



College of Liberal Arts  
Department of Writing and Language Studies  
Policies for Faculty Annual Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion, Comprehensive  
Periodic Evaluation, and Merit Determination  
**Approved by the Office of the Provost February 8, 2024**

**I. OVERVIEW**

**A. Purpose and Philosophy of Faculty Review**

- 1. Applicability.** Full-time faculty members and continuing part-time faculty members at WLS will be evaluated annually. In evaluating a faculty member's performance in teaching, research, or service (as applicable), reviewers are expected to provide faculty with an appraisal of their job performance compared to the standards and criteria set forth in these guidelines.
- 2. Review Purpose.** The objectives of this annual evaluation process include providing faculty with (a) a more concrete understanding of ways to achieve professional growth and (b) a job performance basis for possible merit salary increases, and (c) a reappointment evaluation.
- 3. Review Philosophy.** The Writing & Language Studies Department (WLS) is a large academic unit composed of scholars working in several related yet substantially diverse fields of inquiry including rhetoric and composition, linguistics, English as a second language (ESL), language acquisition, and translation and interpreting. This diversity makes it difficult to codify evaluation criteria that are equitable, insightful, and sufficiently specific enough to apply to all faculty members' activities, especially in the area of Research/Scholarship. Among WLS colleagues working in different disciplines, quantification of scholarly production alone is an unreliable evaluation criterion, since scholarship can take many forms and is subject to vastly different circumstances of scrutiny within professional communities. Furthermore, WLS faculty base substantive and meaningful evaluation of themselves and their departmental colleagues on impact of scholarly output and not on quantity alone.

The department therefore advocates a more general, multifaceted system of guidelines for performance evaluation which ensures that faculty activity in all disciplinary areas and of all ranks have sufficient opportunity to demonstrate both the quantity and the professional impact of their work. This philosophy is the

foundation for all departmental evaluations: Annual Review, Tenure, Comprehensive Periodic, and Promotion.

A generalized, quantitative criterion is established as a baseline for the level of activity that faculty members of each rank are expected to achieve as the minimum for an evaluation of *Meets Expectations* in the areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service (which includes administrative assignments). This threshold is expressed differently for each of the three areas under review, as described in the relevant sections below. The departmental review committee will use the baselines outlined in those sections as quantifiable guidelines for determining whether faculty members have met expectations. More importantly, the departmental review committee is charged with evaluating whether each faculty member's performance also reflects quality and meaningful impact on the field of study in which the faculty member is working. This can only be determined if faculty members actively demonstrate the impact of their Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service activities for the period under review in the *Narrative Summaries* they include in the review dossiers they submit through FPT. Thus, the onus of demonstrating impact and of providing evidence thereof falls upon individual faculty members.

## **B. Department Evaluation Committee and Types of Reviews**

- 1. Formation of Committee.** The departmental Faculty Review Committee is composed of at least six tenured faculty members (elected by blind vote of tenure-track and tenured faculty) and at least four 3-year lecturers (elected by blind vote of lecturers with at least 2 consecutive semesters in WLS) so as to provide representation of the departmental faculty in terms of rank, campus, and discipline.
  - a. The Department Chair cannot be a member of the Faculty Review Committee that handles tenure, promotion, comprehensive periodic, or annual review.
  - b. During years when tenured faculty are applying for promotion to Full Professor, there must be three full professors on the committee. If three full professors are not elected as part of the six tenured faculty, the Department Chair will add the necessary number of full professors based on the departmental vote.
  - c. The committee must include at least one member from each disciplinary area of the department represented by the candidates under review; if the elected committee does not include one member from each area, a second blind vote will be taken in order to elect an eligible member from the unrepresented area.
  - d. Depending on the number of dossiers and the voting results, the Committee Chair may ask the Department Chair to add more than the minimum number of committee members based on the departmental vote.

- e. The committee members will serve for one academic year.
- f. The committee members will elect one of their numbers to serve as Chair. The Chair is responsible for verifying the completeness of dossiers and requesting missing documents, if necessary, appropriately distributing dossiers among committee members, holding committee meetings for review discussion, distributing paper and electronic copies of committee reviews, managing any department committee-level appeals by faculty, initiating routing forms, and arranging for departmental review and certification of tenure application dossiers.

**2. Review Types.** The Faculty Review Committee is responsible for six types of review.

- a. **Annual Review.** The committee will discuss and evaluate all complete dossiers for Annual Review, distributing dossiers so that faculty are evaluated by colleagues at or above their rank. The committee will also vet external review lists for those going up for promotion to Associate or Full Professor.
- b. **Promotion Review for 3-year Lecturers.** The full committee will review complete dossiers for 3-year lecturers applying for promotion who are entering the third year in their contract, distributing them so that faculty are evaluated by colleagues at or above their rank. Reviewing committee members will discuss these evaluations and will sign the final reviews.
- c. **Third Year Review.** Tenured faculty on the committee will evaluate tenure-track faculty's progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion.
- d. **Tenure and Promotion Review.** The tenured members of the committee will review complete dossiers for tenure-track faculty applying for tenure and promotion. Tenured committee members will discuss these evaluations and sign the final reviews. Applications for tenure and promotion require department level certification because the department committee is less than a committee of the whole. All tenured members of the department must certify that they have reviewed the dossier by recording their vote and signing the signature sheet for the routing form.
- e. **Promotion to Full Professor Review.** The full-professor members of the committee will review complete dossiers for tenured faculty applying for promotion to Full Professor. Full-professor members will discuss these evaluations and approve the final reviews.
- f. **Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation.** Full-professor faculty on the committee will evaluate faculty comprehensive periodic evaluation dossiers.

