The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

College of Liberal Arts
Department of Political Science
Evaluation Criteria and Standards For Annual Review,
Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

The following guidelines for promotion and tenure provide the Political Science faculty with specific information regarding the performance expectations that will be applied in the three areas of evaluation for annual review, promotion and tenure and post-tenure review: (1) teaching, (2) research/scholarship, and (3) service. These guidelines delineate the expectations of the Political Science faculty and provide a transparent clarification of those expectations for the persons being evaluated and for the reviewers.

The achievement of the minimum standards in these guidelines will qualify a faculty member to be considered for tenure and promotion, but meeting these minimum standards will NOT automatically grant tenure or promotion.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW,
TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

1.   All Political Science faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor must have a doctorate or equivalent in political science or related discipline, or interdisciplinary program.

2.   Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated annually in accordance with UTRGV's Handbook of Operating Procedures ADM 06-502 Annual Faculty Evaluation[1] and ADM 06-505 Faculty Tenure and Promotion.[2] The evaluation of their first year of tenure track status will occur during the spring semester of their first year and during the fall semester of each year successively thereafter until the final tenure evaluation.[3]

3.   Each subsequent annual evaluation shall be cumulative in nature, i.e., all relevant achievements and activities since the faculty member's last major review (e.g., tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor, or Post-Tenure Review) will be included in the faculty member's dossier.

4.   The candidate's annual evaluation folders shall include a current curriculum vita, and a grid documenting the requisite number of points in various categories. The organization of materials in the folder shall be in the format required for the tenure and promotion evaluation folder that will be submitted in the beginning of the year that the candidate is requesting tenure and/or promotion, per the Institutional Format for Faculty Review Dossier policy (see Appendix A or http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/UTRGV-Format-for-Faculty-Review-Dossier.pdf).

5.   Each faculty member is required to maintain a cumulative and annual total of activity points awarded to them each year in each category of evaluation and to include this information in their dossier.

6.   Unless noted otherwise in the document, the maximum points allowed for an activity throughout this document is the maximum allowed during each six year review period (i.e., promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, or Post-Tenure Review.

7.   Each annual evaluation shall describe, quantitatively and qualitatively, the candidate's annual yearly progress[4] toward meeting the criteria for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review in the three areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service (see Appendices D.1., D2., D.3). In making this assessment, the Annual Review Committee shall take into account the type of scholarly work being undertaken by the candidate, but it shall be the candidate's responsibility to document and explain how the contents of their dossier provides evidence of annual yearly progress toward tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.[5]

---

[1] Available at http://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-502.pdf
[2] Available at http://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-505.pdf
[3] Tenure-track faculty should follow the corresponding "First Year Tenure-Track Faculty Review Pathways" or the "Tenure-Track Pathways" in lieu of an annual [merit] review," see, UTRGV *Pathways for Review Deadlines on the Provost website.*
[4] See, Guidelines for Implementation of Yearly Annual Progress, included as Appendix D.1, D.2, and D.3 of this document.
[5] For example, an individual who is working on a book manuscript, a large-scale longitudinal survey, or other multi-year research project may not have any publications for several years until the project is complete, but the individual

8. A faculty member who receives an evaluative rating of unsatisfactory, does not meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for annual yearly progress shall automatically receive the same evaluative rating for purposes of merit pay in that year.[6]

9. Tenure-track faculty shall be informed in writing of their evaluation based on their performance as reflected in their dossier, in accordance with the pathways document, along with an indication of the review committee's assessment of whether the candidate is likely to complete the remaining probationary period successfully. Each level of review (i.e., committee and chair) must include a written narrative highlighting strengths of the faculty member's performance, as well as recommendations for improvement, if deemed necessary, by the committee.

10. The fourth year of the tenure-track shall be a pre-tenure review. The review committee and the Chair shall clearly state their assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure and identify any remaining activities to be completed by the sixth year on the tenure track in order to receive a positive recommendation for tenure from the Annual Review Committee and Chair, respectively.

11. Faculty can appeal the results of the annual review in writing at each level of department review. If the faculty member making an appeal is not satisfied with the department committee or chair level evaluation after an appeal, the faculty member may request a review by a college committee, who will make a recommendation to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

12. 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.

13. All Political Science faculty seeking promotion or tenure must meet the minimum approved requirements in teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

14. The minimum requirements for tenure include the minimum requirements for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

15. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a complete tenure and promotion dossier adhering to University and Departmental requirements. Departmental mentors and the Department Chair should provide guidance in this process. Additional documentation may be requested by the Committee and/or Department Chair in the course of the evaluation process.

16. In case of foreign language publications, the Annual Review Committee, Tenure and Promotion Committee, or Post-Tenure Review Committee may request a translation of the publication from qualified sources within or outside the University in consultation with the candidate being reviewed; the department will cover any cost(s) associated with this request.

17. Applications for early tenure or promotion (i.e., before the normal six year review period) are generally discouraged and will be considered only in cases of exceptional research/scholarship as determined by the departmental evaluation process.

---

must demonstrate annual yearly progress toward completion of the project, such as completed written book chapters, completed surveys, interviews, data collection, external grants, book or grant contracts, and scholarly conference presentations related to the project in order to "meet expectations."

[6] UTRGV HOP ADM 06-502.5.a: "The outcome of each faculty member's annual performance evaluation will be used in determining the amount of merit awarded to the faculty member, should merit pay be available."

18. All publications and activity points in teaching, research/scholarship, and service accumulated at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley's legacy institutions will carry forward and count toward tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley.

19. The honorific title of Emeritus Faculty may be conferred on a retired faculty member of the Department of Political Science who has made a significant contribution to the Department and University. The nomination and review process shall be conducted in accordance with the UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Proceedures*, Section ADM 06-402, "Emeritus Faculty."

DEFINITIONS

1. All references to quantitative "student evaluation ratings" shall be on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being the lowest possible rating and 5.0 being the highest possible rating.

2. The term "transdisciplinary" refers to research, publications, conference presentations, and other academic activities conducted by scholars from different disciplines working jointly to create new conceptual, theoretical, methodological, and translational innovations that integrate and move beyond discipline-specific approaches to address a common problem.

3. The term "interdisciplinary "refers to research, publications, conference presentations and other academic activities that are wholly or partially outside the disciplinary field of an individual's PhD.

4. An "applied policy report" or "white paper" refers to work that is often categorized as "grey literature." It is sponsored or funded by a government, private, or non-profit organization to support informed decision-making by public and private officials. It may apply scholarly concepts, draw on scholarly literature, and collect primary and/or secondary data to analyze a particular problemnd results in a *written report* submitted to the sponsoring organization. While this type of report may be subject to intense outside scrutiny by the media, legislators, business executives, the general public, and sponsoring organizations, it does not undergo the same type of double-blind academic peer review process employed by scholarly journals or university presses.

5. The specific requirements for exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, and unsatisfactory in a category of evaluation are defined in "Guidelines Toward Annual Yearly Progress," which is incorporated into this document as Appendices D.1, D.2, and D.3.

6. For a Summary Rating of Exceeds Expectations in an Annual Review, Tenure or Promotion decision, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must exceed expectations in Research & Scholarship and 1 other category of evaluation and at least meet expectations in the remaining category of evaluation.

7. For a Summary Rating of Meets Expectations in an Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion decision, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must at least meet expectations in all 3 categories of evaluation, but not meet the standard for Exceeds Expectations.

8. For a Summary Rating of Does not Meet Expectations in an Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion decision, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must not meet expectations in any 1 category of evaluation.

9. For a Summary Rating of Unsatisfactory in an Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion decision, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must not meet expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation.

TENURE & PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR[7]

TEACHING

The minimum teaching requirements to meet expectations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are: (1) successful completion of the probationary period (early promotion and tenure requests are allowed but discouraged); (2) the satisfaction of the minimum criterion of Activity 1 below; (3) an overall student evaluation rating of 3.5 to 4.4, (4) the accumulation of at least 12 points from the Activities outlined below (see Appendix D.1), and (5) evidence of peer observation of teaching (see Appendix B.2).

The minimum teaching requirements to exceed expectations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are: (1) at least 4 years at the rank of Assistant Professor successful completion of the probationary period (early promotion and tenure requests are allowed but discouraged); (2) the satisfaction of the minimum criterion of Activity 1; (3) an overall student evaluation rating of 4.5 to 5.0, (4) the accumulation of at least 15 points from the Activities outlined below (see Appendix D.1), and evidence of peer observation of teaching (see Appendix B.2).

The Department Promotion and Tenure committee will be responsible for evaluating the quality of each activity, including but not limited to, verifying that each activity was accomplished, judging the activity by standards of the department's policy, and guidance by the American Association of University Professor recommendations (e.g., in the case of workshops, the regional level of the workshop, and the quality of the program).

Activities:

1.   No more than 10% of the average of responses of the student evaluations for the evaluation period as a whole falling below the neutral category (e.g., below 3 on a 1 to 5 point scale with 5 being the highest possible rating).

2.   A faculty member shall be awarded activity points for teaching as follows:

"70% to 79% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (0.5 points for each semester).

"80% to 89% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (1.0 points for each semester).

"90% to 100% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (1.5 points for each semester).

The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information in addition to student evaluations. The relevant review committee and the Department Chair will also take into

---

[7] See "Guidelines for Annual Yearly Progress Toward Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor (Appendix D.1)" for specific definitions of "meets expectations" and "exceeds expectations" for each category of evaluation and the summary evaluation.

account the following considerations in evaluating teaching effectiveness, where applicable:

- The quality and rigor of course tools, such as examinations, syllabi, written assignments (e.g., papers, white papers), oral presentations in the class, and other course assignments,
- Clarity of classroom materials and presentations (e.g., PowerPoints),
- The use of teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content,
- The clarity and specificity of course goals and learning objectives,
- The fostering of an appreciation for different points of view,
- The complexity of the subject matter and its level of difficulty for students,
- Whether the course is required or elective,
- Whether the course provides a service to non-majors.

Individual faculty are responsible for providing a narrative (and supporting documentation, if applicable) that will allow the relevant review committee to incorporate these considerations into its evaluation of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

3. Attendance at teaching workshops and/or seminars on appropriate course areas (up to a maximum of 10 points):[8]

    a. "Lunch-time" sessions (0.5 points),
    b. COLTT online teaching certification (2.0 points),
    c. Quality Matters online teaching certification (2.0 points),
    d. Center for Teaching Excellence Learning Communities with 3 or more sessions on one topic (2.0 points),
    e. New Faculty Orientation (2.0 points if attended at least 75% of activities)
    f. Other teaching training activities to be calculated as:
        i. less than 2 hours with no individual work (0.5 points)
        ii. more than 2 hours and with assessment and/or individual work included (2.0 points)

4. Development of teaching materials, such as banks of test questions, computer exercises, workbooks, etc. (1 point each up to a maximum of 4 points).

