

DEPARTMENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

**Department of Teaching and Learning
College of Education and P-16 Integration
UTRGV**

Approved by Teaching and Learning Department faculty: May 5th, 2023

Approved by the Dean, College of Education and P-16 Integration:

Signed: _____  _____ **Date:** 5.22.2023

Approved by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs:

Signed: _____ **Date:** _____

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction/Overview | 3 |
| Statement on the Purpose of Faculty Review | |
| Department Evaluation Committees | |
| Evaluation Timelines | |
| Performance Rating | |
| Differentiated Workload and Ratings | |
| Teaching Effectiveness Resources | |
| Peer Observation of Teaching | |
| Student Course Evaluation data and Student Comments | |
| Selection of External Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion and Promotion to Full Reviews | |
| Tenure and promotion standards | |
| Tenure-track and tenured faculty | |
| Teaching..... | 7 |
| Research..... | 9 |
| Service..... | 17 |
| Lecturers | |
| Teaching..... | 20 |
| Service..... | 22 |
| Professors of Practice | |
| Teaching..... | 24 |
| Research..... | 26 |
| Service..... | 27 |
| Annual review standards | |
| Tenure-track and tenured faculty..... | 31 |
| Lecturers..... | 40 |
| Professors of practice..... | 45 |
| Action Plans | 53 |
| References and Resources | 55 |
| Appendices | 56 |

Introduction/Overview

Statement on the Purpose of Faculty Review

The purpose of faculty review is to fairly evaluate faculty for annual reviews, contract renewals, and personnel actions. This document is the result of over three years of faculty deliberation that began in AY 2020 and continued through AY 2021. This document was approved in February of 2022 by the faculty of the Teaching and Learning Department and then updated and re-approved in August of 2022 to be in accord with the College of Education and P-16 Integration Guidelines. This document was further updated in the Fall of 2022 to reflect the contents of “Best Practices for Creating and Revising Department Evaluation Guidelines for Annual Review, Promotion, and Tenure.” Finally, this document was again revised in Fall of 2022 and Spring of 2023 after discussions with Dr. Alma Rodriguez, Dean of the College of Education and P16 Integration. It was most recently approved by department faculty in May 2023. This document represents a collective effort of the Department of Teaching and Learning’s Ad hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Revision along all levels. The Ad hoc Committee served in generating the document and received feedback from all full-time faculty of all titles and ranks in a series of meetings between Fall of 2020 and February of 2022, and then submitted subsequent revisions in dialogue with faculty through the Spring of 2023, as outlined above.

Department Evaluation Committees

The Department Evaluation Committees’ constitution follows the *UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures* sections ADM 06-503 “Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments,” ADM 06-504 “Tenured Faculty Evaluation,” and Appendix E referring to both ADM 06-503 and ADM 06-504 “Department Evaluation Guidelines” and “Tenured Faculty Evaluation. (For all documents referenced in this document, see the References and Resources page at the end of this document.) Both the Department Action Review Committee (3rd year, tenure, promotion, and comprehensive periodic evaluation) and the Annual Review Committee will be constituted by faculty members representative of the ranks being reviewed in accordance with Appendix E “Review Committee Composition and Requirements of Review.” The Department Action Review Committee and the Annual Review Committee are reconstituted on an annual basis with no terms or other inherited gate-keeping privileges. The Department Action Review Committee will review all tenure-track faculty and all faculty going up for an action, contract renewal, or comprehensive periodic evaluation. The Annual Review Committee will review all faculty undergoing routine annual review. The Department Action Review Committee and the Annual Review Committee will both be structured with faculty of all ranks, including a minimum of three full professors on both Committees to conduct full professor reviews, and both Committees will have a minimum of one-third of the total full time faculty in the department.

In the case of faculty members going up for tenure and promotion, tenured members of the Department Action Committee will report their deliberations with tenured faculty, make the faculty dossier available to all full-time tenured faculty members, and conduct a vote from those faculty members. In the case of a faculty member going up for promotion to full professor, three full professors on the Department Action Committee will report on their deliberations to all full professors in the department and conduct a vote among full professors in the department

regarding the faculty member's promotion to full. For actions for lecturers and professors' of practice actions, mixed rank faculty can review, deliberate, and recommend on those dossiers. Also following Appendix E, full time faculty of all ranks vote on the Department Action Committee and the Annual Review Committee. Faculty volunteering to serve will be elected by faculty to serve on Department Action and Annual Evaluation Committees. From elected members, the Chair will compose the Department Action and Annual Evaluation Committees. These committees will be submitted to faculty for a confirmation vote recorded in Qualtrix by the deadline listed in pathways in May.

Evaluation Timelines (see HOP ADM 06-503 and Appendix A: Early tenure and early promotion)

- All faculty undergo annual evaluation.
- Tenure-track assistant professors apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor at the beginning of their sixth year of review.
- Associate professors become eligible to apply for promotion to the rank of professor beginning in their sixth year as a tenured associate professor. Associate professors are not required to apply for promotion at that time. However, if an associate professor waits to apply for promotion, evaluators will judge the faculty member's work for the five years prior to the year of application (which equals a rolling six year period – the year of evaluation being the sixth year).
- Tenured associate and full professors are due for comprehensive periodic evaluation at the beginning of every sixth academic year after earning tenure.
- Assistant Professors of Practice are eligible to go up for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice after four years as Assistant. Associate Professors of Practice are eligible to go up for promotion to Professor of Practice after four years at Associate.
- Lecturer Is are eligible to go up for Lecturer II after three years. Lecturer IIs are eligible to go up for promotion to Lecturer III after three years as Lecturer II. Lecturer IIIs are eligible to go up for promotion to Senior Lecturer after three years as Lecturer III.
- Faculty may apply early for tenure and/or promotion. See Appendix A for characterizations of Early Tenure and Promotion efforts.

Performance Ratings

Faculty evaluation performance ratings will be conducted in accordance with the *UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures* sections ADM 06-503 "Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments" and ADM 06-504 "Tenured Faculty Evaluation." Following these guidelines, a performance rating applies the criteria in "Teaching and Learning Tenure and Promotion Standards and Annual Review Standards" (*this document*) to the performance categories "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "does not meet expectations," or "unsatisfactory."

This document lists criteria for meeting and exceeding expectations for all evaluations and personnel actions (annual review of all faculty, promotion of non tenure track faculty, tenure and promotion of tenure track faculty, promotion to full professor of tenured faculty, and comprehensive periodic evaluation). It does not list specific criteria for ratings of "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory," since, following Appendix C of HOP ADM 06-503, both

ratings are failures. However, we specify the distinction between those two failing levels below. A rating of “does not meet expectations” is warranted when some evidence of productivity is presented, just not sufficient to meet expectations. As noted in Appendix C, ratings of “does not meet expectations” can be corrected through diligent effort by the faculty member. A rating of “unsatisfactory,” on the other hand, is warranted, according to Appendix C, by “failing to meet expectations for the faculty member’s unit, rank, or contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. It also means failing to meet expectations based on findings of professional misconduct.” To be specific, an “unsatisfactory” rating might also be warranted if the level of productivity is so low as to be unlikely able to be remedied. For example, if a tenured faculty member on a “balanced” workload has, at the time of Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, only produced 3 of the required 12 research products, if teaching scores over the period of review are significantly below the department average such as an average student evaluations consistently below 4.0/5.0, or service projects over a period of review are consistently below the required number of projects describe by rank and category, any of these outcomes warrant “unsatisfactory” in scholarship, teaching, or service, respectively. Additionally, “unsatisfactory” might be immediately applied regarding misconduct is damaging to students or other faculty members’ safety or the department, college, or university missions. According to ADM 503 UTRGV HOP Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluations an unsatisfactory rating can result in non-renewal or dismissal of tenure track or contract faculty. According to HOP ADM 06-504 UTRGV HOP Tenure Faculty Evaluations, a tenured faculty member who received “unsatisfactory” rating for two consecutive annual ratings may be required to undergo early comprehensive periodic evaluation. The decision regarding whether to require the comprehensive periodic evaluation in this circumstance will be made by the Dean after consultation with the Provost/VPAA. Faculty who demonstrate two more years of “unsatisfactory” ratings may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action including termination due to poor performance or when other good cause exists.

Each level of review separately determines its own overall rating based on the ratings in each of the three areas. At the department level, review committees are encouraged to use a flexible system. Such as a system rates two “exceeds” and one “meets” as a combined rating of “exceeds.” Yet, a flexible system might also justify an overall rating of “exceeds” if two areas were strong “meets” and the third area was an extremely high “exceeds,” such as through winning a prestigious award, producing multiple highly selective and prestigious journal publications, or winning significant external grant funding under research. Faculty who exceed or meet expectations are eligible for merit pay as designed by the CEP Merit Pay Guidelines.

Differentiated Workload and Ratings

The Teaching & Learning Department enacts a differentiated workload policy following U.T. System Regents’ Rule 31006 and UTRGV H.O.P. ADM 06-501. Following Appendix A of HOP ADM 06-503, this document describes in detail standards for how ratings in each review category will be determined for faculty with different workload distributions. The details of differentiated workload for teaching, research, and service are discussed in each subsequent section by faculty type and rank with special emphasis on differentiation for faculty actions.

Teaching Resources

For each section on teaching below across faculty classifications and ranks, the Teaching and Learning Evaluation Guidelines reflect and support the UTRGV Documenting Teaching Effectiveness, Resources. Developed by the UTRGV Center for Teaching Excellence, the framework supports standard consensual best-practices and evidence-based approaches to reflective teaching, a foundational bedrock to the Department of Teaching and Learning, our faculty's expertise, and how we prepare preservice teachers, in-service teachers, or teacher and administrative leaders in our graduate programs and certificates. This document supports faculty's consultation with and articulation of the UTRGV Documenting Teaching Effectiveness Resources.

Student Course Evaluation Data and Student Comments

Student course evaluations data and student comments are one important way to document quality teaching. Student course evaluations and comments should be integrated into each faculty narrative on teaching. Faculty are expected to provide evidence of quality teaching in a variety of ways that emphasize student course evaluations and student comments along with other evidence. Please see sections on teaching under each of the faculty classifications in "Teaching and Learning Tenure and Promotion Standards and Annual Review Standards" (*this document*).

Peer Observation of Teaching

Peer observations of teaching will be conducted in accordance with the *UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures* section titled "Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching." This specifies that all lecturers, professors of practice, and tenure track faculty be observed annually and that all tenured faculty be observed once every three years. Peer observations of teaching are meant to be formative and collegial. A "peer" can be defined as a faculty member with whom the observed faculty member has a collegial relationship and from whom he or she might receive constructive feedback. Faculty can select peers of all ranks to observe their teaching, and the purpose of peer observations of teaching is to enhance department and collegial conversations about teaching. The UTRGV Department of Teaching and Learning has developed both face-to-face peer evaluation of teaching instruments and online peer evaluation of teaching instruments. These forms are titled: Department of Teaching and Learning Peer Observation Form (face-to-face) (T&L Peer Observation form (face-to-face)) and Department of Teaching and Learning Peer Observation Form (online) (T&L Peer Observation Form (online)). These forms were developed by a faculty committee in the Spring of 2018, and they were approved in a unanimous vote by faculty at the first meeting in Fall of 2018, August 31st. Observations are a single course visit in the case of face-to-face observations and a single course audit in the case of online observations. Pre- and post-meetings are required as part of the forms and need to be held. Using the established forms, faculty must also provide a narrative on what was learned from the peer observation of teaching. Peer observations and associated peer interactions should be linked to meaningful growth and student achievements in relation classroom or program-level teaching.

Student Course Evaluation Data and Student Comments

Student course evaluations data and student comments are one important way to document quality teaching. Student course evaluations and comments should be integrated into each faculty narrative on teaching. Faculty are expected to provide evidence of quality teaching in a

variety of ways that emphasize student course evaluations and student comments along with other evidence. Please see sections on teaching under each of the faculty classifications in “Teaching and Learning Tenure and Promotion Standards and Annual Review Standards” (*this document*).

Selection of External Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion and Promotion to Full Reviews

The selection of external reviewers for Tenure and Promotion and for Promotion to Full Professor will follow the “College of Education and P16 Integration/Department of Teaching and Learning Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure.” T&L Guidelines for Section of External Reviewers.

Teaching & Learning Department Tenure and Promotion Standards for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

TEACHING

Quality teaching is foundational to the Teaching and Learning Department. Teaching in this department is expected to demonstrate academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice. Additionally, we value proficiency with and integration of educational technology and best practices in education. Because the department wants all students in all classes to receive the best teaching possible, these standards apply to but are also differentiated by faculty designation and rank.

We also recognize that the quality of a faculty member’s teaching is not easily or simply described. Different perspectives and points of view reveal important information about the quality of one’s teaching, but by themselves can be incomplete. Thus, because no panoptic view of teaching exists and focusing on one viewpoint of teaching may not be effective, teaching must be described thoroughly, holistically, and from multiple viewpoints and dimensions.

This means that tenure-track and tenured faculty (both associate and full professor) *must build throughout their career* and present at each decision point (tenure and promotion, promotion to full professor, and comprehensive periodic evaluation) a comprehensive report of their teaching that details a variety of methods, artifacts, and data.

This report *must* fully address tier one activities:

- The faculty member’s narrative description and self-assessment of their teaching
 - The narrative will identify teaching workload, course modalities (i.e. face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, blended....), and course designations (service learning, structured field, accelerated graduate course, etc.).
 - Through the narrative, faculty will describe how their teaching helps to develop and promote core characteristics from the opening paragraph above (academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice, as well as proficiency with technology and best practices in education).

