

Promotion to Full Professor Guidelines for Associate Professors

Principles

The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV) is committed to serving society through the excellence of its faculty, students, and staff. UTRGV is one of the largest and historically significant Hispanic Serving Institutions in the United States, which makes the work of UTRGV faculty a public good that is especially important to the Rio Grande Valley in addition to the state, nation, and each faculty member's respective discipline. To meet UTRGV's commitment to improving the quality of life of the Rio Grande Valley and beyond, faculty members are expected to perform at the highest levels in their respective disciplines and fields, continuously striving for distinction.

Every UTRGV faculty member should present a distinguished record as a scholar, educator, and colleague. UTRGV faculty must attain a successful and high-quality record of research, scholarship, and/or creative work that projects a clear, coherent, and independent identity as a scholar. As educators, UTRGV faculty must establish a teaching profile that demonstrates growth, impact, and student success. With the awarding of promotion to the next rank, UTRGV expects that faculty members will continue providing intellectual leadership in their research and teaching, and model professionalism in all their work, including service and shared governance activities. The following guidelines and expectations are meant to cultivate full professors at UTRGV who achieve these principles.

Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor

To be promoted to the rank of Professor, faculty are expected to perform with excellence and leadership in all areas of responsibility.¹ The dossiers of faculty must provide clear documentation of their effort and success in the categories of teaching, research, and service. UTRGV's Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP), HOP ADM 06-504, articulates the principles and standards for earning promotion that a series of discrete annual reviews cannot fully define or evaluate. The type of review and decision-making required for promotion necessitates a qualitative analysis that goes beyond the reliance on numerical thresholds commonly associated with annual review.

Regarding the principles and standards for promotion, HOP ADM 06-504 makes repeated reference to achieving high standards of excellence with quality, significant, and impactful work that faculty sustained after earning tenure. For example:

- "Promotion to the rank of professor is a recognition of and reward to faculty who have sustained meritorious records of professional accomplishment that contribute to the university mission" (HOP ADM 06-504, C.2).
- "The purpose of promotion" is "to recognize and reward faculty with records of sustained meritorious professional accomplishments and who also demonstrate potential for continued contributions to UTRGV's mission and vision," with faculty needing to demonstrate "high potential for continued excellence and effectiveness (HOP ADM 06-504, Appendix A, Section 2.a.v and 2.a.v.1).
- "The faculty member must have demonstrated effective teaching if teaching is an assigned duty" (HOP ADM 06-504, Appendix A, Section 2.a.v.3).
- In research, scholarship, and/or creative works, the "quality, significance, impact, and quantity of publications or creative works" are factors in determining promotion (HOP ADM 06-504, Appendix B, Section 2.b).
- In service, the "quality, significance, and impact of the contributions to students, colleagues, the department, college, UTRGV, the community, and the profession," are factors in determining promotion (HOP ADM 06-504, Appendix B, Section 3.b).
- "All those involved in the review process are responsible for reading all materials, reviewing and evaluating the faculty member's performance on each of the performance criteria, and participating in committee discussions and formulating of committee recommendations" (HOP ADM 06-504, Appendix E, Section 2.c). The instruction to read all materials in the process of evaluating the

merits of recommending promotion means that an evaluation of faculty must include a qualitative assessment of the quality, significance, and impact of their work.

Faculty must provide the necessary information in their promotion dossiers to help ensure that reviewers can perform the type of analysis HOP requires. HOP ADM 06-504, Appendix D, outlines the structure of faculty dossiers and states that faculty must provide “summaries of professional accomplishments” for all areas of review (teaching, research and scholarship, service, university-related patient care) (Section 2.a.ii). In what follows, this document outlines how faculty should organize their summaries/narratives of professional accomplishments in each area of review and identifies the information necessary to explain how they are achieving the principles and standards identified in HOP ADM 06-504.

Expectations for Teaching

As educators, UTRGV faculty must establish a teaching profile that demonstrates growth, impact, and student success.² To document growth, impact, and student success, a successful teaching profile will include evidence of ongoing development and improvement in teaching quality, which should result in both student success and a positive and professional reputation as an educator. UTRGV values and holds high expectations for the quality and impact of faculty members’ teaching on student success. These values and expectations are reflected in the categories below. The following categories and expectations are intended to help tenured faculty demonstrate progress towards promotion to full. Department/School minimum criteria are guided by the following expectations:

Pedagogy Statement: Faculty should be able to articulate a philosophy of teaching that communicates their approach to teaching and describes their primary goals as a teacher, advisor and mentor. The body of evidence of teaching practices provided by the faculty member should align with this philosophy.