5. Development of new undergraduate courses (1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points with credit awarded only after course has been approved by the department curriculum committee and taught for the first time by the faculty member who developed the course).

---

[8] Unless noted otherwise in the document, the maximum points allowed for an activity throughout this document is the maximum allowed during each six year review period (i.e., promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, or Post-Tenure Review.

6.   Development of new graduate courses (1 point up to a maximum of 3 points with credit awarded only after course has been approved by the department curriculum committee and taught for the first time by the faculty member who developed the course).

7.   New course preparations, i.e., teaching a previously existing course for the first time (1.0 point per course up to a maximum of 3 points).

8.   Arranged courses, independent study, student research for academic presentation, chairing an Honors project, supervising a Master's thesis (or equivalent), or serving on a doctoral dissertation committee at UTRGV or elsewhere (1.0 point each per year) and supervising a research intern (0.25 points per year) (up to a maximum of 4.0 points per year).

9.   Development reviews of classroom performance based on visits by a faculty representative from the Center for Teaching Excellence (1 point each visit up to a maximum of 2 points). For requirements regarding peer observation see the Guidelines for Peer Observation in the Appendix B).

10.   Recognitions, honors, and awards (up to a maximum of 6 points):

     a. by The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (1.0 point each),
     b. by The University of Texas System (2.0 points each),
     c. by statewide (3.0 points each) or national private or non-profit entities (4.0 points each).

11.   Incorporation of experiential learning pedagogy(ies) into classes, including but not limited to service learning, community engagement, etc. (0.5 points per semester up to a maximum of 4 points, if approved by the UTRGV Office of Student Engagement; otherwise at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee).

12.   Study abroad or teaching abroad (1.0 points per semester up to a maximum of 4 points).

13.   Teaching an online class during a regular semester session (0.25 points per class per semester up to a maximum of 4 points in each 6 year evaluation cycle).

RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP
(Assistant to Associate)

The minimum research/scholarship required to meet expectations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is (1) the authorship, since their last promotion, of at least four (4) peer reviewed publications with at least two (2) articles in refereed journals (may include up to 2 peer-reviewed book chapters), (2) the faculty member shall be the sole or lead author on at least one (1) of the four (4) publications, (3) the accumulation of at least 15 Activity points from the list of Activities below, (4) an a written Significance Narrative describing the significance of the faculty member's publications. All of these publications must be included in the candidate's dossier (see Appendix D.1).

The minimum research/scholarship required to exceed expectations for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is (1) the authorship, since their last promotion, of at least five (5) peer reviewed publications with at least three (3) articles in refereed journals (may include up to 2 peer-reviewed book chapters), (2) the faculty member shall be the sole or lead author on at least two (2) of the five (5) publications, (3) the accumulation of at least 20 Activity points from the list of Activities below, and (4) an a written Impact Narrative describing the significance of the faculty member's publications.

All publications must be included in the candidate's dossier (see Appendix D.1).

Publication of a research book (excluding a textbook, book of readings, popular book, anthology, vanity press, or similar type publication) will substitute for four (4) peer-reviewed (or refereed) articles or book chapters. The manuscript must be peer reviewed to qualify as a research book.

Editorship of a book of original essays (not reprints) will substitute for two (2) peer reviewed or refereed articles, co-editor = 1.5 peer reviewed or refereed articles, associate or assistant editor = 0.5 peer reviewed or refereed articles.

Activities:

1.   Publication of a peer reviewed book (excluding a textbook, book of readings, anthology, vanity press, or similar type publication) beyond the required four (4) articles or book mentioned above (12 points).

     a. When an existing published book authored or co-authored by a faculty member is re-published in a 2nd or later edition (2.0 points).

     b. Each review of an authored or co-authored book in a scholarly journal (0.1 points per review) as a reward for recognition of the book by the scholarly community.

2.   Publication of a peer reviewed journal article(s) or book chapter(s) beyond the Minimum requirement of four (4) peer reviewed articles mentioned above (4 points each). This activity includes transdisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary publications.

3.   Paper presented to a professional or scholarly conference (2 points per paper). Copies of the paper(s) must be placed in the candidate's dossier.

     a.   Co-authored paper presentation at a professional or scholarly conference when not present (0.25 points per paper for a regional conference and 0.5 points per paper for a national or international conference).

b. Presentation to a local (RGV) conference (1.0 point per paper).

4. Presentation at a research panel/workshop/roundtable at a professional or scholarly meeting; presentation materials must be placed in the dossier (up to a maximum of 1 point annually).

5. a. Publication of a book review in a professional or scholarly journal (1 point per activity up to a maximum of 3 points annually).

   b. Publication of a review essay (i.e., it has a title and is a multi-book review essay) in a professional or scholarly journal (2.5 points per activity up to a maximum of 2.5 points annually). Copy(ies) of the reviews must be placed in the dossier.

   c. Encyclopedia and Handbook articles (2.5 points if peer reviewed and 1.0 point if not peer reviewed).

6. a. Publication of a textbook (7 points per book).

   b. Publication of a chapter in a textbook (1 point per chapter).

   c. Publication of a non-peer reviewed book by a scholarly or commercial press recognized for its scholarly publications (5.0 points).

7. Editorship of a book of readings or anthology (4 points per book); associate or -assistant editor (2 points per book).

8. Publication of a non-refereed journal article, book chapter, or article in proceedings (2.5 points per activity). Copy(ies) must be placed in the dossier.

9. a. Applying for an external research grant as a principal or co-principal investigator (3 points per grant).
   Application materials must be placed in the dossier.

   b. Serving as the principal or co-principal investigator on an externally funded grant (4 points in the first year for receiving the grant and 2 points for managing the grant in each subsequent year of a multi-year grant).
   Funding approval documentation must be placed in the dossier.

10. Serving as the principal or co-principal investigator on a grant from within the University (1 points per year).

11. Honors, recognitions, and awards (2.0 points per activity), but not to include non-competitive internal awards.

12. Publication of an article in a professional or trade journal, or author of an externally funded applied policy report (2 points per activity).

13. Development of a copyrighted software or 'game' for use in a pedagogical, academic, or professional capacity (2 points per item).

14.   Publication of a translation into a foreign language of an original English work (or vice versa) (1 point per activity).

15.   Electronic publication of an authored contribution to a nationally or internationally recognized blog (e.g., Monkey Cage, Huffington Post) (0.25 points per activity).

The dossier must include a brief narrative assessment by the faculty member under review explaining the significance of the faculty member's research.

SERVICE
(Assistant to Associate)

The minimum service requirement to meet expectations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is the accumulation of at least 20 service points from the Activities listed below.

The minimum service requirement to exceed expectations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is the accumulation of at least 25 service points from the Activities listed below.

The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will evaluate the quality as well as the quantity of the service activities.

Activities:

1.   Chair of the Faculty Senate, Associate Dean, Center Director (4.0 points per year).

2.   For the following positions and activities (3.0 points per activity per year):

- Secretary to the Department,
- Chair of the Annual Review Committee,
- Chairs of Search & Screen Committees,
- Other committee chairs at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee based on annual workload.

3.   For the following positions and activities (2.0 points per activity per year):

- Member of the Annual Review Committee,
- Member of a Search & Screen Committee,

Other committee memberships at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee based on annual workload.4.   For the following positions and activities (1.5 points per activity per year):

- Chair of a Department committee (other than Annual Review Committee and Search and Screen Committees, see No. 2 above),
- Department Library Liaison,
- Department Web Liaison,
- Program Coordinator/Director,
- Member of the Faculty Senate,
- Sponsor/Advisor of a student organization,
- Officer (below the rank of chair/president) of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization,
- Chair of a College or University committee,
- Member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate,
- Chair of a University-wide initiative or organization,
- Conference Organizer,
- Chair or President of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization,
- Member of an external review committee for a department or academic program at a university other than UTRGV,

- External reviewer for a tenure and/or promotion case at a university other than UTRGV.

5. Member of a Department committee, including committees in other departments and degree programs (other than Annual Review Committee and Search and Screen Committees, see No. 3 above), College level committees, and University level committees (1.0 point per committee per year).

6. Referee for scholarly journal or grant/research proposal (0.50 points per article/proposal).

7. Referee for a complete book manuscript (0.75 points).

8. Editor or managing editor of an academic journal (4.0 points); Guest editor of an academic journal (1.0 points per issue); Associate editor or book review editor of an academic journal (0.5 points per year); editorial board member (0.25 points per year).

9. Discipline-related presentations to a unit of UTRGV or community organizations (0.25 points per presentation up to a maximum of 4 points annually).

10. Serving as panel chair (0.25 points per activity) or discussant (0.50 points per activity) at a professional or scholarly conference (up to a maximum of 1 point per year).

11. Writing an opinion piece or editorial for a newspaper (0.1 point per activity up to an annual maximum of 1 point).

12. 10 hours of student advisement in an academic year. Advisement refers to developmental advising and not meeting with students about coursework, etc. Student advising will be awarded points only if relevant to teaching and research in Political Science (1.0 point per year up to a maximum of 4.0 points for the evaluation period).

13. On-going partnership (meetings, consultations) with community-based organization(s) to be documented via written report of activity and letters of acknowledgment from the organizations involved. Community involvement will be awarded points only if it is professionally relevant to teaching and research in Political Science (1.0 point per 10 hours of engagement, maximum 2.0 points per year and 4.0 points for the evaluation period).

14. Testimony before governmental panels, including legislative committees, administrative organizations, and judicial bodies (2 points per activity).

15. Author of an applied policy report or research-based 'white paper' that is sponsored, prepared for, or funded by a governmental, private, or non-profit organization (2.0 points per activity).

16. Media citations and interviews (e.g., quotes in newspaper, radio, television) (0.1 points each not to exceed 5 points per year).

17. Official Faculty Mentor to a faculty member at UTRGV (provide evidence of mentorship in the narrative) (1.0 point per mentee per year).

18. Summer teaching (1.0 point per course taught).

PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR[9]

TEACHING

The minimum requirements to meet expectations for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are: (1) a minimum of 6 years at the Associate Professor rank (early promotion requests are allowed but discouraged), (2) the satisfaction of the minimum criterion of Activity 1, (3) a student evaluation rating of 3.5 to 4.4, (4) the accumulation of at least 12 points from the Activities listed below during the evaluation period, and evidence of peer observation of teaching (see Appendix B.2).

