

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty

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 tenure and 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 tenured faculty members at UTRGV who achieve these principles.

Probationary Reviews

Tenure-Track (TT) Faculty must undergo yearly Probationary Reviews. These reviews are evaluative, advisory, and qualitative assessments of their progress toward achieving tenure. This progress is measured using the principles outlined above and in UTRGV's Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP). HOP ADM 06-503 articulates the principles and standards for earning tenure and the need for *comprehensive* yearly Probationary Reviews that evaluate and advise TT faculty of their progress towards achieving tenure.

- Comprehensive yearly assessments are *conceptually* distinct from *annual tenure-track* evaluations.
- Per HOP ADM 06-503, annual tenure-track evaluation ratings are to be used for merit purposes in cases where there is not another mechanism to evaluate for merit.
- The annual tenure-track evaluation performance rating **does not guarantee tenure and promotion**.

As the quoted sections of HOP ADM 06-503 make clear below, there are requirements for tenure that a series of discrete annual reviews cannot fully define or evaluate. The type of review and decision-making required for tenure necessitates a qualitative analysis that goes beyond the reliance on numerical thresholds commonly associated with annual review. To make this distinction clear, these comprehensive yearly assessments are called Probationary Reviews.

Regarding the principles and standards for tenure, HOP ADM 06-503 makes repeated reference to achieving high standards of excellence with quality, significant, and impactful work that TT faculty should sustain after earning tenure. For example:

- "UTRGV is committed to retaining tenure-track faculty whose work achieves a high standard of excellence and...a sustained commitment to professionalism" (HOP ADM 06-503, C.1).
- "Tenure and promotion is not solely a reward for performance during the probationary period; rather, it is a deliberate act taken after comprehensive evaluation of the faculty member's past performance and potential for continued contributions to UTRGV's mission and vision" (HOP ADM 06-503, Section D.1.d).
- "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 TT faculty needing to demonstrate "high potential for continued excellence and effectiveness (HOP ADM 06-503, 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 06-503, 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 tenure and promotion (HOP ADM 06-503, 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 tenure and promotion (HOP ADM 06-503, Appendix B, Section 3.b).

The standards and principles identified above require an evaluative, advisory, and qualitative assessment of TT faculty that is distinct from annual reviews. According to HOP ADM 06-503, these TT assessments must be cumulative, thorough, and focused on trajectory while also occurring on a yearly basis.¹ For example:

- "It is the policy of UTRGV to evaluate tenure-track faculty member's performance in teaching, research, service, patient care, or administration (as applicable); to provide guidance for continued and meaningful faculty development that assists the faculty member with their progress towards tenure and promotion" (HOP ADM 06-503, C.2).
- The tension between the need to conduct both *annual* and *comprehensive* reviews of TT faculty is expressed in HOP ADM 06-503, Section D.5, which is titled "Annual Tenure-Track Evaluation Process." This section states that in addition to an annual review of work done in the previous academic year, the evaluation "should *also* address the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses over the period of time on tenure-track, whether or not the faculty member is making progress toward promotion and tenure, and recommendations for improvement" (HOP ADM 06-503, D.5.c, *emphasis added*).
- "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 06-503, Appendix E, Section 2.c). The instruction to read all materials in the process of evaluating the merits of recommending tenure means that an evaluation of TT faculty must include a qualitative assessment of the quality, significance, and impact of their work.

TT faculty must provide the necessary information for their Probationary Reviews. HOP ADM 06-503, Appendix D, outlines the structure of TT faculty dossiers and states that TT faculty must provide "summaries of professional accomplishments" for all areas of review (teaching, research and scholarship, service, patient care) (Section 2.a.ii). In what follows, this document outlines how TT 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 06-503.

Tenure Evaluation and Advisory Committee

TT faculty members shall have a Tenure Evaluation and Advisory Committee (TEAC). TEAC is a department-level committee composed of tenured faculty close to the TT faculty member's area of research expertise. TEAC membership should stay as consistent as possible throughout the TT faculty member's probationary period.² TEAC is responsible for writing the Probationary Reviews and the Annual Reviews of the TT faculty member. These Probationary Reviews evaluate and advise TT faculty each year as they work toward earning tenure and promotion. TEAC's Probationary Review and those of other review levels as specified by the Pathways document have the responsibility of recommending reappointment or removal from the tenure track each year. As an entire committee, TEAC must meet with the TT faculty member at least once a year to discuss that faculty member's progress toward tenure and provide guidance in areas that need improvement, but individual members of TEAC are encouraged to have ongoing communication with the TT faculty member.

