedback.

IV. Scholarship and Creative Activities

- A. “The scholarship role of the university is to expand the domain of human knowledge, imagination, and forms of expression; contribute to improvements in professional practice; and enhance teaching effectiveness. Scholarly pursuits include not only the diverse attributes that comprise inquiry, but also the forms of public statements of results that comprise inquiry, such as publications, performance, or presentation” (excerpt from *The Research Mission of the University*, Fall 1990).
- B. Boyer’s (1990) teacher-scholar model underpins TWU’s faculty advancement standards. The components of the model are scholarship of discovery of new knowledge, scholarship of integration, scholarship of application, and scholarship of teaching. Sound scholarship may be individual or collaborative, within one discipline or interdisciplinary. The emphasis in evaluation is quality and impact rather than quantity.
- C. Scholarly outputs consist of original intellectual/creative/artistic expressions that enhance the knowledge of society. To expand public knowledge, a scholarly output must find public expression, such as peer-reviewed publications and presentations, performances, or juried exhibitions.
- D. University and AC criteria for the domain of scholarship are appropriate for the University’s overall scholarship goals and consistent with the standards of the specific discipline. AC criteria will emphasize quality and impact and reflect disciplinary standards for the quantity and type of scholarly output. As appropriate for each discipline, criteria will also recognize the role of grants. Evaluation of scholarship will include feedback from external reviewers, as required for tenure and/or promotion.

V. Service

- A. For the purpose of faculty performance review, service is the engagement of faculty related to their academic disciplines or expertise, which produces a benefit to another party. In a broad sense, institutional service is using a faculty’s knowledge and skills to benefit the institution, professional organizations, and the community through active involvement and leadership. Professional service encompasses active participation in an

organization by providing leadership or facilitating the goals of the organization. Therefore, appropriate documentation of service will emphasize both the activity undertaken and the benefit produced to the other party. Faculty members at all levels are expected to engage in meaningful service.

B. Service is generally grouped into two categories: internal and external to the University.

1. Internal service is an extension of the commitment to shared governance, and the opportunity and responsibility of faculty members to participate in such governance (See URP 02.330: Faculty Responsibilities, Standards of Conduct, and Disciplinary Processes, for a description of participation and leadership in the decision-making processes of the University.).

2. External service is frequently grouped into one of two categories: service to the profession or service to the community. Although faculty members should not be discouraged from providing service in any field in which they have an interest, faculty service activities are evaluated as part of performance review when faculty members use their professional expertise to serve their academic, professional, and civic communities. External service is expected to be provided with little or no additional compensation to the faculty member rendering the service.

C. University and AC criteria for the domain of service must be appropriate for the University's overall mission and vision and related to the characteristics of the specific discipline. University and AC criteria should emphasize quality and impact of service rather than quantity. Evaluation of external service may include feedback from external reviewers, as required for tenure and/or promotion.

VI. Performance Rating Scale

Assignment of ratings will occur in two stages: (a) ratings for each separate performance domain of teaching, scholarship, and service; and (b) a single rating indicating the overall assessment of aggregate performance for a faculty member across the three performance domains of teaching, scholarship, and service.

VII. Domain Assessment

A. At each stage of the evaluation process, the reviewer(s) will assign a rating to performance in each of the three domains (teaching, scholarship, and service). Domain ratings should be assigned by evaluators according to criteria defined by the University and academic component with subsequent approval at the College and Divisional levels. The rating scale will be as follows:

1. Exceptional Performance
2. Effective Performance
3. Performance Needs Improvement
4. Ineffective Performance

B. Following is a brief description of the performance associated with each category:

1. *Exceptional Performance* – The performance of the faculty member has met the criteria associated with a rating of *effective performance*, plus has resulted in significant or extraordinary outcome(s).
2. *Effective Performance* – The performance of the faculty member has consistently and comprehensively produced the expected, desired results identified in the TWU and AC criteria.
3. *Performance Needs Improvement* – The performance of the faculty member has inconsistently produced the expected results as identified in the TWU and AC criteria, and the performance needs specified improvements to reach *effective performance*. To facilitate the specific improvements, the AC administrator and faculty member will develop an informal plan to address the areas in need of improvement. To assess improvement, a periodic performance review will be scheduled for the following year.
4. *Ineffective Performance* – The performance of the faculty member has not produced the expected, desired results as identified by the TWU and AC criteria. Significant improvements in performance are needed, and a professional development plan must be developed collaboratively and immediately as described in Section XI below entitled, “Periodic Review with Performance Rating(s) of *Ineffective Performance*.”