The minimum requirements to exceed expectations for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are: (1) a minimum of 6 years at the Associate Professor rank (early promotion requests are allowed but discouraged), (2) the satisfaction of the minimum criterion of Activity 1, (3) a student evaluation rating of 4.5 to 5.0, (4) the accumulation of at least 15 points from the Activities listed below during the evaluation period, and evidence of peer observation of teaching (see Appendix B.2).

Faculty may undergo Post-Tenure Review and Review for Promotion to Full Professor simultaneously.

The review committee will be responsible for evaluating the quality of each activity, including but not limited to, verifying that each activity was accomplished, judging the value of the activity against the department's evaluation standards and criteria, and insuring that the process is consistent with the American Association of University Professors' good practices in tenure and promotion evaluations.[10]

ACTIVITIES:

1.   No more than 10% of the average of responses of the student evaluations for the evaluation period as a whole falling below the neutral category (e.g., below 3 on a 1 to 5 point scale with 5 being the highest possible rating).

2.   A faculty member shall be awarded activity points for teaching as follows:

"70% to 79% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (0.5 points for each semester).

"80% to 89% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (1.0 points for each semester).

"90% to 100% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (1.5 points for each semester).

The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information in addition to student evaluations. The relevant review committee and the Department Chair will also take into

---

[9] See "Guidelines for Annual Yearly Progress Toward Promotion to Full Professor (Appendix D.2)" for specific definitions of "meets expectations" and "exceeds expectations" for each category of evaluation and the summary evaluation.
[10] American Association of University Professors,
https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Good%20Practice%20in%20Tenure%20Evaluation.pdf

account the following considerations in evaluating teaching effectiveness, where applicable:

- The quality and rigor of course tools, such as examinations, syllabi, written assignments (e.g., papers, white papers), oral presentations in the class, and other course assignments,
- Clarity of classroom materials and presentations (e.g., PowerPoints),
- The use of teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content,
- The clarity and specificity of course goals and learning objectives,
- The fostering of an appreciation for different points of view,
- The complexity of the subject matter and its level of difficulty for students,
- Whether the course is required or elective,
- Whether the course provides a service to non-majors.

Individual faculty are responsible for providing a narrative (and supporting documentation, if applicable) that will allow the relevant review committee to incorporate these considerations into its evaluation of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

3.Attendance at teaching workshops and/or seminars on appropriate course areas (up to a maximum of 10 points):.[11]

- g. "Lunch-time" sessions (0.5 points),
- h. COLTT online teaching certification (2.0 points),
- i. Quality Matters online teaching certification (2.0 points),
- j. Center for Teaching Excellence Learning Communities with 3 or more sessions on one topic (2.0 points),
- k. New Faculty Orientation (2.0 points if attended at least 75% of activities)
- l. Other teaching training activities to be calculated as:
  - i. less than 2 hours with no individual work (0.5 points)
  - ii. more than 2 hours and with assessment and/or individual work included (2.0 points)

4. Development of teaching materials, such as banks of test questions, computer exercises, workbooks, etc. (1 point each up to a maximum of 4 points).

5. Development of new undergraduate courses (1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points with credit awarded only after course has been approved by the department curriculum committee and taught for the first time by the faculty member who developed the course).

---

[11] Unless noted otherwise in the document, the maximum points allowed for an activity throughout this document is the maximum allowed during each six year review period (i.e., promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, or Post-Tenure Review.

6. Development of new graduate courses (1 point up to a maximum of 3 points with credit awarded only after course has been approved by the department curriculum committee and taught for the first time by the faculty member who developed the course).

7. New course preparations, i.e., teaching a previously existing course for the first time (1.0 point per course up to a maximum of 3 points).

8. Arranged courses, independent study, student research for academic presentation, chairing an Honors project, supervising a Master's thesis (or equivalent), or serving on a doctoral dissertation committee at UTRGV or elsewhere (1.0 point each per year) and supervising a research intern (0.25 points per year) (up to a maximum of 4.0 points per year).

9. Development reviews of classroom performance based on visits by a faculty representative from the Center for Teaching Excellence (1 point each visit up to a maximum of 2 points). For requirements regarding peer observation see the Guidelines for Peer Observation in the Appendix B).

10. Recognitions, honors, and awards (up to a maximum of 6 points):

    a. by The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (1.0 point each),
    b. by The University of Texas System (2.0 points each),
    c. by statewide (3.0 points each) or national private or non-profit entities (4.0 points each).

11. Incorporation of experiential learning pedagogy(ies) into classes, including but not limited to service learning, community engagement, etc. (0.5 points per semester up to a maximum of 4 points, if approved by the UTRGV Office of Student Engagement; otherwise at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee).

12. Study abroad or teaching abroad (1.0 points per semester up to a maximum of 4 points).

13. Teaching an online class during a regular semester session (0.25 points per class per semester up to a maximum of 4 points in each 6 year evaluation cycle).

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP[12]
(Associate to Full)

The minimum research/scholarship required to meet expectations for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is (1) the authorship, since their last promotion, of at least four (4) peer reviewed publications with at least two (2) articles in refereed journals (may include up to 2 peer-reviewed book chapters), (2) the faculty member shall be the sole or lead author on at least one (1) of the four (4) publications, (3) the accumulation of at least 20 Activity points from the list of Activities below, (4) a written Impact Narrative describing or documenting the impact of the faculty member's publications, and (5) evidence of peer observation of teaching (see Appendix B.2) All publications must be included in the candidate's dossier (see Appendix D.2).

The minimum research/scholarship required to exceed expectations for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is (1) the authorship, since their last promotion, of at least five (5) peer reviewed publications with at least three (3) articles in refereed journals (may include up to 2 peer-reviewed book chapters), (2) the faculty member shall be the sole or lead author on at least two (2) of the five (5) publications, (3) the accumulation of at least 24 Activity points from the list of Activities below, (4) a written Impact Narrative describing or documenting the impact of the faculty member's publications, and (5) evidence of peer observation of teaching (see Appendix B.2)All publications must be included in the candidate's dossier (see Appendix D.2).

Publication of a research book (excluding a textbook, book of readings, popular book, anthology, vanity press, or similar type publication) will substitute for four (4) peer-reviewed (or refereed) articles or book chapters. The publication must be peer reviewed to qualify as a research book.

Editorship of a book of original essays (not reprints) will substitute for two (2) peer reviewed or refereed articles, co-editor = 1.5 peer reviewed or refereed articles, associate or assistant editor = 0.5 peer reviewed or refereed articles.

Activities:

1.   Publication of a peer reviewed book (excluding a textbook, book of readings,
anthology, vanity press, or similar type publication) beyond the required four (4) articles or book mentioned above (12 points).

   a. When an existing published book authored or co-authored by a faculty member is re-published in a 2nd or later edition (2.0 points).

   b. Each review of an authored or co-authored book in a scholarly journal (0.1 points per review) as a reward for recognition of the book by the scholarly community.

2.   Publication of a peer reviewed journal article(s) or book chapter(s) beyond the
Minimum requirement of four (4) peer reviewed articles mentioned above (4 points each). This activity includes transdisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary publications.

---

[12] University policy allows any tenured faculty member the option of being evaluated on a "Teaching Track," rather than a "Research Track" as long as they teach a 4-4 course load. Teaching Track faculty are still evaluated in Reserach/Scholarship, but can meet expectations for the purpose of merit evaluations by accumulating the required number of Activity Points from the list of Reserach/Scholarship activities (i.e., 10 points to meet expectations and 14 points to exceed expectations). However, an individual cannot meet expectations for purposes of promotion to Full Professor without the minimum number of scholarly publications required by the department's evaluation standards.

3. Paper presented to a professional or scholarly conference (2 points per paper). Copies of the paper(s) must be placed in the candidate's dossier.

   a. Co-authored paper presentation at a professional or scholarly conference when not present (0.25 points per paper for a regional conference and 0.5 points per paper for a national or international conference).

   b. Presentation to a local (RGV) conference (1.0 point per paper).

4. Presentation at a research panel/workshop/roundtable at a professional or scholarly meeting; presentation materials must be placed in the dossier (up to a maximum of 1 point annually).

5. a. Publication of a book review in a professional or scholarly journal (1 point per activity up to a maximum of 3 points annually).

   b. Publication of a review essay (i.e., it has a title and is a multi-book review essay) in a professional or scholarly journal (2.5 points per activity up to a maximum of 2.5 points annually). Copy(ies) of the reviews must be placed in the dossier.

   c. Encyclopedia and Handbook articles (2.5 points if peer reviewed and 1.0 point if not peer reviewed).

6. a. Publication of a textbook (7 points per book).

   b. Publication of a chapter in a textbook (1 point per chapter).

   c. Publication of a non-peer reviewed book by a scholarly or commercial press recognized for its scholarly publications (5.0 points).

7. Editorship of a book of readings or anthology (4 points per book); associate or assistant editor (2 points per book).

8. Publication of a non-refereed journal article, book chapter, or article in proceedings (2.5 points per activity). Copy(ies) must be placed in the dossier.

9. a. Applying for an external research grant as a principal or co-principal investigator (3 points per grant). Application materials must be placed in the dossier.

   b. Serving as the principal or co-principal investigator on an externally funded grant (4 points in the first year for receiving the grant and 2 points for managing the grant in each subsequent year of a multi-year grant). Funding approval documentation must be placed in the dossier.

10. Serving as the principal or co-principal investigator on a grant from within the University (1 points per year).

11. Honors, recognitions, and awards (2.0 points per activity), but not to include non-competitive internal awards.

12. Publication of an article in a professional or trade journal, or author of an externally funded applied policy report (2 points per activity).

13. Development of a copyrighted software or 'game' for use in a pedagogical, academic, or professional capacity (2 points per item).

14. Publication of a translation into a foreign language of an original English work (or vice versa) (1 point per activity).

15. Electronic publication of an authored contribution to a nationally or internationally recognized blog (e.g., Monkey Cage, Huffington Post) (0.25 points per activity).

For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, candidates are also required to include a narrative assessment of the impact of their research. Candidates have flexibility in terms of how they assess the impact of their research and publication, as well as how they measure its national and international visibility. Candidates shall speak to the quality of their work in addition to simple counting. A combination of some of the following sources (or something similar) may be included by the candidate in the research section of the dossier:

1. Citations in the *Social Sciences Citation Index*, *Arts & Humanities Citation Index*, www.scholar.google.com, www.academia.edu, www.researchgate.net, or comparable indices.

