FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT - ANNUAL REVIEW

Faculty member: _____ Department: _____
Rank: _____ Evaluation Period: _____

Areas to be evaluated and rated are (1) teaching, (2) research/scholarship/creative activity, (3) service, and (4) overall performance.[1] In each area, the department head rates faculty performance on a scale of 1 to 5, as set forth below, relative to expectations for his or her rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member (including goals for the previous year and each of the preceding two years in the Evaluation Period) and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks).

FE - Far exceeds expectations for rank
EE - Exceeds expectations for rank
ME - Meets expectations for rank
FS - Falls short of meeting expectations for rank[2]
FF - Falls far short of meeting expectations for rank[2]

	FE	***EE***	***ME***	***FS***	***FF***	
Teaching	□	□	□	□	□	NA
Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity	□	□	□	□	□	NA
Service	□	□	□	□	□	NA
Overall	□	□	□	□	□	NA

The department head's Progress and Performance Narrative shall be attached to this Report. Other supporting materials also may be attached. For tenured faculty in Good Standing,[3] the department head is required to attach a Progress and Performance Narrative only every three years, unless the faculty member asks the department head to draft and attach a narrative for that year.[4] In years for which a Progress and Performance Narrative is not attached, the faculty member's Faculty Activity Report for that year is attached to this Report in lieu of the Progress and Performance Narrative.

For purposes of improvement plans and Cumulative Performance Review:

A faculty member who receives an Overall performance rating of a "falls short of expectations for rank" or "falls far short of expectations for rank" is required to submit an improvement plan.

For purposes of Cumulative Performance, an Overall performance of "falls short of expectations for rank" is consistent with "Needs Improvement for Rank" in UT Board of Trustees Policy.

An evaluation rating of "falls far short of expectations for rank" is consistent with "Unsatisfactory for Rank" in the same document.

For purposes of merit and performance-based salary adjustments, the following rules apply:

A faculty member with an Overall performance rating of "far exceeds expectations for rank", "exceeds expectations for rank", or "meets expectations for rank" is eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase.

---

[1] Procedures and standards are set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, and the departmental bylaws.
[2] An improvement plan is required.
[3] A tenured faculty member is in "Good Standing" if he or she (a) receives an overall rating in this annual review indicating that his or her performance meets or exceeds expectations for his or her rank and (b) is not under a Cumulative Performance Review.
[4] A department head may also voluntarily attach a Progress and Performance Narrative in any year in which it is not required.
[5] Attach rating and rationale, as necessary.

A faculty member with an Overall rating of "falls short of expectations for rank" is not eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase. Across board increases do apply.

A faculty member with an Overall rating of "falls far short of expectations for rank" is not eligible for any merit pay or other performance-based salary increase, or across board increases.

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have participated in the review process and have received a copy of this review *(without implying agreement or disagreement).* I understand that I have the right to respond in writing to this form within two weeks from the date I received this form in accordance with Part II.B. of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

Faculty Member: _____ Date: _____

Department Head: _____ Date: _____

Dean:[5] _____ Date: _____

Chief Academic Officer:[4] _____ Date: _____