

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Annual Review Template

Faculty member (name, title, rank):

Track and pathway (If applicable):

Department/school:

College:

Campus:

Review year:

Date of review:

Workload allocation

Provide the previous review year average workload allocation for any area of effort with at least 5% assigned (e.g., teaching, scholarship, service, clinical work, administration, others as defined by the TIU head, regional campus dean/director and/or unit APT document). This information should be available in the previous year’s annual review. For the 2026 annual review only, if workload for 2025 was not provided, list estimated workload. Annual review writers may seek input from the faculty member about what their workload distribution was for the previous review period. If the documented workload and faculty member’s reported workload do not coincide, provide the reason for this discrepancy.

Teaching and mentoring (including clinical teaching, advising and supervision):

Research, scholarship or creative work plans:

Service:

Clinical care (if separate from teaching and mentoring):

Administration:

Additional areas determined by the TIU head, regional campus dean/director and/or articulated in the unit’s APT document (describe each additional area):

Areas of work evaluation

Complete for each area of work in which a faculty member had at least 5% effort allocated. Copy and paste additional sections as needed.

Area:

Workload allocation for that area for the review period (out of 100%):

* What were the expectations for the faculty member in this area during the review period?
* How do you evaluate the performance of the faculty member in this area during the review period (use the metrics defined in the APT document as a basis for the evaluation)?
* Provide additional qualitative feedback on the faculty member’s performance in this area.
* Provide a rating of the faculty member’s performance in this area. The rating must include “exceeds expectation,” “meets expectations” and “does not meet expectations,” though units can include up to two additional ratings, which must be defined in the unit’s APT document.

Summary evaluation

Provide an overall narrative evaluation of performance for the review period. This evaluation does not have to include a specific rating, though units may include one if they choose. Reaffirm or update the workload allocation for the next review period, and include explicit goals for each area of work assigned. If updating the workload, provide a clear interpretation of what this new workload allocation will look like for the faculty member.

