

## GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS | COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES

The guidelines herein for annual performance evaluations (APEs) are based upon the UTEP [Handbook of Operating Procedures, Section III, Chapter 4.5](#) as well as Chapters [4.3.2](#), [4.4.5.5.3](#), [4.4.6](#), and [4.4.8](#) and aligned with the approved [College of Health Sciences Faculty Workload Policy](#). Guidance from the Provost's Office exists to assist APE reviewers when evaluating the *quality* of Faculty contributions; see [Suggested Quality Indicators](#).

In an effort to enhance communication and transparency, Department Chairs or Program Directors are expected to meet individually with Faculty to discuss APEs and establish future goals, including **workload distributions** (i.e., % teaching, scholarship/research, and service). The guidelines below provide a shared baseline for the College of Health Sciences for the "meets expectations" (i.e., score=3) level of performance on the APE review. Guidelines for "exceeding expectations" (i.e., score=4) level of performance will be determined and developed by the faculty in each department. The Dean will consider separate, discipline-specific reviews from Departmental Committees and Department Chairs/Program Directors when assigning final, whole number evaluation scores for teaching, scholarship/research, and service. An overall APE evaluation score will be calculated as the sum of each whole number score weighted by workload distribution and rounded to the nearest tenth. The rating scale is 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = does not meet expectations, 3 = meets expectations, and 4 = exceeds expectations.

### TEACHING

Faculty member wrote a self-reflection **narrative** (300-500 words) explaining the quality of teaching impacts, including course load, University course evaluation scores, peer teaching evaluation feedback, improvements made in the current year of evaluation, and strategies to improve teaching for the next calendar year of evaluation.

Faculty member taught a **course load** that fulfilled the minimum expectation for assigned teaching workload distribution (i.e., one organized/structured course (without a lab component) is approximately equivalent to 10% teaching distribution).

Faculty member earned **University course evaluation** average responses for *Rating of Instructor* and *Rating of Course*  $\geq 3.0$  for each organized/structured course taught.

**SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH** Faculty members with 0% research distribution will not be evaluated on this area. Ten percent is equivalent to 4 hours, 20% is equivalent to 8 hours of a 40-hour week, etc. Faculty with  $\leq 10\%$  research distribution may use one, or several, of the following indicators to fulfill their research expectations.

Faculty member wrote a self-reflection **narrative** (300-500 words) explaining the quality of research impacts, including publications, intra or extramural funding, and research mentorship and/or collaboration.

With  $> 20\%$  research distribution, faculty member **published** a minimum of one research article in a moderate- to high-impact, peer-reviewed, scientific journal for every 20% research distribution. With  $\leq 20\%$  research distribution, faculty member presented a scholarly product in a peer-reviewed venue, professional association, and/or published a minimum of one research abstract in a peer-reviewed journal or substantively contributed/collaborated on one publication for every 10% research distribution.

With  $> 20\%$  research distribution, faculty member sought or managed **extramural funding** as primary investigator or co-primary investigator/co-investigator that supports their program of research. With  $\leq 20\%$  research distribution, faculty member contributed to collaborative research funding (i.e., intra/extramural funding) efforts as contributor, investigator, or primary investigator.

With > 20% research distribution, faculty member served as a **research mentor** for a minimum of one student as thesis/dissertation committee chair, capstone research project advisor, honors thesis chair, or RSRC 4033 undergraduate research course with at least one scholarly product, for every 20% research distribution. With ≤ 20% research distribution, faculty member substantively contributed to one undergraduate or graduate student research development activity for every 10% research distribution (e.g., as member of thesis/dissertation committee).

## **SERVICE**

Faculty member wrote a self-reflection **narrative** (300-500 words) explaining the quality of service impacts, including service on organized institutional (Program, Department, College, and University), professional, and public service engagements. Administrative assignments are counted within the service distribution. If there is an administrative assignment, faculty must articulate the duties, outcomes, and deliverables of the assignment and explain how much service is attributed to the administrative role versus service attributed to the faculty role in the “*Administrative Assignments*” link within Digital Measures.

For service attributable to the faculty role, faculty member participated on a minimum of one organized **institutional** (Program, Department, College, or University), **professional**, or **public service engagement** (as appropriate for title/rank) for every 10% service distribution.