The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

College of Fine Arts
Creative Writing Program
Faculty Evaluation Policies

Table of Contents

Policies Voted by Faculty
1/24/17 and 2/2/17

1. General Guidelines for Creative Writing Program Annual Reviews

1. In accordance with H.O.P. ADM 06-502 the Program Annual Review Committee will be composed of three elected tenured faculty members who will review all annual review folders. In addition, the director of the program will independently evaluate all annual review folders. The elected program committee and the program director will independently assign faculty to one of the four categories of **exceeds**, **meets**, **does not meet expectations**, or **unsatisfactory**.

1.2   All faculty members will present each year an **updated copy of their CV** in their annual review folder on the FTP site.

1.3   **Point of clarification regarding program identity:** Professional publications by program faculty will typically be creative writing, though some faculty may also have scholarly research interests and publications. For the sake of uniformity across UTRGV departments, however, both creative achievements and other scholarly output will be classified under the heading Research/Scholarship. The program in no way intends to privilege scholarly publication above creative publication, however. Henceforth in this document **the term "research/scholarship"** should be understood to include **creative writing** in the **foremost** position.

1.4   **Documentation** may be requested at any level for teaching, professional achievement, and service. This would include copies of journal publications, conference acceptance letters, conference papers, recognition of service, awards received, "before" and "after" syllabi from a major course revision, etc. Please keep all of your pertinent supporting documentation.

1.5   Individual **student evaluation comment sheets** are not needed for annual evaluation but should be kept for Tenure/Post-tenure Review.

1.6   **Grade distributions** are not required but should be kept for Tenure/Post-tenure Review.)

1.7   **Points of clarification regarding the Long Form:**

   a. "New course" credit is given only for teaching a course for first time it is ever taught by any instructor
   b. No credit is given for Who's Who among American Teachers or equivalent.
   c. In the category of professional achievement, only lecturers and tenured faculty assigned a **teaching workload over 3 courses** per semester may apply their fourth and fifth class(es) to the area of Research/Scholarship.

1.8 The program faculty recognize that for those who are tenured, annual review documents will become a part of the Post-Tenure Review dossier. To coordinate terminology with the Regents' Rules standards for AR and PTR, the Creative Writing Program **scoring system** is as follows:

overall program annual review score of	category	Regents' Rule Annual Evaluation Rank
4.0	exceeds expectations	4
3.0	meets expectations	3
2.0	does not meet expectations	2
1.0	unsatisfactory*	1

*Please note Regents' Rule 31102.2.sec 5.1.g.(3) and (4) regarding annual review ratings of "unsatisfactory."

1.9 The program director will meet with any faculty member who requests a discussion regarding the results of the review by March 1 of each year.

1.10 Any faculty member whose total score for all three areas (teaching, research/scholarship, and service) is **unsatisfactory** (<1.49) or **does not meet expectations** (1.00-1.99) will be required to meet with the director to discuss the results.

1.11 **Point of clarification regarding review committees:** At the time of adoption of this policy (AY 2016-17), the Creative Writing Program consists of very few faculty members. Subsections of this document refer to a Lecturer Evaluation Committee, Annual Review Committee, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Workload Review Committee. In practice, however, it is currently possible, and most efficient, for a single 3-member Personnel Committee to handle all of the necessary annual review functions. Rarely, there may be cases in which it is appropriate to appoint a separate committee for particular circumstances (e.g., there are insufficient full professors on the Personnel Committee to conduct a review of an application for promotion to Full Professor), and therefore, for clarity, this policy specifies separate committee titles for each function. It is also possible that, in the future, an expanded Creative Writing Program/Department with a larger faculty body may need to appoint separate committees to handle the review volume.

1.12 Note on pronoun usage: This document will abide by the modern convention of using "they"/"their" as a gender-indeterminate pronoun in both singular and plural syntactic environments, as appropriate. The creative-writing faculty collectively judge singular-they to be a more elegant and inclusive solution to the pronoun-gender problem than constructions such as "s/he," "her/his," and the like.

2. Lecturer Review Process & Policy

The Creative Writing Program has established the following policy to supplement the University Guidelines for Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers and Clinical Faculty as delineated in H.O.P ADM 06-502

2.1 Policy scope

This policy applies to 3-year lecturers for their annual review of the three-year contract, their reappointment to a new three-year contract, and/or promotion within the ranks of Lecturer. Previous appointment in the program on a one-year hire does not contribute to this policy.

2.2   Procedures
1. A review evaluation folder shall be submitted to the program director by the faculty member during the fall semester as described in the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Student Success & P-16 Integration's Pathways for Lecturer Review.
2. The review evaluation folder should include separate sections for teaching, research/scholarship, and professional service along with documentation of effectiveness in all three areas and tabular summaries as found on the FTP website
3. The lecturer evaluation folder will include a current curriculum vitae, a copy of the program's annual review guidelines as reference, documents demonstrating the faculty member's achievements in the areas of teaching, including peer observation summary reports and student evaluation summaries; professional achievement, including representative samples of published and presented materials; and professional service, including documentation/description of contributions made to the entity served; as well as the narrative statements summarizing the faculty member's accomplishments for the previous year(s) since promotion.
4. Three-year lecturers and tenured/tenure-track faculty in the program will elect the annual Lecturer Evaluation Committee from lecturers at rank 2 or above and tenured/tenure-track faculty. Lecturers applying for promotion are ineligible to serve on the college committee that year. The committee will elect its own chair.
5. Each year, in accordance with the Lecturer Promotion/Review Calendar, the Lecturer Evaluation Committee and the program director will independently and successively evaluate the performance of the faculty member under review providing:
   a. written evaluation of noted strengths and/or weakness in performance
   b. recommendation to reappoint as continuing lecturer at the same rank, reappoint as continuing lecturer and promote in rank, or remove from lecturer positions with appropriate notification for termination of employment as per the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Student Success & P-16 Integration's website.