**C. Overall Performance Rating**

Faculty members will receive an evaluative rating of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory for each of the three categories of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. Based upon these three separate ratings, one Summary Rating for each faculty member is determined according to the following guidelines:

1. For a Summary Rating of **Exceeds Expectations** in an Annual Review or Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, a faculty member must have performed at a level significantly beyond the norm, exceeded expectations in any two categories of evaluation or in at least 80% of the faculty member's negotiated workload, and must have at least met expectations in the remaining category/categories of evaluation.
2. For a Summary Rating of **Meets Expectations** in an Annual Review or Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation a faculty member must have performed at a level approximating the norm, and at least met expectations in all categories of evaluation, but must have not met the standard for Exceeds Expectations.
3. For a Summary Rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations** in an Annual Review or Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, a faculty member must have failed to perform at a level approximating the norm, and not met expectations in at least one category of evaluation.
4. For a Summary Rating of **Unsatisfactory** in an Annual Review or Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, a faculty member must have not met expectations or failed to meet contractual obligations or clearly demonstrated significant incompetence in at least two categories of evaluation.

#### **D. Guidelines for Peer Observation of Teaching**

The following departmental guidelines align with the approved institutional guidelines from the Office of the Provost/VPAA. This policy applies to all full-time faculty whose duties consist of teaching organized courses, including hybrid and online courses, and/or clinical instruction. The policy also applies to full-time faculty who hold administrative appointments at 50% or less.

##### **1. Frequency of Observation**

- a. All tenure-track faculty shall be observed at least once per academic year.
- b. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every three years.
- c. Faculty members with the rank of Lecturer I, Lecturer II, Lecturer III, Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, and Clinical Associate Professor shall be observed at least once per academic year.

- d. Faculty members with the rank of Senior Lecturer and Clinical Professor shall be observed at least once every three years.

**2. Selection of Observer**

- a. Faculty may choose any full-time faculty member at the rank of the faculty member being observed or higher with appropriate subject expertise in the course being observed
- b. Faculty may ask the chair to select any full-time faculty member at the rank of the faculty member being observed or higher with appropriate content expertise in the course being observed.

- 3. Timeline.** The Faculty Member Report shall be provided to the department chair, unit head or equivalent (or the CLA Dean in the event the faculty member being observed is the Department Chair), no later than the last day of classes for the semester in which the observation takes place. The Faculty Member Report will also be included in the faculty member's dossier.

- 4. Guidelines for Peer Observer Evaluative Report and Faculty Member Report.** Guidelines for the Peer Observer Evaluative Report, which is provided only to the faculty member, as well as the Faculty Member Report, which is required to be included in the faculty member's dossier, are outlined below. A faculty member may choose to include the Peer Observer Evaluative Report in their dossier.

**5. To Be Included in Peer Observer Evaluative Report**

- a. Course number, section, and title of observed class
- b. Date, time, and location of observation(s)
- c. Name, title, and signature of faculty member
- d. Name, title, and signature of peer observer
- e. Faculty member's goals for class day of observation
- f. Peer observer's feedback

**6. To Be Included in Faculty Member Report**

- a. Course number, section, and title of observed class
- b. Date, time, and location of observation(s)
- c. Name, title, and signature of faculty member

- d. Name, title, and signature of peer observer
- e. A narrative written by the faculty member describing their assessment of the Report and what they learned from the peer observation process as well as any plans for improvement or development.

#### **E. Guidelines for Student Course Evaluations**

Upon reviewing a faculty member's teaching, the review committee will consider course evaluations provided by students. However, student course evaluations provide only one perspective—that of students—on a faculty member's teaching performance. Peer evaluations of teaching provide professional perspective on teaching expertise and are equally important in judging baseline performance. Scores on course evaluations administered by the university will be combined with other evidence of teaching performance (e.g., student comments, teaching innovations, peer observations) in evaluating a faculty member on the category of teaching.

#### **F. Guidelines for Selection of External Reviewers and for Tenure and Promotion & Promotion to Full Dossier Content and Submission**

The department will follow the Provost/VPAA's Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure Review

(<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/7.-guidelines-for-the-selection-of-external-reviews-for-faculty-promotion-and-tenure-8.23.2022.pdf>).