Continued Development of Teaching Skills: Faculty are expected to stay current with and utilize best practices in teaching and student engagement. Faculty are encouraged to contribute to the advancement of pedagogy within their respective fields. Efforts to develop teaching skills and to keep current on content in the field demonstrate dedication to high-quality teaching. Such efforts might include attending professional development sessions on best practices in teaching, utilizing resources to gather student feedback on teaching, and attending seminars that provide updates to current knowledge and trends in their respective disciplines. Faculty may create teaching and learning scholarship, develop peer-reviewed teaching resources, design and deliver professional development trainings on teaching, and/or create other materials that contribute to advancing pedagogy in higher education.

Use of Peer Feedback on Teaching: In accordance with UTRGV’s [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observations of Teaching](#), Faculty must obtain at least one peer observation every three years. Peer observations of teaching should provide constructive feedback oriented to supporting faculty members’ continuous growth in teaching. Faculty must reflect on what they learned in this process and how they used their peers’ feedback to improve their pedagogical practices.

Alignment of Curricular Practices to Student Needs: Faculty should analyze and reflect on student outcomes regularly. This analysis and reflection should involve exploring student evaluations and feedback for patterns and using those patterns to make changes to course design, pedagogical strategy, assessment mechanisms, and other aspects of the course that best meets the learning needs of students.³

Engagement with Student Learning Outside the Classroom: This engagement may take many different forms and includes but is not limited to involving students in research and creative activities, supporting students’ participation in service learning and/or community engagement activities, supervising clinical or field experiences, and/or mentoring students in career exploration and development.

Participation in Development of Curricula: While these activities might not occur every year, faculty are expected to participate in course and program development and/or redesign to ensure curricula are reflective of current knowledge in the discipline, aligned with relevant program learning outcomes, and best meet the needs of students. Faculty must provide syllabi and their reflection on how their course aligns with the values and expectations established here.

Expectations for Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works

Upon earning tenure, UTRGV faculty must sustain a successful and high-quality record of research, scholarship, and/or creative work that projects a clear, coherent, and independent identity as a scholar.

The work of faculty in this area should lead to the advancement of knowledge.⁴ By achieving these expectations the faculty member will have demonstrated intellectual leadership, but documenting this achievement requires more than enumerating a list of scholarly products. Faculty must demonstrate their achievement in ways that allow for rigorous evaluation of the quality and impact of their work by professional peers both internal and external to the university. The following categories and expectations are intended to help tenured faculty demonstrate progress towards promotion to full. Department/School minimum criteria are guided by the following expectations:

Significance and National Reputation: Faculty should demonstrate achievement in research, scholarship, and/or creative work that establishes themselves as significant and distinguished contributors to the field or profession. Faculty should explain their reasons for choosing the venues where they publish, perform, and/or display their work and should demonstrate how the significance of their work yielded a nationally recognized research program with a coherent and focused theme. Faculty should articulate this theme and peers should be able to recognize the importance of the faculty member's role in developing knowledge in this area.

Consistent Record of Accomplishment with Increasing Significance and Impact: Upon earning tenure and maintaining a research-intensive workload, faculty should continue with the scholarly productivity that earned them tenure, but with increased significance and impact. Scholarly productivity refers to writing peer-reviewed research materials (including but not limited to books, chapters, and journal articles), participating in supplementary scholarly activities (including but not limited to participation in community-engaged scholarship, conferences, edited volumes, substantial book reviews reaching a broad audience, encyclopedia entries, blogs, and public publications, etc.), creating intellectual contributions (including but not limited to patents, inventions, and other intellectual property), displaying and/or performing of creative work, and obtaining external grant funding. Faculty must explain gaps in productivity when those gaps exist.

Sustainability of Agenda and Trajectory: Faculty must demonstrate that their research, scholarship, and/or creative work productivity continues to be sustainable by documenting their ability to secure external grant funding for their research/creative-work trajectory and/or by showing the systematic accumulation of a body of work that builds from their earlier research.