6. The candidate undergoing evaluation, whether for review, reappointment, or promotion, may appeal their evaluation at any level of the process. Faculty members wishing to appeal will follow the "Request for Consideration" procedures under the UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures.
7. Lecturer evaluation categories are divided into the following percentages in the College of Fine Arts:
   60% teaching effectiveness
   10% professional achievement
   10% professional service
   20% to be distributed to any of the above three categories depending on the duties of the lecturer

2.3 Performance standards for annual review

Like tenured and tenure-track faculty, lecturers will be rated as "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or "unsatisfactory" in all three areas, based on the criteria above in section 1, "General Guidelines," using the program's documents (appendices A-C) for annual review. Lecturers are expected to excel in teaching effectiveness and continue to be active in the areas of professional achievement and professional service. The average of all student evaluations, peer teaching observations, and other contributions to the Creative Writing Program in teaching over the previous three year period will be used--one low-scored course should not be considered representative when others are clearly more effective.

Lecturers shall meet expectations in Teaching Effectiveness and, at a minimum, meet expectations in *either* Professional Achievement or Professional Service for a successful annual review

2.4. Performance standards for promotion

As the lecturer promotion process is based on all three areas, faculty applying for promotion in lecturer rank should meet expectations in Teaching Effectiveness and, at a minimum, meet expectations in *both* Professional Achievement and Professional Service. The average of all student evaluations, peer teaching observations, and other contributions to the program in teaching over the entire period since the previous promotion in rank may be used, based on the Creative Writing Program's annual review criteria.

2.4.1 *Criteria for evaluating Teaching Effectiveness*
With this requirement, the Program's Lecturer Evaluation Committee will consider student evaluations, peer observation of teaching reports, and contributions to the curriculum, mentoring, etc., which promote student success in classroom activities in the Creative Writing Program. These and all other requirements will be based on the Creative Writing Program's general criteria for teaching effectiveness for annual review.

The Teaching Effectiveness rating "exceeds expectations" is defined as contributions to the Creative Writing Program that exceed expectations on student evaluations, peer teaching observations, and at least one other area contributing to teaching excellence as determined by the program's annual review policy. Similarly, "meets expectations" refers to satisfactory student evaluations and peer teaching observations as would be counted in the program's annual review policy, while "does not meet expectations" falls below this standard.

2.4.2 *Criteria for evaluating Professional Achievement*
The Professional Achievement rating "exceeds expectations" is defined as any two or more works published or presented in peer-reviewed venues during the previous three-year period which would be counted for annual review within the Creative Writing Program. Similarly, the rating "meets expectations" is defined as any one work published or presented in peer-reviewed venues during the previous three-year period, while "does not meet expectations" is defined as fewer than one work published or presented within the three-year period and/or since the previous promotion.

2.4.3 *Criteria for evaluating Professional Service*
The Professional Service rating "exceeds expectations" is defined as substantial contributions to at least two areas of service which would be counted for annual review within the Creative Writing Program or significant contributions to one area of service, such as student advising, which would be counted for annual review within the Creative Writing Program. Similarly, the rating "meets expectations" is defined as any one substantial contribution to an area of service which would be counted for annual review within the Creative Writing Program, while "does not meet expectations" is defined as less than active service.

3. Peer Evaluation Teaching Effectiveness Policy

In accordance with institutional guidelines for faculty peer evaluations as found at https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm the Creative Writing Program faculty will conduct regular teaching effec-tiveness peer evaluations.

3.1 Purpose: to continuously improve creative-writing courses for our students.

The program faculty believe that teaching effectiveness is reviewed as follows:

a. by student evaluation of the course,

b. by continued participation in mentoring our students, variously by designing new courses, revising current courses for reduced seat and/or online delivery, etc.,

c. by peer observation of teaching and review of course materials. The present policy formalizes the peer observation and review of course materials.

3.2 Objective: This policy affects all full-time faculty, including 3-year lecturer, tenure-track, and tenured faculty. Tenured faculty will be required to have at least one peer observation within a three-year period, tenure-track and lecturer faculty will be required to have at least one peer observation per year following procedures as noted below. Faculty may request additional review as desired and are encouraged to do so. Faculty will select the course for which that evaluation is to take place among those they are teaching, including any type of course—face-to-face, reduced seat, or fully online.

3.3 Selection of Reviewer: Faculty may select from one of the following options for review:

a. Faculty may choose any UTRGV faculty member at their same rank or higher, or

b. Faculty may ask the director to select randomly any faculty member at the rank of the reviewee or higher

3.4 Procedure:

The faculty member wishing review may inform the program director regarding the candidate's choice of review method and the director may make the selection, inform the faculty member of the randomly selected evaluator(s), and then inform the requested parties. Otherwise, faculty members are responsible for meeting the policy criteria on their own.

Should a faculty member believe that a randomly selected individual may not be appropriate for reasons unrelated to academic matters, he/she will have the right to request a second random selection. Only the program director will know that this request was made.

Faculty being observed will prepare the Creative Writing Program Observation Form (appendix C), will give internet access to their course materials that are available online and will scan those not online to ensure that the reviewing faculty member has copies well in advance of their agreed-upon observation date or dates should an online course be selected.

Course materials provided must include 1) the syllabus, 2) examples of how students are evaluated (e.g., prompt for a paper, copy of an exam...), 3) examples of in-class materials used/viewed/handed out if such exist, 4) examples of how the textbook is used (e.g., a reading assignment & how it is addressed in class) if appropriate. The reviewed faculty member is free to provide additional materials if desired.

Faculty will include the summative portions of the review in the annual review folder for the year in which it was performed and as appropriate for tenure & promotion and post-tenure review decisions.