1. **Dossier Submission.** All faculty members submit one review dossier annually in alignment with the Provost/VPAA's guidelines, pathways, and timelines. This one dossier will suffice for all review processes, including annual, tenure, comprehensive periodic, and promotion.
2. **Dossier Content.** The faculty dossier will follow the format and include the items outlined at Faculty Electronic Dossier site, developed and posted by the Office of the Provost/VPAA under Faculty Resources > Faculty Reviews (<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-portfolio-tool/faculty-electronic-dossier/index.htm>). Faculty should include supporting documentation for activities in the dossier, and they should be prepared to provide any missing items or additional documentation at the request of reviewers.
3. **Narrative Summaries.** The narrative summaries of teaching, research/scholarship, and service are particularly important and should include discussions of achievements and their impact.
4. **Professional Growth Plans.** According to the HOP ADM 06-504 policy, Appendix D: Dossier Requirements, all full-time faculty should include in their dossier "a summary statement of professional goals, or a proposed professional development

plan, leading to the next comprehensive and/or promotion review. This is optional for faculty in a terminal rank (Professor, Senior Lecturer, Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice).” According to guidelines in the Institutional Format for Faculty Review Dossier, “The purpose of the professional development plan is to help ensure that the faculty member, the department and the Dean have a congruent understanding of the nature of a faculty member's responsibilities and the general level of performance expected in the three areas of review. The professional development plan is not a contract: achieving all of the stated goals does not in and of itself guarantee a faculty member tenure or promotion, nor does deviation from the plan in and of itself justify action against the faculty member.” In alignment with these policies, 3-year lecturer dossiers should include a 3-year professional growth plan that lecturers update each year as they approach their application for reappointment and promotion. Tenure-track dossiers should include a 6-year professional growth plan that assistant professors update each year as they approach tenure and promotion application.

5. **Dossier Delivery.** Faculty will submit dossiers following the process developed and posted by the Office of the Provost/VPAA under Faculty Resources > Faculty Reviews > Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines (<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/blocks/4.-annual-faculty-evaluations-process-and-guidelines-8.22.2022.pdf>).
6. **Dossier Submission Dates and Timeline.** The dates for dossier submission and the timeline for completion of each level of the review process will follow the Review Pathways developed and announced annually by the Office of the Provost/VPAA (<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>).

## II. CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

WLS is committed to retaining and promoting full-time faculty whose work achieves a high standard of excellence and who demonstrate, through the performance of their duties, a commitment to professionalism and to UTRGV’s mission. The reviews described below serve to further that commitment.

As regards review criteria, faculty **will not meet expectations** in any of the areas of the reviews below if they do not satisfy the “meets expectations” criteria specified but this seems subject to correction.

Faculty performance in any area will be deemed **unsatisfactory** if they do not meet the criteria for “meets expectations” in the reviews below and if previous requests for correction have been disregarded. Faculty who are found to have engaged in professional misconduct will also be considered to have performed in an unsatisfactory manner.

The criteria below indicate what constitutes **meets expectations** and **exceeds expectations** in teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

## **A. Tenure-Track Faculty**

### **1. Annual Cumulative Review Criteria**

- a. **General observations.** Tenure-track faculty members in WLS will be evaluated annually. Each annual review will be cumulative in nature highlighting progress toward tenure and promotion. Faculty should structure cumulative review narratives according to the outline provided in Appendix IV.

Annual cumulative tenure-track reviews should consider workload distributions. It is the responsibility of tenure-track faculty to describe their workload for the year under review in their dossier narrative statements and to explain any impacts workload distributions might have had on criteria used in review.

#### **b. Teaching**

- 1) Faculty will **meet expectations** for teaching when during the review period:
  - a) Student evaluations average 80-89% in the Agree/ Strongly Agree category or its equivalent 4.0-4.4 weighted average.
  - b) The requisite number of peer evaluations is presented, and these indicate reflection and attempts at improvement in teaching as judged by those reviewing the dossier.
  - c) Quality and impact are reflected through participation in activities related to the areas described in Appendix I.
- 2) Faculty will **exceed expectations** for teaching when during the review period:
  - a) Student evaluations average 90% or above in the Agree/Strongly Agree category or its equivalent 4.5 or above weighted average.
  - b) The requisite number of peer evaluations is presented, and these indicate reflection and attempts at improvement in teaching as judged by those reviewing the dossier.
  - c) Quality and impact are reflected through substantial participation in activities related to the areas described in Appendix I.

#### **c. Research/Scholarship**

- 1) Faculty will **meet expectations** for research/scholarship when during the review period:
  - a) They have actively engaged in research and scholarship. Such active engagement is evidenced by participation in several of the activities found in Appendix II.
  - b) Faculty with lower research workloads have participated in fewer research/scholarship activities, and faculty with higher such loads have participated in more of such activities.
- 2) Faculty will **exceed expectations** for research/scholarship when during the review period:
  - a) They have actively engaged in research and scholarship and can point to impactful activities. Such proactive, impactful engagement is evidenced by participation in activities described among the more valuable items in Appendix II.
  - b) Faculty with lower research workloads have participated in more impactful activities.