VIII. Overall Assessment

The aggregate assessment of a faculty member’s performance is intended to represent a synthesis of contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service, thereby providing a faculty member with an understanding of the totality of performance across the performance domains. The overall rating is a subjective decision supported by the preponderance of documentation in the three domains. The rating scale for overall assessment is the same as for domain assessment.

IX. Peer Review Committee

- A. The input of faculty peers is an essential element of a faculty performance review system. As such, each AC will create written criteria to establish a Peer Review Committee including the following:
1. Minimum membership of three tenured members of the faculty in the AC. If an AC elects to have a total PRC membership larger than three members, the total membership must be an odd number.
 2. Staggered membership terms of three years. Each member will be limited to two consecutive terms.
 3. A process for election of members and designation or election of the PRC chair.
 4. When clinical or lecturer faculty are under review by the PRC, at least two clinical or lecturer faculty beyond the beginning rank at TWU will be elected to the PRC and participate in the review of the clinical or lecturer faculty. If an insufficient number of clinical or lecturer faculty members are available to serve, the faculty member under review may choose: (a) not to include the two clinical or lecturer faculty, or (b) to request that the AC select up to two clinical or lecturer faculty from another AC in the college.
 5. In the case of joint appointments, the faculty member will be evaluated in the component where the majority of time is spent; if time is spent equally, the faculty member may choose the component. The AC administrator of the unit not conducting the review will provide input to either the PRC or AC administrator completing the first level of review.
 6. Ideally, faculty being reviewed for promotion and tenure will not serve on the PRC during that review cycle. When necessary, these faculty members may serve on the PRC but must recuse themselves from their own reviews. Departments must elect an alternate member to serve for that review.
 7. Faculty members holding line administrative appointments are excluded from PRC service.
 8. A faculty member may not serve during a year in which he/she is subject to either an informal plan to address a rating of *Performance Needs Improvement* or a professional development plan to address a rating of *Ineffective Performance*.

- B. The AC criteria for the AC PRC are developed by regular, full-time faculty in the AC. These criteria must be reviewed and approved by the (1) AC administrator, (2) college dean, (3) Faculty Evaluation and Development Committee, (4) University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and (5) Provost/VPAA
- C. Given the size and composition of some ACs, establishment of a PRC consistent with the criteria above may not be possible. The following exceptions are available to an AC, with the concurrence of the Dean, in such situations:
 - 1. If there are not enough tenured faculty members in the AC to rotate off of the PRC, the term limit rule may be waived.
 - 2. If there are not enough tenured faculty members in the AC to populate the PRC, faculty in the AC may elect tenured faculty members from another AC within the college.
- D. The applicable PRC will review the performance of a faculty member and provide a comprehensive written evaluation in the following situations:
 - 1. 3rd Year and 6th Year PPR;
 - 2. Each required review after the 6th Year review;
 - 3. Any review associated with an application for promotion and/or tenure;
 - 4. Any review conducted immediately subsequent to a PPR which includes a rating of *ineffective performance*.
- E. In addition, a faculty member who desires to have a PRC review outside of the above requirements may request that opportunity in writing to the AC administrator, with a copy to the appropriate dean, within 14 calendar days of the first day of the fall semester.

X. Protocol for Faculty Periodic Performance Review

- A. The University will develop and communicate the process for administering the faculty PPR policy. For each review cycle, the faculty member being reviewed will document relevant performance as defined by this URP and consistent with the process identified in the procedures for faculty periodic performance review. Faculty-prepared PPR documents, including an updated curriculum vitae in the university format, will be submitted electronically to the AC administrator in accordance with the schedule published by TWU each year. When applicable, the AC administrator will provide the documentation to the applicable PRC for its review and subsequent evaluation. The PRC will prepare a comprehensive written

evaluation of faculty performance. The faculty member being reviewed will have the opportunity to review and comment on the PRC evaluation prior to submission of the final evaluation to the AC administrator. Faculty will be afforded the opportunity for similar review and comment upon completion of the evaluation prepared by each subsequent reviewer prior to consideration at the next level. Upon completion of its review, the PRC chair will submit the committee's final evaluation, including rationale for its recommendations, and all minority reports regarding periodic performance review to the AC administrator. Any committee member may attach a signed minority report to the PRC report. A minority report is defined as a written statement indicating reasons for dissenting from a majority position. A copy of the final evaluation, including minority reports, will go to the candidate.