2. The quality and reputation of book publishers.

3. The quality of journals, including rankings, circulation (numeric and geographic), and whether journals are sponsored by an academic or professional organization.

4. The number and quality of reviews and citations of an applicant's publications.

5. The number of requests for copies of article reprints and conference papers.

6. Book sales data, including course adoptions.

7. Number of name listings on the Internet.

8. Evidence documenting that an individual's work is being incorporated into course syllabi at other institutions of higher education.

9. External letters of support from recognized scholars who are familiar with the individual's scholarship.

10. Letters of support from government and school officials, private business and non-profit executives, or other community leaders who are familiar with the impact of the individuals applied policy scholarship, consulting activities, and public service.

11. Number of invited talks to professional and academic organizations.

12. Foreign translations of publications.

13. The number of media citations and appearances related to one's scholarship.

14. Invitations to teach or speak at other institutions of higher education.

15. Consultantships with non-university organizations.

The Tenure & Promotion Committee will take into account the quantity and quality of the individual's research/scholarships and, may waive the minimum quantitative standards for publication in recognition of the exceptional quality or impact of the individual's publications.

SERVICE
(Associate to Full)

The minimum service requirement to meet expectations for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is the accumulation of at least 25 service points from the Activities listed below.

The minimum service requirement to exceed expectations for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is the accumulation of at least 30 service points from the Activities listed below.

Activities:

1. Chair of the Faculty Senate, Associate Dean, Center Director, Department Chair(4.0 points per year).

2. For the following positions and activities (3.0 points per activity per year):

    - Associate Chair,
    - Graduate Program Director,
    - Secretary to the Department,
    - Chair of the Annual Review Committee,
    - Chairs of Search & Screen Committees,
    - Other committee chairs at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee based on annual workload.

3. For the following positions and activities (2.0 points per activity per year):

    - Member of the Annual Review Committee,
    - Member of a Search & Screen Committee,
    - Other committee memberships at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee based on annual workload.

4. For the following positions and activities (1.5 points per activity per year):

    - Chair of a Department committee (other than Annual Review Committee and Search and Screen Committees, see No. 2 above),
    - Department Library Liaison,
    - Department Web Liaison,
    - Program Coordinator/Director,
    - Member of the Faculty Senate,
    - Sponsor/Advisor of a student organization,
    - Officer (below the rank of chair/president) of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization,
    - Chair of a College or University committee,
    - Member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate,
    - Chair of a University-wide initiative or organization,
    - Conference Organizer,
    - Chair or President of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization,

- Member of an external review committee for a department or academic program at a university other than UTRGV,
- External reviewer for a tenure and/or promotion case at a university other than UTRGV.

5. Member of a Department committee, including committees in other departments and degree programs (other than Annual Review Committee and Search and Screen Committees, see No. 3 above), College level committees, and University level committees (1.0 point per committee per year).

6. Referee for scholarly journal or grant/research proposal (0.50 points per article/proposal).

7. Referee for a complete book manuscript (0.75 points).

8. Editor or managing editor of an academic journal (4.0 points); Guest editor of an academic journal (1.0 points per issue); Associate editor or book review editor of an academic journal (0.5 points per year); editorial board member (0.25 points per year).

9. Discipline-related presentations to a unit of UTRGV or community organizations (0.25 points per presentation up to a maximum of 4 points annually).

10. Serving as panel chair (0.25 points per activity) or discussant (0.50 points per activity) at a professional or scholarly conference (up to a maximum of 1 point per year).

11. Writing an opinion piece or editorial for a newspaper (0.1 point per activity up to an annual maximum of 1 point).

12. 10 hours of student advisement in an academic year. Advisement refers to developmental advising and not meeting with students about coursework, etc. Student advising will be awarded points only if relevant to teaching and research in Political Science (1.0 point per year up to a maximum of 4.0 points for the evaluation period).

13. On-going partnership (meetings, consultations) with community-based organization(s) to be documented via written report of activity and letters of acknowledgment from the organizations involved. Community involvement will be awarded points only if it is professionally relevant to teaching and research in Political Science (1.0 point per 10 hours of engagement, maximum 2.0 points per year and 4.0 points for the evaluation period).

14. Testimony before governmental panels, including legislative committees, administrative organizations, and judicial bodies (2.0 points per activity).

15. Author of an applied policy report or research-based 'white paper' that is sponsored, prepared for, or funded by a governmental, private, or non-profit organization (2.0 points per activity).

16. Media citations and interviews (e.g., quotes in newspaper, radio, television) (0.1 points each not to exceed 5.0 points per year).

17. Official Faculty Mentor to a faculty member at UTRGV (provide evidence of mentorship in the narrative) (1.0 point per mentee per year).

18. Summer teaching (1.0 point per course taught).

COMPREHENSIVE PERIODIC EVALUATION[13]
(POST TENURE REVIEW) [14]

The Texas Education Code Section 51.942– Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty requires the Board of Regents of the University of Texas to adopt rules and procedures providing for a periodic performance evaluation process for all tenured faculty. This process is established in Regents' Rule 31102: Evaluation of Tenured Faculty and further specified in the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley *Handbook of Operating Procedures* ADM 06-504 Post-Tenure Review.[15]

The purpose of comprehensive periodic evaluation is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas.

1. Annual Reviews.

Evaluation of tenured faculty shall be performed annually. However, annual reviews are not the comprehensive periodic evaluations required under *Texas Education Code* Section 51.942, which focus on individual merit relative to assigned responsibilities in accordance with Regents' Rule 30501.

2. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluations.

(a) Scheduled Reviews. Comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall be performed no less often than every six years. The evaluation may not be waived for any tenured faculty member but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period will coincide with approved leave, comprehensive review promotion, or appointment to an endowed position. No deferral of review of an active faculty member may extend beyond one year from the scheduled review. Institutional policy may specify that periods when a faculty member is on leave need not be counted in calculating when the comprehensive evaluation is required.

(b) Responsibilities Reviewed. The evaluation shall include review of the faculty member's professional responsibilities in teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

(c) Notice of Evaluation. Reasonable individual notice of at least six months of intent to review shall be provided to a faculty member.

(d) Material Submitted. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit a curriculum vita, including a summary statement of professional accomplishments, and shall submit or arrange for the submission of annual reports and teaching evaluations and other materials as required below in each category of evaluation. The faculty member may provide copies of a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other additional materials the faculty member deems appropriate.

---

[13] See "Guidelines for Annual Yearly Progress for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Appendix D.3)" for specific definitions of "meets expectations" and "exceeds expectations" for each category of evaluation and the summary evaluation.

[14] University policy allows any tenured faculty member the option of being evaluated on a "Teaching Track," rather than a "Research Track" as long as they teach a 4-4 course load. Teaching Track faculty are still evaluated in Reserach/Scholarship, but can meet expectations for the purpose of merit evaluations by accumulating the required number of Activity Points from the list of Reserach/Scholarship activities (i.e., 10 points to meet expectations and 14 points to exceed expectations). However, an individual cannot meet expectations for purposes of promotion to Full Professor without the minimum number of scholarly publications required by the department's evaluation standards.

[15] Available at http://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-504.pdf

3. Procedure for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation.

a. All tenured faculty will be evaluated annually, with a comprehensive periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty performed every six years following the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or post tenure review. The six-year evaluation does not replace the annual reviews, but rather supplements them. Under special circumstances, such as approved leave, the review may be delayed with the approval of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If the post tenure review cycle coincides with the faculty member's application for promotion, the latter will be considered as a concurrent application for post tenure review. Any recommending entity that recommends for promotion shall be deemed to have given an equivalent recommendation for post tenure. If a recommending entity recommends against promotion, then that entity should make one of the three additional recommendations provided for in Section 4.a, b, or c.

4. The Department Post-Tenure Review Committee's report shall include a narrative summary of the faculty member's performance in teaching, research/scholarship, and service, and shall make one of the following recommendations:

a. The faculty member exceeds expectations and no further action is warranted.

b. The faculty member meets expectations and no further action is warranted.

c. The faculty member does not meet expectations as there are areas of serious concern that justify a meeting among the faculty member, department chair, and dean to address these areas of concern and develop an action plan to address all deficiencies. The action plan must be approved by the Chair and College Dean.

c. The faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory as it is deficient in meeting the faculty member's academic responsibilities taken as a whole and with due consideration to the time devoted to each of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service, and will be referred to the dean for appropriate action which must include the development of an action plan to address all deficiencies. The action plan must be approved by the Chair and the College Dean

The Department Chair will communicate the results in writing to the faculty member and to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts for review. The faculty member being evaluated will have the opportunity to respond, in writing and in person, to the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PERIODIC REVIEW

The Department Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be responsible for evaluating the quality of each activity, including but not limited to, verifying that each activity was accomplished, judging the activity by standards of the department's evaluation policy, and guidance by the American Association of University Professors recommendations.

TEACHING
(Post-Tenure)

To meet expectations in a comprehensive periodic review, a faculty member must: (1) meet the minimum criterion of Activity 1 below, (2) have an overall student evaluation rating of 3.5 to 4.4, (3) accumulate at least 12 points from the Activities listed below during the evaluation period and (4) evidence of peer observation of teaching.

To exceed expectations in a comprehensive periodic review, a faculty member must: (1) meet the minimum criterion of Activity 1 below, (2) have an overall student evaluation rating of 4.5 to 5.0, (3) accumulate at least 15 points from the Activities listed below during the evaluation period, and (4) evidence of peer observation of teaching

Activities:

1. No more than 10% of the average of responses of the student evaluations for the evaluation period as a whole falling below the neutral category (e.g., below 3 on a 1 to 5 point scale with 5 being the highest possible rating).

2. A faculty member shall be awarded activity points for teaching as follows:

    "70% to 79% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (0.5 points for each semester).

    "80% to 89% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (1.0 points for each semester).

    "90% to 100% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (1.5 points for each semester).

    The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information in addition to student evaluations. The relevant review committee and the Department Chair will also take into account the following considerations in evaluating teaching effectiveness, where applicable:

    - The quality and rigor of course tools, such as examinations, syllabi, written assignments (e.g., papers, white papers), oral presentations in the class, and other course assignments,
    - Clarity of classroom materials and presentations (e.g., PowerPoints),
    - The use of teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content,

- The clarity and specificity of course goals and learning objectives,
- The fostering of an appreciation for different points of view,
- The complexity of the subject matter and its level of difficulty for students,
- Whether the course is required or elective,
- Whether the course provides a service to non-majors.