**d. Service (Including Administrative Duties)**

- 1) Faculty will **meet expectations** for service when during the review period:
  - a) They have engaged in service. Such engagement is evidenced by participation in activities found in Appendix III.
  - b) Faculty with lower service workloads have participated in fewer service activities and faculty with higher such loads have participated in more of such activities.
  - c) Tenure-track faculty have not taken on extensive service commitments while working toward tenure. Tenure track service should complement their development as scholars. They should prioritize impactful research, publication, and presentations.
- 2) Faculty will **exceed expectations** for service when during the review period:
  - a) They have engaged in service in a way that is more impactful. Such impactful engagement is evidenced by participation in activities at multiple levels, both within the university and externally, as are listed in Appendix III.

- b) Faculty with lower service workloads have participated in more impactful activities.
- c) Tenure-track faculty have participated in more impactful activities.

**2. Third-Year Review Criteria.** Tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated in a third-year review. The third-year review will follow the same review criteria as the annual reviews, with the exception that the review period encompasses the first three years of the faculty member's tenure track. This review should provide feedback from the Annual Review Committee and Chair on how the faculty member is progressing towards tenure and promotion in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The review will focus explicitly on evaluating progress toward tenure and promotion by considering the number and types of professional activities completed to date, such as the number of scholarly publications in preparation or submitted. As general guidelines, at this point the faculty member should have:

- made substantial progress on moving a minimum of two to three projects toward publication;
- documented two to three examples of teaching effectiveness and improvement; and
- contributed time and effort in two to three service activities that had positive and reportable impact on the respective communities served.

### **3. Tenure and Promotion Criteria**

- a. **General observations.** As a rule, faculty on tenure track will apply for tenure and promotion at the onset of their sixth year as tenure-track faculty. The five years prior constitute the entire tenure-track probationary period.

It is the candidate's responsibility to document and explain how the contents of their dossier provides evidence of annual yearly progress toward tenure in the areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. This should be done in the Applicant Statement, and Self- Evaluation and Narrative Summaries of the faculty member's dossier.

The Department Chair will meet with each tenure-track faculty member annually after completion of the Chair's evaluation to discuss the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to demonstrate consistent progress toward the achievement of tenure, and the Chair is expected to facilitate this by providing guidance about strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for continued progress.

Faculty will be evaluated with exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory according to the review criteria for

annual reviews, except that the evaluation will cover the entire probationary period. The evaluation will be based upon considering the averages of all annual reviews within the probationary period.

The criteria below apply specifically to the recommendation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

- b. **Teaching.** Faculty will be recommended for tenure and promotion when they present evidence of:
  - 1) An overall student evaluation rating of at least Meets Expectations using the departmental criteria for assessing Teaching effectiveness on student evaluations stated above in (II.A.1.b.).
  - 2) Peer evaluations which consistently attest to the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.
  - 3) A range of diversified and impactful Teaching Enrichment activities throughout the course of the candidate's probationary period.
- c. **Research/Scholarship.** Faculty will be recommended for tenure and promotion when they present evidence of:
  - 1) At least FOUR (4) peer-reviewed journal articles or their equivalent.
  - 2) A history of diversified and impactful professional activities from the list in Appendix 2 during the probationary period that provides evidence of progress toward meeting publication requirements for tenure and promotion.
  - 3) Personal Statement, and Reflection and Summary Narrative documents describing the significance and impact of the faculty member's scholarly achievements.
- d. **Service (Including Administrative Duties).** Faculty will be recommended for tenure and promotion when they present evidence of at least an overall rating of Meets Expectations using the departmental criteria for assessing Service stated above in (II.A.1.d.). This must include a range of diversified and impactful Service activities throughout the course of the candidate's probationary period.

## B. Tenured Faculty

- 1. **Annual Review Criteria.** Tenured faculty members at WLS will be evaluated annually. Review committees should advise faculty on the benchmarks they need for their next Action review (Cumulative Periodic Evaluation or Full promotion). Annual tenured faculty reviews should consider workload distributions. It is the

responsibility of tenured faculty to describe their workload for the year under review in their dossier narrative statements and to explain any impacts workload distributions might have had on criteria used in review. Generally, tenured faculty members will be evaluated according to the same criteria as tenure-track faculty members. However, the following differences should be noted:

- a. In teaching, tenured faculty are required to include only one peer observation every three years.
  - b. In research, tenured faculty are expected to maintain an active research/scholarship agenda after the achievement of tenure. However, the trajectory and intensity of their professional activities may shift as a result of the expanded service and administrative commitments which tenured faculty are often asked to perform for the university.
  - c. In service, tenured faculty are expected to have expanded service commitments to the department, the college, and the university. They are also more likely to serve nationally or internationally within their disciplines, for example as officers of professional organizations or on the editorial boards of journals.
2. **Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Criteria.** Tenured faculty members in WLS will undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation every year. The purpose of this review is to document and discuss progress toward professional goals. The comprehensive periodic evaluation will follow the same review criteria as the annual reviews.