Scholarly Independence: Upon earning tenure, faculty must continue to be independent as a scholar. This independence should be documented by a publication and authorship record that is separate from earlier mentors (such as dissertation committee members), by the author ordering conventions in their respective disciplines, and by thorough explanations of their contributions to co-authored publications, or other collaborative endeavors such as external grant activity. Research, scholarship, and/or creative works conducted as teams are valuable and do not undermine scholarly independence, but faculty must demonstrate their contribution to that work and how that work has greater impact than if it was completed individually.

Quality and Impact: Faculty must explain the quality and impact of their research, scholarship, and/or creative works to both experts and non-experts alike who will evaluate their achievements relative to expectations. Peer review is a crucial indicator of quality work. Beyond peer review, many proxies (or metrics) exist that faculty may use as an indication of quality and impact. These proxies include but are not limited to journal impact factors, journal indices, journal acceptance rates, author citation indices (e.g., h-index), downloads/views, location or venue of the display or performance of creative work, and source of grant funding.⁵ UTRGV supports the responsible use of these proxies, which means that assessment of quality and impact shall not rely on any one proxy and that proxies shall not be used in place of qualitative, expert judgment.⁶ To help ensure responsible use, faculty must not rely on these proxies as being substitutes for detailed explanations of the steps they took to produce high-quality work. Faculty must document and explain how the significance of their work leads to disciplinary and societal impact. The documentation of impact can include but is not limited to the application of knowledge in the community and/or the use of the work in decision-making, citations, awards, and/or the use of products by others in the community, academic or otherwise (e.g., datasets, products, inventions).⁷ Faculty must demonstrate that the impact of their research agenda is greater than it was before earning tenure.

Selection of External Reviewers for Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works: External review of faculty in research, scholarship, and/or creative work is extremely important because these external reviewers provide input into the significance, reputation, trajectory, quality, and impact of this work.

Guidelines and selection procedures can be found in the [UTRGV Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure](#).

Expectations for Service and Shared Governance

UTRGV expects faculty members to model professionalism in all their work, including service and shared governance activities. These activities are essential to the life of the university and an important component of faculty profiles.⁸ Faculty should conceive of their service and shared governance activities as occurring in three areas: the university and its students, university operations and shared governance, and the profession and community. Upon earning tenure, faculty must assume leadership roles in service toward university operations and shared governance and assume leadership roles in their respective disciplinary organizations. Documented and sustained leadership and impact in service and shared governance is an essential component to promotion to the rank of Professor. When participating and leading in shared governance, faculty must document their role in the development of policies and decision-making that affect UTRGV. The following categories and expectations are intended to help tenured faculty demonstrate progress towards promotion to full. Department/School minimum criteria are guided by the following expectations:

Service and Student Success: Faculty should contribute as members, advisors, or leaders in student organizations, international experiences, and recruitment events for the university, college and/or department.

Service to University Operations and Shared Governance: Faculty must contribute to and lead in the life of their university, college, and department by serving on committees and taskforces in a membership and leadership role, which may include curriculum, assessment, awards, hiring, Faculty Senate, and many other areas of university, college, and department operations.

Service to the Profession and the Community: Faculty must contribute to their profession and community. They may contribute in a variety of ways, including but not limited to reviewing manuscripts and/or grant proposals, writing book reviews, or serving/leading in the following: professional organizations (for example, committee work and/or conference planning), agencies, non-profit community organizations, and/or advisory boards that reflect their professional expertise.

Minimum Criteria for Promotion

Upon earning tenure, faculty must evaluate and assess their progress toward achieving the principles and standards of promotion outlined in HOP ADM 06-504, which are specified more clearly in this document.⁹ This document instructs faculty to structure their work and career to meet these high standards and structure their dossiers to allow for rigorous qualitative reviews. Conducting these reviews helps ensure that UTRGV makes promotion recommendations with more substantial analysis than using quantitative minimum criteria as mere thresholds for guaranteeing promotion. The minimum criteria only offer guidance to faculty and does so without setting a threshold for achievement that guarantees promotion.