Faculty may meet with the reviewer(s) to discuss formative issues and may meet with the director at any time to discuss teaching effectiveness issues. Furthermore, faculty may request the University to offer faculty development in area(s) that they deem would be helpful to their improvement as noted by reviewer(s).

Faculty members who perform observations will be eligible for annual review evaluation points under the Professional Service area. Any faculty member asked to be a reviewer may decline but all faculty are expected to participate at least once within the 3-year period and cannot be assigned more than once per year if selected randomly.

5. **Appeal:** Faculty may write responses to any evaluation on the program rubric.

4. Tenure and Promotion

Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship

4.1 General Information:

By the date of the tenure review for a candidate, the majority of work must either be in print or in press. Work that is accepted and forthcoming should be established in the dossier.

For purposes of authorship, the Creative Writing Program equates collaborative work with single authorship. In the case of collaboratively-authored texts, candidates should include a description of their individual, substantive contributions to the text in their professional achievement narrative.

The significant portion of work considered in Professional Achievement for tenure must be published by reputable venues after a peer-review process (no vanity press publications will be counted). Assessment of a tenure-track faculty member's record in Professional Achievement will be based on substantial original contributions to creative writing and/or contemporary literature/scholarship.

4.2 External Review Process

Candidates will consult with the program director to arrange evaluation by peers outside the institution. (See the institutional document on External Reviews:

https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/guidelines_for_external_reviewers.pdf

Please consider the following departmental guidelines to ensure that external reviews are received prior to the formal review process that begins in the fall. The goal of this procedure is to acquire a minimum of four external reviews for the candidate's dossier, in accordance with UTRGV requirements.

In the **spring previous to their application** for promotion (and tenure if that applies)

    1) By March 1: Provide the elected tenure and promotion committee chair with a minimum of **eight** names who are peers in comparable academic fields to the candidate, their relationship to each, and a brief statement why that individual will be a good choice for external review. The candidate should also order the list of outside reviewers, providing reasons for the ordering if needed.

2) By March 31: Provide a scanned version of the following to the program director:

   a. their up-to-date CV,

   b. a statement summary of their professional achievement since (i) their last application for tenure or (ii) their start as Assistant Professor.

   c. samples of their most recent creative work and/or research.

3) By March 31: The elected Creative Writing Program T&P committee will:

   a. Consider the list provided by candidate(s) for promotion (and tenure) and establish their own independent ranking of the names, taking the candidate's top choices into consideration as they do so.

   b. Forward the committee's ranked list of names to the program director.

4) During April, the program director will contact reviewers in order from the list forwarded by the chair of the elected T&P committee until a minimum of **four** have responded that they will be able to review the candidate. The additional names will be held by the chair of the T&P committee in case one or more of the original reviewers does not respond in timely fashion.

5) The program director will send one set of the documents provided by the candidate to each reviewer with a letter/e-mail requesting that the review comment on the current, as well as the potential, state of the candidate's research/scholarship/creative work. The letter will also describe the confidentiality of the process and include a one-sentence summary of the typical workload in the program, its typical travel support, and the highly competitive nature of UTRGV's Faculty Development Leave. The reviewer should also be supplied with the program's Tenure & Promotion Policy guidelines. Additionally, a form will be supplied requesting the personal and contact information of the reviewer, their CV, and a request for the written review to have no identifying marks.

6) During this process of soliciting and collating the external reviews, the program director may consult with the T&P committee or other appropriate senior faculty if any questions or difficulties arise. If promised external reviews are not provided in a timely fashion, the T & P committee's list of reviewers should be consulted again, with the program director contacting a new reviewer as appropriate, stressing that the review is particularly time-sensitive and needed in early September.

7) Once four external reviews have been obtained, they should be placed in the candidate's dossier. Per UTRGV guidelines, the candidate must receive copies of all reviews, but these copies should contain no identifying information about the reviewers. (See section 4 in the UTRGV Guidelines for External Reviewers.)

4.3 For TENURE and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

To be considered eligible for tenure, in addition to presentations, a tenure-track faculty member must meet the publication requirements as established in this policy. The following list provides possible combinations which meet the minimum requirements. The Creative Writing Program acknowledges that not every genre can be encapsulated in these categories and that common-sense equivalences not yet listed should be considered. The program places great value on the quality of the creative work, the quality of the venue of publication/production, and/or the significance of a work's reception. These demonstrations of excellence in quality may supersede the below considerations as to the quantity of publications. For this level, a candidate should produce a coherent body of creative work.

These brief examples will clarify the program's minimum expectations for publication and/or production:

• typically, a book published at a reputable venue in a peer-reviewed process, OR

•a full-length play or feature-length screenplay produced by a reputable production company or theater company selected in a peer-review process, or a poetry chapbook from a reputable press, or a chapbook-sized poetry portfolio published in reputable, peer-reviewed magazines and journals, OR

• approximately five prose works published in reputable venues in a peer-reviewed process, OR

• a textbook, a scholarly monograph, an edited collection, or translation, or a major co-authored long-form publication/production/multi-media projects, etc.

In narrative summaries about research, candidates should explain how markers of quality, such as an award or prize for creative work, an anthology distinction, a competitive grant or residency distinction, or a significant body of conference presentations and/or invited performances, in conjunction with their published works, serve to demonstrate excellence in craft or import of scholarship. Additional markers of professional success can include a signed book contract/acceptance or an advance, a signed agreement with a literary agent for representation, a finalist

distinction for a book-length manuscript, etc. While their area(s) of interest may have evolved since their time of hire, it is understood that candidates will continue to establish a career trajectory, and through their narrative summaries, suggest where their current and future work will take them and how it will serve and expand the understanding of contemporary literature and creative writing.