### 3. **Promotion to Full Professor Review Criteria**

- a. **General observations.** Tenured faculty are not obligated to apply to the rank of Full Professor. As a rule, the earliest they may apply to become full professors is at the moment of their first comprehensive periodic evaluation. The review period for promotion to Full Professor encompasses the entire period since the awarding of tenure.

As for the review criteria, faculty will be evaluated with exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory according to the review criteria for annual reviews, except that the evaluation will cover a review period of six years. The criteria below apply specifically to the recommendation for promotion to Full Professor status.

- b. **Teaching.** Faculty will be recommended for promotion to Full Professor when they present evidence of:

- 1) An overall student evaluation rating of at least meets expectations using the departmental criteria for assessing teaching effectiveness on student evaluations stated above in (II.A.1.b.).
  - 2) Peer evaluations which consistently attest to the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.
  - 3) A range of diversified and impactful teaching enrichment activities throughout the course of the candidate's probationary period.
- c. **Research/Scholarship.** Faculty will be recommended for promotion to Full Professor when they present evidence of:
- 1) At least FIVE (5) peer reviewed impactful professional achievements, including 4 peer reviewed journal articles or their equivalent.
  - 2) A history of diversified and impactful professional activities from the list in Appendix 2 during the probationary period.
  - 3) Personal Statement, and Reflection and Summary Narrative documents describing the significance and impact of the faculty member's scholarly achievements.
- d. **Service (including administrative duties).** Faculty will be recommended for promotion to Full Professor when they present evidence of demonstrated service leadership at the Department, College, and University levels.

## C. Lecturer Faculty

### 1. Annual Review Criteria

- a. **General observations.** All full-time lecturers at WLS will be evaluated annually.

Research/scholarship is not required for lecturers. Thus, lack of research will not affect whether or not they meet expectations. Even so, lecturers may engage in research/scholarship to enhance or to impact their teaching. Because the primary role of lecturers is to teach, any research/ scholarship they engage in is expected to align with their teaching in some manner. If lecturers do engage in such research (see Appendix II), they will be considered to exceed expectations for that area.

Annual lecturer reviews should consider workload distributions. It is the responsibility of lecturers to describe their workload for the year under review in their dossier narrative statements and to explain any impacts workload distributions might have had on criteria used in review.

## **b. Teaching**

- 1) Lecturers will **meet expectations** for teaching when during the review period (considering these three types of evidence holistically):
  - a) Student evaluations average 80-89% in the Agree/Strongly Agree category or its equivalent 4.0-4.4 weighted average.
  - b) The requisite number of peer evaluations is presented, and these indicate reflection and attempts at improvement in teaching as judged by those reviewing the dossier.
  - c) Quality and impact are reflected through participation in activities related to the areas described in Appendix I.
- 2) Lecturers will **exceed expectations** for teaching when during the review period (considering these three types of evidence holistically):
  - a) Student evaluations average 90% or above in the Agree/Strongly Agree category or its equivalent 4.5 or above weighted average.
  - b) The requisite number of peer evaluations is presented, and these indicate reflection and attempts at improvement in teaching as judged by those reviewing the dossier.
  - c) Quality and impact are reflected through substantial participation in activities related to the areas described in Appendix II.

## **c. Research/Scholarship**

- 1) Lecturers will **meet expectations** for research/scholarship by system default when during the review period they do not engage in research/scholarship activities. (Lecturers are not required by contract to engage in research/scholarship.)
- 2) Lecturers will **exceed expectations** for research/scholarship when, during the review period, they have actively engaged in research and scholarship. Active engagement is evidenced by participation in at least one activity such as those listed in Appendix II.

## **d. Service**

- 1) Lecturers will **meet expectations** for service when during the review period:
  - a) They have engaged in service (primarily in the department and complementary to their teaching duties and individual interests). Such

engagement is evidenced by participation in activities such as those listed in Appendix III.

- b) Faculty with lower service workloads have participated in fewer service activities and faculty with higher such loads have participated in more of such activities.
- 2) Lecturers will **exceed expectations** for service when during the review period:
- a) They have engaged in service in a way that is more impactful. Such impactful engagement is evidenced by participation in activities such as those listed in Appendix III.
  - b) Faculty with lower service workloads have participated in more impactful activities.

## 2. Promotion Criteria

- a. **General observations.** Full-time lecturers are eligible to apply for promotion based upon years of experience at specific ranks, which are described within the Guidelines for Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-Time Lecturers, Professors of Practice, and Clinical Faculty (<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/5guide1.pdf>). In general, Lecturers are eligible to apply for promotion on the following timelines (required years in rank for promotion at UTRGV\*):

- Lecturer II: Eligibility for promotion to this level requires at least three (3) years at the rank of Lecturer I.
- Lecturer III: Eligibility for promotion to this level requires at least three (3) years at the rank of Lecturer II.
- Senior Lecturer: Eligibility for promotion to this level requires at least six (6) years at the rank of Lecturer III.\*]

[\*With three (3) years at Lecturer I, three (3) years at Lecturer II, and six (6) years at Lecturer III, a total of 12 years at the lecturer ranks is required to be eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer.]

