



## Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies (ELPS) Faculty Annual Performance Review

### I. Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Non-Tenure Track (Full Time) Faculty

#### Introduction and Scope

Faculty annual performance review (F-APR) is an opportunity for full-time tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track faculty to reflect on accomplishments of the year and to consider the extent to which established objectives were met. Reviews are based on workload plans collaboratively developed each year between each faculty member and the chair where the distribution of actual (%) effort across the domains of teaching, research, and service is established.

F-APR policy for non-full-time instructors of record can be found on the [ELPS Policies & Forms](#) website.

#### Materials for Submission

The F-APR portfolio includes the following documents:

- A copy of the approved workload plan
- A completed faculty annual performance review report
- A current CV
- A completed self-evaluative rubric (see Evaluation Components and Rubric Section). In circumstances where a domain is not relevant for the year's APR, faculty will note as such.

#### Faculty Annual Performance Review Report

The F-APR Report includes applicable information for your role to include information on teaching, service, and/or research for the previous calendar year. Specific information for teaching includes relevant information about courses taught to include: format, course evaluation data, data-informed course changes, course showcases/related activities, course recruitment activities, advising, student mentoring, funded teaching projects, and/or teaching/advising awards/recognition. Service activities include relevant information about service to the community, profession, program coordination/leadership, committees, assessment and program reports, editing and reviewing, funded service projects, leadership training or skill development, service recognitions, etc. Research/creative activity includes relevant information about publications, presentations, grants and funded projects, research recognitions, etc. Administrative activities must be included for faculty with an administrative appointment.



## Review Process

- A. By January 15 of each academic year, each faculty member will electronically submit an F-APR portfolio to the department chair. The portfolio should be submitted electronically per request.
- B. The department chair and ELPS Executive Committee will review all submitted materials, and, by March 1, the department chair will submit a draft review letter for review by the faculty member, including a completed rubric as an appendix. During the first 2 weeks of March, the department chair will meet individually with each faculty member to discuss the letter. Faculty may request reconsideration of their rubric scores within five days of receiving their draft letters. Final letters will be provided to all faculty no later than April 1 of each year.
- C. By December 15 of each academic year, each faculty member will meet individually with the department chair to establish a workload plan for the upcoming year; draft work plans should be submitted to the department chair by December 1.

## Role of the ELPS Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chair and Associate Chair, one tenured/ranked faculty member from each program concentration, and one at-large promoted non-tenure track faculty member. This committee will be charged to review F-APR portfolios and make rubric score recommendations to the department chair for each applicable performance domain (i.e., teaching, service, and/or research).

## Role of the Department Chair

The ultimate assessment of faculty performance data is the responsibility of the department chair. The department chair will take into consideration the quantitative and qualitative data collected from the F-APR portfolio submissions and recommendations received from the ELPS Executive Committee to assign rubric scores and write individualized annual review letters. Final review letters may be used to document any concerns regarding professionalism in the workplace, articulate a data-driven rationale for any changes to budgeted time, and/or provide objective professional goals for the upcoming calendar year.

## Evaluation Components and Rubric

The evaluation is based on the materials submitted. The ELPS Executive Committee members review the materials and meet to recommend a rating for each applicable domain; the Department Chair assigns a rating for each applicable domain. Faculty performance is rated on a scale from 5 to 1, with 5 being “outstanding,” 4 being “proficient,” 3 being “satisfactory,” 2 being “deficient,” and 1 being “unacceptable.” Scores 3-5 *meet* standards while scores 1-2 *do not meet* standards. According to the UH Enhanced Performance Evaluation (EPE) of Tenured Faculty Policy, a mandatory EPE process is triggered based on two negative (i.e., scores of 1 or 2) F-APR outcomes for research/scholarship or teaching/instruction in any three consecutive annual performance periods beginning with the 2023 annual faculty performance review period.