- Further, the narrative must provide evidence describing the development of students' learning, including syllabi, sample course assignments, *and* samples of student work, plus, if applicable, other course documents/products/artifacts that illustrate quality in teaching.
- Discussion of student course evaluations. The overall rating across all courses should average at least 4.0 out of 5.0 over the period of review. For ratings less than 4.0 out of 5.0, faculty should discuss specific actions for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns. Faculty should be sure that student course evaluations and students' comments for all courses are uploaded to FPT.
- Peer observations of teaching are required by Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching (utrgv.edu). Please see teaching evaluation forms in the reference and resource page.

Faculty *must also* present additional supporting evidence of tier two activities to develop a case for the quality of teaching including in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported narratives of the following areas:

- Self-improvement, study, or professional development to advance teaching.
- Teaching awards
- Blueprinting courses
- Innovation in instructional approaches
- Innovation in use of technology
- Evidence of assessment aligned to student learning outcomes
- Student needs assessments/asset mapping
- Supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.
- Extensive mentoring
- Program revision
- New course development
- Significant revision of existing courses
- Broader impacts on the field, such as through publishing textbooks or other instructional resources (scholarship specifically related to teaching and learning may also be mentioned to further develop a case for quality in teaching)

The list of items above is not meant as a superficial check list of items to be addressed or counted. Rather, the list of items above is intended as a menu of possible directions for in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of quality teaching. To be clear, a table or "list" that briefly addresses many or all items above is not what the menu above suggests. Instead, the menu of items above should lead faculty toward (a few to several) in-depth areas to document teaching quality. As examples of in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas, faculty might (1) provide a rationale for participating in self-study or professional development along with discussions of what they learned and implemented, (2) link an item above in ways that demonstrate clear and substantial learning outcomes they document, (3) link peer observations and associated peer interactions to meaningful growth and student achievement in items related to teaching at classroom or program-level, or (4) link professional teaching activities in the menu above to student learning outcomes and gains. Other ways of providing in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of teaching

quality teaching are also acceptable. The preceding enumerated items are but examples of how to document quality teaching.

For Third Year Review:

In their narratives, assistant professors completing third year review must *provide evidence of emerging teaching quality* by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least one tier two activity.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

In their narratives, assistant professors applying for tenure and promotion must *provide evidence of teaching quality* by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least two tier two activities.

For Promotion to Full Professor:

In their narratives, associate professors applying for promotion to full professor must *provide clear and consistent evidence of teaching quality* by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least three tier two activities, one of which must include teaching, supervision, course or program development, or leadership at the graduate level. Tier two areas of teaching should be developed across and throughout the review period.

For Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation:

In their narratives, tenured professors undergoing comprehensive periodic evaluation must *provide sustained evidence of teaching quality* by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least three tier two activities. Tier two activities of teaching should be developed across and throughout the review period.

RESEARCH

The Teaching and Learning Department aims to produce impactful research that advances knowledge and understanding in teaching, curriculum, teacher education, and other related fields. Faculty work to expand the reach of their scholarship and to significantly contribute to their fields. The department values a broad range of scholarship, but emphasizes research published in high quality, peer-reviewed national and international journals. As faculty advance in rank, markers of quality such as acceptance rate, Scimago rating, and citations of one's work by other scholars become increasingly important in considerations for promotion. See Appendix E for how to represent in-process research in different stages of acceptance and details delineating counting publications for the period under review.

Grant funding, both external and internal, is also valued. Faculty may substitute grants for publishing, depending on the particular circumstances and limitations explained below. Grants are counted only during and for the year they are awarded. For example, for a faculty member going up for tenure and promotion, a \$50,000 external grant can substitute for only one journal article publication, regardless of how many years the grant is in effect. Specific substitutions are listed under research at each faculty action level. Publication credit for grants is contingent upon the evidence presented for the faculty member's responsibilities within the grant.

The Teaching and Learning Department offers differentiated workload options for tenured and tenure-track faculty (see Appendix B for general percentages for each workload). This differentiated workload system maximizes faculty strengths, interests, and circumstances at different times in their careers (see U.T. System Regents' Rule 31006 and UTRGV H.O.P. ADM 06-501). This differentiated workload system creates varying standards, as explained below, for different promotion and evaluation actions. The department offers three different workload options: a "research" workload, a "balanced" workload, and a "teaching" workload:

"Research" workload – faculty will teach approximately between 30 and 40% of workload (See Appendix B), including the following 1/1 graduate courses, 2/2 UG courses, or combinations. Gratis or teach out sections will not be included in workload. Tenured faculty who maintain a research workload over a 6-year review period will produce a minimum total of 10 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, plus 10 other scholarly products. Tenure-track faculty are only eligible for a research workload during years 4-6 of their tenure track, and they must produce a minimum total of 5 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, plus 5 other scholarly products during those three years.

"Balanced" workload – faculty will teach approximately 60% of workload (See Appendix B), 2/2 graduate courses, 3/3 UG courses, 2/3 mixed graduate and UG loads, or 3/3 loads including mixed loads (2 UG courses/1 graduate course). Gratis or teach out courses will not be included in workload. Tenure track or tenure track faculty who maintain a balanced workload over a 6-year review period will produce a minimum total of 6 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, plus 6 other scholarly products.

"Teaching" workload – faculty will teach approximately between 70 and 80% (See Appendix B), including 4/4 UG courses, 3/3 graduate courses, and combinations including 3 UG courses and one graduate course across semesters. A teaching workload is not available for tenure track-faculty; only tenured faculty are eligible for a teaching workload. Tenured-faculty on a teaching workload will produce a minimum of 2 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, plus 2 other scholarly products every 6 years. Emblematic of Teaching and Learning's support for the University's aspirations to greater research production and R1 status, a teaching workload's research production does *not* provide a pathway to full professor. For faculty on a teaching workload who apply to full professor, research production levels must equal those of a balanced load.

All tenure-track faculty work on a "balanced" workload during their first 3 years on tenure track. If they (a) have produced at least 5 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter publications during those first three years, (b) at least one of those publications appears in a Q1 or Q2 rated peer-reviewed journal, and (c) their student evaluations approximate the department average (for example, between 4.35-4.60/5.0), those faculty can request through the Department Chair one course release per semester to enact a "research" workload during years 4-6 of their tenure track. In consultation with the Department Chair and as long as they meet all the conditions (a, b, and c above), faculty can switch between a "balanced" and a "research" workload at any time during years 4-6 of their tenure track.

Upon earning tenure, tenured faculty will be assigned a “balanced” workload, unless, in consultation with the Department Chair, faculty select a “teaching” workload or a “research” workload. At any time during the timeframe for comprehensive periodic evaluation, tenured faculty may, in consultation with the Department Chair and provided they have demonstrated in advance the requisite research productivity, move from a “teaching” to a “balanced” workload or from a “balanced” to a “research” workload. *However*, faculty may only switch from a “research” to a “balanced” workload or from a “balanced” to a “teaching” workload during the first year of a comprehensive periodic evaluation timeframe. Faculty may not switch to a workload requiring more teaching and less research after the first year of a comprehensive periodic evaluation timeframe. (The *only exception* that can be made will be in the first year of implementation of this new document, for faculty who articulated desire to be on a teaching load during the approval process for this document and whose role was primarily a teaching role during that time.)

For Third-Year Review while on Tenure-track: All tenure-track faculty will submit materials for third-year review for a “balanced” workload (tenure-track faculty only have the possibility of earning a “research” workload beginning in year 4 of tenure track). However, since third year review comes at the beginning of year three and application for tenure is at the beginning of year six, faculty’s progress should be roughly 40% towards meeting the standard for, at minimum, a balanced workload. Minimum publications to meet expectations at third year review should be two peer-reviewed publications and 2 “other” forms of scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conference presentations; competitive internally and externally funded grants (as PI or Co-PI) of more than \$10K but less than \$50K; peer-reviewed conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journals; and regional, state, and local conferences.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: Faculty applying for tenure and promotion to associate professor must demonstrate achievement in scholarship and creative activities that establishes the faculty member as a potentially significant contributor to the field and profession. Faculty will provide clear and consistent evidence of the expanding reach of their scholarship. Additionally, in their narrative, faculty will explain in detail how their scholarship and creative activities meet and exceed the specific criteria listed below (see Appendix C: Faculty narratives).

Specific criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor:

1. Faculty must produce scholarship in two broad categories
 - a) Faculty will publish a minimum of 6 peer-reviewed publications during the tenure-track period (books, journal articles in national/international journals, or book chapters). Two of these 6 peer-reviewed publications may be book chapters.
 - b) Faculty are also expected to produce an additional 6 forms of “other” scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conference presentations; competitive internally and externally funded grants (as PI or Co-PI) of more than \$10K but less than \$50K; peer-reviewed conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journals; and regional, state, and local conferences.
2. Faculty scholarship must show at least one sustained line of inquiry.

3. At least 1 of the peer-reviewed publications (from #1a above) must be in a journal with an acceptance rate of 30% or less or a Scimago rating of Q1 or Q2.
4. Faculty must be single or lead author on at least 2 peer-reviewed publications (from #1a above).
5. External grant funding (as PI or Co-PI) is also valued. Externally funded grants of \$50K or greater may substitute for one peer-reviewed journal article publication (but not counting the selectivity requirement in #3 above). Multiple funded external grant dollars may be combined to reach this funding milestone. Only one journal article may be substituted for grants when applying for tenure and promotion to associate professor, even if the grant funding exceeds \$50K. Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal.
6. Single-authored books will substitute for up to 3 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books by 2 coauthors will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications (for each coauthor in the department). Books by 3 or more coauthors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coauthor in the department). No authored books substitute for the selectivity requirement in #3 above. Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
7. Single-edited books will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books with 2 or more coeditors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coeditor in the department). No edited books substitute for the selectivity requirement in #3 above. Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
8. To further develop a case for tenure, faculty *may also* show quality in other ways, such as through winning research awards, through large amounts of citations of their work, and/or that their work has influenced other scholars in their field or produced practical effects in their field. However, this extra evidence does not substitute for criteria #1-3 above.

For Promotion to Full Professor: Faculty must meet one of two different sets of criteria for promotion to full professor, depending on their workload. Criteria only exist for balanced and research workloads. There are no criteria for teaching workloads; if faculty choose a teaching workload, they must still complete the research requirements for at least a balanced workload. Thus, faculty planning to apply for promotion to full professor are strongly encouraged to select either a balanced or a research workload.

Faculty applying for promotion to the rank of “full” professor must demonstrate achievement in scholarship and creative activities which establishes the faculty member as a significant contributor to the field and the profession. Faculty will provide clear and consistent evidence of the sustained reach of their scholarship. Additionally, in their narrative, faculty will explain in detail how their scholarship and creative activities meet and exceed the specific criteria listed below.

For promotion to full, “research load”: Standards in this subsection directly below are relevant to faculty applying for promotion to full professor under a “research workload.”

1. Faculty must produce scholarship in two broad categories:
 - a. Publish a minimum of 10 peer-reviewed publications (books, journal articles in national/international journals, or book chapters) over the period of review. Four of these publications may be book chapters.
 - b. Faculty are also expected to produce, over the period of review, an additional 10 forms of “other” scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conferences; competitive internally and externally funded grants (as PI or Co-PI) of more than \$10K but less than \$50K; conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journals; and regional, state, and local conferences.
2. Faculty scholarship must show at least one sustained line of inquiry.
3. At least 5 of the peer-reviewed publications (from #1a above) must be in a journal with an acceptance rate of 30% or less or a Scimago rating of Q1 or Q2.
4. Faculty must be single or lead author on at least 5 peer-reviewed publications (from #1a above).
5. Single-authored books will substitute for up to 3 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books by 2 coauthors will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications (for each coauthor in the department). Books by 3 or more coauthors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coauthor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
6. Single-edited books will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books with 2 or more coeditors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coeditor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
7. External grant funding (as PI or co-PI) is also valued. Funded external grants of \$100K or greater may substitute for one peer-reviewed journal article publication. Funded external grants of \$200K or greater may substitute for 2 journal articles or book chapter publications. Funded external grants of \$500K or greater may substitute for 3 journal articles or book chapter publications. Multiple funded grant dollars may be combined to reach these milestones. Regardless of amounts rewarded, 3 substitutions are the maximum allowance of substitutions for peer-reviewed publications. Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal. No grants may substitute for the selectivity requirements indicated in #3 above.
8. Faculty ***must also*** show quality in other ways, such as through winning research awards, through citations of their work by other scholars, and/or that their work has influenced other scholars in their field or produced practical effects in their field. However, this extra evidence does not substitute for #1-3 above.

For promotion to full, “balanced load”: Standards in this subsection directly below are relevant to faculty applying for promotion to full professor under a “balanced workload.”

1. Faculty must produce scholarship in two broad categories:

- a) Publish a minimum of 6 peer-reviewed publications (books, journal articles in national/international journals, or book chapters) as an associate professor. Two of these 6 peer-reviewed publications may be book chapters.
 - a) Faculty are also expected to produce, as an associate professor, an additional 6 forms of “other” scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conference presentations; competitive internally and externally funded grants (as PI or Co-PI) of more than \$10K but less than \$50K; peer-reviewed conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journals; and regional, state, and local conferences.
2. Faculty scholarship must show at least one sustained line of inquiry.
3. At least 3 of the peer-reviewed publications (from #1a above) must be in a journal with an acceptance rate of 30% or less or a Scimago rating of Q1 or Q2.
4. Faculty must be single or lead author on at least 3 peer-reviewed publications (from #1a above).
5. Single-authored books will substitute for up to 3 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books by 2 coauthors will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications (for each coauthor in the department). Books by 3 or more coauthors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coauthor in the department). No authored books substitute for the selectivity requirement in #3 above. Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
6. Single-edited books will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books with 2 or more coeditors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coeditor in the department). No edited books substitute for the selectivity requirement in #3 above. Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
7. External grant funding (as PI or co-PI) is also valued. Funded external grants of \$100K or greater may substitute for one peer-reviewed journal article publication. Funded external grants of \$200K or greater may substitute for 2 journal articles or book chapter publications. Funded external grants of \$500K or greater may substitute for 3 journal articles or book chapter publications. Multiple funded grant dollars may be combined to reach these milestones. Regardless of amounts rewarded, 3 substitutions are the maximum allowance of substitutions for peer-reviewed publications. Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal. No grants may substitute for the selectivity requirements indicated in #3 above.
8. Faculty ***must also*** show quality in other ways, such as through winning research awards, through citations of their work by other scholars, and/or that their work has influenced other scholars in their field or produced practical effects in their field. However, this extra evidence does not substitute for #1-3 above.

For Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation: Following Regents’ Rules, Rule 31102, the Teaching and Learning Department conducts a comprehensive periodic evaluation every 6 years for tenured faculty. Comprehensive periodic evaluation provides faculty with meaningful feedback and guidance, and it acknowledges the range of work performed by tenured faculty.

Specific criteria for meeting expectations for comprehensive periodic evaluation for tenured faculty on a “*research*” workload:

1. Faculty must produce scholarship in two broad categories:
 - a. Publish a minimum of 10 peer-reviewed publications (books, journal articles in national/international journals, or book chapters) over the period of review.
 - b. Faculty are also expected to produce, over the period of review, an additional 10 forms of “other” scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conferences; competitive internally and externally funded grants (as PI or Co-PI) of more than \$10K but less than \$50K; conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journals; and regional, state, and local conferences.
2. Single-authored books will substitute for up to 3 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books by 2 coauthors will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications (for each coauthor in the department). Books by 3 or more coauthors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coauthor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
3. Single-edited books will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books with 2 or more coeditors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coeditor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
4. External grant funding (as PI or co-PI) is also valued. Funded external grants of \$200K or greater may substitute for one peer-reviewed journal article publication. Funded external grants of \$500K or greater may substitute for 2 journal articles or book chapter publications. Funded external grants of \$1 million or greater may substitute for 3 journal articles or book chapter publications. Multiple funded grant dollars may be combined to reach these milestones. Regardless of amounts rewarded, 3 substitutions are the maximum allowance of substitutions for peer-reviewed publications. Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal.
5. To further develop a case for meeting or exceeding expectations for comprehensive periodic review, faculty *may also* show the quality of their scholarship in other ways, such as through winning research awards, through large amounts of citations of their work, and/or that their work has influenced other scholars in their field or produced practical effects in their field.

Specific criteria for meeting expectations for comprehensive periodic evaluation for tenured faculty on a “*balanced*” workload:

1. Faculty must produce scholarship in two broad categories:
 - a) Publish a minimum of 6 peer-reviewed publications (books, journal articles in national/international journals, or book chapters) over the period of review.
 - b) Faculty are also expected to produce, over the period of review, an additional 6 forms of “other” scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conferences; competitive internally and externally funded grants (as PI or Co-PI) of more than \$10K but less than \$50K; conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journals; and regional, state, and local conferences.

2. Single-authored books will substitute for up to 3 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books by 2 coauthors will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications (for each coauthor in the department). Books by 3 or more coauthors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coauthor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
3. Single-edited books will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books with 2 or more coeditors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coeditor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
4. External grant funding (as PI or co-PI) is also valued. Funded external grants of \$200K or greater may substitute for one peer-reviewed journal article publication. Funded external grants of \$500K or greater may substitute for 2 journal articles or book chapter publications. Funded external grants of \$1 million or greater may substitute for 3 journal articles or book chapter publications. Multiple funded grant dollars may be combined to reach these milestones. Regardless of amounts rewarded, 3 substitutions are the maximum allowance of substitutions for peer-reviewed publications. Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal.
5. To further develop a case for meeting or exceeding expectations for comprehensive periodic evaluation, faculty *may also* show the quality of their scholarship in other ways, such as through winning research awards, through large amounts of citations of their work, and/or that their work has influenced other scholars in their field or produced practical effects in their field.

Specific criteria for meeting expectations for comprehensive periodic evaluation for tenured faculty on a “teaching” workload:

1. Faculty must produce scholarship in two broad categories:
 - a. Publish a minimum of 2 peer-reviewed publications (books, journal articles in national/international journals, or book chapters) over the period of review.
 - b. Faculty are also expected to produce, over the period of review, an additional 2 forms of “other” scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conferences; competitive internally and externally funded grants (as PI or Co-PI) of more than \$10K but less than \$50K; conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journals; and regional, state, and local conferences.
2. Single-authored books will substitute for up to 3 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books by 2 coauthors will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications (for each coauthor in the department). Books by 3 or more coauthors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coauthor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
3. Single-edited books will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books with 2 or more coeditors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coeditor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.

4. External grant funding (as PI or co-PI) is also valued. Funded external grants of \$200K or greater may substitute for one peer-reviewed journal article publication. Funded external grants of \$500K or greater may substitute for 2 journal articles or book chapter publications. Funded external grants of \$1 million or greater may substitute for 3 journal articles or book chapter publications. Multiple funded grant dollars may be combined to reach these milestones. Regardless of amounts rewarded, 3 substitutions are the maximum allowance of substitutions for peer-reviewed publications. Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal.
5. To further develop a case for meeting or exceeding expectations for comprehensive periodic evaluation, faculty *may also* show the quality of their scholarship in other ways, such as through winning research awards, through large amounts of citations of their work, and/or that their work has influenced other scholars in their field or produced practical effects in their field.

SERVICE

Service is a necessary and important part of faculty work. Faculty service provides a wide range of functions: it helps the department, college, and university to effectively and efficiently operate; it cultivates faculty leadership capacity; it supports students in a variety of ways; it develops the professional field; it strengthens the community; and more. As faculty progress in their careers, they are expected to perform service in increasing numbers of areas, to assume leadership roles in their service, and to develop a theme or purpose for their service. This means that faculty are not expected to perform service randomly or haphazardly, but instead to develop a coherent service trajectory or path through which they might gain useful experience and contribute expertise through their service. Faculty narratives should also emphasize quality of service rather than a simple tallying of activities. Effort in service matters, but expertise, significance, and leadership provide more sustained benefit.

As a note, faculty across load types retain a 20% service workload; therefore, service expectations are the same. The few faculty members with a 10% service workload have appointments with the Dean's Office, and those few have increased opportunities to lead through service projects from those positions. For these reasons mentioned in this note, service performance across ranks follows a single standard differentiated at each decision point.

The Teaching & Learning Department divides service into five different areas: (1) department, (2) college, (3) university, (4) professional field, and (5) community. The possibilities for service in these areas are too numerous to precisely and exhaustively list. But, in the attempt to provide a sense of the possibilities, the following presents a short, non-comprehensive list of potential examples of service in each of the five areas above.

Department service examples include but are not limited to:

- department committee work (e.g., faculty search committees, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)

- program support (e.g., syllabus revision, social media maintenance, faculty mentoring, etc.)
- TExES review (e.g., PPR workshops, content area review workshops, etc.)
- course leadership (e.g., course lead, course blueprinting, etc.)
- program leadership (e.g., program coordinator, recruitment, etc.)

College service examples include but are not limited to:

- accreditation work
- Equal Opportunity Liaison (EOL).
- advising/sponsoring student organizations
- college committees (e.g., curriculum committee, college council, etc.)
- college workgroups and/or task forces (e.g., policy revisions, policy development, design teams, etc.)

University service examples include but are not limited to:

- university standing committees, councils, workgroups, and/or task forces (e.g., review committee, policy development or revision, etc.)
- Women's Faculty Network (e.g., active member, standing committee officer, executive team, etc.)
- faculty senate (e.g., elected representative, standing committee member, elected officer, etc.)
- IRB representative and reviewer
- Faculty Fellow

Professional field service examples include but are not limited to:

- manuscript and/or conference proposal review
- editorial activities for publications (e.g., review of manuscripts, editor of special issue or book, editor of journal, etc.)
- professional organization committee work (e.g., conference site coordinator, conference program committee, etc.)
- contributing expertise (e.g., Site visit evaluator, Consulting, invited keynote speaker, etc.)
- leadership in professional organizations (e.g., elected officer, chair of committee, etc.)

Community service examples include but are not limited to:

- judging, mentoring, and/or advising at events such as science and history fairs
- local school or educational organization support and/or training (e.g., providing professional development for practitioners, consulting, fundraising events for programming, volunteering time and expertise, etc.)
- work with local, state, and/or national civic organizations related to education (e.g., serving on boards, committees, etc.)
- organizing/leading/coordinating education related community events (e.g., summer institute or camps, etc.)
- leadership role in community organization related to education

For Third Year Review

In their narratives, assistant professors completing third year review are expected to provide *evidence of emerging service* in at least *three of the five areas*, one of which must include service to the department. These multiple areas of service should be developed across and throughout the review period. Assistant professors are expected to provide evidence of a developing theme or purpose to their service (much like faculty develop a theme or thread to their research), as well as provide evidence of the impact and level of engagement in their service. Further, assistant professors completing their year review must present *evidence of emerging leadership* in service activities.

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

In their narratives, assistant professors applying for tenure and promotion are expected to provide *clear evidence* of service in at least *three of the five areas*, one of which must include service to the department. These multiple areas of service should be developed across and throughout the review period. Assistant professors are expected to provide evidence of a developing theme or purpose to their service (much like faculty develop a theme or thread to their research), as well as provide evidence of the impact and level of engagement in their service. Further, assistant professors applying for tenure and promotion must present *clear evidence of developing leadership* in service activities.

For Promotion to Full Professor:

In their narratives, associate professors applying for promotion to full professor are expected to provide *clear and consistent evidence* of service in at least *four areas*, two of which must include service to the department and service to the profession. These multiple areas of service should be developed across and throughout the review period. Associate professors are expected to provide evidence of a theme or purpose to their service (much like faculty develop a theme or thread to their research), as well as provide evidence of the impact and level of engagement in their service. Further, associate professors applying for promotion must present *clear and consistent evidence of leadership* in service activities.

For Comprehensive periodic evaluation:

For comprehensive periodic evaluation, tenured faculty are expected to provide, in their narratives, *clear sustained evidence* of service in at least *three of the five areas*, one of which must include service to the department. This does not mean that tenured faculty are required to provide evidence of service in all three areas every year. Instead, these multiple areas of service should be developed across and throughout the review period. Tenured faculty are expected to provide evidence of a theme or purpose to their service (much like faculty develop a theme or thread to their research), as well as provide evidence of the impact and level of engagement in their service. Further, tenured faculty must present *sustained evidence of leadership* in service activities.

Teaching & Learning Department Promotion Standards for Lecturers

TEACHING

Quality teaching is foundational to the Teaching and Learning Department. Teaching in this department is expected to demonstrate academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice. Additionally, we value proficiency with and integration of educational technology and best practices in education. Because the department wants all students in all classes to receive the best teaching possible, these standards apply to but are also differentiated by faculty designation and rank.

We also recognize that the quality of a faculty member's teaching is not easily or simply described. Different perspectives and points of view reveal important information about the quality of one's teaching, but by themselves can be incomplete. Thus, because no panoptic view of teaching exists and focusing on one viewpoint of teaching may not be effective, teaching must be described thoroughly, holistically, and from multiple viewpoints and dimensions.

This means lecturers across ranks *must build throughout their career* and present at each decision point a comprehensive report of their teaching that details a variety of methods, artifacts, and data.

This report *must* fully address tier one activities:

- The faculty member's narrative description and self-assessment of their teaching
 - The narrative will identify teaching workload, course modalities (i.e. face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, blended...), and course designations (service learning, structured field, accelerated graduate course, etc.).
 - Through the narrative, faculty will describe how their teaching helps to develop and promote core characteristics from the opening paragraph above (academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice, as well as proficiency with technology and best practices in education).
 - Further, the narrative must provide evidence describing the development of students' learning, including syllabi, sample course assignments, *and* samples of student work, plus, if applicable, other course documents/products/artifacts that illustrate quality in teaching.
- Discussion of student course evaluations. The overall rating across all courses should average at least 4.0 out of 5.0 over the period of review. For ratings less than 4.0 out of 5.0, faculty should discuss specific actions for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns. Faculty should be sure that student course evaluations and students' comments for all courses are uploaded to FPT.
- Peer observations of teaching (as required by [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching \(utrgv.edu\)](#)). Please see teaching evaluation forms in the reference and resource page below.

Faculty *must also* present additional supporting evidence of tier two activities to develop a case for the quality of teaching including in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported narratives of the following areas:

- Self-improvement, study, or professional development to advance teaching.
- Teaching awards
- Blueprinting courses
- Innovation in instructional approaches
- Innovation in use of technology
- Evidence of assessment aligned to student learning outcomes
- Student needs assessments/asset mapping
- Supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.
- Extensive mentoring
- Program revision
- New course development
- Significant revision of existing courses
- Broader impacts on the field, such as through publishing textbooks or other instructional resources (scholarship specifically related to teaching and learning may also be mentioned to further develop a case for quality in teaching)

The list of items above is not meant as a superficial check list of items to be addressed or counted. Rather, the list of items above is intended as a menu of possible directions for in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of quality teaching. To be clear, a table or “list” that briefly addresses many or all items above is not what the menu above suggests. Instead, the menu of items above should lead faculty toward (a few to several) in-depth areas to document teaching quality. As examples of in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas, faculty might (1) provide a rationale for participating in self-study or professional development along with discussions of what they learned and implemented, (2) link an item above in ways that demonstrate clear and substantial learning outcomes they document, (3) link peer observations and associated peer interactions to meaningful growth and student achievement in items related to teaching at classroom or program-level, or (4) link professional teaching activities in the menu above to student learning outcomes and gains. Other ways of providing in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of teaching quality teaching are also acceptable. The preceding enumerated items are but examples of how to document quality teaching.