It is the candidate's responsibility to document and explain how the contents of their dossier provides evidence of annual yearly progress toward promotion in the areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. This should be done in the Applicant Statement, and Self- Evaluation and Narrative Summaries of the faculty member's dossier.

Lecturers will be evaluated with exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory according to the review criteria for annual reviews, except that evaluations will cover the entire periods at the respective ranks.

The criteria below apply specifically to the recommendation for promotion.

**b. Teaching.** Lecturers will be recommended for promotion after a holistic evaluation of the three areas of teaching based on evidence of:

- 1) An overall student evaluation rating of at least Meets Expectations using the departmental criteria for assessing Teaching effectiveness on student evaluations stated above in (II.C.1.b.).
- 2) Peer evaluations which consistently attest to the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.
- 3) A range of diversified and impactful Teaching Enrichment activities throughout the course of the candidate's period of years at the respective rank.

**c. Research/Scholarship**

- 1) Research/scholarship is not required for lecturers. Thus, lack of research cannot affect whether or not they are granted promotion.
- 2) Lecturers will be recommended for promotion when they present evidence of an overall rating of at least Meets Expectations using the departmental criteria for assessing Research stated above in (II.C.1.c.).

**d. Service (Including Administrative Duties).** Lecturers will be recommended for promotion when they present evidence of at least an overall rating of Meets Expectations using the departmental criteria for assessing Service stated above in (II.C.1.d.). This must include a range of diversified and impactful Service activities throughout the course of the candidate's period of years at the respective rank.

**D. Remediation and Action Plans**

If a faculty member receives an overall summary rating of "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory" on any evaluation, excluding tenure and promotion evaluation, the faculty member must develop and submit an action plan by the deadline established by the Provost/VPAA to the chair and dean for their review and approval. The plan must address the performance weaknesses or concerns and any support to enhance or strengthen the faculty member's performance in the designated area(s). The faculty member's progress towards meeting the goals of the plan shall be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions. If the comprehensive periodic evaluation is

“unsatisfactory” in any of the areas, the dean, in consultation with the department chair may recommend a change in the faculty member’s workload or recommend additional actions to the Provost/VPAA.

**E. Merit Determination**

Merit pay will be awarded according to the guidelines established by CLA.

**III. RESOURCES**

**A. Relevant Policies from the UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP)**

- ADM 06-501 Faculty Workload
- ADM 06-503 Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments
- ADM 06-504 Tenured Faculty Evaluation

**B. UTRGV Faculty Reviews Links from Provost/VPAA**

- <https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>

## **APPENDIX I**

### **Teaching Enrichment Activities**

All faculty will demonstrate their commitment to engaged teaching within their specific disciplines by undertaking activities to enrich their pedagogical pursuits and development. The following is a list of teaching enrichment activities that dossier reviewers will consider when assessing the impact of teaching for all reviews. The items are not exhaustive, nor have they been listed in any order of preference. **Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the impact and significance of these activities in their review narratives or summaries.**

#### **1. Contributions to curriculum development and growth**

Designing, revising/redesigning, and/or implementing changes to degree plans; reevaluating/redeveloping degree assessments for majors/minors; and/or revisions to degree or minor specific learning outcomes. Also here are contributions to forging partnerships across disciplines to develop interest in interdisciplinary investment in courses.

The work of curriculum development and implementation is vital to student recruitment and retention.

#### **2. Developing new courses and revising existing courses**

The creation of new courses that support existing or redesigned curriculum. Also included is the work of revising existing courses to better fit the needs of changing degree/minor plans and/or to address needed skills of workplace environments, as well as the devising of new and/or adapted versions of existing courses into alternative formats such as web- based courses (whether asynchronous or synchronous).

The work of developing new courses and/or revising existing courses contributes significantly to keeping courses relevant, and it also serves students productively.

#### **3. Mentoring of students**

Mentoring Graduate Teaching Assistants or undergraduate and/or graduate students, for a variety of reasons that encourage and support their professional development in their future fields of employment. Some of these important contributions include mentorship geared toward: forwarding/advancing teaching; developing work to make presentations at state, regional, and/or national conferences; serving as Chair or Committee Member of an undergraduate portfolio committee or a graduate thesis committee.

#### **4. Professional development in the area of teaching**

Evidence of professional development in the area of teaching (attending professional development seminars and integrating new material into courses) and/or attending conferences that lead to improvements in teaching).

#### **5. Innovative responsibilities and developments in teaching**

Independent study sections of courses for students in need, community service learning or study abroad opportunities, field trips, performances, travels with students for academic or cultural purposes, creation of a lecture series, online and reduced seat courses for the benefit of students, the implementation of innovative pedagogical strategies, or contributions to area specific teaching initiatives, such as contributing to WAC (Writing Across Curriculum) or WID (Writing in the Disciplines).