Third-Year Review

TT faculty undergo a review at the beginning of their probationary period's third year. This review is cumulative, with TEAC, the department chair, college tenure and promotion committee, Dean, and Provost rendering judgment on the progress toward and prospect of earning tenure and promotion. It is imperative that each dossier is complete with all information and documentation aligning with the expectations stated below.³

Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, faculty are expected to perform with excellence in all areas of responsibility during their probationary period and demonstrate a trajectory aligned with the expectations of tenured faculty members.⁴ The dossiers of TT faculty must provide clear documentation of their effort and success in the categories of teaching, research, and service.

Expectations for Teaching

As educators, UTRGV TT faculty must establish a teaching profile that demonstrates growth, impact, and student success.⁵ 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 TT faculty demonstrate progress towards tenure and promotion. Department/School minimum criteria are guided by the following expectations:

Pedagogy Statement: TT 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. This statement must include an annual reflection on how they are adapting their teaching practices to best meet student needs and an analysis of which practices lead to student success and which practices need to improve or change.

Continued Development of Teaching Skills: TT faculty are expected to stay current with and utilize best practices in teaching and student engagement. TT 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 discipline. TT 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](#), TT faculty must obtain at least one peer observation each year during the probationary period. Peer observations of teaching should provide constructive feedback oriented to supporting faculty members' continuous growth in teaching. TT 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: TT 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.⁶

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, TT 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. TT 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

UTRGV TT 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. The work of TT faculty in this area should lead to the advancement of knowledge.⁷ By achieving these expectations the TT faculty member will have demonstrated intellectual leadership, but documenting this achievement requires more than enumerating a list of scholarly products. TT 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 TT faculty demonstrate progress towards tenure and promotion. Department/School minimum criteria are guided by the following expectations:

Significance and Progress toward National Reputation: TT faculty should demonstrate achievement in research, scholarship, and/or creative work that establishes the faculty as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for continued success and distinction. TT 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 will yield (or has yielded already) a nationally recognized research program with a coherent and focused theme. TT 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 and Increasing Record of Accomplishment: There should be a steady increase in scholarly productivity as TT faculty learn to balance their time and duties. 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. TT faculty must explain gaps in productivity when those gaps exist.

Sustainability of Agenda and Trajectory: TT faculty must demonstrate that their research, scholarship, and/or creative work productivity is 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: TT faculty must establish their independence 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 TT faculty must demonstrate their contribution to that work and how that work has greater impact than if it was completed individually.

Quality and Impact: TT 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 TT 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.⁸ 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.⁹ To help ensure responsible use, TT faculty must not rely on these proxies as being substitutes for detailed explanations of the steps they took to produce high-quality work.

TT 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).¹⁰

Selection of External Reviewers for Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works: External review of TT 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 TT faculty profiles.¹¹ TT 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. While TT faculty should make meaningful contributions in this area and should reflect on the type of service profile that they want to develop at UTRGV, this area is not a major emphasis of their duties and TT faculty are not expected to be active in all components listed below. TT faculty should work with TEAC and their department chairs to ensure a balance in service/shared-governance activities that corresponds with the high expectations in the teaching and research categories. TT faculty must document the outputs and outcomes of their service effort, and when participating in shared governance, they must document their role in the development of policies and decision-making that affect UTRGV. The following categories and expectations are intended to help TT faculty demonstrate progress towards tenure and promotion. Department/School minimum criteria are guided by the following expectations:

Service and Student Success: TT 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: TT faculty should contribute to the life of their university, college, and department by serving on committees and taskforces in a membership or 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: TT faculty should contribute to their profession and community. They may contribute by reviewing manuscripts and/or grant proposals, writing book reviews, and/or serving 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 Tenure and Promotion

In compliance with HOP ADM 06-503, TT faculty must receive comprehensive assessments each year of their probationary period (Probationary Reviews) that evaluate and advise their progress toward achieving the principles and standards in HOP ADM 06-503, which are specified more clearly in this document.¹² This document instructs TT faculty to structure their work and career to meet these high standards and structure their dossiers to allow for rigorous, qualitative Probationary Reviews. Conducting these reviews helps ensure that UTRGV makes tenure recommendations with more substantial analysis than using quantitative minimum criteria as mere thresholds for guaranteeing tenure. The minimum criteria only offer guidance to TT faculty and does so without setting a threshold for achievement that guarantees tenure and promotion.

All evaluation categories can be found in HOP ADM 06-503 [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 06-503 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. TT faculty, TEAC, and all other reviewers should use the following minimum criteria as a guide without setting a specific (enumerated) threshold or checklist for achievement.

Endnote

¹ HOP ADM 06-503, Section 3.b is titled “Tenure-Track Evaluations” and states that “all tenure-track faculty will be evaluated for their work performance in teaching, research, service, and patient care, as applicable, each academic year following the schedule set forth in Pathways.”