For Promotion to Lecturer II:

In their narratives, Lecturers going up for promotion to Lecturer II must *provide evidence of teaching quality* by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least two tier two activities. Tier two areas of teaching should be developed across and throughout the review period.

For Promotion to Lecturer III:

In their narratives, Lecturer IIs going up for promotion to Lecturer III must provide *clear and consistent evidence* of teaching quality by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least three tier two activities. Tier two areas of teaching should be developed across and throughout the review period.

For Promotion to Senior Lecturer:

In their narratives, Lecturer IIIs going up for promotion to Senior Lecturer must provide *clear and sustained evidence* of quality teaching by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least four tier two activities. Tier two areas of teaching should be developed across and throughout the review period.

SERVICE

Service is a necessary and important part of faculty work. Faculty service provides a wide range of functions: it helps the department, college, and university to effectively and efficiently operate; it cultivates faculty leadership capacity; it supports students in a variety of ways; it develops the professional field; it strengthens the community; and more. As faculty progress in their careers, they are expected to perform service in increasing numbers of areas, to assume leadership roles in their service, and to develop a theme or purpose for their service. This means that faculty are not expected to perform service randomly or haphazardly, but instead to develop a coherent service trajectory or path through which they might gain useful experience and contribute expertise through their service. Faculty narratives should also emphasize quality of service rather than a simple tallying of activities. Effort in service matters, but expertise, significance, and leadership provide more sustained benefit.

The Teaching & Learning Department divides service into five different areas: (1) department, (2) college, (3) university, (4) professional field, and (5) community. The possibilities for service in these areas are too numerous to precisely and exhaustively list. But, in the attempt to provide a sense of the possibilities, the following presents a short, non-comprehensive list of potential examples of service in each of the five areas above.

Department service examples include but are not limited to:

- department committee work (e.g., faculty search committees, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)
- program support (e.g., syllabus revision, social media maintenance, faculty mentoring, etc.)
- TExES review (e.g., PPR workshops, content area review workshops, etc.)
- course leadership (e.g., course lead, course blueprinting, etc.)
- program leadership (e.g., program coordinator, recruitment, etc.)

College service examples include but are not limited to:

- accreditation work
- Equal Opportunity Liaison (EOL).
- advising/sponsoring student organizations
- college committees (e.g., curriculum committee, college council, etc.)
- college workgroups and/or task forces (e.g., policy revisions, policy development, design teams, etc.)

University service examples include but are not limited to:

- university standing committees, councils, workgroups, and/or task forces (e.g., review committee, policy development or revision, etc.)
- Women's Faculty Network (e.g., active member, standing committee officer, executive team, etc.)
- faculty senate (e.g., elected representative, standing committee member, elected officer, etc.)
- IRB representative and reviewer
- Faculty Fellow

Professional field service examples include but are not limited to:

- manuscript and/or conference proposal review
- editorial activities for publications (e.g., review of manuscripts, editor of special issue or book, editor of journal, etc.)
- professional organization committee work (e.g., conference site coordinator, conference program committee, etc.)
- contributing expertise (e.g., Site visit evaluator, Consulting, invited keynote speaker, etc.)
- leadership in professional organizations (e.g., elected officer, chair of committee, etc.)

Community service examples include but are not limited to:

- judging, mentoring, and/or advising at events such as science and history fairs
- local school or educational organization support and/or training (e.g., providing professional development for practitioners, consulting, fundraising events for programming, volunteering time and expertise, etc.)
- work with local, state, and/or national civic organizations related to education (e.g., serving on boards, committees, etc.)
- organizing/leading/coordinating education related community events (e.g., summer institute or camps, etc.)
- leadership role in community organization related to education

For Promotion to Lecturer II:

In their narrative, lecturers applying for Lecturer II positions are expected to provide evidence of service in at least two areas, one of which must include service to the department. They should also provide evidence of the impact and level of engagement of their service.

For Promotion to Lecturer III:

In their narrative, Lecturer II faculty who apply for Lecturer III positions are expected to provide evidence of service in at least two areas, one of which must include service to the department. Lecturer II faculty are also expected to provide *clear evidence* of the impact and level of engagement in their service, as well as *developing leadership* in service.

For Promotion to Senior Lecturer:

In their narrative, Lecturer III faculty who apply for Senior Lecturer positions are expected to provide evidence of service in at least three areas, one of which must include service to the

department. Lecturer III faculty are also expected to provide *strong and well-documented evidence* of the impact and level of engagement in their service, as well as *sustained evidence of leadership* in service.

Teaching & Learning Department Promotion Standards for Professors of Practice

TEACHING

Quality teaching is foundational to the Teaching and Learning Department. Teaching in this department is expected to demonstrate academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice. Additionally, we value proficiency with and integration of educational technology and best practices in education. Because the department wants all students in all classes to receive the best teaching possible, these standards apply to but are also differentiated by faculty designation and rank.

We also recognize that the quality of a faculty member's teaching is not easily or simply described. Different perspectives and points of view reveal important information about the quality of one's teaching, but by themselves can be incomplete. Thus, because no panoptic view of teaching exists and focusing on one viewpoint of teaching may not be effective, teaching must be described thoroughly, holistically, and from multiple viewpoints and dimensions.

This means that professor of practice across ranks *must build throughout their career* and present at each decision point a comprehensive report of their teaching that details a variety of methods, artifacts, and data.

This report *must* fully address tier one activities:

- The faculty member's narrative description and self-assessment of their teaching
 - The narrative will identify teaching workload, course modalities (i.e. face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, blended...), and course designations (service learning, structured field, accelerated graduate course, etc.).
 - Through the narrative, faculty will describe how their teaching helps to develop and promote core characteristics from the opening paragraph above (academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice, as well as proficiency with technology and best practices in education).
 - Further, the narrative must provide evidence describing the development of students' learning, including syllabi, sample course assignments, *and* samples of student work, plus, if applicable, other course documents/products/artifacts that illustrate quality in teaching.
- Discussion of student course evaluations. The overall rating across all courses should average at least 4.0 out of 5.0 over the period of review. For ratings less than 4.0 out of 5.0, faculty should discuss specific actions for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns. Faculty should be sure that student course evaluations and students' comments for all courses are uploaded to FPT.
- Evidence of teaching excellence in field supervision and teaching students in the field.

- Peer observations of teaching (as required by Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching (utrgv.edu)). Please see teaching evaluation forms in the reference and resource page below.

Faculty *must also* present additional supporting evidence of tier two activities to develop a case for the quality of teaching including in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported narratives of the following areas:

- Self-improvement, study, or professional development to advance teaching.
- Evidence of teaching excellence in organizing field activities for other field supervisor and students
- Teaching awards
- Blueprinting courses
- Innovation in instructional approaches
- Innovation in use of technology
- Evidence of assessment aligned to student learning outcomes
- Student needs assessments/asset mapping
- Supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.
- Extensive mentoring
- Program revision
- New course development
- Significant revision of existing courses
- Broader impacts on the field, such as through publishing textbooks or other instructional resources (scholarship specifically related to teaching and learning may also be mentioned to further develop a case for quality in teaching)

The list of items above is not meant as a superficial check list of items to be addressed or counted. Rather, the list of items above is intended as a menu of possible directions for in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of quality teaching. To be clear, a table or “list” that briefly addresses many or all items above is not what the menu above suggests. Instead, the menu of items above should lead faculty toward (a few to several) in-depth areas to document teaching quality. As examples of in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas, faculty might (1) provide a rationale for participating in self-study or professional development along with discussions of what they learned and implemented, (2) link an item above in ways that demonstrate clear and substantial learning outcomes they document, (3) link peer observations and associated peer interactions to meaningful growth and student achievement in items related to teaching at classroom or program-level, or (4) link professional teaching activities in the menu above to learning outcomes in field supervision and teaching. Other ways of providing in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of teaching quality teaching are also acceptable. The preceding enumerated items are but examples of how to document quality teaching.

*Note that professors of practice, across ranks, all have an 80% teaching workload. Therefore, professors of practice across ranks have the same teaching standards despite “applied” and “academic” designations.

For Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice:

In their narratives, Professors of Practice going up for Associate Professor of Practice must *provide evidence of teaching quality* by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least two tier two activities. Tier two areas of teaching should be developed across and throughout the review period.

For Promotion to Full Professor of Practice:

In their narratives, Associate Professors of Practice going up for Full Professor of Practice must provide *clear and consistent evidence* of teaching quality by fully addressing all tier one requirements and at least three tier two activities. Tier two areas of teaching should be developed across and throughout the review period.

RESEARCH

Two workloads are available to assistant, associate, and professors of practice: an “applied” workload and an “academic” workload (see Appendix B). An “applied” workload does not contain a research component, whereas an “academic” workload does contain one. Assistant, associate, and professors of practice may apply for an “academic” workload after three years of service on an “applied” workload. Further, in order to qualify for an “academic” workload, professor of practice must present evidence of successful publishing prior to being assigned an academic workload. This process helps ensure that faculty will succeed on the academic workload track.

Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors of Practice with an “academic” workload have only 10% dedicated to research. The greater portion of their job is dedicate to teaching, teaching in the field, service, and service related organizing and supervising field sites. The amount of research required under the “academic” workload, per tenure and promotion is not incremental, but instead assumes a steady stream of research production or grant supports that constitute reflective practices in undergraduate programs, with a special focus on organizing, supporting, and teaching in field sites. As a note, Professors of Practice with an “applied” workload are not required to do research and, therefore, there is no research standard for that faculty workload designation.

If faculty select an “academic” workload, they must satisfy the following criteria during each 3-year period of review (see Appendix E for guidelines on representing research in different stages of review):

1. Publish a minimum of 1 peer-reviewed publication (book, journal article in a national or international journal, or book chapter).
2. Additionally, produce at least 1 other form of scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conference presentation; competitive internally and externally funded grant (as PI or Co-PI) of more than \$10K but less than \$50K; conference proceeding; regional, state, and practitioner journal article; or regional, state, and local conferences.
3. Single-authored books will substitute for up to 3 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books by 2 coauthors will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal

- article publications (for each coauthor in the department). Books by 3 or more coauthors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coauthor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
4. Single-edited books will substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal article publications. Books with 2 or more coeditors will substitute for 1 peer-reviewed journal article publication (for each coeditor in the department). Books must be published by a university-affiliated publisher, a national curriculum or education organization, or a nationally recognized commercial publisher.
 5. External grant funding (as PI or co-PI) is also valued. Funded external grants of \$100K or greater may substitute for one peer-reviewed journal article publication. Funded external grants of \$350K or greater may substitute for 2 journal articles or book chapter publications. Funded external grants of \$700k or greater may substitute for 3 journal articles or book chapter publications. Multiple funded grant dollars may be combined to reach these milestones. Regardless of amounts rewarded, 3 substitutions are the maximum allowance of substitutions for peer-reviewed publications. Grants will be counted only during the review period under which they are procured. Grant renewals will also count newly during the period under which they are procured.

SERVICE

Service is a necessary and important part of faculty work. Faculty service provides a wide range of functions: it helps the department, college, and university to effectively and efficiently operate; it cultivates faculty leadership capacity; it supports students in a variety of ways; it develops the professional field; it strengthens the community; and more. As faculty progress in their careers, they are expected to perform service in increasing numbers of areas, to assume leadership roles in their service, and to develop a theme or purpose for their service. This means that faculty are not expected to perform service randomly or haphazardly, but instead to develop a coherent service trajectory or path through which they might gain useful experience and contribute expertise through their service. Faculty narratives should also emphasize quality of service rather than a simple tallying of activities. Effort in service matters, but expertise, significance, and leadership provide more sustained benefit.

In the case of professors of practice, field supervision of students and site coordination is a central and ongoing activity for faculty hired into this faculty category. Specifically, the job title “professors of practice” is linked to “practice” in undergraduate field experiences, and work in the field is an expected ongoing component of this position. In addition to field requirements under teaching, service in field is also expected across all ranks in our teacher education programs. Appearing under college service below, involvement in field supervision of students and site coordination efforts are essential activities, and leadership and coordination of field sites is the overall intended and required outcome of this category of faculty as they progress through ranks from assistant to full.

The Teaching & Learning Department divides service into five different areas: (1) department, (2) college, (3) university, (4) professional field, and (5) community. The possibilities for service in these areas are too numerous to precisely and exhaustively list. But, in the attempt to provide a sense of the possibilities, the following presents a short, non-comprehensive list of potential examples of service in each of the five areas above.

Department service examples include but are not limited to:

- field activities such as department committees related to field, involvement in program-level field decisions, writing field reports, and other course or program-level field service
- department committee work (e.g., faculty search committees, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)
- program support (e.g., syllabus revision, social media maintenance, faculty mentoring, etc.)
- TExES review (e.g., PPR workshops, content area review workshops, etc.)
- course leadership (e.g., course lead, course blueprinting, etc.)
- program leadership (e.g., program coordinator, recruitment, etc.)

College service examples include but are not limited to:

- field supervision of students
- field site coordination
- providing professional development for other clinical and university field supervisors
- accreditation work
- advising/sponsoring student organizations
- college committees (e.g., curriculum committee, college council, etc.)
- college workgroups and/or task forces (e.g., policy revisions, policy development, design teams, etc.)

University service examples include but are not limited to:

- university standing committees, councils, workgroups, and/or task forces (e.g., review committee, policy development or revision, etc.)
- Women's Faculty Network (e.g., active member, standing committee officer, executive team, etc.)
- faculty senate (e.g., elected representative, standing committee member, elected officer, etc.)
- IRB representative and reviewer
- Faculty Fellow

Professional field service examples include but are not limited to:

- manuscript and/or conference proposal review
- editorial activities for publications (e.g., review of manuscripts, editor of special issue or book, editor of journal, etc.)
- professional organization committee work (e.g., conference site coordinator, conference program committee, etc.)