4.4 Promotion from Associate to Full Professor:

While the trajectory and intensity of an associate professor's professional activities may shift as a result of their expanded service and administrative commitments, candidates who wish to apply for promotion to Full Professor are expected to continue their career trajectory by regularly publishing their work/performing.

Only achievements not counted on the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Student Success & P-16 Integration's tabular summaries for research in an application for a previous promotion are applicable for promotion to full professor. In addition to publication, literary awards, grants, fellowships, curated/invited readings and/or performances, reprints, anthologized work, competitive residencies, national book reviews, and other markers of literary success may be considered.

This brief example will clarify the Program's minimum expectation for publication and/or production:

• typically, a book, or its near equivalent in publications/productions in reputable venues in a peer-reviewed process,

Furthermore, a candidate should find themselves more often in national conversations in their discipline, and contributing to and expanding their field. Care should be taken in the narrative summary to describe how their work has been received, or to speak to or demonstrate its quality, or ways it expands our understanding of creative writing and contemporary literature.

In narrative summaries about research/scholarship, candidates should explain how markers of quality, such as an award or prize for creative work, a competitive grant or residency distinction, or a significant body of conference presentations and/or invited performances, in conjunction with their published works, serve to demonstrate excellence in craft or import of scholarship. Additional markers of professional success can include a signed book contract/acceptance or an advance, a signed agreement with a literary agent for representation, a finalist distinction for a book-length manuscript, etc. While their area(s) of interest may have evolved since their time of hire, it is understood that candidates will continue to establish a career

trajectory, and through their narrative summaries, suggest where their current and future work will take them and how it will serve and expand the understanding of contemporary literature and creative writing.

5. Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (PTR)

5.1 Purpose: The purpose of this post-tenure review (PTR) policy is to state the underlying guidelines for meeting expectations in the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and professional service/ administration for the Creative Writing Program.

5.2 Objective This document defines the Creative Writing Program criteria to meet expectations according to HOP ADM 06-505 and Regents' Rule 31102.2.sec. 5. 5.2.

5.3 Guidelines:

5.3.1 Faculty will begin the summary document for PTR by clarifying how their time has been allocated over the six-year period. This will be substantiated by the inclusion of annual review evaluations but should be clearly summarized in order to provide the committee members with a snapshot of expectations. For example, clarify the teaching load as 3/3 or 4/4 load and any releases, the research or teaching workload determination for professional achievement, and the types of service assignments for professional service. (See section 6 for a discussion of the Workload Determination Policy.)

5.3.2 Faculty will then include a summary of their activities in each area over the past six years, copies of their annual reviews for the same period, an updated, current CV, and any other documentation required by the HOP or Regents' Policy with reference to periodic performance evaluation of tenured faculty.

Section: ADM 06 -504

5.3.3 *Program-Level Review Committee*:

a. Comprehensive performance reviews will be carried out at the program level by a review committee that will include at least three tenured faculty members at an equivalent (or higher) rank of each of the faculty member(s) undergoing review.

b. When there are fewer than three tenured faculty members at an equivalent or higher rank of the faculty member(s) undergoing review, the program chair, in consultation with the dean, may invite full professors from other departments/programs to participate as members of the program review committee.

c. When the faculty member undergoing review is the program chair, the chair-level review will be skipped and the file will move to the next level (i.e., the dean).

d. The program review committee is elected by the voting members of the program faculty.

e. The chair of the program review committee will be elected by the committee members.

f. Faculty members with part-time administrative positions (with the exception of the college's associate dean) are eligible to serve on the program review committee.5

5.3.4. Each faculty member undergoing PTR should follow the relevant guidelines of the Institutional Format for Faculty Review Dossier as found on the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Student Success & P-16 Integration's website. The dossier should include (but is not limited to) the following required information (Regents' Rule 31102):

   a. current, updated CV2

   b. summary statement of professional accomplishments

   c. all annual review reports for the 6-year period under consideration

   d. student evaluations for the 6-year period under consideration

   e. peer teaching observations/evaluations for the 6-year period

The faculty member is free to provide any other documentation of teaching that they would like to, including student comments, course syllabi, etc. The elected review committee will consider the documents provided and then provide an opportunity for the faculty member to meet with the committee to discuss their dossier.

5.4 Criteria: The Creative Writing Program is setting the following criteria for meeting expectations in all areas under consideration.

5.4.1. Criteria for meeting expectations of faculty in Teaching Effectiveness:

Faculty peer evaluations: indicating 80% or greater satisfactory or better in-class performance (using our newly approved 5-item format, this means 4 of 5 items are satisfactory, good or excellent).

Student evaluations: 80% of all courses evaluated for the faculty member by online student evaluations for the period under consideration will have scores of 4 or greater on the composite AVG for all five UT System required questions. Faculty may optionally remove any course for which there is less than 50% participation from students in the course.

5.4.2. Criteria for meeting expectations of faculty in Professional Achievement:

Faculty who are on Teaching Workload (see Section 6 for workload-policy details) are primarily teaching faculty yet are expected to keep abreast of developments in

their field(s); these faculty will document professional achievement activities meeting expectations as evidenced by the following as long as it is within the program's disciplines

1) presenting at meetings of professional organizations which may be local, state or regional,

2) attending professional meetings and/or workshops which will continue their development in their disciplines,

3) participating on panels, workshops, etc.

4) showing evidence of publications such as book reviews, and/or shorter works than required for Research Workload,

5) publishing in venues that may be non-peer reviewed or are local, etc.

Faculty who are on Research Workload will document that they have met the minimal requirements for remaining on Research Workload in order to be considered meeting expectations.

5.4.3. Criteria for meeting faculty responsibilities in Professional Service & Administration:

The Faculty member has served the university on program, college, university-wide committees, standing and/or elected and/or ad hoc, served as peer observer for teaching effectiveness, chaired a major committee, coordinated a discipline within the Program, advised student organizations, mentored new faculty, etc., for an average of **two** venues per year under consideration.

