Department of Civil Engineering
Criteria for Evaluation and Levels of Performance for Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review, and Annual Review

From its inception, the faculty of the Department of Civil Engineering has recognized the importance of fostering each member’s unique interests and abilities. Cognizant of the effectiveness of this philosophy we believe that tenure and promotion should also recognize the uniqueness of each faculty member. Thus, we place utmost importance on the faculty's progress along their uniquely established plan for professional growth in the weighting of the categories and the associated criteria used to evaluate each individual faculty member. This requires that each faculty member work with the Departmental Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review, and Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair to initially establish a viable Workload Effort Distribution Plan that is sufficient to warrant tenure and promotion. This Plan is the basis of determining to what extent the expectations are met during the tenure and promotion evaluation process. The evaluation process of tenure and promotion monitors each faculty member’s progress along their individual faculty growth plan and, to make adjustments if deemed necessary. Any adjustments should occur at the beginning of the academic year and will be reviewed by the Committee and the Department Chair. This document is informed by the following guidelines provided by the Division of Academic Affairs:

Annual Faculty Evaluations Process and Guidelines
https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/annual_faculty_evals_and_tenure_and_promotion_process_and_guidelines.pdf

Format for Faculty Review Electronic Dossier
https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/format_for_faculty_review電子_dossier.pdf

1. Criteria for Evaluation

Faculty members will be evaluated based on accomplishments in and contributions to teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship, and service. The following criteria lists attempt to state activities in which a faculty member should be, but is not necessarily required to be, involved and do not necessarily represent a complete list of activities for each of the category of the evaluation. Faculty may receive credit for additional activities related to teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship, and service, which are not listed in the Evaluation Criteria.

1.1. Teaching Effectiveness is a major component in the tenure and promotion evaluation process. Teaching effectiveness is not measured solely by performance in the classroom but is also measured in the broader context of how one assists in the preparation of the student for the practice of engineering. Performance in this area may be evaluated by, although not limited to, the criteria mentioned below.

1.1.1. Evaluation Criteria

I. Teaching Excellence. Evidence of teaching excellence includes:
   a. Student evaluations of performance in the classroom and in discharge of
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teaching responsibilities

b. Peer evaluations of performance in the classroom and discharge of teaching duties (e.g., delivery of required UG courses)

c. Activities toward the development/improvement of classroom aids/materials and different systems of delivery
d. Development of significant new pedagogical tools or approaches and demonstrably successful dissemination of those to other faculty in the Department.
e. Mentoring of new faculty in development of their own teaching skills.

II. Other Teaching Related Activities. Evidence of other teaching related activities includes:

a. Career awards and honors received for excellent teaching
b. Evidence which demonstrates comprehensive and current knowledge of course content (e.g., development of graduate offering(s) and/or UG technical electives in area of expertise)
c. Evidence which demonstrates continuing education/training on course-related subjects to improve teaching efficiency
d. Evidence which reveals a positive and proactive attitude in discharging classroom responsibilities (e.g., delivery of required UG courses).
e. Supervision and/or assistance/advice of Senior Design projects and/or student competition teams
f. Providing oversight to curriculum through service as a course coordinator for at least three years.
g. Additional and/or extra-curricular teaching opportunities offered by the faculty member to the students beyond the required coursework and which allow students to expand their knowledge of the profession.
h. Other technical advising and mentoring of students

1.2. Research/Scholarship: Research/Scholarship may include original scholarly works in the area of education as well as in technical research areas. Performance in this area may be judged by, although not limited to, the criteria mentioned below.

1.2.1. Evaluation Criteria

I. Dissemination of Research. Evidence of research dissemination includes:

a. Publications including
   i. Technical journal articles including open-access journal*
   ii. Book chapters (in Civil Engineering disciplines)*
   iii. Books (in Civil Engineering disciplines, valued up to one journal article per chapter as determined by the Departmental T&P Committee)*
   iv. Discipline-related critical reviews* (published book reviews etc.)
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v. Conference proceeding article* (It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide sufficient evidence of journal level merit for conference proceedings on a case by case basis.)