- contributing expertise (e.g., Site visit evaluator, Consulting, invited keynote speaker, etc.)
- leadership in professional organizations (e.g., elected officer, chair of committee, etc.)

Community service examples include but are not limited to:

- judging, mentoring, and/or advising at events such as science and history fairs
- local school or educational organization support and/or training (e.g., providing professional development for practitioners, consulting, fundraising events for programming, volunteering time and expertise, etc.)
- work with local, state, and/or national civic organizations related to education (e.g., serving on boards, committees, etc.)
- organizing/leading/coordinating education related community events (e.g., summer institute or camps, etc.)
- leadership role in community organization related to education

As a note there is differentiated service for Professors of Practice across ranks according to “applied” and “academic” designations. Professors of Practice designated as “applied” have 20% service as part of their workload. In contrast, Professors of Practice designated as “academic” have 10% service as part of their workload. Therefore, service loads are distinct according to designation.

Assistant, Associate, Professor (*Applied*)

For Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor of Practice:

In their narrative, Assistant Professors of Practice applying for promotion to Associate Professors of Practice are expected to provide evidence of service in at least three areas, two or more of which might include service dedicated to supervision of students and site coordination. Assistant Professors applying for promotion are also expected to provide *clear evidence* of the impact and level of engagement in their service, as well as *developing leadership* in service.

For Promotion from Associate to Full Professor of Practice:

In their narrative, Associate Professor of Practice who apply for Full Professors of Practice are expected to provide evidence of service in at least four areas, three or more of which might include service dedicated to supervision of students, field development and organization, and field coordination. Associate Professors of Practice applying for promotion are also expected to provide *strong and well-documented evidence* of the impact and level of engagement in their service, as well as *sustained evidence of leadership* in service.

Assistant, Associate, Professor (*Academic*)

For Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor of Practice:

In their narrative, Assistant Professors of Practice applying for promotion to Associate Professors of Practice are expected to provide evidence of service in at least two areas, one or more of which might include service dedicated to supervision of students and site coordination. Assistant Professors of Practice applying for promotion are also expected to provide *clear evidence* of the impact and level of engagement in their service, as well as *developing leadership* in service.

For Promotion from Associate to Full Professor of Practice:

In their narrative, Associate Professor of Practice who apply for Full Professors of Practice are expected to provide evidence of service in at least three areas, two or more of which might include service dedicated to supervision of students, field development and organization, and field coordination. Associate Professors applying for promotion are also expected to provide *strong and well-documented evidence* of the impact and level of engagement in their service, as well as *sustained evidence of leadership* in service.

Annual Review Standards for the Teaching & Learning Department

Annual review (AR) has two purposes:

- 1) to demonstrate faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service for the previous academic year (AY), and
- 2) to demonstrate faculty progress towards meeting teaching, research, and service goals for the next decision point (i.e., third year review, tenure and promotion, promotion, or comprehensive periodic evaluation).

For AR, faculty should be sure to update their CV within FPT, and faculty should provide a description of their production for the previous AY in teaching, research, and service. By including an updated CV as well as a description of productivity for the previous AY, faculty review committees, as well as the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost/VPAA, can evaluate and offer feedback for faculty regarding their trajectory towards the next decision point. Annual review ratings will be based on performance for the previous AY, but different levels of review are encouraged to use the faculty member's CV to give feedback to help the faculty member best prepare for the next decision point.

In terms of how a review committee determines an overall rating, the department recommends that review committees use a flexible system. Such as a system might rate two "exceeds" and one "meets" as a combined rating of "exceeds." Yet, a flexible system might also justify an overall rating of "exceeds" if two areas were strong "meets" and the third area was an extremely high "exceeds," such as through winning a prestigious award, producing multiple highly selective and prestigious journal publications, or winning significant external grant funding.

Because the department is committed to hiring the highest quality faculty at all designations and ranks, the department assumes that all faculty will usually earn ratings of meets or exceeds expectations. However, it is possible, of course, for faculty to earn failing ratings of "does not meet expectations" and "unsatisfactory." Any faculty who do not provide evidence of productivity that meets or exceeds standards in an area will earn a rating of "does not meet expectations" for that area. Following Appendix C of HOP ADM 06-503, ratings of "unsatisfactory" are reserved for faculty who "disregard previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, dereliction of duty, or incompetence...or for professional misconduct."

Annual Review Standards for Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty

TEACHING

Quality teaching is foundational to the Teaching and Learning Department. Teaching in this department is expected to demonstrate academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice. Additionally, we value proficiency with and integration of educational technology and best practices in education. Because the department

wants all students in all classes to receive the best teaching possible, these standards apply to but are also differentiated by faculty designation and rank.

We also recognize that the quality of a faculty member's teaching is not easily or simply described. Different perspectives and points of view reveal important information about the quality of one's teaching, but by themselves can be incomplete. Thus, because no panoptic view of teaching exists and focusing on one viewpoint of teaching may not be effective, teaching must be described thoroughly, holistically, and from multiple viewpoints and dimensions.

This means that tenure-track and tenured faculty (both associate and full professor) *must build* a comprehensive report of their teaching that details a variety of methods, artifacts, and data.

This report *must* fully address tier one activities:

- The faculty member's narrative description and self-assessment of their teaching
 - The narrative will identify teaching workload, course modalities (i.e. face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, blended...), and course designations (service learning, structured field, accelerated graduate course, etc.).
 - Through the narrative, faculty will describe how their teaching helps to develop and promote core characteristics from the opening paragraph above (academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice, as well as proficiency with technology and best practices in education).
 - Further, the narrative must provide evidence describing the development of students' learning, including syllabi, sample course assignments, *and* samples of student work, plus, if applicable, other course documents/products/artifacts that illustrate quality in teaching.
- Discussion of student course evaluations. The overall rating across all courses should average at least 4.0 out of 5.0 over the period of review. For ratings less than 4.0 out of 5.0, faculty should discuss specific actions for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns. Faculty should be sure that student course evaluations and students' comments for all courses are uploaded to FPT.
- Peer observations of teaching (as required by [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching \(utrgv.edu\)](http://utrgv.edu)). Please teaching evaluation forms in the reference and resource page below.

Faculty *must also* present additional supporting evidence of tier two activities to develop a case for the quality of teaching including in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported narratives of the following areas:

- Self-improvement, study, or professional development to advance teaching.
- Teaching awards
- Blueprinting courses
- Innovation in instructional approaches
- Innovation in use of technology
- Evidence of assessment aligned to student learning outcomes
- Student needs assessments/asset mapping
- Supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.

- Extensive mentoring
- Program revision
- New course development
- Significant revision of existing courses
- Broader impacts on the field, such as through publishing textbooks or other instructional resources (scholarship specifically related to teaching and learning may also be mentioned to further develop a case for quality in teaching)

The list of items above is not meant as a superficial check list of items to be addressed or counted. Rather, the list of items above is intended as a menu of possible directions for in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of quality teaching. To be clear, a table or “list” that briefly addresses many or all items above is not what the menu above suggests. Instead, the menu of items above should lead faculty toward (a few to several) in-depth areas to document teaching quality. As examples of in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas, faculty might (1) provide a rationale for participating in self-study or professional development along with discussions of what they learned and implemented, (2) link an item above in ways that demonstrate clear and substantial learning outcomes they document, (3) link peer observations and associated peer interactions to meaningful growth and student achievement in items related to teaching at classroom or program-level, or (4) link professional teaching activities in the menu above to student learning outcomes and gains. Other ways of providing in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of teaching quality teaching are also acceptable. The preceding enumerated items are but examples of how to document quality teaching.

For Tenure Track Faculty:

To meet expectations, Assistant Professors must provide *emerging evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with one tier two activity.

To exceed expectations, Assistant Professors must provide *emerging evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with two tier two activities. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

For Associate Professors:

To meet expectations, Associate Professors must provide *clear and consistent evidence* of quality teaching by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with two tier two activities.

To exceed expectations, Associate Professors must provide *clear and consistent evidence* of quality teaching by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three or more tier two activities. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

For Full Professors:

To meet expectations, Full Professors must provide *sustained evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three tier two activities.

To exceed expectations, Full Professors must provide *sustained evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with four or more tier two activities. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

RESEARCH

The following standards outline how tenure-track and tenured faculty can meet and exceed expectations for annual review for research. All substitutions and equivalencies outlined in the department tenure and promotion standards apply for annual review purposes. Different levels of review should be sure to ascertain the faculty member's workload for the previous academic year and evaluate their research productivity according to that workload.

As a note, meeting expectations each year or evening mixing years with meeting and exceeding expectations *is not* a guarantee of meeting expectations at a cumulative decision point. See specific guidelines for decision points under each faculty category.

For tenure track Assistant Professors to meet expectations for research:

Tenure-track faculty with a "research" workload meet expectations by producing 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter, plus 1 additional scholarly product, such as a conference presentation, conference proceeding, or state or regional journal article. Tenure-track faculty are only eligible for a "research" workload in years 4-6 of tenure track.

Tenure-track faculty with a "balanced" workload meet expectations when they provide evidence of being able to produce, on average each year across the tenure track period, 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter, plus 1 additional scholarly product, such as a conference presentation, conference proceeding, or state or regional journal article. The department recognizes that, for this workload, research production may not "hit" in the form of deliverables each year, but that faculty can still show evidence of productivity towards deliverables. Evidence of such productivity might include items such as publications, conference presentations, IRB proposals, book contracts, qualitative accounts of research projects, manuscript submissions, etc.

As a note, meeting expectations each year is *not* a guarantee of meeting expectations at a cumulative decision point.

For tenure track Assistant Professors to exceed expectations for research:

Tenure-track faculty with a “research” workload exceed expectations by producing 3 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, 2 journal articles in journals with a 30% or less acceptance rate or Scimago ratings of Q1 or Q2, a scholarly book as single or lead author, or combined awarded external grant funding of over \$100K (as PI or Co-PI). Tenure-track faculty are only eligible for a “research” workload in years 4-6 of tenure track.

Tenure-track faculty with a “balanced” workload exceed expectations by producing 2 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, one peer-reviewed publication in a journal with an acceptance rate of 30% or less or a Scimago rating of Q1 or Q2, a scholarly book as single, lead, or second author, or combined awarded external grant funding of over \$50K (as PI or Co-PI).

For Associate Professors to meet expectations for research:

Associate Professors with a “research” workload meet expectations when they produce 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter, plus 1 additional scholarly product, such as a conference presentation, conference proceeding, or state or regional journal article.

Associate Professors with a “balanced” workload meet expectations when they provide evidence of being able to produce, on average each year during the comprehensive periodic evaluation timeframe, 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter, plus 1 additional scholarly product, such as a conference presentation, conference proceeding, or state or regional journal article. The department recognizes that, for this workload, research production may not “hit” in the form of deliverables each year, but that faculty can still show evidence of productivity towards deliverables. Evidence of such productivity might include but is not limited to items such as publications, conference presentations, IRB proposals, book contracts, qualitative accounts of research projects, etc.

Associate Professors with a “teaching” workload meet expectations when they provide evidence of being able to produce, in total across the entire comprehensive periodic evaluation timeframe, 2 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, plus 2 additional scholarly products, such as conference presentations, conference proceedings, or state or regional journal articles. The department recognizes that, for this workload, research production may not “hit” in the form of deliverables each year, but that faculty can still show evidence of productivity towards deliverables. Evidence of such productivity each AY might include but is not limited to items such as publications, conference presentations, IRB proposals, book contracts, qualitative accounts of research projects, etc.

For Associate Professors to exceed expectations for research:

Associate Professors with a “research” workload exceed expectations when they produce 3 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, 2 journal articles in journals with a 30% or less acceptance rate or Scimago ratings of Q1 or Q2, a scholarly book, or combined awarded external grant funding of over \$100K (as PI or Co-PI). Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal.

Associate Professors with a “balanced” workload exceed expectations when they produce 2 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, 1 peer-reviewed article in a journal with an acceptance rate of 30% or less or a Scimago rating of Q1 or Q2, a scholarly book, or combined awarded external grant funding of over \$50K (as PI or Co-PI). Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal.

Associate Professors with a “teaching” workload exceed expectations when they produce 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter.

For Full Professors to meet expectations for research:

Full Professors with a “research” workload meet expectations when they produce 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter, plus 1 additional scholarly product, such as a conference presentation, conference proceeding, or state or regional journal article.

Full Professors with a “balanced” workload meet expectations when they provide evidence of being able to produce, on average each year during the comprehensive periodic evaluation timeframe, 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter, plus 1 additional scholarly product, such as a conference presentation, conference proceeding, or state or regional journal article. The department recognizes that, for this workload, research production may not “hit” in the form of deliverables each year, but that faculty can still show evidence of productivity towards deliverables. Evidence of such productivity might include but is not limited to items such as publications, conference presentations, IRB proposals, book contracts, qualitative accounts of research projects, etc.

Full Professors with a “teaching” workload exceed expectations when they produce 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter.

For Full Professors to exceed expectations for research:

Full Professors with a “research” workload exceed expectations when they produce 3 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, 2 journal articles in journals with a 30% or less acceptance rate or Scimago ratings of Q1 or Q2, a scholarly book, or combined awarded external grant funding of over \$100K (as PI or Co-PI). Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal.

Full professors with a “balanced” workload exceed expectations when they produce 2 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, 1 peer-reviewed article in a journal with an acceptance rate of 30% or less or a Scimago rating of Q1 or Q2, a scholarly book, or combined awarded external grant funding of over \$50K (as PI or Co-PI). Grants will be counted only in the year of procurement or renewal.