- B. The next step in the PPR is the AC administrator's preparation of a performance review using any relevant information, including all documents submitted by the faculty member and the PRC. After the faculty member has reviewed and/or commented on the evaluation by the AC administrator, all PPR materials will be forwarded by the AC administrator to the appropriate dean for the final review. An Equal Employment Opportunity compliance review will be conducted by the appropriate dean to ensure faculty employment evaluations are equitable and in compliance with federal and state laws. A copy of the PPR is provided to the faculty member, who may respond according to the published schedule. The faculty member may grieve the results of the PPR by following URP 02.350: Faculty Grievance, Review, and Appeal Processes.

XI. Periodic Review with Rating(s) of Ineffective Performance

- A. For any faculty member with a rating of *Ineffective Performance* overall or in any of the three domains, a professional development plan will be developed collaboratively to address the identified area(s) of concern.
- B. For tenure-track faculty in the first five years of employment or non-tenured faculty in the first six years of employment, the faculty member and AC administrator will develop the plan. The faculty member may request the participation of the PRC in development of the professional development plan. For tenured faculty and non-tenured faculty past the 6th year of employment, the faculty, PRC, and AC administrator will develop the plan. The faculty member may invite an additional tenured faculty member to participate in the development and implementation of the plan and subsequent evaluation of the faculty member's performance to determine whether the terms of the plan have been met. This option is available in all steps of the professional development plan process. All participants in the process are expected to make a good faith effort to develop and execute the plan, i.e., the faculty member is expected to follow the plan to make meaningful improvements and the AC administrator and/or PRC are

expected to support and assist the faculty member in making such improvements. The plan will include, at a minimum:

1. Specific deficiencies to be addressed,
2. Mutually agreed upon goals to remedy the deficiencies,
3. Actions to be taken to achieve the goals, and
4. A time frame to correct the identified deficiencies.

- C. Each plan requires review and approval by the dean prior to implementation.
- D. During the following year's PPR, the PRC and the AC administrator will evaluate the faculty member's performance to determine whether the terms of the plan have been met. If the evaluation results in an improved rating in the relevant category(ies), the faculty member's improvement will be recognized in the performance review. Upon review and approval by the dean, the faculty member will return to the established time intervals for evaluation.
- E. If the individual's performance continues to be evaluated as ineffective in any category, the faculty member, AC administrator, and PRC will revise the professional development plan for review and approval by the dean. As previously specified above regarding the original plan, all participants in the developing the revised plan "...are expected to make a good faith effort to implement the plan, i.e., the faculty member is expected to follow the plan to make meaningful improvements and the AC administrator and/or PRC are expected to support and assist the faculty member in making such improvements."
- F. During the PPR for the second year on a professional development plan, the PRC and the AC administrator will evaluate the faculty member's performance to determine whether the terms of the revised plan have been met. If the evaluation results in an *improved* ratings in the relevant category(ies), the faculty member's improvement in performance will be recognized in the performance review. Upon review and approval by the dean, the faculty member will return to the established time intervals for evaluation.
- G. If, at this time, the individual's performance continues to be evaluated as *ineffective* in any category or overall, the dean will recommend to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost ("EVPAA/Provost") appropriate action, including revocation of tenure and termination of employment, non-renewal or termination of employment, or potential extension of the professional development plan. The faculty member may appeal the decision of the EVPAA/Provost by following

procedures in URP 02.350: Faculty Grievance, Review, and Appeal Processes.

REVIEW

This policy will remain in effect and published until it is reviewed, updated, or archived. This policy is to be reviewed once every six years. Interim review may be required as a result of updates to federal and state law or regulations, Board of Regents policies, or internal processes or procedures.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors. *Policy Documents and Reports*.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation.

[TWU Research Mission. \(1990\).](#)

[URP 02.350: Faculty Grievance, Review, and Appeal Processes](#)

[URP 02.342: Faculty Promotion and Tenure](#)

[URP 02.330: Faculty Responsibilities, Standards of Conduct, and Disciplinary Processes](#)

FORMS AND TOOLS

None

Publication Date: 07/02/2021

Revised: 07/02/2021; 10/10/2022; 09/01/2023