All evaluation categories can be found in HOP ADM 06-504 [Appendix B Evaluation Categories and Standards](#) and dossier requirements can be found in [Appendix D Dossier Requirements](#). All processes regarding the review, including committee composition and the protocols therein can be found in [Appendix E Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review](#).

Any criteria referenced by HOP ADM 06-504 or the appendices, the UTRGV [External Reviewer Guidelines](#), or the [Peer Observation of Teaching Guidelines](#) should not be included in the Department/School/College guidelines as they are applicable as institutional requirements. The following minimum criteria are discipline-specific and uphold the institutional standard of quality, significance, impact, and productivity. Faculty and all other reviewers should use the following minimum criteria as a guide without setting a specific (enumerated) threshold or checklist for achievement.

End Note

¹ These guidelines and expectations have been drafted to establish clarity and consistency in the qualitative judgments that are required in tenure decision-making. On this point, please see...

² Appendix B, section 1, of HOP ADM 06-504 lists the teaching activities expected of faculty.

³ Research on student evaluations of teaching is extensive and tends to confirm the bias and limited usefulness of student evaluations. For example, please see Troy Heffernan, "Sexism, Racism, Prejudice, and Bias: A Literature Review and Synthesis of Research Surrounding Student Evaluations of Courses and Teaching," *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 47, no. 1 (2022), 144-154; and, Kerry Chávez and Kristina M.W. Mitchell, "Exploring Bias in Student Evaluations: Gender, Race, and Ethnicity," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 53, no. 2 (2020), 270-274

⁴ Appendix B, section 2, of HOP ADM 06-504 lists the research, scholarship, and creative work activities expected of faculty.

⁵ Research documenting the limitations of using any one of these proxies/metrics is extensive. Some proxies are not amendable to all disciplines, research, and/or publication types (e.g., journal articles versus books), and some proxies are subject to manipulation and inflation (as found with journal impact factors). For example, please see Kyle Siler and Vincent Larivière, "Who Games Metrics and Rankings? Institutional Niches and Journal Impact Factor Inflation," *Research Policy* 51 (2022), 104608; Peter Andras, "Research: Metrics, Quality, and Management Implications," *Research Evaluation* 20, no. 2 (2011), 90-106; Björn Hammarfelt and Alexander D. Rushforth, "Indicators as Judgment Devices: An Empirical Study of Citizen Bibliometrics in Research Evaluation," *Research Evaluation* 26, no. 3 (2017), 169-180. Using proxies as the dominant method for evaluation may lead to perverse incentives that undermine the goals that promotion guidelines seek to achieve, such as creativity, intellectual breakthroughs, and excellence. For example, please see Usha C.V. Haley, "Triviality and the Search for Scholarly Impact," *Organizational Studies* 44, no. 9 (2023), 1547-1550; Kevin Ryan, "Academic Freedom and the Eye of Power: The Politics and Poetics of Open Enclosures," *Journal of Political Power* 9, no. 2 (2016), 249-268.

⁶ For documentation of how proxies have been inappropriately substituted for expert decision-making and the slow adoption of responsible use in the United States, please see Alexander Rushforth and Sarah De Rijcke, "Practicing Responsible Research Assessment: Qualitative Study of Faculty Hiring, Promotion, and Tenure Assessments in the United States," *Research Evaluation* 00, preprint (2024), 1-11.

⁷ Documentation of impact, whether artistic, scientific, social, or political is not uniform across disciplines and takes careful consideration. Faculty should consider how impact is conceived in their field. For an overview of these issues, please see Emanuela Reale, et al., "A Review of Literature on Evaluating the Scientific, Social and Political Impact of Social Sciences and Humanities Research," *Research Evaluation* 27, no. 4 (2018), 298-308; Ziyad Marar, "On Measuring Social Science Impact," *Organizational Studies* 43, no. 5 (2022), 821-824; Teresa Penfield, et al., "Assessment, Evaluations, and Definitions of Research Impact: A Review," *Research Evaluation* 23 (2014), 21-32. The diversity of proxies/metrics supported here, and the demand for qualitative explanations of how faculty achieve quality and impact is in-line with the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), which calls for the expansion of research quality assessment beyond "journal-based metrics" like Journal Impact Factor. For a brief review of DORA and DORA-approved assessments in the field of biomedical research (with applications for research assessment in other disciplines), please see Anna R. Gagliardi, et al, "DORA-Compliant Measures of Research Quality..." *PLoS ONE* 18, no. 5 (2023): e0270616.