Full Professors with a “teaching” workload exceed expectations when they produce 1 peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter and demonstrate substantial additional research productivity such as articles under review, developing conference presentations, and ample evidence of future publications being developed.

SERVICE

As faculty progress in their careers, they are expected to perform service in increasing numbers of areas, to assume leadership roles in their service, and to develop a theme or purpose for their service. This means that faculty are not expected to perform service randomly or haphazardly, but instead to develop a coherent service trajectory or path through which they might gain useful experience and contribute expertise through their service. Faculty narratives should also emphasize quality of service rather than a simple tallying of activities. Effort in service matters, but expertise, significance, and leadership provide more sustained benefit.

The Teaching & Learning Department divides service into five different areas: (1) department, (2) college, (3) university, (4) professional field, and (5) community. The possibilities for service in these areas are too numerous to precisely and exhaustively list. But, in the attempt to provide a sense of the possibilities, the following presents a short, non-comprehensive list of potential examples of service in each of the five areas above.

Department service examples include but are not limited to:

- department committee work (e.g., faculty search committees, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)
- program support (e.g., syllabus revision, social media maintenance, faculty mentoring, etc.)
- TExES review (e.g., PPR workshops, content area review workshops, etc.)
- course leadership (e.g., course lead, course blueprinting, etc.)
- program leadership (e.g., program coordinator, recruitment, etc.)

College service examples include but are not limited to:

- accreditation work
- Equal Opportunity Liaison (EOL).
- advising/sponsoring student organizations
- college committees (e.g., curriculum committee, college council, etc.)
- college workgroups and/or task forces (e.g., policy revisions, policy development, design teams, etc.)

University service examples include but are not limited to:

- university standing committees, councils, workgroups, and/or task forces (e.g., review committee, policy development or revision, etc.)
- Women's Faculty Network (e.g., active member, standing committee officer, executive team, etc.)
- faculty senate (e.g., elected representative, standing committee member, elected officer, etc.)
- IRB representative and reviewer
- Faculty Fellow

Professional field service examples include but are not limited to:

- manuscript and/or conference proposal review
- editorial activities for publications (e.g., review of manuscripts, editor of special issue or book, editor of journal, etc.)
- professional organization committee work (e.g., conference site coordinator, conference program committee, etc.)
- contributing expertise (e.g., Site visit evaluator, Consulting, invited keynote speaker, etc.)
- leadership in professional organizations (e.g., elected officer, chair of committee, etc.)

Community service examples include but are not limited to:

- judging, mentoring, and/or advising at events such as science and history fairs
- local school or educational organization support and/or training (e.g., providing professional development for practitioners, consulting, fundraising events for programming, volunteering time and expertise, etc.)
- work with local, state, and/or national civic organizations related to education (e.g., serving on boards, committees, etc.)
- organizing/leading/coordinating education related community events (e.g., summer institute or camps, etc.)
- leadership role in community organization related to education

Assistant Professors meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least two areas,
- Aligning service to at least one theme, and
- Documenting evidence of *emerging* impact and engagement

Assistant Professors exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least three areas,
- Aligning service to at least two themes,
- Documenting evidence of *emerging* impact and engagement, and
- Presenting evidence of *emerging* leadership in service activities or
- Winning awards for service

Associate Professor meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least three areas,
- Aligning service to at least two themes, and
- Documenting *clear* evidence of impact and engagement

Associate Professors exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least four areas,
- Aligning service to at least three theme,
- Documenting *clear* evidence of impact and engagement, and
- Presenting *clear* evidence of leadership in service activities or
- Winning awards for service

Full Professors meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least three areas,
- Aligning service to at least two themes, and
- Documenting *sustained* evidence of impact and engagement

Full Professors exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least four areas,
- Aligning service to at least three theme,
- Documenting *clear and sustained* evidence of impact and engagement, and
- Presenting *clear and sustained* evidence of leadership in service activities or
- Winning awards for service

Annual Review Standards for Lecturers

TEACHING

Quality teaching is foundational to the Teaching and Learning Department. Teaching in this department is expected to demonstrate academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice. Additionally, we value proficiency with and integration of educational technology and best practices in education. Because the department wants all students in all classes to receive the best teaching possible, these standards apply to but are also differentiated by faculty designation and rank.

We also recognize that the quality of a faculty member's teaching is not easily or simply described. Different perspectives and points of view reveal important information about the quality of one's teaching, but by themselves can be incomplete. Thus, because no panoptic view of teaching exists and focusing on one viewpoint of teaching may not be effective, teaching must be described thoroughly, holistically, and from multiple viewpoints and dimensions.

This means that lecturers must develop a comprehensive report of their teaching that details a variety of methods, artifacts, and data.

This report *must* fully address tier one activities:

- The faculty member's narrative description and self-assessment of their teaching
 - The narrative will identify teaching workload, course modalities (i.e. face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, blended....), and course designations (service learning, structured field, accelerated graduate course, etc.).
 - Through the narrative, faculty will describe how their teaching helps to develop and promote core characteristics from the opening paragraph above (academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice, as well as proficiency with technology and best practices in education).
 - Further, the narrative must provide evidence describing the development of students' learning, including syllabi, sample course assignments, *and* samples of student work, plus, if applicable, other course documents/products/artifacts that illustrate quality in teaching.
- Discussion of student course evaluations. The overall rating across all courses should average at least 4.0 out of 5.0 over the period of review. For ratings less than 4.0 out of 5.0, faculty should discuss specific actions for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns. Faculty should be sure that student course evaluations and students' comments for all courses are uploaded to FPT.
- Peer observations of teaching (as required by Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching (utrgv.edu)). Please teaching evaluation forms in the reference and resource page below.

Faculty *must also* present additional supporting evidence of tier two activities to develop a case for the quality of teaching including in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported narratives of the following areas:

- Self-improvement, study, or professional development to advance teaching.
- Teaching awards
- Blueprinting courses
- Innovation in instructional approaches
- Innovation in use of technology
- Evidence of assessment aligned to student learning outcomes
- Student needs assessments/asset mapping
- Supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.
- Extensive mentoring
- Program revision
- New course development
- Significant revision of existing courses
- Broader impacts on the field, such as through publishing textbooks or other instructional resources (scholarship specifically related to teaching and learning may also be mentioned to further develop a case for quality in teaching)

The list of items above is not meant as a superficial check list of items to be addressed or counted. Rather, the list of items above is intended as a menu of possible directions for in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of teaching quality teaching. To be clear, a table or “list” that briefly addresses items above is not what the menu above suggests. Instead, the menu of items above should lead faculty toward (a few to several) in-depth areas to document teaching quality. As examples of in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas, faculty might (1) provide a rationale for participating in self-study or professional development along with discussions of what they learned and implemented, (2) link an item above in ways that demonstrate clear and substantial learning outcomes they document, (3) link peer observations and associated peer interactions to meaningful growth and student achievement in items related to teaching at classroom or program-level, or (4) link professional teaching activities in the menu above to student learning outcomes and gains. Other ways of providing in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of teaching quality teaching are also acceptable. The preceding enumerated items are but examples of how to document quality teaching.

For Lecturer I Faculty:

To meet expectations, Lecturer I faculty must provide *emerging evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with two tier two activities.

To exceed expectations, Lecturer I faculty must provide *emerging evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three or more tier two activities. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

For Lecturer II Faculty:

To meet expectations, Lecturer II faculty must provide *clear evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three tier two activities.

To exceed expectations, Lecturer II faculty must provide *clear evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with four or more tier two activities. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

For Lecturer III Faculty:

To meet expectations, Lecturer III faculty must provide *sustained evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three tier two activities.

To exceed expectations, Lecturer III faculty must provide *sustained evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with four or more tier two activities. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

For Senior Lecturer Faculty:

To meet expectations, Senior Lecturer faculty must provide *sustained evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three tier two activities, one of which *must include teacher leadership* in course revision/development, program revision development, or student mentoring/guided student learning.

To exceed expectations, Senior Lecturer faculty must provide *sustained evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with four or more tier two activities, two which *must include teacher leadership* in course revision/development, program revision development, or student mentoring/guided student learning. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

SERVICE

As faculty progress in their careers, they are expected to perform service in increasing numbers of areas, to assume leadership roles in their service, and to develop a theme or purpose for their service. This means that faculty are not expected to perform service randomly or haphazardly, but instead to develop a coherent service trajectory or path through which they might gain useful experience and contribute expertise through their service. Faculty narratives should also emphasize quality of service rather than a simple tallying of activities. Effort in service matters, but expertise, significance, and leadership provide more sustained benefit.

The Teaching & Learning Department divides service into five different areas: (1) department, (2) college, (3) university, (4) professional field, and (5) community. The possibilities for service in these areas are too numerous to precisely and exhaustively list. But, in the attempt to provide a sense of the possibilities, the following presents a short, non-comprehensive list of potential examples of service in each of the five areas above.

Department service examples include but are not limited to:

- department committee work (e.g., faculty search committees, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)

- program support (e.g., syllabus revision, social media maintenance, faculty mentoring, etc.)
- TExES review (e.g., PPR workshops, content area review workshops, etc.)
- course leadership (e.g., course lead, course blueprinting, etc.)
- program leadership (e.g., program coordinator, recruitment, etc.)

College service examples include but are not limited to:

- accreditation work
- Equal Opportunity Liaison (EOL).
- advising/sponsoring student organizations
- college committees (e.g., curriculum committee, college council, etc.)
- college workgroups and/or task forces (e.g., policy revisions, policy development, design teams, etc.)

University service examples include but are not limited to:

- university standing committees, councils, workgroups, and/or task forces (e.g., review committee, policy development or revision, etc.)
- Women's Faculty Network (e.g., active member, standing committee officer, executive team, etc.)
- faculty senate (e.g., elected representative, standing committee member, elected officer, etc.)
- IRB representative and reviewer
- Faculty Fellow

Professional field service examples include but are not limited to:

- manuscript and/or conference proposal review
- editorial activities for publications (e.g., review of manuscripts, editor of special issue or book, editor of journal, etc.)
- professional organization committee work (e.g., conference site coordinator, conference program committee, etc.)
- contributing expertise (e.g., Site visit evaluator, Consulting, invited keynote speaker, etc.)
- leadership in professional organizations (e.g., elected officer, chair of committee, etc.)

Community service examples include but are not limited to:

- judging, mentoring, and/or advising at events such as science and history fairs
- local school or educational organization support and/or training (e.g., providing professional development for practitioners, consulting, fundraising events for programming, volunteering time and expertise, etc.)
- work with local, state, and/or national civic organizations related to education (e.g., serving on boards, committees, etc.)
- organizing/leading/coordinating education related community events (e.g., summer institute or camps, etc.)
- leadership role in community organization related to education

(As a note, in the CEP Lecturers of all ranks have a 90% teaching load.)

Lecturer I faculty meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 1 area, and
- Documenting *emerging* evidence of impact and engagement in service activities

Lecturer I faculty can exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Documenting *emerging* evidence of impact and engagement in service activities,
- Providing service in at least 2 areas, and
- Providing evidence of *emerging* leadership in service or
- Winning awards for service

Lecturer III faculty meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 2 areas and
- Documenting evidence of *sustained* impact and engagement in service activities

Lecturer III faculty can exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 3 areas,
- Documenting evidence of *sustained* impact and engagement in service activities, and
- Providing *sustained* evidence of leadership in service or
- Winning awards for service

Senior Lecturers meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 2 areas, *one of which* must instantiate a clear service project to the department or college and
- Documenting *sustained* evidence of sustained impact and engagement in service activities

Senior Lecturers can exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 3 areas,
- Documenting *sustained* evidence of impact and engagement in service activities, *one of which* must instantiate a clear service project to the department or college, and
- Providing evidence of *sustained* leadership in service or
- Winning awards for service

Annual Review Standards for Assistant, Associate, and Professors of Practice

TEACHING

Quality teaching is foundational to the Teaching and Learning Department. Teaching in this department is expected to demonstrate academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice. Additionally, we value proficiency with and integration of educational technology and best practices in education. Because the department

wants all students in all classes to receive the best teaching possible, these standards apply to but are also differentiated by faculty designation and rank.

We also recognize that the quality of a faculty member's teaching is not easily or simply described. Different perspectives and points of view reveal important information about the quality of one's teaching, but by themselves can be incomplete. Thus, because no panoptic view of teaching exists and focusing on one viewpoint of teaching may not be effective, teaching must be described thoroughly, holistically, and from multiple viewpoints and dimensions.

This means that professor of practice must provide a comprehensive report of their teaching that details a variety of methods, artifacts, and data.

This report *must* fully address tier one activities:

- The faculty member's narrative description and self-assessment of their teaching
 - The narrative will identify teaching workload, course modalities (i.e. face-to-face, synchronous, asynchronous, blended...), and course designations (service learning, structured field, accelerated graduate course, etc.).
 - Through the narrative, faculty will describe how their teaching helps to develop and promote core characteristics from the opening paragraph above (academic rigor, higher-level analytical and critical thinking, cultural competence, and social justice, as well as proficiency with technology and best practices in education).
 - Further, the narrative must provide evidence describing the development of students' learning, including syllabi, sample course assignments, *and* samples of student work, plus, if applicable, other course documents/products/artifacts that illustrate quality in teaching.
- Discussion of student course evaluations. The overall rating across all courses should average at least 4.0 out of 5.0 over the period of review. For ratings less than 4.0 out of 5.0, faculty should discuss specific actions for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns. Faculty should be sure that student course evaluations and students' comments for all courses are uploaded to FPT.
- Evidence of quality teaching in field supervision and teaching students in the field.
- Peer observations of teaching (as required by [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching \(utrgv.edu\)](http://utrgv.edu)). Please teaching evaluation forms in the reference and resource page below.

