Q&A about the Faculty Development & Evaluation Cycle

Why Align Faculty Development, Mentoring and Productivity Planning with the Annual Faculty Evaluation?

Why is faculty development vital to the SOM?
Through effective faculty development and mentoring programs, the SOM becomes a vital force through which faculty members can reach their fullest potential personally and professionally, and thus contribute to the Department and institution in turn achieving their fullest potential.

Why integrate faculty development with other faculty processes?
Optimal faculty development relies on having structure, details and reminders that build and ensure strong bi-directional connections and communication among the institutional plans, policies, procedures, processes and programs through which academic faculty life is valued, namely the following:

- Appointment offer letter
- Faculty member’s own goals
- Division/department/school/institution (contextual) goals
- Departmental XYZ Compensation Plan
- Mentoring, sponsoring and advising (formal and informal)
- Faculty development
- Faculty recognition
- Faculty promotion/tenure processes and criteria
- Formal faculty evaluation (annual and other)

Historically, when these processes have operated partially or entirely independently, lower rates of faculty member productivity, achievement, advancement, recognition and renown have been found along with lower rates of faculty satisfaction and retention with similar negative effects on the department/center and institutional levels.

Who is accountable for what in the Annual Faculty Evaluation process?

- Each Department/Center or other administrative unit is responsible for conducting the annual faculty evaluation process in a timely fashion prior to the end of each fiscal year, allowing time for integration of the review processes with the faculty development and mentoring processes, and for each supervisory level in the chain of authority through the Department Chair to document accountability in these processes prior to their own evaluation.
- The leadership of each academic home department is accountable for implementing and sustaining an effective early career and new faculty mentoring system. One approach is to assign a potentially short-term ‘on-boarding’ mentor who will assist with orienting the new
faculty member, guiding development of the initial career development plan (ICDP) within one month of appointment, and identifying one or more 'longer-term' mentors within about 6 months who will address one or more of the written ICDP goals.

- Demonstrated implementation and outcomes of faculty development as well as faculty mentoring programs will serve as benchmarks for the Chair’s or Director’s annual evaluation of supervisory faculty members.
- Demonstrated implementation and outcomes of faculty development as well as faculty mentoring programs will serve as benchmarks in the SOM Dean’s evaluation of Department Chairs, and of Center or Institute Directors.
- Departments/Centers/Institutes are each responsible for maintaining the record of results from their faculty member's formal Annual Faculty Evaluation, and for having a record of or access to a current CV for each faculty member. Any faculty member may have more than one evaluator and annual evaluation when the role assignment and activities of that faculty member cross multiple domains.

Which faculty members receive an annual review?

According to the University of Texas Board of Regents’ rules and our institution’s Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP), everyone appointed as a faculty member will be evaluated annually in part to enhance faculty development.

What should comprise the annual review of ‘other types’ of faculty appointments?

Annual faculty reviews of those appointed in such as unpaid teaching positions or special types of faculty designations, should be concise, reasonable and effective in serving the needs of both the Department/Center and the faculty while fulfilling HOP policy.

- **Adjunct faculty without salary**: The performance review process devised by department should focus on documenting the basis needed to support any promotion in rank. Keep it simple and effective. List faculty member’s expected/assigned duties. (See Adjunct appointment form.) Ask faculty member to submit a concise record of their contributions through the year related to the duties listed, and other contributions made. Is reappointment - an annual process – desired? Before reappointment, review and document whether performance met departmental quantity and quality standards and expectations.
- **Adjoint faculty**: The performance review process is devised and conducted by the department to meet departmental performance standards. Anticipate and discuss the needs of the Adjoint partnership (employing) institution in order to coordinate and share review report(s) with each other, when desired.
- **Other faculty titles**: (Emeritus; Visiting; etc.): As needed.
What UTHSCSA HOP policies cover faculty development and evaluation?

The UTHSCSA Handbook of Operating Procedures Policy 3.2.4 Evaluation of Faculty Members states in part:

As a result of the policy established by the Board of Regents, the Health Science Center has subscribed to and implemented a written personnel evaluation program for all faculty employees. **The faculty will be evaluated annually. The evaluation will provide information to administrators and faculty that will enhance faculty development.**

The UTHSCSA Handbook of Operating Procedures Policy 3.6.1 General Consideration for Appointment or Promotion Without Regard to Rank states in part:

*Each individual must be judged in the context of those responsibilities assigned by the Chair. There must be an appropriate division of time and labor, as well as opportunity, to accomplish the academic goals necessary for achieving departmental objectives. It may be difficult for a given faculty member to attain excellence in research, teaching, and service (e.g., patient care, supportive services, administration) when the candidate’s departmental assignments exclude time for one or more of these activities. Therefore, the degree of responsibility assigned to an individual is a consideration for the determination of rank.*

This SOM Annual Faculty Development, Productivity & Evaluation approach aims to assist in fulfilling HOP policy by providing an organizational structure for these activities while insuring effective communication and alignment among the related entities and processes.

Additionally, **HOP 3.4.1 General Appointment Policies** states that each faculty member through Year 5 of appointment should discuss and consider whether the current appointment track is the ‘best fit’ for them. **Changing tracks** is generally allowed to occur once, and must be conducted during year 3-5.

According to the HOP, **additional required reviews** should be conducted in an overlapping or simultaneous fashion to minimize duplication of effort:

- **Tenure Track Mid-Probationary Review**: a formal review occurring in the fifth year of the 9-year tenure track probationary period.
- **Annual post-tenure review**: BOR instituted 5/2012; HOP update pending.
- **Evaluation of Academic Administrators**: From the HOP - The term “Academic Administrator” is intended to refer to the Chief Academic Officer, academic Deans, department Chairs, and Directors of academic units. ….proposed that the evaluation of administrators at The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio occur in conjunction with post tenure review for those Academic Administrators who have faculty appointments with tenure. It is intended that a single review occurs complying with all evaluation requirements.’

**Related Resources:** TIPS for Promoting Faculty Vitality; Individual Career Development Plan (ICDP); UTHSCSA PTAC Criteria Checklist; Annual Faculty Evaluation Form; UTHSCSA SOM Annual Faculty Evaluation Process Steps.