**6. Contributions to student success**

Coordinating TExES certification training, leading review sessions, and implementing curricular changes to ensure student success.

**7. Teaching or mentorship in non-traditional classroom settings and public communities to further pedagogical growth and encourage reciprocal learning**

Teaching of CTL “Learning Communities,” leading or participating in WLS “Constellations” sessions, as well as engaging in community/public education efforts such as service- learning courses, teaching UTRGV Community Education Courses, etc.

The value of teaching in non-traditional settings and in the manner of reciprocal learning is crucial to furthering pedagogical growth and ensuring that the teaching pursuits within the department are aligned with community goals.

**8. Evidence of teaching enhancements and activities or course design revisions that impact student learning (primarily for non-tenure-track faculty)**

The creation or redesigning of existing peer feedback experiences, the implementation of new and effective teaching strategies or student feedback practices, as well as the designing new assignments, the organizing international learning experiences, the revising of syllabi, etc.

**9. Awards and honors for teaching excellence**

## APPENDIX II

### Research/Scholarship Activities

Tenure-track and tenured faculty members\* will demonstrate the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other scholarly activities specific to their discipline. The following is a list of research/scholarship activities that will be considered in assessing the impact of research/scholarship for all reviews. Items 1-4 are presented in order of the general perception of their value to our department. Item 5 is designed for more discipline-specific items whose value may vary depending on the field. **Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the impact and significance of these activities in their review narratives or summaries.**

#### 1. Dissemination of research through publication

Scholarly books (including textbooks), journal articles, book chapters, reference works, and conference proceedings which are peer-reviewed and issued by reputable academic publishers.

Most important is that the outlet be peer-reviewed in the case of articles and book chapters, or that the publisher be reputable and established in the field in the case of books. Thus, whether the journal is print-only, online-only, or both is less significant than whether or not the journal is peer-reviewed and reputable within its specific field. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to indicate whether the journal is peer reviewed and what its reputation is within the field in question.

As regards multi-author publications, it is understood that practices vary across, and even within, disciplines. Ordinarily, the first author is the main author, but in some instances, authors are listed alphabetically. In some journals, the last author is the main contributor. In view of such variation, it is the faculty member's responsibility to make plain in their dossier the significance of their contribution to any multi-author work.

#### 2. Dissemination of the research of colleagues through publication

If a faculty member serves as primary editor, peer-reviewed scholarly books, journals, and special volumes issued by reputable, academic publishers are included here.

#### 3. Dissemination of research through presentations

Mainly, presentations given at scholarly conferences, symposia, congresses, etc. Poster presentations are included as well, but they are less valued. The organization of a conference is usually valued on par with a poster presentation.

International conferences are generally estimated more highly than national conferences, as they tend to have more proposals, follow more rigorous review processes, and reach wider audiences. Regional conferences tend to be valued less.

than international and national conferences. Scholarly conferences are valued more than professional conferences. However, there are exceptions to these generalizations. Faculty

members are responsible for indicating the relative significance of the conferences in which they participate.

#### **4. Funding for research or scholarly activities**

Grants and their equivalents.

Successful funding applications are significant and positively evaluated proposals which are unsuccessful are of some value. However, poorly evaluated applications which fail to secure funding are of far less value.

#### **5. Discipline-specific research/scholarship activities**

The development of language corpora, the creation of open-access materials, the translation of substantive and relevant texts, and the engagement of the general public with scholarship.

Faculty members are encouraged to report on these and other forms of research/scholarship. However, they are responsible for indicating in their dossiers the relevance and relative value of these activities.

\* Faculty members who are lecturers are not required to undertake research/ scholarship. However, if a lecturer chooses to engage in activities of this kind they should be sure to do so in a way that is developed from, linked to, or impactful on their teaching. See section (II.C.1.a.).

## **APPENDIX III**

### **Service Activities**

The following is a list of service activities that will be considered in assessing the impact of service activities for all types of reviews. The items have roughly been ordered from more to less impactful within the numbered sections, but flexibility in interpreting the order of items is possible. The list is not exhaustive. **Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the impact and significance of these activities in their review narratives or summaries.**

#### **1. Service to the Department**

- a. Administrative duty
- b. Search committee (chair, member)
- c. Review committee (chair, member)
- d. General standing committee (chair, member)
- e. Ad hoc committee (chair, member)
- f. Advisor of a student organization
- g. Mentor of a new faculty member

#### **2. Service to the College**

- a. Administrative duty
- b. Review committee (chair, member)
- c. General standing committee (chair, member)
- d. Ad hoc committee (chair, member)
- e. Task force
- f. Advisor of a student organization

#### **3. Service to the University**

- a. Administrative duty
- b. Administrative search committee (chair, member)
- c. Faculty Senate

- d. General standing committee or council (chair, member)
- e. Ad hoc committee (chair, member)
- f. Task force
- g. Advisor of a student organization

#### **4. Service to the Community**

- a. Participation in discipline--related community organizations
- b. Membership on local boards and committees in an area of disciplinary expertise
- c. Activity related to K-12 schools and educational organizations
- d. Professional consultation in the community
- e. Presentations, workshops, conferences or seminars within the community
- f. Pro bono expertise to non-profit organizations
- g. Community-oriented programs and festivals (e.g., HESTEC, International Week, FESTIBA, MultiLingua Fest, etc.)