Faculty *must also* present additional supporting evidence of tier two activities to develop a case for the quality of teaching including in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported narratives of the following areas:

- Self-improvement, study, or professional development to advance teaching.
- Evidence of teaching excellence in organizing field activities for other field supervisor and students
- Teaching awards
- Blueprinting courses
- Innovation in instructional approaches
- Innovation in use of technology

- Evidence of assessment aligned to student learning outcomes
- Student needs assessments/asset mapping
- Supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.
- Extensive mentoring
- Program revision
- New course development
- Significant revision of existing courses
- Broader impacts on the field, such as through publishing textbooks or other instructional resources (scholarship specifically related to teaching and learning may also be mentioned to further develop a case for quality in teaching)

The list of items above is not meant as a superficial check list of items to be addressed or counted. Rather, the list of items above is intended as a menu of possible directions for in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of quality teaching. To be clear, a table or “list” that briefly addresses many or all items above is not what the menu above suggests. Instead, the menu of items above should lead faculty toward (a few to several) in-depth areas to document teaching quality. As examples of in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas, faculty might (1) provide a rationale for participating in self-study or professional development along with discussions of what they learned and implemented, (2) link an item above in ways that demonstrate clear and substantial learning outcomes they document, (3) link peer observations and associated peer interactions to meaningful growth and student achievement in items related to teaching at classroom or program-level, or (4) link professional teaching activities in the menu above to learning outcomes in field supervision and teaching. Other ways of providing in-depth, evidence-based, and document-supported areas of ongoing foci of teaching quality teaching are also acceptable. The preceding enumerated items are but examples of how to document quality teaching.

As a note, Professors of Practice, across categories, all have an 80% teaching workload and, therefore, Professors of Practice have the same teaching standards despite “applied” and “academic” designations. Contrastingly, Professor of Practice have differentiated standards for “applied” and “academic” designations in research and service.

For Assistant Professors of Practice, “Applied” and “Academic” Work Loads:

To meet expectations, Assistant Professors of Practice faculty must provide *emerging evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with two tier two activities.

To exceed expectations, Assistant Professor of Practice faculty must provide *emerging evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three or more tier two activities. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

For Associate Professors of Practice, “Applied” and “Academic” Work Loads:

To meet expectations, Associate Professors of Practice faculty must provide *clear evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three tier two activities.

To exceed expectations, Associate Professor of Practice faculty must provide *clear evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with four or more tier two activities. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

For Professors of Practice, “Applied” and “Academic” Work Loads:

To meet expectations, Full Professors of Practice faculty must provide *sustained evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with three tier two activities one of which *must include teacher leadership* in course revision/development, program revision development, or student mentoring/guided student learning.

To exceed expectations, Full Professor of Practice faculty must provide *sustained evidence of quality teaching* by fully addressing all tier one requirements along with four or more tier two activities, two of which *must include teacher leadership* in course revision/development, program revision development, or student mentoring/guided student learning. The designation of exceeds expectations requires *documentary evidence* for each of the tier two activities advanced.

RESEARCH

Assistant, associate, and professors of practice with an “academic” workload are required to have ongoing lines of research. The department recognizes that, for this workload, research production may not “hit” in the form of deliverables each year, but that faculty can still show evidence of productivity towards deliverables. Evidence of such productivity each AY might include but is not limited to items such as publications, conference presentations, IRB proposals, book contracts, qualitative accounts of research projects, grant writing, etc.

Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors of Practice on an “academic” workload have 10% workload dedicated to research; the greater portion of their job is dedicated to teaching, teaching in the field, service, and service related site coordination. The amount of research required under the “academic” workload, per promotion standards, is not incremental, but instead assumes a steady stream of research production or grant supports that constitute reflective practices in undergraduate programs, with a special focus on organizing, supporting, and teaching in field sites. As a note, Professors of Practice with an “applied” workload are not required to do research and, therefore, there is no research standard for that faculty workload designation.

For Assistant Professors of Practice with an “academic” workload:

To meet expectations, Assistant Professors of Practice provide *emerging evidence of coherent and focused* scholarly or research activities including at least one conference presentation, grant submissions, published conference proceeding, or finished manuscript.

To exceed expectations, Assistant Professors of Practice document *emerging evidence of coherent and focused* scholarly or research activities by publishing one peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter for the year under review or by securing on their own or as part of a team competitive external grant funding. To be clear, internal grant awards do not count in this category, but they might be documented as *emerging evidence* of grant activities above.

For Associate Professors of Practice with an “academic” workload:

To meet expectations, Associate Professors of Practice provide *clear* evidence of *coherent and focused* scholarly or research activities including at least one conference presentation, grant submission, published conference proceeding, or finished manuscript.

To exceed expectations, Associate Professors of Practice document *clear* evidence of *coherent and focused* scholarly or research activities by publishing one peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter for the year under review or by securing on their own or as part of a team competitive external grant funding. To be clear, internal grant awards do not count in this category.

For Professors of Practice with an “academic” workload:

To meet expectations, Professors of Practice provide *sustained* evidence of *coherent and focused* scholarly or research activities including at least one conference presentation, grant submission, published conference proceeding, or finished manuscript.

To exceed expectations, Professors of Practice document *sustained* evidence of *coherent and focused* scholarly or research activities by publishing one peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter for the year under review or by securing on their own or as part of a team competitive external grant funding. To be clear, internal grant awards do not count in this category.

SERVICE

Faculty are not expected to perform service randomly or haphazardly, but instead to develop a coherent service trajectory or path through which they might gain useful experience and contribute expertise through their service. Faculty narratives should emphasize quality of service rather than a simple tallying of activities. Effort in service matters, but expertise, significance, and leadership provide more sustained benefit.

The Teaching & Learning Department divides service into five different areas: (1) department, (2) college, (3) university, (4) professional field, and (5) community. The possibilities for service in these areas are too numerous to precisely and exhaustively list. But, in the attempt to provide a sense of the possibilities, the following presents a short, non-comprehensive list of five potential examples of service in each of the five areas above. Note that one component of service to the department for assistant, associate, and professors of practice will likely relate to field coordination or field supervision of students. For assistant, associate, and professors of practice, this field service can be combined with other types of service to the department to count as two areas of service.

In the case of professors of practice, field supervision of students and site coordination is a central and ongoing activity for faculty hired into this faculty category. Specifically, the job title professors of practice is linked specifically to “practice” in the field, and work in the field is an expected ongoing component of this job title. In addition to field requirements under teaching, service in field is also expected across all ranks. Appearing under college service below,

involvement in field supervision of students and cite coordination is an essential activity, and it is the overall intended activity of this category of faculty as they progress through trunks for assistant to full. *To be explicit, it is possible for Professors of Practice to focus all of their service on different dimensions of student supervision and site coordination*, though additional avenues of service are available for Professors of Practice as they develop their annual evaluations.

The Teaching & Learning Department divides service into five different areas: (1) department, (2) college, (3) university, (4) professional field, and (5) community. The possibilities for service in these areas are too numerous to precisely and exhaustively list. But, in the attempt to provide a sense of the possibilities, the following presents a short, non-comprehensive list of potential examples of service in each of the five areas above.

Department service examples include but are not limited to:

- field activities such as department committees related to field, involvement in program-level field decisions, writing field reports, and other course or program-level field service
- department committee work (e.g., faculty search committees, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)
- program support (e.g., syllabus revision, social media maintenance, faculty mentoring, etc.)
- TExES review (e.g., PPR workshops, content area review workshops, etc.)
- course leadership (e.g., course lead, course blueprinting, etc.)
- program leadership (e.g., program coordinator, recruitment, etc.)

College service examples include but are not limited to:

- field supervision of students,
- field site coordination
- providing professional development for clinical and university field supervisors
- coordinating activities between the Office of Field Experiences and field sites
- developing or designing field instruments, activities, or assessments
- accreditation work
- college committees (e.g., curriculum committee, college council, etc.)
- college workgroups and/or task forces (e.g., policy revisions, policy development, design teams, etc.)

University service examples include but are not limited to:

- university standing committees, councils, workgroups, and/or task forces (e.g., review committee, policy development or revision, etc.)
- Women's Faculty Network (e.g., active member, standing committee officer, executive team, etc.)
- faculty senate (e.g., elected representative, standing committee member, elected officer, etc.)
- IRB representative and reviewer
- Faculty Fellow

Professional field service examples include but are not limited to:

- manuscript and/or conference proposal review
- editorial activities for publications (e.g., review of manuscripts, editor of special issue or book, editor of journal, etc.)
- professional organization committee work (e.g., conference site coordinator, conference program committee, etc.)
- contributing expertise (e.g., Site visit evaluator, Consulting, invited keynote speaker, etc.)
- leadership in professional organizations (e.g., elected officer, chair of committee, etc.)

Community service examples include but are not limited to:

- judging, mentoring, and/or advising at events such as science and history fairs
- local school or educational organization support and/or training (e.g., providing professional development for practitioners, consulting, fundraising events for programming, volunteering time and expertise, etc.)
- work with local, state, and/or national civic organizations related to education (e.g., serving on boards, committees, etc.)
- organizing/leading/coordinating education related community events (e.g., summer institute or camps, etc.)
- leadership role in community organization related to education

As a note there is differentiated service for Professors of Practice across ranks according to “applied” and “academic” designations. Professors of Practice designated as “applied” have 20% service as part of their workload. In contrast, Professors of Practice designated as “academic” have 10% service as part of their workload. Therefore, service loads are distinct according to designation.

Assistant professors of practice with an “applied” workload:

Meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 2 areas and
- Documenting *emerging* evidence of impact and engagement

Exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 3 areas,
- Documenting *emerging* evidence of impact and engagement, and
- Providing *emerging* evidence of *leadership* in service or
- Winning awards for service

Associate professors of practice with an “applied” workload:

Meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 2 areas and
- Documenting *clear* evidence of impact and engagement

Exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 3 areas,
- Documenting evidence of *clear* impact and engagement in service activities, and
- Providing *clear* evidence of leadership in service or
- Winning awards for service

Professors of practice with an “applied” workload:

Meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 3 areas and
- Documenting evidence of *sustained* impact and engagement

Exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 4 areas,
- Documenting evidence of *sustained* impact and engagement, and
- Providing evidence of *sustained* leadership in service or
- Winning awards for service

Assistant professors of practice with an “academic” workload:

Meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 1 areas and
- Documenting *emerging* evidence of impact and engagement

Exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 2 areas,
- Documenting *emerging* evidence of impact and engagement, and
- Providing *emerging* evidence of *leadership* in service or
- Winning awards for service

Associate professors of practice with an “academic” workload:

Meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 1 areas and
- Documenting *clear* evidence of impact and engagement

Exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 2 areas,
- Documenting evidence of *clear* impact and engagement in service activities, and
- Providing *clear* evidence of leadership in service or
- Winning awards for service

Professors of practice with an “academic” workload:

Meet expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 2 areas and
- Documenting evidence of *sustained* impact and engagement

Exceed expectations in service by doing the following:

- Providing service in at least 3 areas,
- Documenting evidence of *sustained* impact and engagement, and
- Providing evidence of *sustained* leadership in service or
- Winning awards for service

Action Plans

Tenured Faculty

Outcomes/Remediations and Action Plans will be conducted in accordance with the *UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures* section titled and ADM 06-504 “Tenured Faculty Evaluation.” These policies specify action plans developed by faculty who receive “does not meet expectations” or “unsatisfactory” in one or more areas in an annual review. The faculty member must develop and submit an action plan by the deadline established by the Provost/VPAA to the Chair and Dean for their review and approval. The plan must address the

performance weaknesses or concerns and any support to enhance or strengthen the faculty member's performance in the designated area(s). Remediation action plans will be reviewed annually by the Chair and the tenured faculty receiving "does not meet" or "unsatisfactory." A tenured faculty member who receives an "unsatisfactory" rating for two consecutive annual reviews may be required to undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation. The decision regarding whether to require the comprehensive periodic evaluation in this circumstance will be made by the Dean after consultation with the Provost/VPAA. "A faculty member may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including termination in accordance with Regents' Rule 31008, for poor performance or when other good cause exists." Poor performance will be defined as four years of "does not meet" or "unsatisfactory" within a single review period or spanning any six annual reviews.

Tenure-Track Faculty

Action Plans will be conducted in accordance with the *UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures* section titled ADM 06-503 (Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments). These policies specify remediation and action plans developed by the Chair for faculty who receive "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory" in one or more areas in an annual review. The faculty member must develop and submit an action plan by the deadline established by the Provost/VPAA to the Chair and Dean for their review and approval. The plan must address the performance weaknesses or concerns and any support to enhance or strengthen the faculty member's performance in the designated area(s). After each tenure-track evaluation cycle, the faculty member will request to meet with the Department Chair to discuss the process and recommendations from the various review levels to develop an action plan to guide the faculty for the following academic year. The action plan may include recommendations for remediation. The faculty member's progress in response to the action plan will be monitored through subsequent evaluations. Tenure-track not meeting improvement goals of the action plan may be subject to removal from tenure track and non-renewal.

Lecturers and Professors of Practice (Non tenure-track faculty)

Action Plans will be conducted in ways similar to those described in the *UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures* section titled ADM 06-503 (Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments). These policies specify remediation and action plans developed by the Chair for faculty who receive "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory" in one or more areas in an annual review. The faculty member must develop and submit an action plan by the deadline established by the Provost/VPAA to the chair and dean for their review and approval. The plan must address the performance weaknesses or concerns and any support to enhance or strengthen the faculty member's performance in the designated area(s). After each evaluation cycle, the faculty member will request to meet with the Department Chair to discuss the process and recommendations from the various review levels to develop an action plan to guide the faculty for the following academic year. The action plan may include recommendations for remediation. The faculty member's progress in response to the action plan will be monitored through subsequent evaluations. Lecturers and professors of practice not meeting improvement goals of the action plan may be subject to non-renewal.