AND/OR

Faculty has served the community *without remuneration* as consultant, presenter, and/or group leader for the discipline in venues such as FESTIBA, HESTEC, community discussion groups, in-service teacher trainings, etc. a minimum of **three** times in the six-year period.

AND/OR

Faculty has served the profession organizing round tables, panels, judging abstracts for professional meetings, serving as an editorial referee for a professional journal, etc. a minimum of **three** times in the six-year period.

OR **any combination** of the above service requirements indicating active participation in serving the university, the community, and the profession.

5.5 Evaluation:

The dossier will be evaluated on the following scale:

a. Exceeds expectations--such an evaluation is based on a dossier that shows the faculty member exceeds the levels in the criteria outlined for "meeting expectations" above in two or more areas

b. Meets expectations--such an evaluation is based on a dossier that shows the faculty member has met the expectations outlined above in the criteria for all areas.

c. Does not meet expectations--such an evaluation is based on a dossier that indicates the faculty member has not met the expectations listed above under criteria for one or more of the areas under consideration.

d. Unsatisfactory--such an evaluation is based on a dossier that indicates the faculty member has not met the expectations listed above under criteria for any of the areas under consideration.

6. Workload Determination Policy

6.1 Purpose: This policy provides procedures for the workload review of tenured faculty. Workload review will be used to determine whether a tenured faculty member in the Creative Writing Program will be assigned a "Teaching Load" (four classes each fall and spring term) or a "Research Load" (three courses each fall and spring term).

6.2 Objective: The standard assignment for all tenure-track faculty is a Research Load. All faculty, when first granted tenure and promoted to associate professor, should be continued on a Research Load. Workload review in the Creative Writing Program follows the same timeline as the Post-Tenure Review process for tenured faculty. The purpose of the Workload Review, however, is to determine if tenured faculty have been productive in terms of creative and/or scholarly professional achievement sufficient to be continued on a Research Load or to be placed on a Research Load if previously assigned a Teaching Load.

6.3 Criteria for Workload Determination: The Creative Writing Program recognizes that as faculty move from tenure-track to tenured, associate professor and then professor, responsibilities are likely to change which affect creative professional and scholarly achievement. Faculty workload should take into consideration the duties of the individual faculty member; for example, a faculty member who has been elected to chair a major university committee while on a research load of 3/3 should not be penalized for this vital service by being expected to continue creative publication or scholarly *at the level expected prior to obtaining tenure*. Thus, expectations for maintaining a 3/3 research workload past the tenure-track should take into consideration the overall responsibilities of the tenured faculty member and not simply relate to their professional achievement without such consideration.

Thus, to qualify for a Research workload in the Creative Writing Program, faculty will meet the following minimum criteria in professional achievement:

A. Present a portfolio of published works: short story, creative nonfiction essay, play, screenplay or poems or published pages of poetry in a reputable venue, for example, a university, academic, or national press or literary journal (no vanity presses or custom publishing houses), peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, externally funded grant, within the 6-year review period.

> o Larger works, such as a book, textbook, edited creative/scholarly journal, monograph, or collection which exceed the peer-reviewed article criterion are sufficient to meet this AND the publication for section B1 below.

AND

B. show consistent progress toward continued professional achievement by

1)presenting a portfolio of published works: short story, creative nonfiction essay, play, screenplay or poems or published pages of poetry in a reputable

venue, peer-reviewed articles, book chapter, externally funded grant, for example, a university, academic, or national press or literary journal (no vanity presses or custom publishing houses) within the 6 year review period.

     OR

     2a) presenting at peer-reviewed conferences or as an invited speaker at creative or academic presentations a minimum of six times within the six year period

     AND

     2b) by providing evidence of additional on-going professional achievement such as published book reviews, chapters/sections prepared for a longer book project, guest editing literary/professional volumes, dramatic productions receiving full membership on the graduate faculty, etc.

     This list is neither exhaustive nor ordered; other additional evidence will be considered.

6.4. Guidelines and Procedures

6.4.1. The Workload Review is typically conducted in parallel with the Post-Tenure Review and follows the same timeline, occurring six years after the faculty member's previous Tenure/Promotion or Post-Tenure Review. The review will be conducted by the Program's elected Personnel Committee which shall consist of three (3) tenured faculty members elected in the fall prior to the January of the review. The director will conduct an independent review after the Personnel Committee has completed its review. If the two reviews result in conflicting recommendations, both recommendations will be forwarded to the dean. The dean will decide the issue in consultation with the program director and the chair of the Personnel Committee.

2.The Workload Review will examine a faculty member's creative and/or research/scholarly productivity during the review period to determine if the faculty member should be assigned a Research Load or Teaching Load.

3. A faculty member who had previously been assigned a Research Load who is placed on a Teaching Load as a result of a Workload Review may request another follow-up Workload Review in any year prior to the next scheduled Post-Tenure Review by informing the program director in September prior to the January review if that faculty member feels that additional works accomplished since the previous Workload Review warrant a new review. This will not change the PTR cycle for that faculty member.

4. Faculty members who have administrative assignments entailing a course reduction will keep the same workload as when they began the assignment and will have their research expectations adjusted accordingly during this assignment.

5. Anyone who has received three or more year-long course reductions for administrative purposes during the years under review should initially be granted a Research Load for the ensuing six years once the faculty member no longer holds that administrative assignment.

6. A faculty member may always request to be placed on a Teaching Load.

6.5. Appeal: A faculty member may appeal a Workload Review decision, following the procedures set out in other policies as HOP ADM 06-501:

6.5.1. A request for reconsideration must be initiated by the affected faculty member in writing no more than ten (10) working days after the faculty member has been notified of the recommendation.