² The formation and membership of TEAC is consistent with Appendix E, section 1.c, of HOP ADM 06-503.

³ See HOP ADM 06-503, section D.6.

⁴ 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 the report *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation* published in 2000 by The American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, and the United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group. These guidelines and expectations avoid describing the tenure decision in quantitative terms because “efforts to quantify scholarly productivity or teaching quality are problematic” and “quality must be the major criterion.” For these quotes and a general introduction to the tenure decision, please see Samuel L. Becker, et al., “Making Good Tenure Decisions,” *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration* 30 (2001), 95-103.

⁵ Appendix B, section 1, of HOP ADM 06-503 lists the teaching activities expected of faculty.

⁶ 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.

⁷ Appendix B, section 2, of HOP ADM 06-503 lists the research, scholarship, and creative work activities expected of faculty.

⁸ Research documenting the limitations of using any one of these proxies/metrics is extensive. Some proxies are not amenable 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 tenure and 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.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Documentation of impact, whether artistic, scientific, social, or political is not uniform across disciplines and takes careful consideration. TT 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 TT 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.

¹¹ Appendix B, section 3, of HOP ADM 06-503 lists the basic dimensions of service activities expected of faculty.

¹² See, for example, HOP ADM 06-503, 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 are values that help guide TT 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.

BLS Faculty should provide clear, concise evidence for each criterion, demonstrating growth, commitment to student success, and adaptation to the unique needs of the RGV student population. Evidence to include to support this section includes syllabi, course evaluations with student comments, sample of assignments, certificates of completion of professional development, among others.

Criteria: TT faculty should articulate a philosophy of teaching that communicates their approach to teaching and describes their primary goals as a teacher, advisor and/or mentor.

Guidelines: Pedagogy statements address teaching philosophy and include values and beliefs as well as how these inform their practice. Faculty should address how their teaching aligns and/or contributes to develop and promote CEP and BLS instructional values. In addition, faculty should provide evidence of proficiency with and integration of educational technology and best practices in their instruction; and explaining how their instruction attends to the unique pedagogical implications of teaching P-16 learners in the RGV.

Criteria: Faculty must demonstrate their commitment to developing their teaching skills staying current with best practices in teaching and student engagement

Guidelines: Describe professional development opportunities sought both at the institution or externally. Faculty should also explain and provide concrete examples of how participating in professional development initiatives has contributed to improving their teaching, how they use student data to improve practice, and how they align instruction to best practices. When appropriate faculty are encouraged to demonstrate contributions to the advancement of pedagogy in their field.

Criteria: Faculty are expected to reflect on peer feedback

Guidelines: Critically reflect on the results of the annual peer observation(s) and recommendations from previous faculty reviews and explain how feedback was used to improve practice through specific examples such as changes in syllabi, assignments, teaching strategies, etc.

Criteria: Faculty are expected to align teaching practices to students' needs.

Guidelines: Describe and reflect on student course evaluation results in comparison to the department mean score available through Course Evals application, and a critical analysis of students' comments. Discuss and provide examples that illustrate any contextual factors that might have impacted student evaluations and/or any specific actions for addressing and improving student ratings and concerns.

Criteria: Faculty are expected to engage students beyond the classroom in activities that contribute to extend learning and/or mentor students' development.

Guidelines: Detail and provide examples of contributions to field experience, service-learning assignments, and mentoring accomplishments. By mentoring we mean a significant, lasting professional relationship between a faculty member and student with the purpose of the student's professional growth and development. This can include, among other things, supervision of cumulative projects, theses, and dissertations.

Criteria: Faculty must participate in the development and/or enhancement of course/program development

Guidelines: Describe the specific contributions to program/course innovation and/or development, for example serving as a course leader, creating new program assessments, significantly revising existing program assessments, collaborating with colleagues to advance program design at the department or college level, participating in aligning or realigning a program to state and/or national standards, development and use of technology to improve instruction, significant revisions to a course or new course development, developing test preparation materials (in English or Spanish), blueprinting courses, among others.

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

The following minimum criteria are values that help guide TT 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 significance of their work and progress toward a national reputation, their consistent and increasing record of accomplishment, the sustainability and trajectory of their research/creative agenda, their scholarly independence, and the quality and impact of their work.

The following minimum criteria are values that help guide TT faculty to understanding their progress toward attaining the principles and standards in Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works delineated above. The department values a broad range of multilingual scholarship (i.e., in English, Spanish, and/or other languages) including both independent and collaborative research, interdisciplinary work, and both theoretical and practitioner-oriented work.