Individual faculty are responsible for providing a narrative (and supporting documentation, if applicable) that will allow the relevant review committee to incorporate these considerations into its evaluation of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

3. Attendance at teaching workshops and/or seminars on appropriate course areas (up to a maximum of 10 points):[16]

   a. "Lunch-time" sessions (0.5 points),
   b. COLTT online teaching certification (2.0 points),
   c. Quality Matters online teaching certification (2.0 points),
   d. Center for Teaching Excellence Learning Communities with 3 or more sessions on one topic (2.0 points),
   e. New Faculty Orientation (2.0 points if attended at least 75% of activities)
   f. Other teaching training activities to be calculated as:
      iii. less than 2 hours with no individual work (0.5 points)
      iv. more than 2 hours and with assessment and/or individual work included (2.0 points)

4. Development of teaching materials, such as banks of test questions, computer exercises, workbooks, etc. (1 point each up to a maximum of 4 points).

5. Development of new undergraduate courses (1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points with credit awarded only after course has been approved by the department curriculum committee and taught for the first time by the faculty member who developed the course).

6. Development of new graduate courses (1 point up to a maximum of 3 points with credit awarded only after course has been approved by the department curriculum committee and taught for the first time by the faculty member who developed the course).

7. New course preparations, i.e., teaching a previously existing course for the first time (1.0 point per course up to a maximum of 3 points).

8. Arranged courses, independent study, student research for academic presentation, chairing an Honors project, supervising a Master's thesis (or equivalent), or serving on a doctoral dissertation committee at UTRGV or elsewhere (1.0 point each per year) and supervising a research intern (0.25 points per year) (up to a maximum of 4.0 points per year).

---

[16] Unless noted otherwise in the document, the maximum points allowed for an activity throughout this document is the maximum allowed during each six year review period (i.e., promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, or Post-Tenure Review.

9. Development reviews of classroom performance based on visits by a faculty representative from the Center for Teaching Excellence (1 point each visit up to a maximum of 2 points). For requirements regarding peer observation see the Guidelines for Peer Observation in the Appendix B).

10. Recognitions, honors, and awards (up to a maximum of 6 points):

   a. by The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (1.0 point each),
   b. by The University of Texas System (2.0 points each),
   c. by statewide (3.0 points each) or national private or non-profit entities (4.0 points each).

11. Incorporation of experiential learning pedagogy(ies) into classes, including but not limited to service learning, community engagement, etc. (0.5 points per semester up to a maximum of 4 points, if approved by the UTRGV Office of Student Engagement; otherwise at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee).

12. Study abroad or teaching abroad (1.0 points per semester up to a maximum of 4 points).

13. Teaching an online class during a regular semester session (0.25 points per class per semester up to a maximum of 4 points in each 6 year evaluation cycle).

RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP
(Post-Tenure)

To meet expectations in a comprehensive periodic review, a faculty member (1) must have authored, since their last promotion or comprehensive period evaluation, at least two (2) peer reviewed publications with at least one (1) article in a refereed journal (may include up to 1 peer-reviewed book chapter), (2) the faculty member shall be the sole or lead author on at least (1) of the articles, (3) the accumulation of at least 20 Activity points from the list of Activities below, and (4) an a written Impact Narrative describing or documenting the impact of the faculty member's publications. All of these publications must be included in the candidate's dossier (see Appendix D.3). All of these publications must be included in the candidate's dossier.

To exceed expectations in a comprehensive periodic review, a faculty member (1) must have authored, since their last promotion or comprehensive period evaluation, at least three (3) peer reviewed publications with at least one (1) article in a refereed journal (may include up to 1 peer-reviewed book chapter), (2) the faculty member shall be the sole or lead author on at least two (2) of the articles, (3) the accumulation of at least 24 Activity points from the list of Activities below, and (4) an a written Impact Narrative describing or documenting the impact of the faculty member's publications. All of these publications must be included in the candidate's dossier (see Appendix D.3).

Publication of a research book (excluding a textbook, book of readings, popular book, anthology, vanity press, or similar type publication) will substitute for four (4) peer-reviewed (or refereed) articles or book chapters. The publication of the manuscript must be based on merit and any other conditions (e.g., minimum number of orders) is not acceptable to qualify as a research book.

Editorship of a book of original essays (not reprints) will substitute for two (2) peer reviewed or refereed articles, co-editor = 1.5 peer reviewed or refereed articles, associate or assistant editor = 0.5 peer reviewed or refereed articles.

Activities:

1. Publication of a peer reviewed book (excluding a textbook, book of readings, anthology, vanity press, or similar type publication) beyond the required two (2) to three (3) articles or book mentioned above (12 points).

    a. When an existing published book authored or co-authored by a faculty member is re-published in a 2nd or later edition (2.0 points).

    b. Each review of an authored or co-authored book in a scholarly journal (0.1 points per review) as a reward for recognition of the book by the scholarly community.

2. Publication of a peer reviewed journal article(s) or book chapter(s) beyond the minimum requirement of two (2) peer reviewed articles mentioned above (4 points each). This activity includes transdisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary publications.

3. Paper presented to a professional or scholarly conference (2 points per paper).
   Copies of the paper(s) must be placed in the candidate's dossier.

    a. Co-authored paper presentation at a professional or scholarly conference when notpresent (0.25 points per paper for a regional conference and 0.5 points per paper for a national or international conference).

b. Presentation to a local (RGV) conference (1.0 point per paper).

4. Presentation at a research panel/workshop/roundtable at a professional or scholarly meeting; presentation materials must be placed in the dossier (up to a maximum of 1 point annually).

5. a. Publication of a book review in a professional or scholarly journal (1 point per activity up to a maximum of 3 points annually).

   b. Publication of a review essay (i.e., it has a title and is a multi-book review essay) in a professional or scholarly journal (2.5 points per activity up to a maximum of 2.5 points annually). Copy(ies) of the reviews must be placed in the dossier.

   c. Encyclopedia and Handbook articles (2.5 points if peer reviewed and 1.0 point if not peer reviewed).

6. a. Publication of a textbook (7 points per book).

   b. Publication of a chapter in a textbook (1 point per chapter).

   c. Publication of a non-peer reviewed book by a scholarly or commercial press recognized for its scholarly publications (5.0 points).

7. Editorship of a book of readings or anthology (4 points per book); associate or assistant editor (2 points per book).

8. Publication of a non-refereed journal article, book chapter, or article in proceedings (2.5 points per activity). Copy(ies) must be placed in the dossier.

9. a. Applying for an external research grant outside as a principal or co-principal investigator (3 points per grant). Application materials must be placed in the dossier.

   b. Serving as the principal or co-principal investigator on an externally funded grant (4 points in the first year for receiving the grant and 2 points for managing the grant in each subsequent year of a multi-year grant). Funding approval documentation must be placed in the dossier.

10. Serving as the principal or co-principal investigator on a grant from within the University (1 points per year).

11. Honors, recognitions, and awards (2.0 points per activity), but not to include non-competitive internal awards.

12. Publication of an article in a professional or trade journal, or author of an externally funded applied policy report (2 points per activity).

13. Development of a copyrighted software or 'game' for use in a pedagogical, academic, or professional capacity (2 points per item).

14. Publication of a translation into a foreign language of an original English work (or vice versa) (1 point per activity).

15. Electronic publication of an authored contribution to a nationally or internationally recognized blog (e.g., Monkey Cage, Huffington Post) (0.25 points per activity).

For periodic comprehensive review, candidates are also required to include a narrative assessment of the impact of their research. Candidates have flexibility in terms of how they assess the impact of their research and publication, as well as how they measure its national and international visibility. Candidates shall speak to the quality of their work in addition to simple counting. A combination of some of the following sources (or something similar) shall be included by the candidate in the research section of the dossier:

1. Citations in the *Social Sciences Citation Index*, *Arts & Humanities Citation Index*, www.scholar.google.com, www.academia.edu, www.researchgate.net, or comparable indices.

2. The quality and reputation of book publishers.

3. The quality of journals, including rankings, circulation (numeric and geographic), and whether journals are sponsored by an academic or professional organization.

4. The number and quality of reviews and citations of an applicant's publications.

5. The number of requests for copies of article reprints and conference papers.

6. Book sales data, including course adoptions.

7. Number of name listings on the Internet.

8. Evidence documenting that an individual's work is being incorporated into course syllabi at other institutions of higher education.

9. External letters of support from recognized scholars who are familiar with the individual's scholarship.

10. Letters of support from government and school officials, private business and non-profit executives, or other community leaders who are familiar with the impact of the individuals applied policy scholarship, consulting activities, and public service.

11. Number of invited talks to professional and academic organizations.

12. Foreign translations of publications.

13. The number of media citations and appearances related to one's scholarship.

14. Invitations to teach or speak at other institutions of higher education.

15. Consultantships with non-university organizations.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will take into account the quantity and quality of the individual's research/scholarship and, may waive the minimum quantitative standards for publication in recognition of the exceptional quality or impact of the individual's publications.

SERVICE
(Post-Tenure)

To meet expectations in a comprehensive periodic review, an individual must accumulate at least 25 service points from the Activities listed below.

To exceed expectations in a comprehensive periodic review, an individual must accumulate at least 30 service points from the Activities listed below since their last promotion or Post Tenure Review

Activities:

1.   Chair of the Faculty Senate, Associate Dean, Center Director, Department Chair (4.0 points per year).

2.   For the following positions and activities (3.0 points per activity per year):

- Associate Chair,
- Graduate Program Director,
- Secretary to the Department,
- Chair of the Annual Review Committee,
- Chairs of Search & Screen Committees,
- Other committee chairs at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee based on annual workload.

3.   For the following positions and activities (2.0 points per activity per year):

- Member of the Annual Review Committee,
- Member of a Search & Screen Committee,
- Other committee memberships at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee based on annual workload.

4.   For the following positions and activities (1.5 points per activity per year):

- Chair of a Department committee (other than Annual Review Committee and Search and Screen Committees, see No. 2 above),
- Department Library Liaison,
- Department Web Liaison,
- Program Coordinator/Director,
- Member of the Faculty Senate,
- Sponsor/Advisor of a student organization,
- Officer (below the rank of chair/president) of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization,
- Chair of a College or University committee,
- Member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate,
- Chair of a University-wide initiative or organization,
- Conference Organizer,
- Chair or President of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization,

- Member of an external review committee for a department or academic program at a university other than UTRGV,
- External reviewer for a tenure and/or promotion case at a university other than UTRGV.

5. Member of a Department committee, including committees in other departments and degree programs (other than Annual Review Committee and Search and Screen Committees, see No. 3 above), College level committees, and University level committees (1.0 point per committee per year).