vi. Published abstracts of project reports (e.g., project report, poster presentation) *

vii. Technical publications required by funding agency (e.g., funded project reports)  
     *Indicates whether peer reviewed or non-peer reviewed

b. Presentations including

   i. Research presentations at professional meetings and conferences
   ii. Invited speaking, (e.g., invited keynote speaking)
   iii. Presentations in professional seminars (internal & external)
   iv. Presentations of creative works and exhibitions

II. Recognition of Research. Evidence of research recognition includes:

a. Funding
   i. External grant awards and contracts*
   ii. Internal grant awards
   iii. Research related activities (e.g., conducting funded research project, preparing/developing new research idea)
   iv. Research proposals development**  
      *indicates whether PI or Co-PI and if Project Manager for funds  
      **indicates whether funded or not funded

b. Awards and other professional recognition including
   i. Honors from professional and learned societies
   ii. Membership on journal editorial boards
   iii. Membership on panels, committees and councils which evaluate research projects, creative works, presentations and exhibitions.
   iv. Registration as a Professional Engineer (PE) or certification by professional organization.
   v. Citations of work published in peer reviewed journals

c. Patents awarded (Provisional patent, disclosures)

d. Mentoring of junior faculty who become successful researchers in their own right.

e. Leadership of multiparticipant grant or center where he/she provides mentoring or direction to multiple faculty investigators.

III. Student Involvement in Research. Evidence of student participation in independent studies

a. Supervising student research article publications (e.g., journal, conference proceeding paper)*

b. Supervising student presentation, (e.g., oral/poster presentation in technical conference)*
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1.3. Service is an important component in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. For promotion to Associate Professor, service to students is mandatory. Additionally, service to the University is required for promotion to full professor. Service will be assessed based on time, effort and significance of the activity. Additional weight will be given to service activities involving a leadership role. Performance in this area may be judged by, although not limited to, the criteria mentioned below.

1.3.1. Evaluation Criteria

I. Internal Service to the Department and its Students. Evidence includes:

a. Service to students
   i. Student academic advising
   ii. Sponsorship (faculty advisor/mentor) for student organizations, (e.g., Academic Society of Civil Engineers Student Chapter)
   iii. Review sessions for professional examinations, (e.g., FE exam reviews and seminars/presentations offered to students)

b. Service to the Department
   i. Departmental committees, (e.g., annual review, curriculum, faculty searches, marketing, etc. (Chair of committee more significant))
   ii. Representing Department in student recruitment and outreach events,
   iii. Mentoring new or junior faculty
   iv. Administrative duties (Department Chair, Associate Chair, Graduate program director, UG program director, ABET Coordinator)

II. External Service. Evidence includes:

a. Service to the University (Chair of committee more significant)
   i. University committees or councils, (e.g., University T & P Committee)
   ii. College committees or councils
   iii. Faculty senate and/or FS subcommittees, workgroups or panels.
   iv. Special duties not covered in i-iii (e.g., University Search Committees)
   v. Active (and demonstratable) participation in College &/or University groups which foster any of the goals or objectives included in the UTRGV Strategic Plan

b. Service to the Community outside the University

Approved by Department of Civil Engineering Faculty on October 22, 2019
Approved by CECS Dean on October 22, 2019
Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs on November 4, 2019
i. Active participation in professionally related community organizations
ii. Participation in local boards and committees in the area of professional expertise
iii. Work activities related to public schools and educational organizations
iv. Presentation of workshops, conferences or seminars to the community

2. Performance Requirements for Tenure and Promotion and Post-Tenure Review

Civil Engineering Department faculty members should follow guidelines and processes delineated in HOP Policy ADM 06-502 FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION: https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-505.pdf. Candidates are expected to be awarded overall performance level of “Meets Expectations” of the evaluation rubric from teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship, and service. Candidates cannot have “Unsatisfactory” level in any one of the three evaluation categories.

2.1. Expectations for Tenure and Associate Professor Promotion

2.1.1. Expectations of Teaching Effectiveness

The evaluation rubric in teaching for tenure and associate professor promotion are shown as below. Deviation from the general evaluation rubric must be based on the established Annual Workload Effort Distribution Plan.

Exceeds Expectations:
- Meeting expectations in Criteria a, b, and c under Category I AND meeting expectations in any of the four Criteria under Category II, OR
- Meeting expectations in Criteria a, b, and c under Category I AND exceeding expectations in any of the two Criteria of a, b, and c under Category I.