The final evaluation will provide the faculty member with a clear description of their achievements relative to the expectations of the Department with regard to the roles and responsibilities held. Performance scores

will be provided for each applicable domain. The Evaluation Rubrics for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are below:

*Domain: Teaching*

The breadth and depth of expertise in **Teaching** are indicated by the levels of: (1) excellence in course evaluations and positive informal feedback; (2) challenge in course content and curriculum materials that demonstrate command of current subject matter; (3) quality in pro-active advising of a fair or ample share of the department's/unit's undergraduate and graduate students, (4) student success in graduating from the program; (5) student success in advancing through the program in a timely manner; and (6) the number and proportion of program students advised to program completion or supported through committee membership.

<b>Outstanding:</b> (5)	This rating is reserved for those individuals whose performance in teaching, course development, programmatic advising, instructional support activities, advancing thesis/dissertation progress and/or student advising was broadly recognized as <b>outstanding</b> .
<b>Proficient:</b> (4)	This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in teaching, course development, programmatic advising, instructional support activities, and advising was <b>consistently judged proficient</b> . Although the breadth and depth of their work is not as great as those rated as outstanding, these faculty perform in a skillful manner.
<b>Satisfactory:</b> (3)	This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in teaching, course development, programmatic advising, instructional support activities, and advising was <b>acceptable</b> . Their work in this area received <b>satisfactory rating</b> .
<b>Deficient:</b> (2)	This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in teaching, course development, programmatic advising, instructional support activities, and advising is inadequate and needs improvement. Their work in this area received a <b>deficient rating</b> .
<b>Unacceptable:</b> (1)	This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in teaching, course development, programmatic advising, and instructional support activities was at, or below, the lower rating of merit. A clear pattern of poor performance has been noted and a general plan for improvement in teaching and/or advising is needed and will be closely monitored. Their work in this area received an <b>unacceptable rating</b> .
Overall rating for teaching:	

*Domain: Scholarship*

The breadth and depth of expertise in **Scholarship** are indicated by the levels of: (1) prepared and published manuscripts such as books, book chapters, journal articles, project reports and invited papers; (2) research proposals written for external funding; (3) faculty-initiated research or writing projects; and (4) scholarship

presentations of research. These efforts may also reflect the application of knowledge in public and professional settings through outreach scholarship, including creative and non-routine efforts and/or tackling meaningful problems of practice and policy that impact the profession or discipline.

<p><b>Outstanding:</b> (5)</p>	<p>This rating is reserved for those individuals whose performance in research and scholarly writing activities was broadly recognized as <b>outstanding</b>. The quality and/or quantity of scholarship far exceeds productivity expectations outlined in departmental Promotion &amp; Tenure guidelines (if applicable) and/or individualized faculty workload percentage.</p>
<p><b>Proficient:</b> (4)</p>	<p>This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in research and scholarly writing activities was <b>proficient</b>. The quality and/or quantity of scholarship exceeds productivity expectations outlined in departmental Promotion &amp; Tenure guidelines (if applicable) and/or individualized faculty workload percentage. While not as extensively involved as those rated as outstanding, these faculty would be counted on to perform quality work in a competent and respectable manner.</p>
<p><b>Satisfactory:</b> (3)</p>	<p>This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in research and scholarly writing activities was <b>satisfactory</b>. The quality and/or quantity of scholarship is consistent with expectations outlined in departmental Promotion &amp; Tenure guidelines (if applicable) and/or individualized faculty workload percentage.</p>
<p><b>Deficient:</b> (2)</p>	<p>The quality and/or the quantity of their research and scholarly writing activities is <b>deficient</b> and needs improvement. The quality and/or quantity of scholarship does not meet expectations outlined in departmental Promotion &amp; Tenure guidelines (if applicable) and/or individualized faculty workload percentage.</p>
<p><b>Unacceptable:</b> (1)</p>	<p>This rating is reserved for those faculty whose general performance in research and scholarly writing activities are at or below expectations. A clear pattern of poor performance is established and a general plan for improvement is needed and would be closely monitored. The quality and/or the quantity of their research and scholarly writing activities is <b>unacceptable</b> and needs improvement.</p>
<p>Overall rating for research:</p>	

*Domain: Service*

The breadth and depth of expertise in **Service** are indicated by the levels of service to the institution, college, department, program, and profession/community. This domain may also include administrative service.