6. Referee for scholarly journal or grant/research proposal (0.50 points per article/proposal).

7. Referee for a complete book manuscript (0.75 points).

8. Editor or managing editor of an academic journal (4.0 points); Guest editor of an academic journal (1.0 points per issue); Associate editor or book review editor of an academic journal (0.5 points per year); editorial board member (0.25 points per year).

9. Discipline-related presentations to a unit of UTRGV or community organizations (0.25 points per presentation up to a maximum of 4 points annually).

10. Serving as panel chair (0.25 points per activity) or discussant (0.50 points per activity) at a professional or scholarly conference (up to a maximum of 1 point per year).

11. Writing an opinion piece or editorial for a newspaper (0.1 point per activity up to an annual maximum of 1 point).

12. 10 hours of student advisement in an academic year. Advisement refers to developmental advising and not meeting with students about coursework, etc. Student advising will be awarded points only if relevant to teaching and research in Political Science (1.0 point per year up to a maximum of 4.0 points for the evaluation period).

13. On-going partnership (meetings, consultations) with community-based organization(s) to be documented via written report of activity and letters of acknowledgment from the organizations involved. Community involvement will be awarded points only if it is professionally relevant to teaching and research in Political Science (1.0 point per 10 hours of engagement, maximum 2.0 points per year and 4.0 points for the evaluation period).

14. Testimony before governmental panels, including legislative committees, administrative organizations, and judicial bodies (2.0 points per activity).

15. Author of an applied policy report or research-based 'white paper' that is sponsored, prepared for, or funded by a governmental, private, or non-profit organization (2.0 points per activity).

16. Media citations and interviews (e.g., quotes in newspaper, radio, television) (0.1 points each not to exceed 5.0 points per year).

17. Official Faculty Mentor to a faculty member at UTRGV (provide evidence of mentorship in the narrative) (1.0 point per mentee per year).

18. Summer teaching (1.0 point per course taught).

<u>**APPENDIX A**</u>
Division of Academic Affairs
Institutional Format for Faculty Review Dossier[17]

In an attempt to provide a level of consistency and guidance for faculty, the following is the format to follow when preparing your faculty review dossier. Inserts and sub-inserts in your faculty dossier should include the following in the order shown below.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
1. BASIC INFORMATION
1.1 APPLICANT STATEMENT AND SELF-EVALUATION[1] (updated yearly)
1.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA
1.3 CURRICULUM VITAE** (updated yearly)
2. FACULTY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN[2]
3. RECOMMENDATIONS
3.1 DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
3.2 DEPARTMENT CHAIR RECOMMENDATIONS
3.3 COLLEGE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
3.4 COLLEGE DEAN RECOMMENDATIONS
3.5 UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
3.6 PROVOST RECOMMENDATIONS
4. TEACHING
4.1 TABULAR SUMMARY OF TEACHING EVALUATIONS**
4.2 TABULAR SUMMARY OF TEACHING ACHIEVEMENTS**
4.3 NARRATIVE SUMMARY
4.4 PEER REVIEW / OBSERVATIONS[3]
5. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP
5.1 TABULAR NUMERIC SUMMARY**
5.2 NARRATIVE SUMMARY
5.3 EXTERNAL REVIEWS / ASSESSMENTS*
6. SERVICE
6.1 TABULAR NUMERIC SUMMARY**
6.2 NARRATIVE SUMMARY
7. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION / MATERIAL
7.1 TEACHING (including student evaluations and syllabi/course material)
7.2 RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP
7.3 SERVICE

---

[17] http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-format-for-faculty-review-dossier.pdf

The dossier submitted for review must include cumulative summaries and material/submissions during tenure/promotion cycle. All publications/creative work of the applicant need not be submitted as a part of the supporting documentation (section 7), but a representative sample is required. Please use front and back copies and do *not* use protective sheets. The format indicated above shall be utilized in preparation of the applicant's tenure/tenure track, and promotion dossier. The dossier format and tabular summaries templates can be accessed on the Provost or Faculty Affairs websites. You may also contact your Chair, Dean or Office of Faulty Affairs and Diversity for a copy.

[1]**APPLICANT STATEMENT AND SELF-EVALUATION:** This would normally be the last item the applicant prepares before submitting the file to the department chair. This letter should clearly state the applicant's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion and focus attention on the unique strengths and credentials of the applicant, and should stress the activities and accomplishments of the applicant since the last review. The applicant should recognize that members of the various committees might not be entirely familiar with the applicant's field. It is to the advantage of the applicant to explain the significance of his/her contributions or accomplishments. An applicant might, for example, comment on the relative importance of an exhibit in a gallery or on the professional reputation of a journal which features the applicant's work. A new statement must be prepared each year that the applicant is considered for review. This is also an opportunity for the candidate to state how any improvements recommended during the last review have been addressed.

[2]**FACULTY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN:** 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. The professional development plan covers six years to be updated yearly, so that by the sixth year final review the professional development plan will cover the six years after the candidate receives tenure, if tenure is granted. First year tenure-track faculty will need to develop and submit a written professional development plan in consultation with their department chair and mentor. Deans will review these professional development plans, and work with tenure-track faculty and chair on any revisions the Dean deems necessary. The professional development plan should cover all three areas of review (Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service), and correspond to the department's Basic Performance Criteria for tenure and promotion.

[3]**PEER REVIEWS / OBSERVATIONS:** Peer reviews of teaching, including classroom observations, are required by UT system for all tenure and promotion recommendations. Please refer to the Institutional Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching as well as your department/college guidelines.

***EXTERNAL REVIEWS / ASSESSMENTS:** Required of all Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion. Please refer to the Institutional Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for P&T as well as your department/college guidelines.

**Will be updated and generated via Faculty Portfolio Tool (FPT).

APPENDIX B.1

Division of Academic Affairs
Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching[18]

See, http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-guidelines-for-faculty-peer-observation%20of%20teaching.pdf

Section 1. Purpose and Rationale

The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley recognizes the essential contribution of its faculty members to the quality of students' education and learning experiences and supports faculty development in all aspects of instruction. The process of formative peer observation provides an effective tool for faculty development in the area of teaching. Departments are encouraged to use this process to engage in constructive conversations between faculty members for the purpose of facilitating faculty growth in the area of teaching, as well as in building healthy collegial relationships through conversation in the context of professional development. This document provides the minimum requirements for the peer observation process to be used by departments in developing their own procedures for peer observation.

The goals of the peer observation process are to improve teaching and student learning while serving as a tool for mentoring. The peer observation process shall foster a culture of teaching excellence through collegial dialogue. Thus, the outcome of the faculty peer observation process shall be a reflective summary by the faculty member describing any steps taken or changes made towards the enhancement of teaching and improvement of student learning.

Section 2. Scope

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.

Section 3. Definitions

Faculty Member – The individual whose teaching is being observed.

Faculty Member Report – A report described below in this policy, written by the faculty member whose teaching is being observed. This document is included in the faculty member's dossier.

Peer Observer – Individual who observes and provides feedback to the faculty member.

Peer Observer Evaluative Report – Oral or written report given by the observer to the faculty member for evaluative purposes. The Peer Observer Evaluative Report is given to the faculty

---

[18] http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-guidelines-for-faculty-peer-observation%20of%20teaching.pdf

member only and is not included in the faculty member's report unless the faculty member requests in writing to include the report in the faculty member's dossier.

Peer Observer Summative Report – A written summative evaluation report by a peer observer to be included in the faculty member's dossier; this report only applies to those departments or units in which the majority of the voting members approve to require a summative evaluation of teaching as part of the peer review process.

Department or Unit Faculty – For purposes of this policy, department or unit faculty includes full-time voting members of the department or unit.

Guidelines–Guidelines for the peer observation process developed by department or unit faculty and approved by a majority of the voting members of the department or unit faculty. Guidelines regarding peer observation should be posted in an online location accessible to all faculty.

Section 4. Development of Guidelines

A. Guidelines outlining the peer observation process shall be developed at the department or unit level by the department or unit faculty. The department may, but is not required to, develop and employ summative evaluation criteria separate from the Peer Observation Evaluative Report as part of its peer-review process. If a summative evaluation requirement is developed and approved by the majority of the voting faculty in the department or unit, all faculty in the department or unit shall include the Peer Observation Summative Report in their promotion dossiers. All department or unit guidelines are to be approved by a majority of the voting members of the department or unit. Those departments or units without a specific set of guidelines for peer observation of teaching shall follow the approved institutional guidelines developed by the Office of the Provost.

B. Guidelines shall:

   1. Focus on faculty development and the mentoring aspects of peer observation;
   2. Reflect the variety of instructional delivery methods and topics within each department or unit;
   3. Recognize that no single teaching method or approach is inherently superior to any other; and
   4. Protect against negative effects caused by conflict or disagreements between colleagues.

C. Guidelines shall specify the following:

   1. A timeline for the peer observation process; a recommended timeline is provided below;
   2. Whether observation will consist of a single visit or multiple visits to the faculty member's class or lab;
   3. Expectations for any pre- or post-observation meetings;
   4. Class visits will only occur with prior notification and discussion with the faculty member being observed;

5. Areas of performance to be included in the observation process for different course formats (lecture, lab, online, hybrid, clinical training);
6. For courses in which the faculty member conducts both the lecture and lab sections of the course, department guidelines shall specify whether both lecture and lab are to be included in the observation.
7. If applicable, the details for any summative evaluation criteria developed and approved by the majority of the voting members of the department or unit.

D. Guidelines shall also make a clear distinction between what is required for the Peer Observer Evaluative Report provided only to the faculty member, and what is required for the Faculty Member Report as described below. Only the latter report is required to be included in the faculty member's dossier unless the department or unit requires otherwise. However, the faculty member may request, in writing, for the Peer Observer Report to be included in the faculty member's dossier. The department or unit may additionally develop a Summative Evaluation Report requirement as part of its peer review guidelines/criteria, which shall be approved by a majority of the voting members of the department or unit faculty. Only in these cases must a Peer Observer Summative Report be included in the faculty member's dossier.

Section 5. Peer Observation Required for Promotion and Tenure

A. All promotion and tenure review reports sent to UT System must show evidence of peer evaluations of teaching, including faculty members with administrative appointments at 50% or less.

B. Peer observation of teaching will apply to all full-time faculty.

C. The decision on whether to include peer observation for review of part-time faculty shall be made at the department or unit level.

Section 6. Frequency of Observation

A. The following requirements for the frequency of observation may be increased by departments or units, so long as the minimum requirements of peer observation for promotion and tenure cases are met.

B. Faculty members may request more frequent observation to the extent that can be accommodated by the department or unit.