Meets Expectations:
- Meeting expectations in Criteria a, b, and c under Category I
Does Not Meet Expectations:
- Not meeting expectations in any of Criteria a, b, and c under Category I

Unsatisfactory:
- Documented evidence of a pattern of detrimental behavior towards the teaching mission of the Department (e.g., inattention to teaching duties and responsibilities, lack of timely delivery of appropriately developed ABET course assessments and/or other documents or work as required by the Dept.).

2.1.2. Expectations of Research/Scholarship
The evaluation rubric in research/scholarship for tenure and associate professor promotion are shown as below. Deviation from the general evaluation rubric must be based on the established Annual Workload Effort Distribution Plan. All candidates pursuing tenure and promotion must undergo an external review of their professional achievement: [https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/guidelines_for_external_reviewers.pdf](https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/guidelines_for_external_reviewers.pdf)

Exceeds Expectations:
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria under Category I AND exceeding expectations in any one of the Criteria under Category I AND meeting expectations in any two of the Criteria a, b, and c under Category II AND meeting expectations in any two of the Criteria under Category III, OR
- Exceeding expectations in Criteria a under Category I OR exceeding expectations in Criteria a under Category II AND meeting expectations in any of the two Criteria under Category III.

Meets Expectations:
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria under Category I AND meeting expectations in any one of the Criteria a, b, and c under Category II AND meeting expectations in any two of the Criteria under Category III, OR
- Meeting expectations in any one Criteria under Category I OR meeting expectations in any one of the Criteria a, b, and c under Category II AND exceeding expectations in any two of the Criteria under Category III.

Does Not Meet Expectations:
- Not meeting expectations in any of Criteria under Categories I, II, and III

Unsatisfactory:
- Not engaged in any research/scholarship described in any of Criteria under Categories I, II, and III.

2.1.3. Expectations of Service
The evaluation rubric in service for tenure and associate professor promotion are shown
as below. Deviation from the general evaluation rubric must be based on the established Annual Workload Effort Distribution Plan. Candidates for Tenure and Associate Professor promotion are expected to be awarded Exceeds Expectations or Meets Expectations of the evaluation rubric shown as below.

**Exceeds Expectations:**
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria a and b under Category I AND exceeding expectations in any one of the Criteria under Category I AND meeting expectations in Criteria a, b, and c under Category II, OR
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria a and b under Category I AND exceeding expectations in any one of the Criteria under Category II, OR
- Exceeding expectations in all Criteria a and b under Category I AND meeting expectations in any two of the Criteria under Category II.

**Meets Expectations:**
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria a and b under Category I AND meeting expectations in any one of the Criteria a, b, and c under Category II.

**Does Not Meet Expectations:**
- Not meeting expectations in any of Criteria under Category I OR in any two of Criteria under Category II.

**Unsatisfactory:**
- No evidence of any service to the Department or its students.

2.1.4. Additional Requirements for Tenure and Associate Professor Promotion
The contributions of the candidate to the department mission are of great importance. Candidates are expected to perform their duties in a collegial and professional manner with regard to student, staff, faculty colleagues, and the general public. In addition, candidates are expected to be a licensed PE (Professional Engineer) if licensing is normally expected for practitioners in his/her area of expertise or to hold external certification, e.g., D.WRE., PMP, relevant to their area of practice.

2.1.5. Early Tenure and/or Promotion
Exceptional candidates may apply for early tenure and/or promotion. Such candidates must have outstanding teaching, research and service records far exceeding expectations.

2.2. Expectations for Full Professor Promotion and Post-Tenure Review
Civil Engineering Department faculty members should follow guidelines and process delineated in HOP Policy ADM 06-502 FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION: [https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-505.pdf](https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-505.pdf). Senior faculty are expected to contribute to the maintenance a congenial and productive community of scholars. Candidates are expected to be awarded overall performance level of “Meets Expectations” of the evaluation rubric from teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship, and service. Candidates cannot have
“Unsatisfactory” level in any one of the three evaluation categories. An unsatisfactory rating will be awarded for faculty who have been sanctioned by the state licensing board for violation of professional standards of conduct as specified in the engineering code of ethics and Texas legal code: https://engineers.texas.gov/downloads/lawrules.pdf.