6.5.2. The written request must state grounds for the request and include supporting evidence.

6.5.3. The committee or evaluator with whom a request is filed shall submit a written response to the faculty member within ten (10) working days of receipt of the request. The respondent shall address the substance of the appeal in explaining why the respondent found the appeal either to be convincing or unconvincing. Copies of the response are to be sent to the faculty member and placed in their evaluation portfolio before forwarding the materials to the next level of evaluation.

6.5.4. A faculty member may write a reply to the evaluator's response for inclusion in their portfolio. The reply must be submitted within five working days of the faculty member's receipt of the evaluator's response.

Appendix A. Annual Review Long Form Worksheet

Weighting of Scores

Indicate how you want your Annual Review Scores weighted (e.g Teaching = 40%; Research = 40%; Service = 20%). Please consult the Handbook of Operating Procedures and/or the College Summary Sheet to determine minimum and maximum amounts you may use for each area when weighting your scores.

Teaching _____ %

Research _____ %

Service _____ %

Computing Total Points

Please use the boxes at the right of the page to indicate the points that you are claiming for each relevant item and write the total at the top of each review area (Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service) in the space provided.

Total points for each area will be transferred onto the cover sheet ("short form" [see appendix B]) which is the document used to report overall annual review scores by the Annual Review Committee. If the total for any area is 4 or more points, faculty member will receive a rating of "exceeds expectations" (and a score of 4 points) for that area on the short-form cover sheet since the maximum allowable on this form is 4 points for each area

A. Teaching Effectiveness   Total Score =   _____

1.   Evaluations of Teaching

   a. Student Evaluations of Teaching*

   AVG will be used from the Mandated Question Results:

   4   = 4.0   Review =

   3   = 3.0   Review =

   2   = 2.0   Review =

                                                  = 1.0   Review =
                            1

* Faculty must submit all summary sheets for fall and spring semesters, but full student comments do not need to be included for annual review.

    b. Peer Evaluations of Teaching
(Tenured faculty are not required to complete peer evaluations every year and may have none to report)

One completed form plus peer review of 91%-100% satisfactory
Review points = 4
One completed form plus peer review of 81% - 90% satisfactory
Review points = 3
One completed form plus peer review of 71% - 80% satisfactory
Review points = 2
One completed form plus peer review of 61% - 70% satisfactory
Review points = 1
One completed form plus peer review of 51% - 60% satisfactory
Review points = .5
One completed form plus peer review under 51%
Review points = 0

2.   Contributions to curriculum and course development
   a. development and teaching of a new course in the program for the first time; does not include teaching an existing course for the first time: undergraduate: 1, graduate: 1.5/course..
   b. Major revision of an existing course: .5/course……………………………………..…………………….
   c. creation of web-based Distance Learning course (first time only): 1/course.....………………………….
   d. teaching of graduate course: 1/course…………………………………………………………….
   e. Attendance/participation at 3 or more local, professional development workshops (e.g. Learning Communities, Learning Frameworks, Distance Learning, WAC) or at1 professional development workshop or conference: .5 …………………………………………………………………..
   f. Teaching a study abroad course: 1/trip...…………………………………………………………….
   g. Teaching a Learning Communities and/or UNIV 1301-Learning Frameworks course: .25/course …...
   h. Teaching Reduced Seat or Online Course: .25/course …………………………………………………
   i. Teaching a Service Learning Course: 1/course ………………………………………………….

3.   Awards and Honors for teaching excellence

a. State/national awards for teaching excellence: 2.5
…………………………………………………...

b. UTRGV Excellence in Teaching Award
College Level: ☐
1……………………………………………………………………………..

University Level: 2 ☐
……………………………………………………………………………….

4. Mentoring of students ☐
a. Mentoring of TA's, RAs, GAs: .25 for each per semester
…………………………………………………

b. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students who make presentations ☐
at academic conferences i.e. NCUR, etc.: 1/stu-
dent…..………………………………………………………….

c. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students who successfully publish ☐
creative work or scholarly articles, research, etc., in external non-UTRGV
publications: 1/student…..…………………………………

d. Mentoring students who make internal presentations or publications: ☐
.25/student.…………………………. ☐

e Graduate Thesis Committee members: .5 per semester of active review of ☐
drafts of thesis 1.0 in final semester of completion of thesis for de-
fense…………………………………………………….

f. Chair of Graduate Thesis Committee: 1 per semester for guiding drafts of ☐
thesis in progress, 1.5 in final semester of completion of thesis for de-
fense……………………………………………..

g. Chair of Undergraduate Thesis Committee: 1 per semester for guiding drafts ☐
of thesis in progress, 1.5 in final semester of completion of thesis for de-
fense………………………………………

h. Undergraduate thesis committee member: .5 per semester of active review ☐
of drafts of thesis 1.0 in final semester of completion of thesis for de- ☐
fense……………………………………………..

i. Supervising Program-approved independent study: .5/stu-
dent.…………………………………………

5. Additional indicators of Teaching Achievement:
Please explain teaching activity and assign the appropriate point to- ☐
tal………………………………

B.   Creative Work/Research/Scholarship   Total Score =   _____

Note: Publications will be accepted in print and in electronic media. No vanity
press publications will be awarded annual evaluation points. Vanity press is any
custom publisher or publishing house that requires the author to assume any or all
of the costs of publication. For the purposes of Annual Review, the Creative Writing

Program recognizes single and co-authored research products and processes as equal.