C. Frequency of Observation

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

Section 7. Definition of "Peer" for Purposes of Peer Observation and Selection of Peer Observer

Department Guidelines shall specify who can serve as peer observers. Peer observers can be, but are not required to be, members of the same department or unit as the faculty member. The faculty member being observed shall have considerable input into who will serve as his or her peer observer. Observations by non-faculty experts cannot substitute for peer observations.

Section 8. Recognition of the Time and Effort Involved in the Peer Observation Process

The peer observation process involves significant time and effort on the part of the peer observer. Policies shall specify that this important service contribution shall be recognized and reflected in the annual review of the peer observer.

Section 9. Availability and/or Requirements for Training for the Peer Observer

Guidelines shall specify whether there are requirements for training the peer observer. Guidelines shall also direct peer observers to any available opportunities for training, even if not required.

Section 10. Elements of the Faculty Member Report

A. To be included in Faculty Member Report:

1. Name and signature of faculty member
2. Name and signature of peer observer
3. Name and course number of observed class
4. Date of any pre-observation meeting
5. Date of observation(s)
6. Date of any post-observation meeting
7. A narrative written by the faculty member describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any plans for improvement or development.

B. Guidelines may specify additional information to be provided to the faculty member by the peer observer in the Peer Observer Evaluative Report, but this information should not be included in the Faculty Member Report. Only the faculty member's narrative is included in the Faculty Member Report, unless the majority of the voting members of the department or unit approve to additionally require a Peer Observer Summative Report.

Section 11. Timeline

The Faculty Member Report shall be provided to the department chair, unit head or equivalent (or the 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 department chair, unit head, or equivalent (or dean when the faculty member being observed is the department chair), will file the report in the faculty member's dossier.

Timeline	Action	Responsible Party
No later than two weeks prior to first day of class	Provide faculty member with department guidelines	Department chair or unit head or equivalent
No later than the third week of the semester	Identify peer observer and provide name of observer to the department chair	Faculty member
No later than fifth week of the semester	Meet to discuss teaching materials and set date(s) for observation	Faculty member and peer observer
No later than twelfth week of the semester	Peer observation(s)	Peer observer
Within one week of the observation	Post-observation meeting	Faculty member and peer observer
No later than the last day of class	Faculty Member Report provided to chair	Faculty member

APPENDIX B.2

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
Policy on Peer Observation of Teaching[19]

Purpose: As part of Political Science faculty members' desire to continuously improve their courses for our students, the faculty believe that teaching may be reviewed using: 1. student evaluations of the course, 2. continued participation in the various endeavors of mentoring our students, designing new courses, revising current courses for reduced seats and/or online delivery, etc., 3. peer observation of teaching and review of course materials. This policy is to formalize the peer observation and review of course materials.

Objective: This policy affects all full-time faculty including 1- and 3-year lecturers, tenure-track, and tenured faculty. Each faculty member will be observed and his/her course materials reviewed by peers on the following schedule:

> Tenured Faculty and Senior Lecturers: At least once every three years; dossiers compiled for promotion to the rank of professor must include Peer Observation of Teaching forms from at least two (2) peer reviews.

> Tenure-Track Faculty: Every year.

> Three-year appointment lectures: Every year.

> One-year appointment lecturers: Every year.

Faculty may request additional observation as desired and those on tenure-track are encouraged to do so. Faculty will select the course for which that observation is to take place among those he or she is teaching including any type of course—face-to-face, reduced seat, or fully online.

Selection of Observer: Faculty may select from one of the following options for observation:

> a. Faculty being observed may choose any member of the Political Science Department.

> b. Faculty may ask the Department Chair to select randomly any faculty member.

> c. Faculty may request a team of reviewers including any two or all of the above options to conduct the observation.

The Observation: Observers should be contacted regarding an observation request early in the semester. The formative observation consists of four activities: a meeting between instructor and observers(s) prior to the observation, at least one classroom visit, a review of course material (syllabi, methods of assessment, assignment sheets, notes, etc.), and a final informal oral

---

[19] http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-guidelines-for-faculty-peer-observation%20of%20teaching.pdf

discussion between the faculty member being observed and the observer(s) where the bulk and details of the formative assessment are presented.

Peer Observation of Teaching Form
After the observation, the observer fills out the Political Science Department's Peer Observation of Teaching Form, which will include the dates of all classroom observations and meetings between the observer and the faculty member who was observed that were part of the peer observation process. Both faculty members sign this form, and a copy must be placed in the observed faculty member's annual review folder, as well as any tenure and/or promotion dossier that the candidate submits.

Faculty Member Report
The observed faculty member will also prepare a Faculty Member Report, which includes:

1. Name and signature of faculty member,
2. Name and signature of peer observer,
3. Name and course number of observed class,
4. Date of any pre-observation meeting,
5. Date of observation(s),
6. Date of any post-observation meeting,
7. A brief written narrative (not to exceed one page) by the faculty member describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any plans for improvement or development.

A copy of the Faculty Member Report must be placed in the observed faculty member's annual review folder, as well as any tenure and/or promotion dossier that the candidate submits.

Peer Observer Evaluation
The observed faculty member may request a written Peer Observer Evaluation from the observer summarizing the observation process and providing an assessment of the observed faculty member's teaching, which the faculty member may include in tenure and/or promotion dossiers. A Peer Observer Evaluation should include all four aspects of the observation described above, and should address the following questions:

> Does the instructor clearly define and explain the course objectives and expectations?
> Is the instructor prepared to teach for each instructional activity?
> Does the instructor communicate information effectively?
> Does the instructor encourage students to take an active role in their own learning?
> Is the instructor available to students, either electronically or in person?

Online Courses: Faculty may replace one peer observation by participating in an online review of their course using a method employed by the Center for Online Learning and Technology for course reviews. Faculty who teach all their courses online will be evaluated online.

Approved by Department Vote 23 October, 2015. Amended on March 4, 2016.

Peer Observation of Teaching Documentation Form

Name & Title of Faculty Member Being Observed:_____

Course Number & Title:_____

Name and Title of Observer:_____

Date of Consultation Meeting (Pre-Observation):_____

Date of Debriefing Meeting (Post-Observation):_____

Observer Reviewed Course Material: _____Yes   _____No

Signature of Faculty Member:_____Date:_____

Signature of Observer:_____Date:_____

PEER OBSERVATION REPORT FOR _____

POLS _____: NAME OF COURSE

Pre-observation meeting:

Classroom Observation:

- **Does the instructor clearly define and explain the course objectives and expectations?**

- **Is the instructor prepared to teach for each instructional activity?**

- **Does the instructor communicate information effectively?**

- **Does the instructor encourage students to take an active role in their own learning?**

- **Is the instructor available to students, either electronically or in person?**

Review of course material:

APPENDIX C.1

Division of Academic Affairs Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure[20]

Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Updated: 4/16/2015

1. Department Promotion and Tenure guidelines should clearly describe the process by which external reviewers will be selected and what will be the role of the department, the department chair, the P&T committee, and the candidate in this process.

2. We recommend a minimum of four (4) external reviews of a candidate's record be obtained. *Please see the example/model below for additional details and guidance*.

3. External Reviewers

a. Reference should be made regarding the qualifications of external reviewers.

b. Reviewers shall submit a copy of their updated curriculum vita.

c. Reviewers should be asked to describe the nature of their relationship, if any, with the candidate under review.

d. External reviewers with potential conflicts of interest or personal ties to the candidate should be avoided.

e. External reviewers should represent senior and distinguished or leading scholars in comparable academic or research fields to that of the candidate.

f. Reviewers should be selected from peer or aspirational institutions of higher education or from prominent departments/institutions in the candidate's area of expertise.

g. Reviewers should directly assess the candidate's productivity and accomplishments relative to standards in the field.

4. Confidentiality

a. The names and affiliations of the external reviewers will remain confidential and will not be available to the candidates. However, the candidate will be provided a copy of the reviews, which will contain no identifying information of the reviewers.

b. All review levels must abide by this confidentiality and ensure that no identifying information or material is shared with the candidate.

5. External reviewers should at least be provided with the following information and material:

a. Candidate's updated CV.

---

[20] http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-guidelines-for-external-reviewers.pdf

b. Summary of research and scholarship.

c. Three (3) samples of the candidate's most recent most recent scholarly, research or creative work..

EXAMPLE (MODEL POLICY) FOR THE SELECTION OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

In this section, we present an example/model regarding the process for the selection of external reviewers. This example/model is intended to provide guidance to departments/colleges as they develop their own guidelines/policies. This model policy will also serve as an interim policy until a department/college policy is developed and adopted.

1. The candidate will supply a list of five (5) potential reviewers, with brief reasons for each choice, and his/her relationship to each reviewer. The candidate may provide a listing with a brief explanation of any external peers whom he or she prefers not to be contacted.

2. Peer reviewers, with well-established expertise in the field of the candidate, will be selected as follows:

a. The Departmental P&T Committee will prepare a list of proposed reviewers. The list will include the entire list supplied by the candidate plus an additional five (5) potential reviewers recommended by the Committee.

b. The candidate will be informed of all the names on the list and will have the opportunity to comment on them.

c. The Committee, in consultation with the department chair, will select at least four (4) reviewers from that list, with at least two (2) names from the list provided by the candidate. The candidate's listing of those he/she wishes to be excluded will normally be honored.

d. The names and affiliations of the reviewers selected will not be divulged to the candidate and will remain confidential.

3. The Department Chair will request written peer reviews from the selected reviewers to be placed in the candidate's dossier. External reviewers will be provided with two (2) forms to complete; one (1) for their contact information along with a brief description of their qualifications and the other for their written review. The review form will not contain any identifying information. A copy of the review letter will be included in the candidate's dossier. The reviewer's form which contains the contact information, along with the reviewer's CV will be placed in a manila envelope and included in the dossier.

4. All review levels must ensure that all identifying information/material of the external reviewers is removed from the dossier before allowing the candidate to access or review the dossier.

Included in the information requested from the external referees will be the following questions or their equivalent:

1. What are the candidate's strengths including any contributions and/or impact on their profession/discipline?

2. In your professional opinion, does the candidate demonstrate the potential for continued scholarly or creative productivity? Please provide a brief description to support your answer.

3. Can you identify any weaknesses of the candidate? Do you believe the candidate compares favorably to other scholars at a similar stage in their career and/or at a similar institution as The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley? Please elaborate.