⁸ Appendix B, section 3, of HOP ADM 06-504 lists the basic dimensions of service activities expected of faculty.

⁹ See, for example, HOP ADM 06-504, Appendix A, Section 2.a, which states that department "guidelines must be in accordance with the general policy principles..."



Minimum Criteria in Teaching

The following minimum criteria helps guide faculty to understanding their progress toward attaining the principles and standards in Teaching delineated above. The minimum criteria pertain to their development of pedagogy, development of teaching skills, use of peer feedback on teaching, alignment of curricular practices to student needs, engagement with student learning outside the classroom, and their participation in the development of curricula.

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. Faculty must describe their teaching thoroughly, holistically, and from multiple viewpoints. This means that tenure-track faculty *must build throughout their career* a comprehensive report of their teaching that details a variety of methods, artifacts, and data.

The faculty member's narrative description and self-assessment of their teaching must address the following:

- 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. 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.

Faculty must also show other evidence of quality teaching. This evidence can be shown in a variety of areas, such as course or program development, teaching innovations, professional development, etc. The following lists examples of how such evidence might be addressed.

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



Minimum Criteria in Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works

The following minimum criteria helps guide faculty to understanding their progress toward attaining the principles and standards in Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works delineated above. The minimum criteria pertain to the existence of a national reputation, their consistent record of accomplishment with increasing significance and impact, the sustainability and trajectory of their research/creative agenda, their scholarly independence, and the quality and impact of their work.

In the area of research, applicants for promotion to rank of professor will be reviewed according to the productivity, quality, impact, and significance of their work, along with demonstrated leadership in their field. The following characteristics serve as general descriptors of products and outcomes that the department and university value and, as such, provide guidelines to faculty as they leverage their efforts towards promotion.

Productivity

In terms of productivity, faculty will produce scholarship in two broad categories during the 5-year period preceding applying for promotion.

Category 1: Faculty will publish a minimum of 9 to 10 peer-reviewed products (books, journal articles in national/international journals, or book chapters).

-Journal articles are valued more than book chapters.

-If published on prestigious and established academic presses, the following provide examples of how authored and edited books are counted. Single-authored books count for three Category 1 publications. Lead or second editor on edited books will count for two Category 1 publications, and third editor position will count for one Category 1 publication.

Category 2: Faculty are also expected to produce an additional 9 to 10 forms of “other” scholarship such as peer-reviewed international and national conference presentations; peer-reviewed conference proceedings; regional, state, and practitioner journal publications; regional, state, and local conference presentations; or grant writing activity (internal grants, nonfunded grant applications, etc.).

Quality

Faculty demonstrate quality, impact, and significance in research by publishing articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals, including the top journals in their fields, and books published on prestigious university and commercial presses. Further, faculty *may also* show quality, impact, and significance in other ways, such as through research awards, citations of their work, major funded external research grants, practical effects in their field, and other such indicators.

Leadership

Faculty demonstrate leadership in research through lead and single authored publications and through coherent, sustained, and recognizable lines of inquiry in their field. Faculty discuss role and coherence of collaborative works on publications and grants with regard their research when not lead author or PI.

Grant Activity

Evidence of grant activity is valued, including participation in internal and external grants, integration into grant writing teams in the department or college, or solicitation of grants as PI or Co-PI.

Culture of Research

Faculty contribute to a culture of research by collaborating with students on research projects, guiding research with students, serving on dissertation committees, or chairing dissertations.



Minimum Criteria in Service and Shared Governance

The following minimum criteria helps guide faculty to understanding their progress toward attaining the principles and standards in Service and Shared Governance delineated above. The minimum criteria pertain to their participation and leadership in service to student success, to university operations and shared governance, and to their profession and community.

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.

Faculty applying for the rank of full professor are expected to perform service in increasing numbers of areas (service to the department and professional service must be included), to demonstrate leadership 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 provide the department, college, and university useful experience and expertise through their service. Faculty should also emphasize, in their narratives, quality of service rather than a simple tallying of activities. Effort in service matters, but expertise, significance, and leadership provide more sustained benefit.