2.2.1. Expectations of Teaching Effectiveness
The evaluation rubric in teaching for promotion to full professor or tenured faculty are shown as below. Deviation from the general evaluation rubric must be based on the established Annual Workload Effort Distribution Plan.

Exceeds Expectations:
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria under Categories I and II, OR
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria under Category I AND exceeding expectations in any four of the Criteria under Category II, OR
- Meeting expectations in Criteria a, b, and c under Category I AND exceeding expectations in the Criteria d and e under Category I., OR
- Exceeding expectations in all Criteria under Category I.

Meets Expectations:
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria under Category I, OR
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria under Category I and in any two of the Criteria under Category II.

Does Not Meet Expectations:
- Not meeting expectations in any of Criteria under Category I.

Unsatisfactory:
- Documented evidence of a pattern of detrimental behavior towards the teaching mission of the Department (e.g., no attention to teaching duties and responsibilities, no delivery of ABET course assessment documents, etc.).

2.2.2. Expectations of Research/Scholarship
The evaluation rubric in research/scholarship for promotion to full professor or tenured faculty are shown as below. Deviation from the general evaluation rubric must be based on the established Annual Workload Effort Distribution Plan. However, tenured faculty research effort should never fall below 10%.

Exceeds Expectations:
- Meeting expectations in all Criteria under Category I and Criteria d under Category II AND meeting expectations in any of the two Criteria a, b, and c under Category II AND meeting expectations in any of the two Criteria under Category III, OR
• Exceeding expectations in Criteria a under Category I OR exceeding expectations in Criteria a and d under Category II AND meeting expectations in any of the two Criteria under Category III.

Meets Expectations:
• Meeting expectations in any of one Criteria under Category I AND meeting expectations in any of the one Criteria a, b, and c under Category II AND meeting expectations in any of the two Criteria under Category III, OR
• Meeting expectations in any of one Criteria under Category I OR meeting expectations in any of the one Criteria a, b, and c under Category II AND exceeding expectations in any of the two Criteria under Category III.

Does Not Meet Expectations:
• Not meeting expectations in any of Criteria under Categories I, II, and III

Unsatisfactory:
• Not engaged in any research/scholarship described in any of Criteria under Categories I, II, and III.

2.2.3. Expectations of Service
The evaluation rubric in service for promotion to full professor or tenured faculty are shown as below. Deviation from the general evaluation rubric must be based on the established Annual Workload Effort Distribution Plan.

Exceeds Expectations:
• Meeting expectations in all Criteria a and b under Category I AND exceeding expectations in any one of the Criteria a and b under Category I AND exceeding expectation in any two of the Criteria under Category II, OR
• Exceeding expectations in all Criteria under Category I AND meeting expectations in Criteria a, b, and c under Category II.

Meets Expectations:
• Meeting expectations in all Criteria a and b under Category I AND meeting expectations in any two of Criteria under Category II.

Does Not Meet Expectations:
• Not meeting expectations in any of Criteria a and b under Category I OR in any two of Criteria under Category II.

Unsatisfactory:
• No evidence of any service to the Department or its students.

2.3. Annual Evaluation Rubric
Civil Engineering Department faculty members should follow guidelines and process delineated in HOP Policy ADM 06-502 ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION: https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-502.pdf. Deviation from the general evaluation is invalid.
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Rubric must be based on the established Annual Workload Effort Distribution Plan.

**Exceeds Expectations:**
- Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty
  - Exceeding expectations in at least one Category AND meeting expectations in the other Categories
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty
  - Exceeding expectations in at least one of the Categories of Teaching and Service AND meeting expectations in the other Category.

**Meets Expectations:**
- Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty
  - Meeting expectations in at least two Categories with no unsatisfactory rating in any other Categories
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty
  - Meeting expectations in the two Categories (Teaching and Service).

**Does Not Meet Expectations:**
- Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty
  - Not meeting expectations in at least two Categories
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty
  - Not meeting expectations in Teaching.

**Unsatisfactory:**
- Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty
  - Unsatisfactory in any one of the Categories OR not meeting expectations in all Categories
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty
  - Not meeting expectations in both Teaching and Service.

Endorsed by the Faculty of the Department of Civil Engineering, *September 4th, 2019*