Criteria: Quality, Significance and Progress toward National Reputation

Guidelines: Tenure-track faculty must develop an academic identity and coherent research agenda that includes at least one clearly defined line of inquiry which contributes to the field of bilingual and/or literacy studies and/or responds to the department and university's mission.

Faculty should demonstrate how the quality and significance of their work yield or have yielded national recognition. There are different ways to achieve this such as documenting citations of their work, invitations to share or publish research, impact factor or quality of the journals, and/or providing a rationale of how their research advances the field.

Criteria: Consistent and Increasing Record of Accomplishment

Guidelines: There are multiple ways to be successful in research and scholarship, including both peer-reviewed and supplementary scholarly work and pursuing external funding. That said, BLS tenure-track faculty are expected to publish consistently, resulting in approximately eight or more peer-reviewed publications, depending on quality and impact, by the time of potential tenure and promotion (i.e., articles in peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed book chapters, authored or edited books published by an academic press, etc.). Awarded external grants should be considered as a peer-reviewed scholarly outcome (Spencer Foundation grant, NSF, IES or equivalent in terms of requirement and scope). Additionally, tenure-track faculty need to average at least one supplemental research activity per year (e.g., presentations, internal grants, community engaged scholarship without a clear product, academic blogs, etc.). Preference will be given to supplemental activities where research is disseminated at the highest levels nationally and internationally.

Criteria: Sustainability of Agenda and Trajectory

Guidelines: All tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate that their research, scholarship, and/or creative work productivity is sustainable and to pursue internal and external grant funding to support their scholarship, with increasing grant-related responsibilities over the period of review. By the time of potential tenure and promotion, faculty must have submitted at least one external grant as PI or Co-PI that is aligned to their scholarly identity. However, the department understands that some faculty will spend significant time pursuing external funding while some prefer to focus on other scholarly activities. Faculty who focus on other activities still need to meet the minimum level of grant work and should also demonstrate the sustainability of their research agenda by showing the systematic accumulation of a body of work that builds from their earlier research.

Criteria: Scholarly Independence

Guidelines: While the department values collaborative work and co-authored publications and presentations, tenure-track faculty are expected to document their independence as a scholar through sole-authored/lead author works or through serving as a PI on funded external grants or grant proposals. A minimum of 1/3 of their total scholarly output should be sole-authored or as leading author. Individual contributions to collaborative work should be demonstrated as described in this document.

Minimum Criteria in Service and Shared Governance

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

In their dossier, faculty should communicate the quality, significance, and impact of their service. The dossier documents the outputs and outcomes of the work, and evidence may include an email naming a faculty member to a committee, an email reporting on the results, or a flyer for an event. The following guidelines present a short, non-comprehensive list of examples of service in each area.

Criteria: BLS faculty support the well-being, leadership, and academic success of UTRGV undergraduate and graduate students, extending beyond the classroom.

Guidelines: Describe and reflect on your non-teaching activities which are centered on students, and how you have contributed to UTRGV's broader goal of student success. This is likely to occur through work related to our department and our courses, though it could be organized by the College, institution, or other offices. Examples:

- **Academic success**, such as course leadership, admissions interviews, TExES workshops, advising about future courses, or being a member (not chair) of a dissertation committee
- **Development of student leadership**, such as supporting student organizations such as BESO, SGA, TAFE, or other student-led initiatives
- **Student well-being**, such as projects to advance mental health, REC center, or UTRGV food pantry
- **Recruitment**, such as communicating with prospective applicants or staffing a table at a Graduate College event

Criteria: BLS faculty demonstrate their commitment to serving university operations and shared governance, showing professionalism, and building their own leadership capacity.

Guidelines: University operations are the work that allows UTRGV to function effectively and efficiently, by having the necessary personnel, facilities, degree programs, and many related elements. Shared governance is about the continual presence of faculty voice in university decisions. Describe and reflect on how your particular service activities supported UTRGV's operation and shared governance. Examples:

- **University operations**, such as search committees, faculty review committees, most university-level committees, CEP Curriculum Committee or other college committees and taskforces, among others.
- **Shared governance**, such as Women's Faculty Network, College Council, Office for Bilingual Integration leadership, accreditation, strategic planning, or facilities planning, among others.

Criteria: BLS faculty establish themselves as members of professional communities related to bilingual or literacy studies or to teacher preparation, and as members of a community extending beyond UTRGV's campuses.

Guidelines: Describe and reflect on how you have contributed to the success of your profession beyond UTRGV, and of your community beyond UTRGV. Examples:

- **the profession:** Editorial activities for publications, professional organizations, academic conferences, or contributing expertise to advance organizations with education-related missions
- **the community:** contributing work to support local teachers or students, supporting civic organizations, organizing community events, or helping members of the community informally in ways that reflect your professional expertise.