<b>Outstanding:</b> (5)	This rating is reserved for those individuals whose performance in institutional, professional, and/or administrative service was broadly recognized by their peers as <b>outstanding</b> by the leadership they exerted. Their institutional leadership had a significant impact on the shape or direction of the unit, Department, College, or University. The time and effort they committed to institutional, professional, and/or administrative service went well beyond the usual expectation.
<b>Proficient:</b> (4)	This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance in institutional, professional, and/or administrative service was <b>proficient</b> . They showed initiative and creativity in their institutional service efforts, and exercised leadership in these activities. The time and effort they committed to institutional, professional, and/or administrative service service went beyond the usual expectation.
<b>Satisfactory:</b> (3)	This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance, time, and effort in institutional, professional, and/or administrative service activities was <b>satisfactory</b> .
<b>Deficient:</b> (2)	This rating is reserved for those faculty whose performance of institutional, professional, and/or administrative service responsibilities is <b>deficient</b> and needs improvement. They have not given sufficient time or effort to these responsibilities.
<b>Unacceptable:</b> (1)	This rating is reserved for those faculty whose general performance in institutional, professional, and/or administrative service is at or below the lower limits of merit. A clear pattern of poor performance is established and a general plan for improvement is needed and would be closely monitored. The time and effort they committed to service was <b>unacceptable</b> .
Overall rating for service:	

### Appeals

Faculty who wish to appeal the scores and/or feedback in the final review letter may follow the [ELPS Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures](#).

## II. Instructors of Record (not full time)

Instructors of record include lecturers that are not employed full time. Lecturers are hired each semester on a per-course basis. At the end of each semester, lecturers' teaching evaluations are reviewed by the Program Director. Additional information can be found in the ELPS Adjunct Faculty Handbook on the [ELPS Policies & Forms](#) website.

---



**Original Approval:**

Approved by the ELPS tenured, tenure-track, and promotion-eligible, non-tenure-track faculty on December 8, 2017 (15-0); COE Dean Robert McPherson on 12/21/2018; Associate Provost for Faculty Development & Faculty Affairs on 2/16/2019. See next page for original approval documentation.

**Revision Record:**

Amended to (1) specify the scope of this policy, (2) change the dates related to work plan development to reflect the calendar year rather than academic year, (3) include the evaluation rubric in the policy rather than in an appendix and specify what must be required in the evaluation, (4) change the submission process from submission of a .pdf to an electronic submission, (5) describe the required components of the faculty annual performance review report, (6) clarify the roles of the Executive Committee (peer review) and Department Chair in the review process, (7) add reference to the UH Enhanced Performance Evaluation, (8) revise rubric rating descriptions, (9) add link to F-APR for other classes of instructors-of record, (10) add reference and link to the ELPS grievance policy, (11), add reference and link to the ELPS F-APR policy for non-full time instructors of record, (12) remove Appendix A Sample Workload Plan, Appendix B Sample Annual Performance Review Report, and Appendix C Evaluation Rubric; and (13) include general edits and reformatting designed to increase digital accessibility.

Approved 12-0 via online survey that was open from 12/16/2022 to 1/21/2023.

**Signature Record:**

05/09/2023

COE Dean Signature

Date

Office of the Provost Signature

Date

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

COLLEGE of EDUCATION  
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies

## Revision Log:

Revision Title	Inserted Revision	Date and Recorded Vote of Faculty Approval (including vote of Chair)
Original development of full policy	Full policy	Approved December 8, 2017 (15-0) <i>R/M 8/22/18</i>
		<i>Revised R/M 12/21/18</i>

*[Signature]*  
Mark S. F. Clarke, Ph.D. *2/6/19*

Associate Provost  
Faculty Development & Fac. Affairs

Mark S.F. Clarke, Ph.D.  
Associate Provost, Faculty Affairs

*[Signature]*

Reviewed and Approved, 6-22-23