1.   Publications/item:

  a. Creative Writing
      i. novels, short story collection, poetry collection or play (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited): 12 ……
      ii. chapbook   8…………………………………………………………………
      iii. short story, non-fiction essay, play script, screenplay (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited):   5 …………
      iv. poem (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited): :
        2……………………………………………………….
      v. literary translations
          i. book (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited: 6…………………………………………
          ii. short story/essay or journal article (refereed/peer reviewed/invited: 2
……………………………….
          iii. poem (peer reviewed/invited):
1……………………………………………………………………
          vi. editing a collection of creative work with a critical introduction: 6 …
      b . Journal Articles
          i.   refereed/peer-reviewed/invited: 5
……………………………………………………………….
          ii. non-refereed/peer-reviewed: 1
………………………………………………………………….

          c. Book Chapters
          i.   scholarly (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited): 5
……………………………………………………
          ii. textbook (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited): : 2
……………………………………………………

      d.. Books (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited)
          i.   monograph: 12
              ………………………………………………………………………………
          ii.   textbook: 8 …………………………………………………………………………
          iii. editing a collection of scholarly essays and writing a scholarly introduction or chapter: 8 ……….
          iv.   editing anthology/edition w/scholarly introduction: 6
              ……………………………………………
          v.   preparing textbook manual: 6……………………………………………

      e, concordances (refereed/peer reviewed/invited): 6
          ………………………………………………

    f. bibliographies, book length (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited): 4
……………………………………… ☐

    g. critical reviews (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited): 4
………………………………………………….

        i.   thematic multiple book or software review (refereed/peer-reviewed/in-vited): 3 …………………… ☐

        ii   thematic multiple book or software review (non-refereed/peer-re-viewed/invited): 1.5 …………... ☐

        iii single book review (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited): 1.5
………………………………………. ☐

        iv.   published/broadcast interview: 1 to 2…………………………………………..

    h. Encyclopedia and reference book entries (refereed/peer-reviewed/invited): ☐
……………………………… ☐

    i.   Refereed/peer reviewed/invited in new media
       i. productions: .5 to 5 …………………………………………………
       ii. presentations: .5 ……………………………………………………………….

    j.   Invitations to submit works: .5 ☐
…………………………………………………………. ☐

    k. works in progress: .25 to 2………………………………………………….

2.   Presentations/Performances
    a: Presentation or performance of creative work at a conference
         i. invited: 3 …………………………………………………………
         ii. refereed/peer reviewed/curated: 3
……………………………………………………………….

    b. research papers at academic conferences
       i. invited: 3 ……………………………………………………………………………………..☐
       ii. refereed/peer-reviewed: 3 ☐
          ………………………………………………………………………….

     c.   presentation/performance/research presentation at Program or com-☐
munity meeting: 1 …………………

3. a.   Invited seminar or workshop leader at external venues: 3 ☐
……………………………….

    b.   Invited seminar or workshop leader at internal venues: 1 ………………. ☐

4.   Professional Recognition:
    a. state/regional/national award from professional and learned societies: ☐
    3………………………………….. ☐
    b. membership on journal editorial boards: .75
……………………………………………….. ☐
    c. Fulbright or other major award:
    3…………………………………………………………………..
    d. nomination/finalist for award: .25 to 2
………………………………………………………

e. service as Executive Officer of professional organization: 2
………………………………………………
f. work chosen as "best of…": 1.5 …………………………………………………………………
g. UTRGV Excellence in Research Award
   College Level: 1 …………………………………………………………………………………☐
   University Level: 2 …………………………………………………………………………………

5.   Other Indicators of professional achievement:
   a. preparing grant proposals:
      External funded: 6
      ……………………………………………………………………….. ☐☐

      External non-funded: 1.25
      …………………………………………………………………………. ☐

      Internal funded: 3
      ………………………………………………………………………………… ☐

      Internal non-funded: 1.25
      ………………………………………………………………………………..
   b. editor, journal: 4 ……………………………………………………………………….. ☐
      guest editor, journal: 3 ………………………………………………………………..
   c. prepared commentary as respondent or discussion leader at conference: 1 ☐
      …………………………
   d. creating sessions for scholarly meetings and/or academic conferences: .75 ☐
      ……………………………..
   e. recognition of significance creative publications or scholarly work such as in a
      review, reference, or extended citation by academic or professional peers i☐
      the year under review: 1 ……………………..
   g. translation of faculty member's creative or scholarly work from: .25 to 2
      …………………. ☐
   g. reprints or subsequent editions of previously published work: 1
      …………………………………………. ☐
   h adaptation and/or production of previously published creative work in a dif-
      ferent medium : 1 ……….
   i. additional: …………………………………………………

C.   Service   Total Score = _____

Note: Please keep documentation related to service activities since you may be asked to submit details of your work. No service points can be taken for outside employment, which is defined in HOP 4.13.1 as "any activity performed by an employee, other than fulfilling employment obligations at the university, for which remuneration is received."

1.   Service to the Program, College, or University per committee or activity☐
   a. Faculty Senate: 2 ………………………………………………………………………………☐…..

      i. Faculty Senate Executive Committee: 2
…………………………………………………….

b. standing college committees: 1.25   ☐
…………………………………………………………..

c. standing university committees or councils: 1.25   ☐
…………………………………………………..

d. standing Program committee: 1.25   ☐
……………………………………………………………….

e. advisor, student organization: 1.25   ☐
………………………………………………………………..

f. ad hoc committee member: 1.25   ☐
………………………………………………………………….

g. search committee member: 1.25
………………………………………………………………….

h. chair of committee for any activity listed above, add .5   ☐
………………………………………………………

i. mentoring new faculty: 1   ☐
…………………………………………………………..

j. task force member or facilitator: 1.25   ☐☐
…………………………………………………………….

k. SACS/Program Review
    i. Workshop leader: 2 ………………………………………………………………………   ☐
    ii. Documented participation in SACS-related activities

    l: coordinate presentations: .25 to 2   ☐
    m. Peer-evaluation of faculty: 1 per evaluation
      ………………………………………………….