References and Resources

College of Education and P16 Integration/Department of Teaching and Learning Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure.

T&L Guidelines for Section of External Reviewers

Department of Teaching and Learning Peer Observation Form (face-to-face)

T&L Peer Observation form (face-to-face)

Department of Teaching and Learning Peer Observation Form (online)

T&L Peer Observation Form (online)

Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching

UTRGV Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching

UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures section ADM 06-503 “Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations and Reappointments”

UTRGV HOP Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluations

UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures section ADM 06-504 “Tenured Faculty Evaluations.”

UTRGV HOP Tenure Faculty Evaluations

UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures, Appendices to HOP 06-503 and 06-504

- Appendix A.pdf “Department Evaluation Guidelines,”
- Appendix B.pdf “Evaluation Categories and Standards,”
- Appendix C.pdf “Definition of Performance Ratings,”
- Appendix D.pdf “Dossier Requirements,” and,
- Appendix E.pdf “Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review”

UTRGV Documenting Teaching Effectiveness, link to webpage UTRGV Documenting Teaching Effectiveness, Resources

Appendix A: Early tenure and/or early promotion

According to ADM 06-503 “Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations and Reappointments” and ADM 06-504 “Tenured Faculty Evaluations,” faculty may apply for early tenure and/or early promotion if they “substantially exceed expectations.” This appendix provides factors faculty should consider when making the decision whether to apply. First, faculty should know that earning early tenure and/or promotion is extremely rare. Second, regarding research, “substantially succeeds” means at the very minimum doubling research productivity per workload category including doubling the quantity of required selective publications designated by rank. Third, applying for early tenure and/or promotion places burdens on faculty to substantially exceed expectations in teaching and service as well. Regarding teaching, evaluators might require, at a minimum, faculty to earn annual evaluation ratings of “exceeds expectations” in teaching for all prior years, in addition to substantive performance on top of those ratings. In addition to exceeding expectations, faculty going up early would be expected to provide substantial evidence documenting of leadership in teaching. For service, faculty would need to develop the substantial leadership capacity within a compressed timeframe, perhaps by chairing multiple committees that develop significant change within the department, college, and university, in addition to developing clear and impactful leadership roles within their professional fields. Fourth, faculty should be aware that evaluators will look for evidence of “substantially exceeding expectations” not in just a few areas, but across all areas of the tenure and promotion standards. Prior to applying, faculty should already be exceeding standards and expectations at the target level (in other words, assistant professors should be exceeding expectations written for associate professors, and so forth).

Appendix B: Faculty workload percentages

The Teaching & Learning Department follows the CEP workload policy. According to that policy, “workload options...will be determined by each individual faculty and the respective chair. With approval of Department Chair and Dean, full-time faculty, with the exception of faculty in the Lecturer ranks, can have other research, teaching, and service workload percentages not shown in this table.” Faculty on “special assignment” from the Dean’s Office, must provide accompanying letters of rationale depicting special services rendered, and they must be signed by the Department Chair and Dean. These letters will explain the special service provided and the evaluation categories amended or suspended during the special assignment period. The great majority of loads will follow the established loads in the table, and letters seeking approval for loads not on the table below should be considered special assignments. They must be approved and articulated before review across supervisory levels via the letter mentioned above.

The table below shows the general or typical workload percentages indicated in the CEP workload policy. Overall, the purpose of the table below is to articulate acceptable standard work loads to best articulate faculty and department needs. In consultation with the Department Chair, faculty might have variability in determining their exact workload percentages in ways congruent, for example, with research productivity requirements:

| Faculty Designation | Research % | Teaching % | Service % | Administration % |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Lecturer I, II, and III, & Senior Lecturer | 0 | 90 | 10 | 0 |
| Assistant, Associate, Clinical Professor (Applied) | 0 | 80 | 20 | 0 |
| Assistant, Associate, Clinical Professor (Academic) | 10 | 80 | 10 | 0 |
| Assistant, Associate, and Professor of Practice (Applied) | 0 | 80 | 20 | 0 |
| Assistant, Associate, and Professor of Practice (Academic) | 10 | 80 | 10 | 0 |
| Tenure-Track Faculty (balanced) | 20 | 60 | 20 | 0 |
| Tenure-Track Faculty (research) | 40 | 40 | 20 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|
| Tenured Faculty (research) | 40 | 40 | 20 | 0 |
| Tenured Faculty (balanced) | 20 | 60 | 20 | 0 |
| Tenured Faculty (teaching) | 10 | 70 | 20 | 0 |
| Faculty with Administrative Appointments | 10 | 30 | 10 | 50 |

Appendix C: Faculty narratives

All faculty are required to write narratives for annual evaluations and cumulative actions, reviews, or contract renewals. These narratives might be thought of as empirically-based descriptions, explanations, or even stories (verifiable and documented stories, of course) that capture and convey a faculty member's work during the course of a review period. It is through these narratives that faculty contextualize and present their case for the specific type of review. Faculty should divide their narratives into sections appropriate to their workload and help evaluators understand how they meet and/or exceed the standards for each area. When writing narratives, faculty are required to write into and clearly address the standards and criteria in this document for each relevant section. Additionally, faculty should keep in mind several principles:

- Describe the impact of your work relative to particular standards. For example, if demonstrating leadership in service is one of the standards, explain how you chaired committees, task forces, programs, or other such endeavors. If publishing in selective journals is a standard, be sure to include relevant acceptance rates or Scimago ratings in your narrative.
- Strive for a balance of depth and brevity as you contextualize your strengths and accomplishments in each area. Write what you need to fully explain how your work meets and exceeds standards, but keep that the focus of the narrative. Additional and lengthy philosophical discussions do not strengthen narratives. Nor should you cite or include a reference list. They usually just distract. Moreover, extended lists of unequal items (some suggesting time-consuming and impactful activities, others seemingly trivial) can distract from the impact of main impactful contributions. Narrate main impactful contributions while detailing smaller and less impactful items in a list.
- Make your narratives as easy to read as possible. Do not, at actions or cumulative reviews, simply cut and paste in annual review narratives, but re-write and narrate the main impactful events that were accomplished over the action or cumulative review period. Help evaluators at all levels easily see and recognize the significance and impact of your work. Use clear language and paragraph structure. Perhaps include bulleted lists where appropriate and useful, especially for related, equally weighted items. Aim for simplicity and clarity.

Appendix D: Standards for tenure and promotion as related to differentiated workloads

The Teaching and Learning Department employs parallel, but not identical systems for tenure and promotion and for faculty workloads. Standards of promotion to associate professor are not linked to workload percentages. However, standards of promotion to full professor are approximately proportionate to workload and additional time allotted for research according to “balanced” and “research” loads.

The differentiated workload system benefits faculty by allowing them, depending on the particular circumstance, to select a workload that maximizes their interests and strengths. Some faculty will choose to produce more research. Others will choose to teach more classes. Still others will find a balance between those two interests. Aligned with CEP guidelines, research productivity varies according to faculty workload.

The differentiated workload system benefits the department also because it best utilizes faculty strengths. Faculty may elect to produce more research, which benefits the department. But the department and students also benefit if expert faculty elect to teach more classes.

| Workload | AVG Workload % Teaching/Research/Service | Examples of approx. Course loads | Minimum Research Productivity per 6 years |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| T/TT Research | 40T/40R/20S | 2/2 UG; 1/1 GR; 1 GR/2 UG; and, and mixed loads of UG/GR similar workload percentages within semesters | 20 total products |
| T/TT Balanced | 60T/20R/20S | 3/3 UG; 2/2 GR; and, 2 GR/3 UG; and mixed loads of UG/GR similar workload percentages within semesters | 12 total products |
| T Teaching | 70T/10R/20S | 4/4 UG; 3/3 GR; and mixed loads of UG/GR similar workload percentages within semesters | 4 total products |
| PoP Applied | 80T/0R/20S | 4/4 UG; and mixed loads of UG/GR similar workload percentages within semesters | 0 total products |

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--|------------------|
| PoP Academic | 80T/10R/10S | 4/4 UG; and mixed loads of UG/GR similar workload percentages within semesters | 4 total products |
| Lecturer | 90T/0R/10S | 4/5 UG; and mixed loads of UG/GR similar workload percentages within semesters | 0 total products |

Notes: -Faculty courseloads and actual workload percentages may vary according to faculty and department needs, such as when faculty teach mixed UG and GR loads.
 -Minimum research productivity includes both national/international peer-reviewed publications plus other products such as conference presentations and regional or state-level publications. Divide each total number in half for the minimum number in each category of research publications and other scholarly products. For example, on a research workload, faculty produce a minimum of 10 peer-reviewed publications plus 10 other scholarly products, for a total of 20 products. For a second example, on a balanced workload, faculty produce minimum of 6 peer reviewed publications plus 6 other scholarly products, for a total of 12 products. For each of these minimums, in each category faculty must meet selectivity requirements where relevant in standards above.

In order to maintain a balanced or research workload, faculty must produce the required research production during the evaluation time period (either for tenure, for promotion, or for comprehensive periodic evaluation). If faculty do not maintain the required productivity (and other requirements), they will be moved to a workload with less research requirements and more teaching.

Faculty are wise to choose the workload that best helps them meet their promotion goals. For example, if an associate professor chooses a “teaching” workload after receiving tenure and wishes to one day apply for full professor, that faculty member must still meet the standard for promotion to full professor, which might be difficult with a teaching workload. In that case, balanced and research workloads likely best facilitate faculty in meeting the standard for promotion to full professor.

Appendix E: Representing research or scholarship “*in process*” (etc.) and action timeframe/windows

Teaching and Learning values processes of drafting, revising, submitting, peer review, further revision, and eventually, publication of finalized peer-reviewed research. We understand that this process is complicated and, in the case of competitive Q1 and Q2 journals, time consuming. We lay out the following definitions and guidelines to assist faculty in articulating research or scholarship in different stages of review. We also lay out guidelines for the committee to “count” publications as completed.

Definitions of terms:

“*In process*” – This signifies an early draft of research or scholarship that is not yet under review, but a draft is provided. This *cannot* be counted as a finished publication during a year or action period but are noted as developing manuscripts/products. If this work has been presented at conference or other forums, it can be counted under “other work products”.

“*Under review*” – This signifies a completed draft of research or scholarship that has been submitted to a publishing forum and is being reviewed. Research or scholarship can be “under review” in multiple stages (e.g., as an initial submission, as a revised submission). This *cannot* be counted as a finished publication during a year or action period but are noted as developing manuscripts/products. If this work has been presented at conference or other forums, it can be counted under “other work products”.

“*Revise and resubmit*,” “*Accepted with revisions*,” or “*Accepted, pending revisions*” – These signify a completed draft submitted to a journal that is currently being revised in response to reviewers’ comments. This *cannot* be counted as a finished publication during a year or action period but are noted as developing manuscripts/products. If this work has been presented at conference or other forums, it can be counted under “other work products”.

“*Accepted*” – This signifies research or scholarship for which the author can demonstrate positive proof (email, system generated message, etc.) that a manuscript has been accepted in its current form and is being advanced by an editor or editorial team toward publication. Final editing, including un-blinding, often remain as final publishing details. Manuscripts in this stage *can be counted* as final products for tenure and promotion, promotion to full professor, and comprehensive periodic evaluation, as well as for annual review.

“*In press*” – This signifies research or scholarship for which the author can demonstrate positive proof (galley, email, generated message, etc.) that a manuscript has been accepted, has passed through production, and is finished. An “In press” article is only awaiting assignment to a journal or can be published by the journal as “an advanced online publication.” Manuscripts in this stage *can be counted* as final products for tenure and promotion, promotion to full professor, and comprehensive periodic evaluation, as well as for annual review.

“*Published*” – This signifies that research or scholarship is being disseminated in its final form in journal, website, open-source forum, etc. “Published” signifies that an article is finally assigned

a year. Articles showed as “published” with a final date in one AY cannot be re-used newly in a second AY. The listing of the Year of publication means that the article is concluded and finished, no longer available for consideration in the next year’s or time frame/window’s productivity.

With specific reference to the acknowledgement of “Accepted” or “In press” products, this paragraph and the next paragraph delineate guidelines for publications/products that span action time frames/windows. Firstly, tenure and promotion or annual evaluation committees may recognize work at different stages of acceptance per the definitions laid out above. In terms of annual review, articles that are “*Accepted*” or “*In press*” may count towards annual review. But if faculty count such an article towards annual review one year, faculty may not count that article again in subsequent years that it may still be waiting publication (since sometimes publication times can be lengthy) or when the article eventually becomes published. Faculty may only count such an article one time, not multiple times.

Similarly, as part of tenure and promotion, articles that are “*Accepted*” or “*In press*” are to be counted. Only “*Published*” research or scholarship requires the assignment of a year. Of key emphasis, articles that are leveraged as “*Accepted*” or “*In press*” during one action (i.e., tenure and promotion, promotion to full, periodic cumulative review) *cannot* be recirculated in a following action time frame/window as “*Published*.” This is to clarify, especially, in the case where an “*Accepted*” or “*In press*” article is leveraged toward one action, but the lapse before it is published is lengthy or it simply spans periods. In such a case, the “*Accepted*” or “*In press*” article used to leverage one action expires as that action is completed. This paragraph expressly and purposely *disallows* “double dipping” across actions periods for a single publication that was “*Accepted*” or “*In press*” in one action time frame/window being *re-used* to leverage an action in a second time frame/window. For additional clarification, for faculty taking longer than six years to apply for full professor, only products within the last six years can be leveraged toward the action. To be specific, faculty who have taken, for example, eight years to apply for full, can only represent products from the most recent six AYs. Products from the previous 2 AYs expire.