#### **5. Service to the Profession**

- a. Organizer of an academic conference
- b. Peer-review of an article submitted to a scholarly journal, or peer-review of a book chapter submitted for a special scholarly volume
- c. Officer of a professional organization
- d. Member of a professional board (e.g., advisory or editorial board of a journal)
- e. Member of a professional or educational organization (e.g., annual conference or society)
- f. Assistant at a professional seminar or workshop
- g. Participant at a professional seminar, workshop, or meeting

## **APPENDIX IV**

### **Narrative Templates**

Please use the following templates to write your narratives. Narratives are intended to show a trajectory of development at the current rank. Therefore, for each area, a brief listing of previous activities (at the current rank!) will serve as a preface to the activities reported for the current review period. As you report on activities for the current review period, make sure to highlight any enrichments mentioned in Appendixes I-III. Remember that it is the faculty member's responsibility to highlight the impact of these activities.

Please adapt the following as necessary to reflect your own situation:

#### **TEACHING**

##### ***Previous Review Periods***

In previous review periods, I taught the following courses:

- [List all courses, following this example: TRSP 3341 (6 sections). This should only be a list, as the specific details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

In addition, I fulfilled the following teaching-related activities:

- [List all additional teaching related activities. This should only be a list, as the specific details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

##### ***Current Review Period***

During the current review period I fulfilled a [X/X] teaching load, as follows:

- [List courses taught, along with relevant information, e.g., modality, student evaluation ratings and feedback, etc.]

During the current review period, I also participated in the following teaching related activities:

- [List academic advising, if any, along with relevant information.] [List academic mentoring, if any, along with relevant information.]
- [List directed student learning, if any, along with relevant information.] [List non-credit instruction taught, if any, along with relevant information.]
- [List faculty development activities attended, if any, along with relevant information.] [List other relevant activities related to your teaching, along with relevant information.]

#### **RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP**

##### ***Previous Review Periods***

In previous review periods, I engaged in the following research/scholarship:

##### **Publications**

- [This should only be a list. Please use a consistent referencing style (e.g., CMS, MLA, etc.) for all publications.]

**Presentations**

- [This should only be a list. Please use a consistent referencing style.]

**Funding**

- [This should only be a list, as the specific details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

**Additional research/scholarship**

- [This should only be a list, as the specific details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

***Current Review Period***

During the current review period I worked on [x] research projects, including the writing, submission, and publication of academic works, as follows:

**Research in progress**

- [List research projects you worked on during the current review period but did not start writing nor publishing.]

**Writing in progress**

- [List all papers written. Note that a paper can only be listed under one category. For example, if you wrote, submitted, and published during the review period, it counts only as “published.”]
- [List all papers submitted or revised after submission.]

**Publications**

- [List all papers published.]
- [List any additional publications that are relevant to your discipline but may not fall in the traditional “paper” categories.]

During the current review period I made [X] presentations, as follows:

**Academic presentations**

- [List all papers presented at academic conferences.]

**Professional presentations**

- [List all papers presented at professional conferences.]

**Other presentations**

- [List all presentations given at other venues, including community and campus events.]

**Funding**

- [List all any funding applied for. Make sure to list the funder, the amount requested, and *whether the funding was granted.*]

### **Additional research/scholarship**

- [List any additional research/scholarship you engaged in relevant to your discipline. Provide any information that will help reviewers contextualize it.]

## **SERVICE**

### ***Preview Review Periods***

In previous review periods, I provided service as follows:

### **Writing & Language Studies**

- [This should only be a list (position + committee/activity). Further details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

### **College of Liberal Arts**

- [This should only be a list (position + committee/activity). Further details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

## **UTRGV**

- [This should only be a list (position + committee/activity). Further details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

### **Profession (Academy)**

- [This should only be a list (position + committee/activity). Further details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

## **Public**

- [This should only be a list (position + committee/activity). Further details have been provided in previous dossiers.]

### ***Current Review Period***

During the current review period, I served the [list the specific levels (e.g., department, college)], as follows:

### **Writing & Language Arts**

- [List your position, committee/taskforce/organization, and your achievements for any department service.]

### **College of Liberal Arts**

- [List your position, committee/taskforce/organization, and your achievements for any college service.]

**UTRGV**

- [List your position, committee/taskforce/organization, and your achievements for any university service.]

**Profession (Academy)**

- [List your position, committee/taskforce/organization, and your achievements for any service to the profession.]

**Public**

- [List your position, committee/taskforce/organization, and your achievements for any service to the community and the public in general.]