2. Administrative Duties
    a. Creative Writing Program Director: 4 …………………………….
    b. University directorships and administrative Fellowships (CTE, CMAS, CB☐
    ,etc) : 3 ………………………
    c. coordinators/advisors (MAS-Brownsville campus, Gallery magazine, Writing Center, etc.) 2……………..

3.   Community Service Capped at 2
    a. active participation in professionally-related community group: 1   ☐☐
    ………………………………………...
    b. service in professional capacity to boards/committees: ☐
    1……………………………………………….
    c. professional service to public schools and agencies: 1   ☐
    ………………………………………………….
    d. professional consulting: ☐
    1…………………………………………………………………………………..
    e. presentations at workshops, meetings, etc. in community: 1.   ☐
    ………………………………………...

  f. organized labor at community-oriented Programs and festivals: .25 to 1 …….

4. Service to Professional Organizations Capped at 2
  a. participation at professional meeting as assigned moderator: 1 ☐
   ………………………………………….
  b. participation on boards and committees: 1. ☐
   …………………………………………………………….
  c. assistance to professional group organizing meetings, administrative, etc ☐
   1…………………………….
  d. service on panels such as award selection panels for professional or scholarly
   organizations: 1…..
  e participation in review of grants, fellowships, award applications for external ☐
   organizations: 1……..
  f. completion of reviews of articles under consideration for publication in schol-
   arly journals: 1.5 ……….
  g. prepublication reviews of book or article manuscripts for major press or ☐
   scholarly journal: 2 ………………………
  h short, non-refereed/peer-reviewed, non-scholarly pieces written for profes-
   sional or scholarly publications (such as professional news items or repo☐):
   1. …………………………………………..
  i. cooperative activities with local public schools (such as campus visits, class-
   room visits): 1.5 ………..
  j. professional mentorships (non-UTRGV, AWP, Puente Program, etc.): 1
   …………………………………

5. UTRGV Excellence in Service Award ☐
 College Level: 1 …………………………………………………………………………………………..
 University Level: 2 …………………………………………………………………………………………
 6. UTRGV Excellence in Mentoring Faculty Award
 College Level: 1 …………………………………………………………………………………………….
 University Level: 2 ………………………………………………………………………………………. ☐

7. Additional indicators of Service Achievement:
 Please explain service activity and assign the appropriate point total… ☐

Appendix B. Annual Review Cover Sheet ("short form")

_____   _____   ____
          Name of Candidate   Rank   Year

List your activities from September 1 through August 31 in the space below. All documentation should be kept by the faculty member. Please attach a current CV and tabulars (from the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Student Success & P-16 Integration's Office website) as well as your long form.

Teaching Effectiveness (List courses taught, AVG on student evaluations for the composite of the 5 UT System required questions, and other teaching achievements):

RAW SCORE_____Claiming _____ for TE _____%

Research/Scholarship (List publications, presentations, other recognition):

RAW SCORE_____Claiming_____ for R/S _____%

Professional Service (List university, professional and community service activities in your discipline):

RAW SCORE_____Claiming_____ for PS_____%

I certify that the information above is accurate.

_____
Signature   Date

_____
Committee Chair
Date

_____

Program Director   Date

*Please see Regents' Rule 31102.2.sec 5.1.g.(3) and (4) regarding annual review ratings of UNSATISFACTORY.

Appendix C. Peer Teaching Observation Cover Sheet

This page is all that is REQUIRED in your Annual Review, Tenure & Promotion, and/or Post Tenure Review file. It must be there to document that Peer Teaching Observations have taken place according to UT-System policy. You may choose to add any part of the Peer Observation form as well.

DATE of Pre-Observation Conference:
_____

Date of Observation:
_____

Course & Section: **_____**

Time / Classroom: **_____**

Date of Post-Observation Conference:
_____

SIGNATURES:

Observer:

_____

Printed name: _____

Observer Title: _____

INSTRUCTOR:

_____

Printed name: _____

Class Observation Rubric   Part I, Creative Writing Program Instructor

Complete sections A, B, & C below and send this document to your observer along with a copy of your course syllabus and any handouts/materials you may be distributing during class on the day of your observation. [Approved faculty vote July 24, 2015 and April 7, 2016]

A. Instructor and Course Information

      Name of Teacher:
      Name of Observer:
      Course:
      Time/Location:
      Date:

B. Self-reflection on Course Goals and Desired Outcomes

   1. What are your overall course goals and desired outcomes?

   2. What strategies do you implement to meet your goals?

   3. How do your course assignments relate to your course goals and desired outcomes?

C. Would you like feedback on any specific aspects of your teaching? If so, which ones?

  D. Would you like to respond to any of the comments made by your peer observer? (Optional and after receiving a completed observation form)

Class Observation Rubric   Part II, Creative Writing Program Observer

Bring this document to the observation. Complete the form by selecting the appro-priate descriptor for each of the five categories and by providing comments.

1. Content of Class Instruction: _____Excellent   Comments:
                                          _____Good
                                          _____Satisfactory
                                          _____Needs Improvement
                                          _____Unsatisfactory

2. Use of Class Time: _____Excellent   Comments:
                                          _____Good
                                          _____Satisfactory
                                          _____Needs Improvement
                                          _____Unsatisfactory

3. Instructor Preparation: _____Excellent   Comments:
                                          _____Good
                                          _____Satisfactory
                                          _____Needs Improvement
                                          _____Unsatisfactory

4. Demonstration of Subject Expertise:_____Excellent   Comments:
                                          _____Good
                                          _____Satisfactory
                                          _____Needs Improvement
                                          _____Unsatisfactory

5. Student Engagement with Instruction:_____Excellent   Comments:
                                          _____Good
                                          _____Satisfactory
                                          _____Needs Improvement
                                          _____Unsatisfactory

Please feel free to summarize your visit and provide further comments about your observation on another page.