4. UTRGV guiding principles include promoting access to postsecondary education to a diverse student body to become one of the largest and most successful Hispanic-serving institutions in the country, as well as employ the highest quality faculty members who pursue excellence in teaching, research, and service. In your professional opinion, do you foresee this candidate will significantly contribute to these goals? Please provide some examples to support your answer.

APPENDIX C.2

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Policy on External Review of Tenure and Promotion Candidates

Summary: In the fall semester of the year before a candidate's final year on the tenure track, the candidate, department chair, and the department's tenure and promotion committee will compile a list of at least six names to contact for external reviews of the candidate's professional achievement. These potential reviewers will be contacted during the Spring semester prior to the candidate's final review year.

Selection of Reviewers

1. The candidate will supply a list of six (6) potential reviewers, with brief reasons for each choice, and his/her relationship to each reviewer. The candidate may provide a listing with a brief explanation of any external peers whom he or she prefers not to be contacted.

2. Peer reviewers, with well-established expertise in the field of the candidate, will be selected as follows:

a. The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee will prepare a list of proposed reviewers. The list will include the entire list supplied by the candidate plus up to an additional four (4) potential reviewers recommended by the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

b. The candidate will be informed of all the names on the list and will have the opportunity to comment on them.

c. The Tenure and Promotion Committee, in consultation with the department chair, will select at least four (4) reviewers from that list, with at least three (3) names from the list provided by the candidate. The candidate's listing of those he/she wishes to be excluded will normally be honored.

d. The names and affiliations of the reviewers selected will not be divulged to the candidate and will remain confidential.

3. The Department Chair will request written peer reviews from the selected reviewers to be placed in the candidate's dossier. External reviewers will be provided with two (2) forms to complete; one (1) for their contact information along with a brief description of their qualifications and the other for their written review. The review form will not contain any identifying information. A copy of the review letter will be included in the candidate's dossier. The reviewer's form which contains the contact information, along with the reviewer's CV will be placed in a manila envelope and included in the dossier.

4. All review levels must ensure that all identifying information/material of the external reviewers is removed from the dossier before allowing the candidate to access or review the dossier.

The Review Process

The external reviewers will provide an evaluation of the candidate's achievements in the category of research/scholarship only. The Department Chair will provide the external reviewers with copies of relevant publications, a copy of the candidate's curriculum vita, a summary of the candidate's workload in terms of teaching (class sizes, number of course preparations, etc.) and service, and information about the level of support (travel funds, course releases, etc.) the

University has provided to support the candidate's research. External reviewers should address the question of whether the publication(s) represent a contribution to the scholarship in the candidate's field. External reviewers should be asked to provide at least a one to two paragraph evaluation of the candidate's research record. Reviewers will send their reviews to the Department Chair.

It is possible that fewer than three reviews will be received in a timely fashion. If the candidate met his or her responsibility in terms of submitting appropriate names for reviewers, the fact that fewer than three reviews are obtained can in no way be held against the candidate by internal reviewers.

Once reviews have been chosen for inclusion, the department chair will add the reviews, together with a current curriculum vita of the reviewers, to the candidate's final review dossier after the candidate has submitted that dossier to the Department Chair and before the dossier is submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee during the candidate's final review year.

The Role of the External Reviews

The external reviews of a candidate's scholarly accomplishments are intended to be just one facet of the candidate's dossier. They are intended to provide internal reviewers with some additional insight into the candidate's record, but are not to be viewed as more significant than the internal reviews, especially those at the department level, where faculty have a richer perspective of the candidate's overall performance in terms of the three areas of review: teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

APPENDIX D.1

APPENDIX D1. GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE & PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR							
	Year 1	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Year 6** **Tenure & Promotion Decision**	**Summary Evaluation**
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS							
Minimum Requirement - Student Evaluations	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	
Student Evaluation Rating	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2	4	6	8	10	10 change to 12	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Requirement - Student Evaluations	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	
Student Evaluation Rating	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2 change to 4	5 change to 6	7 change to 8	10	12	12 change to 15	**Exceeds Expectations**
PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT							
Minimum Publications (cumulative)**	0	1	1	2	3	4	
1 sole or lead (first) author? (yes/no)						1 - Yes/No	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2 change to 0	4 change to 3	7	10	12	15	
Significance Narrative						Yes/No	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Publications (cumulative)**	1	2	2	3	4	5	
1 sole or lead (first) author? (yes/no)						2 - Yes/No	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2	6	10	14	18	20	
Significance Narrative						Yes/No	**Exceeds Expectations**
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE							
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	4 change to 1	8 change to 1	12 change to 4	16 change to 10	20 change to 15	20	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	4 change to 2	8 change to 5	13 change to 10	18 change to 15	22 change to 20	22 change to 25	**Exceeds Expectations**

*Annual Review and Tenure & Promotion Committees have flexibility to deviate from this guideline based on factors such as size of teaching load, size of class, type of class (e.g., required statistics), quality of syllabi and testing instruments, rigor of grading, and peer observation.

**Annual Review and Tenure & Promotion Committees have flexibility to deviate from this guideline due to quality and/or impact of publication and to account for the type of research underway (e.g., book project or multi-year research project (see *Evaluation Criteria & Standards*, p. 4 fn. 3).

***Faculty are required to maintain a cumulative total of activity points awarded to them each year in each category of evaluation and include this information in their dossier.

NOTE: The failure to meet the minimum criteria for "meets expectations" in any category of evaluation will result in a rating of "does not meet expectations" for that category.

OVERALL SUMMARY RATING

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS: Must Exceed Expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation and at least Meet Expectations in remaining 1 category. One the two categories must be Research & Scholarship.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS: Must at least Meet Expectations in all 3 categories of evaluation (but does not Exceed Expectations).

DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS: Does Not Meet Expectations in any 1 category of evaluation.

UNSATISFACTORY: Does Not Meet Expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation.

Approved by Faculty – May 13, 2016
Approved by Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs – August 10, 2017

APPENDIX D.2

APPENDIX D2. GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS TOWARD PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR							
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Summary Evaluation
						Promotion Decision	
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS							
Minimum Requirement - Student Evaluations	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	
Student Evaluation Rating	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2	4	6	8	10	10 change to 12	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Requirement - Student Evaluations	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	
Student Evaluation Rating	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2 change to 4	5 change to 6	7 change to 8	10	12	12 change to 15	**Exceeds Expectations**
PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT							
Minimum Publications+**	0	1	1	2	3	4	
1 sole or lead (first) author? (yes/no)	-	-	-	-	-	1 - Yes/No	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2	6	10	14	18	20	
Impact Narrative						Yes/No	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Publications+**	1	2	2	3	4	5	
1 sole or lead (first) author? (yes/no)	-	-	-	-	-	2 - Yes/No	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	4	8	12	16	20	24	
Impact Narrative						Yes/No	**Exceeds Expectations**
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE							
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	5 change to 4	10 change to 8	15 change to 12	20 change to 16	25 change to 20	25	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	6 change to 5	12 change to 10	18 change to 15	24 change to 20	30 change to 25	30	**Exceeds Expectations**

rigor of grading, and peer observation.

**Annual Review and Tenure & Promotion Committees have flexibility to deviate from this guideline due to qualiy and/or impact of publication and to account for the type of research underway (e.g., book project or multi-year research project (see *Evaluation Criteria & Standards*, p. 4 fn. 3).

***Faculty are required to maintain a cumulative total of activity points awarded to them each year in each category of evaluation and include this information in their dossier.

+Tenured faculty who are on the Teaching Track are exempt from the minimum publications requirements, but must still accumulate 10 activity points in Research & Scholarship to meet expectations and 14 activity points in Research & Scholarship to exceed expectations.

NOTE: The failure to meet the minimum criteria for "meets expectations" in any category of evaluation will result in a rating of "does not meet expectations" for that category.

OVERALL SUMMARY RATING

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS: Must Exceed Expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation and at least Meet Expectations in remaining 1 category. One the two categories must be Research & Scholarship.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS: Must at least Meet Expectations in all 3 categories of evaluation (but does not Exceed Expectations).

DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS: Does Not Meet Expectations in any 1 category of evaluation.

UNSATISFACTORY: Does Not Meet Expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation.

Approved by Faculty – May 13, 2016
Approved by Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs – August 10, 2017

APPENDIX D.3

APPENDIX D3. GUIDELINES TOWARD ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PERIODIC EVALUATION (POST-TENURE REVIEW)							
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Summary Evaluation
						Promotion Decision	
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS							
Minimum Requirement - Student Evaluations	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	
Student Evaluation Rating	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	3.5 to 4.4	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2	4	6	8	10	10 change to 12	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Requirement - Student Evaluations	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	<10% below neutral	
Student Evaluation Rating	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	4.5 to 5.0	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2 change to 4	5 change to 6	7 change to 8	10	12	12 change to 15	**Exceeds Expectations**
PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT							
Minimum Publications (cumulative)[+]**	0	0	1	1	1	2	
1 sole or lead (first) author? (yes/no)						1 - Yes/No	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	2	6	10	14	18	20	
Impact Narrative						Yes/No	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Publications (cumulative)[+]**	0	1	1	2	2	3	
1 sole or lead (first) author? (yes/no)						2 - Yes/No	
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)[+] ***	4	8	12	16	20	24	
Impact Narrative						Yes/No	**Exceeds Expectations**
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE							
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	5 change to 4	10 change to 8	15 change to 12	20 change to 16	25 change to 20	25	**Meets Expectations**
Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***	6 change to 5	12 change to 10	18 change to 15	24 change to 20	30 change to 25	30	**Exceeds Expectations**

rigor of grading, and peer observation.

**Annual Review and Tenure & Promotion Committees have flexibility to deviate from this guideline due to quality and/or impact of publication and to account for the type of research underway (e.g., book project or multi-year research project (see *Evaluation Criteria & Standards*, p. 4 fn. 3).

***Faculty are required to maintain a cumulative total of activity points awarded to them each year in each category of evaluation and include this information in their dossier.

+Tenured faculty who are on the Teaching Track are exempt from the minimum publications requirements, but must still accumulate 10 activity points in Research & Scholarship to meet expectations and 14 activity points in Research & Scholarship to exceed expectations.

NOTE: The failure to meet the minimum criteria for "meets expectations" in any category of evaluation will result in a rating of "does not meet expectations" for that category.

OVERALL SUMMARY RATING

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS: Must Exceed Expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation and at least Meet Expectations in remaining 1 category. One of the two categories must be Research & Scholarship.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS: Must at least Meet Expectations in all 3 categories of evaluation (but does not Exceed Expectations).

DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS: Does Not Meet Expectations in any 1 category of evaluation.

UNSATISFACTORY: Does Not Meet Expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation.