



College of Sciences
School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
Post Tenure Review Criteria, Policies and Procedures

1. PURPOSE

The School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences (SMSS) in accordance with UTRGV policies (ADM 06-504) and UT System Regents Rules supports a system of post-tenure review for all tenured faculty. As a preamble to this document, the following section comes directly from the UT System Regents Rules regarding post-tenure review retrieved from the following source on November 21, 2016 [<https://www.utsystem.edu/board-of-regents/rules/31102-evaluation-tenured-faculty>]. The full UT Systems Regents Rules on Post Tenure are in the APPENDIX. In addition, faculty should refer to ADM 6-504 POST- TENURE REVIEW policy for further clarification.

2. SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND STATISTICAL SCIENCES POST-TENURE POLICY

In accordance with the UT-System Rules for post-tenure review and the UTRGV 's HOP Policy: ADM 6-504 POST-TENURE REVIEW, the School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences adopts compliant rule that "recognizes the time-honored practice of tenure for university faculty as an important protection of free inquiry, open intellectual and scientific debate, and unfettered criticism of the accepted body of knowledge. Academic institutions have a special need for practices that protect freedom of expression, since the core of the academic enterprise involves a continual reexamination of ideas. Academic disciplines thrive and grow through critical analysis of conventions and theories. Throughout history, the process of exploring and expanding the frontiers of learning has necessarily challenged the established order. That is why tenure is so valuable, not merely for the protection of individual faculty members but also as an assurance to society that the pursuit of truth and knowledge commands our first priority. Without freedom to question, there can be no freedom to learn."

In similar accordance with the UT System Board of Regents Rules, the SMSS also "supports a system of periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty. Periodic evaluation is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. The purpose of 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."

And, like the Board of Regents, the SMSS also pledges to "regular monitoring of this system to make sure that it is serving its intended purposes and does not in any way threaten tenure as a concept and practice." In implementing the plan, the SMSS shall maintain an appropriate balance of emphasis on teaching, research, service, and other duties of faculty.

Thus, all SMSS faculty will be evaluated annually with a comprehensive post-tenure review occurring every six years following the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. When they coincide, the comprehensive post-tenure review will include the Faculty Annual Review. When they coincide, the information provided for the review of an endowed position (e.g., endowed professor or endowed chair) may be incorporated into the appropriate elements of the comprehensive review. Under special circumstances, such as approved leave, each of these reviews may be delayed with the approval of the EVPAA.

3. PROCEDURES

Following the University calendar for post-tenure review, full-time tenured faculty members submit their Faculty Review Dossiers (FRD) for review in accordance with UTRGV Guidelines. (Appendix A). The information about FRD, Pathway for Review Deadlines and Forms may be obtained from the Faculty Recourses website at <https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>. Some key points are listed below:

- At least 2 peer observations (one for every three years) must be submitted,
- A sample of syllabus can be submitted and all syllabi are uploaded on the FPT online folder
- For additional support material, the faculty member must submit Annual Evaluation Summary Recommendations for each year of the evaluation period under review.
- The faculty member must submit their teaching workload for each semester during the review period.

The faculty member may also include additional material in support of their application. The material to be included and the organization of the FRD should conform to the Instructions for Preparation of Faculty Review Dossiers.

Each faculty member is required to submit their completed FRD to the appropriate department chair/school director no later than the due date each year. Faculty holding joint appointments shall submit their FRDs to the chair/director of their majority appointment department/school. In such cases, it is the responsibility of the Director/Chair of the school/department in which the faculty member holds a majority (>50%) appointment to obtain input on the faculty member's performance from the minority appointment school/department and include it in his/her FRD and from the Director/Chair of the minority appointment school/department and include it in his/her FRD.

In accordance with University policies and UT System Regent's Rules, each FRD for post-tenure review will be independently reviewed by the school Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC), the School Director, and if applicable also the College TPPTRC (Tenure and Promotion and Post-Tenure Review Committee), the Dean, and the EVPAA. The School's Post-Tenure Review Committee must be composed of tenured faculty whereby the committee must include at least three tenured faculty members at an equivalent or higher rank of each of the faculty member(s) undergoing review as per current HOP ADM06-504, and at least one of the members must be a full professor. The chair of the School's Post-Tenure Review Committee is elected by the committee members. It is preferable that Chair will be full professor.

As per current ADM06-504 the chair of the SMSS Post-Tenure Review Committee will communicate the Post-tenure Review Committee's evaluation and recommendation to the faculty member and the School Director. The School Director will conduct an independent review of the faculty member and communicate his/her recommendation to the faculty member and the Dean. Upon review of the SMSS Post-Tenure Review Committee's and Director's recommendations, the Dean will make a decision concerning the results of the comprehensive performance review.

As per current ADM06-504, if the Dean's decision is "Does not meet expectations" or "Unsatisfactory" in overall, then the Dean may appoint, either at the request of the faculty member or if the Dean believes one is needed, a College Post-Tenure Review Committee to review the case. If a College Post-Tenure Review Committee is appointed: (i). The faculty member will be given the opportunity to provide further evidence of contributions or activity in the area(s) of concern to the college Post-Tenure Review Committee; (ii) The college Post-Tenure Review Committee will submit its report to the Dean; and (iii) The Dean will then determine results of the comprehensive performance review and, recommend any necessary actions or follow-up. The Dean will communicate the results of the comprehensive performance review to the EVPAA for review and approval. Once reviewed and approved by the EVPAA, he or she will communicate the final comprehensive performance review results in writing to the faculty member, the School Director, the Dean and the President. The EVPAA is also required to send a summary of the institutional post-tenure review outcomes to The University of Texas System. Each review level must include a detailed written narrative highlighting strengths and weaknesses for post-tenure action.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences tenured faculty are responsible for developing criteria for post-tenure review of tenured Associate and Full Professors, which must be reviewed and approved by the SMSS tenured faculty before it is reviewed by the School Director, the Dean, and the EVPAA to ensure consistency with UTRGV policies and UT System Regent's Rules. The School's Post-Tenure Review criteria will be developed and recommended by a faculty committee of the tenured faculty elected by the tenured faculty using secret ballot, and the criteria must be approved by using a secret ballot vote and approval must have a simple majority of SMSS tenured faculty. Once the post tenure criteria has been reviewed and approved by the School's tenured faculty, the Dean, and the EVPAA, the School's criteria will apply until it is modified again (when applicable) beginning at the School level.

Faculty post-tenure criteria must include three basic competency areas – *teaching, research & scholarship*, and *service*. In accordance with UT System Regents Rules and UTRGV policies four performance levels are used to evaluate each area of competency: *exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations*, and *unsatisfactory*.

TEACHING

Preamble: It is the intention of this review to encourage high academic standards and promote faculty academic freedom or faculty autonomy in terms of pedagogy, curriculum, and student assessment. The School's excellence in teaching depends on the passion and personal investment of faculty in pedagogies informed by the faculty's teaching philosophy. It also depends on giving special consideration to faculty who pursue innovative or iconoclastic pedagogies, invest valuable time in the development of teaching-related resources, teach online or blended courses, contribute to our graduate and undergraduate degree programs by teaching advanced undergraduate or graduate courses or by leading undergraduate or graduate student research, or provide leadership in major teaching-related projects. Faculty are expected to meet all teaching-related responsibilities outlined in the policy ADM 06-106. In particular, compliant syllabi are required for accreditation and faculty are expected to attend assigned courses on time and regularly utilize allotted course period; i.e. do not regularly dismiss classes significantly early.

A “**Meets Expectations**” rating in Teaching requires that the faculty member meets the following criteria:

- Satisfactory student evaluations are required. Faculty should strive to achieve an average evaluation score of 4.0 or higher out of 5.0, but an average evaluation score equal to or greater than 3.5 out of 5.0 will be considered satisfactory¹.
 - Written comments used in evaluating the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching may also be provided by the faculty member at his/her discretion.
 - The average student evaluation score will be calculated by averaging the scores of all classes taught during the review period excluding summer courses taught, unless the faculty member may voluntarily include all or none of the summer course student evaluations².
- Has two peer observations and submits the Faculty Member Report that includes a narrative written by the faculty member describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any improvements made or planned.

¹ Striving to obtain an average of 4.0 out 5.00 score on student evaluations means that faculty need to make an effort to improve his/her student evaluations scores. This does not mean that the faculty is mandated to have a minimum 4.0 average score out of 5.0 across the evaluation period. However, with regard to student evaluations, the Post-Tenure Review Committees and administration should take into account the following: a) SMSS faculty often teach lower division service courses with students who are deemed mathematically weak, and these students tend to underrate the faculty's teaching effectiveness; b) low number of enrolled students in math courses at the time of evaluation can cause low evaluation scores; c) the drop rate is very high in low level classes, however, some students who are not able to drop because of the 6-Drop policy are able to submit an evaluation for the faculty, even after they stop attending the class, which contributes to the unreliability of the student evaluations. For these reasons, student evaluations can result in lower than normal teaching evaluations and can adversely impact faculty.

² Since summer teaching is optional, and whereas, not all faculty teach in the summer, student evaluations should not be counted because they can severely alter the student evaluation average negatively since summer teaching includes different type of students, such as high school students from dual enrollment programs, and underprepared students (e.g., those who failed a class in previous Fall and/or Spring semesters); additionally, the format of teaching with longer time periods and teaching done every day can add to students' mathematics anxiety, adverse negative mathematics attitudes, and can impact their perspectives about the instructor's teaching overall in a negative way.

The report can include description of lessons learned and changes/ improvements in pedagogy and/or technology made or planned as a result of the peer review; see peer observation guidelines at <https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>.

- Participated in at least two professional development conferences/workshops or presented at two professional development conferences/workshops at any level
- Taught assigned workload consistent with workload distribution
- Assigned grades based solely on performance of students
- Used tests or other quantitative evaluation procedures appropriate to the course
- Provided course syllabi in a timely manner to students, preferably within 7 days of the commencement of the semester
- Consistently engaged students in learning in or outside the classroom (e.g., uses appropriate questioning strategies, group learning, or community-engaged research and learning projects, capstone projects)

An “**Exceeds Expectations**” rating in teaching for a faculty member undergoing post-tenure review requires that *in addition to* the criteria described in the “Meets Expectations” section above the faculty member achieves at least three (3) out of the following

- Over the review period, average student evaluations score is an average of 4.0 out of 5.0 or higher. As noted before, the average student evaluation score will be calculated by averaging the scores of all classes taught during the review period excluding summer courses taught, unless the faculty member chooses voluntarily to include any of the summer courses ².
- Taught two or more upper-level undergraduate courses or graduate courses
- Taught two or more large classes with at least 50 registered students on census day
- Mentored at least one graduate student through the completion of a thesis/dissertation or master project; or three undergraduates through the completion of an Honor Thesis or Research Project.
- Substantial contributions to the development/preparation of a new course and/or taught the newly developed course
- Substantially improved/revised an existing course, developed new teaching materials, or included a community-engaged research and/or learning component
- Developed or implemented innovative pedagogy method(s), or effective use of technology in teaching and learning
- Taught a study abroad course formally approved by UTRGV
- Published solutions to teaching related mathematics problems in professional journals and/or published a textbook
- Received external grant funding for student/teacher training
- Won a significant teaching/mentoring award

A “**Does Not Meet Expectations**” rating will be given if the criteria for “Meet Expectations” are not satisfied, but not to the extent that warrants an “Unsatisfactory” rating. A faculty member will receive an “**Unsatisfactory**” rating in teaching if the faculty member fails to meet expectations for the faculty member’s unit, rank, including contractual obligations in teaching in

such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Preamble: It is not the intention of this review to provoke faculty members to forego long-term research plans in favor of short-term results. The excellence of the School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences depends on the academic freedom of all faculty to freely pursue their research agenda, which may include long-term and/or iconoclastic research, time invested in the development of complex mathematical software, or shifts in emphasis that require a period of learning or retraining.

A **“Meets Expectations”** rating in Research and Scholarship requires that Tenured Faculty member with a standard teaching workload (with 18 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year) meets the following criteria:

- Three refereed publications (including journal articles, book chapters³, and proceedings) authored or co-authored by the faculty member in quality journals or book series in the field of mathematics or a related area; or one refereed publication (including journal article, book chapter³, and proceedings) in quality journals or book series and one published in a prestigious venue monograph⁴ authored or co-authored by the faculty member in the field of mathematics or a related area
- Three presentations at conferences/colloquia/seminars made by the faculty member at any level
- Evidence of consistent effort to secure external grant funding for research (actual submissions, awards) as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator, unless faculty already has another funded teaching/research/service grant with a substantial assigned budget for faculty member
- Mentored at least one graduate student toward completion of a dissertation, thesis, or a master research⁵ project; or mentored at least two UTRGV undergraduate/high school students toward completion of a research⁵ project, a presentation or a publication.

A **“Meets Expectations”** rating in Research and Scholarship requires that the Tenured Faculty member with 21 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year meets the following criteria:

³ Evidence that the book chapter was refereed is required. It must be published in a prestigious venue.

⁴ Evidence that monograph proposal or monograph itself was refereed is required.

⁵ Research here can be interpreted broadly to include research of various types and not necessarily engaging students in the solving of “unsolved” mathematical problems. Students can engage in independent study of research interests, or a capstone project, or a pedagogical research project

- Two refereed publication (including journal articles, book chapters³, and proceedings) authored or co-authored by the faculty member in quality journals or book series in the field of mathematics or a related area including pedagogical publications
- Two presentations at conferences/colloquia/seminars/workshops at any level or mentored at least two undergraduate/high school students toward completion of a research⁵ project or evidence of effort to secure funding of an external research grant (actual submission, award) as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator, unless faculty has another funded teaching/research/service grant with an assigned budget for faculty member

A “**Meets Expectations**” rating in Research and Scholarship requires that the Tenured Faculty member with 24 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year meets the following criteria:

- One refereed publication (including journal articles, book chapters, and proceedings) authored or co-authored by the faculty member in quality journals or book series in the field of mathematics or a related area including pedagogical publications
- Two presentations at conferences/colloquia/seminars/workshops at any level or mentored at least one undergraduate/high school student toward completion of a research⁵ project or evidence of effort to secure funding of an external research grant (actual submission, award) as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator, unless faculty has another funded teaching/research/service grant with an assigned budget for faculty member

A “**Meets Expectations**” rating in Research and Scholarship requires that Tenured Faculty member with 15 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year meets the following criteria:

- Five refereed publications (including journal articles, book chapters³, and proceedings) authored or co-authored by the faculty member in quality journals or book series in the field of mathematics or a related area; or three refereed publications (including journal article, book chapter³, and proceedings) in quality journals or book series and one published monograph authored or co-authored by the faculty member in the field of mathematics or a related area
- Five presentations at conferences/colloquia/seminars made by the faculty member at any level
- Evidence of consistent effort to secure external grant funding for research (actual submission, award) as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator, unless faculty already has another funded teaching/research/service grant with a substantial assigned budget for faculty member
- Mentored at least one graduate student toward completion of a dissertation, thesis, or a master research⁵ project; or mentored at least four UTRGV undergraduate/high school students toward completion of a research⁵ project, a presentation or a publication.

A “**Meets Expectations**” rating in Research and Scholarship requires that the Tenured Faculty member with 12 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year meets the following criteria:

- Seven refereed publications (including journal articles, book chapters³, and proceedings) authored or co-authored by the faculty member in quality journals or book series in the field of mathematics or a related area; or four refereed publications (including journal article, book chapter³, and proceedings) in quality journals or book series and one published in a prestigious venue monograph⁴ authored or co-authored by the faculty member in the field of mathematics or a related area
- Seven presentations at conferences/colloquia/seminars made by the faculty member at any level
- Evidence of consistent effort to secure external grant funding for research (actual submission, award) as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator, unless faculty already has another funded teaching/research/service grant with a substantial assigned budget for faculty member
- Mentored at least two graduate students toward completion of a dissertation, thesis, or a master research⁵ project; or mentored at least six UTRGV undergraduate/high school students toward completion of a research⁵ project, a presentation or a publication.

An “**Exceeds Expectations**” rating in Research and Scholarship for a faculty member undergoing post-tenure requires that *in addition to* the criteria described in the “Meets Expectations” section above the Tenured Faculty member with standard teaching workload (with 18 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year) achieves at least three (3) of the following criteria:

- Three or more refereed publications (including journal articles, book chapters³, and proceedings) authored or co-authored by the faculty member in quality journals or book series in the field of mathematics or a related area
- At least one refereed publication authored or co-authored by the faculty member is in a high-quality journal in mathematics or related area
- Two or more presentations at conferences/colloquia/seminars made by faculty member at any level and at least one presentation is at the national level or higher
- Keynote/plenary speaker at a national or international conference or symposium
- Evidence of external research funding as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator from a USA funding agency or from a prestigious international research grant
- Development of research-related software or software library, patent, etc.
- Research-related award at the college level or higher

An “**Exceeds Expectations**” rating in Research and Scholarship for a faculty member undergoing post-tenure requires that *in addition to* the criteria described in the “Meets Expectations” section above the Tenured Faculty member with 21 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year achieves at least two (2) of the following criteria:

- Two or more refereed publications (including journal articles, book chapters³, and proceedings) authored or co-authored by the faculty member in quality journals or book series in the field of mathematics or a related area
- At least one refereed publication authored or co-authored by the faculty member is in a high-quality journal in mathematics or related area
- Two or more presentations at conferences/colloquia/seminars made by faculty member at any level and at least one presentation is at the national level or higher
- Keynote/plenary speaker at a national or international conference or symposium
- Evidence of external research funding as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator from a USA funding agency or from a prestigious international research grant
- Development of research-related software or software library, patent, etc.
- Research-related award at the college level or higher

An “**Exceeds Expectations**” rating in Research and Scholarship for a faculty member undergoing post-tenure requires that *in addition to* the criteria described in the “Meets Expectations” section above the Tenured faculty member with 24 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year achieves at least two (2) of the following criteria:

- One or more refereed publications (including journal article, book chapter, and proceedings) authored or co-authored by the faculty member in mathematics or related area including pedagogical publications in quality journals or book series
- Two or more presentations at conferences/colloquia/seminars/workshops at any level and at least one presentation is at the regional/state/national/international level
- At least one publication authored or co-authored by faculty member is in a high-quality journal
- Mentored at least two undergraduate/high school students toward completion of a research³ project, a presentation or a publication.
- Development of research-related software or software library, patent, etc.
- Research-related award at college level or higher
- Evidence of consistent effort to secure funding of an external research grant (actual submission, award) as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator, unless faculty another funded teaching/research/service grant with a substantial assigned budget for faculty member

An “**Exceeds Expectations**” rating in Research and Scholarship for a faculty member undergoing post-tenure requires that *in addition to* the criteria described in the “Meets Expectations” section above for the respective 12 or 15 credit hours teaching per academic year Tenured Faculty member with 12 or 15 credit hours equivalent teaching workload per academic year achieves at least three (3) of the following criteria:

- At least two refereed publications authored or co-authored by the faculty member are in a high-quality journals in mathematics or related area
- Three or more presentations at a conference/colloquium/seminar made by faculty member at any level and at least two presentations are at national level or higher

- Keynote/plenary speaker at a national or international conference or symposium
- Evidence of external research funding as PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel, or Evaluator
- Development of research-related software or software library, patent, etc.
- Research-related award at the college level or higher

Summary Information about Publications: The number of minimum publications expected during the Post Tenure review period in order to receive Meets Expectations rating in Research and Scholarship area is as follows: 12 credit hours equivalent teaching workload – 7 publications; 15 credit hours equivalent teaching workload – 5 publications; 18 credit hours equivalent teaching workload – 3 publications; 21 credit hours equivalent teaching workload – 2 publications; 24 credit hours equivalent teaching workload – 1 publications. This is assuming the workload noted was consistent throughout the duration of the review period; else, fair adjustments should be made if the workload was not consistent throughout the review period. For example, even one semester without the adequate release for research will require a fair adjustment, and a fair adjustment downward or upward in the number of expected publications will be made if the teaching workload was inconsistent with the teaching workload as noted above. The fair adjustment, if and when applicable, should be initiated by the SMSS Post Tenure Committee and the adjustment made should be taken into consideration by other levels of review.

A **“Does Not Meet Expectations”** rating will be given if some activity is reported but falls short of satisfying the criteria for “Meet Expectations”. A faculty member will receive an **“Unsatisfactory”** rating in research if the faculty member fails to meet expectations for the faculty member’s unit, rank, including contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

SERVICE

Preamble: The School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences values service at the School, College, or University level, as such service is essential for creating an institutional culture of shared governance. Other forms of service are also valued as they can promote the well-being of our discipline, our community, or be indicative of an outstanding faculty reputation and recognition. Service contributions are considered major or distinguished depending on the extent that they involve leadership roles, substantial responsibility or recognition, or a substantial time investment.

A **“Meets Expectations”** rating in Service requires that the faculty member with standard service commitment meets the following criteria (additional University service can offset professional or community service, and vice versa):

- Contribution to at least one committee/council/task force at the school, college or university level (including the Faculty Senate) on average per year.
- Contribution to at least one professional or community service activity on average per year
- Compliance with all departmental, college, university, and UT System policies.

An “**Exceeds Expectations**” rating in Service requires that *in addition to* fulfilling the “meets expectations” criteria, the faculty member with standard service commitment attains at least three (3) of the following criteria:

- College and/or UTRGV Faculty University Service Award(s) for excellent and/or outstanding service-related accomplishments
- Served on multiple major School, College, or University committees with significant contributions
- Leadership of a significant committee/council/task force/ at any level within the University
- Leadership in relevant professional organizations and/or exceptional service contributions at the state, national, or international levels
- Extensive service contributions to the scientific community (e.g. referring manuscripts submitted to journals, reviewing books in the field of mathematics, serving as external reviewer for national/international universities)
- Served on a grant review panel at the national/international level and/or reviewed multiple external grant proposals for a funding agencies that required substantial work⁶
- Conducted other substantial service to the School (e.g. provided documented teaching leadership of peers to improve quality of course/curricula such as significant number of peer review teaching observations; mentored a junior faculty consistently and substantially; provided active and substantial leadership in preparation of multiple common final examinations, core or major or other assessment, etc.) unless a course release was received for this purpose, thus the faculty member cannot claim this criteria toward “Exceeds Expectations”
- Served on an editorial board of a refereed research journal or editor of a book or conference proceedings, or a special issue of a research journal
- Provided or organized workshops or presentations for students at conferences or other professional venues and/or was an academic advisor/mentor to students pursuing minors/majors, or degrees in math or math related fields; provided mathematics education benchmark exams unless a course release was received for this purpose, thus the faculty member cannot claim this criteria toward “Exceeds Expectations”
- Chair or organizer of a conference or a technical session or panel with evidence of significant work such as reviewing abstracts, conference proceedings, or feedback provided to presenters and/or organizing a special session or serving on a conference scientific committee or a conference panel or significant contribution in organizing a math conference unless a course release was received for this purpose, thus the faculty member cannot claim this criteria toward “Exceeds Expectations”
- Performed extensive service work related to an externally funded grant (e.g., PI, Co-PI, account manager, evaluator) unless a course release was received for this purpose, thus the faculty member cannot claim this criteria toward “Exceeds Expectations”

⁶ A justification of substantial work must be submitted

Service appointments that are in excess of standard service commitment (with a corresponding decrease in teaching load) must be approved by the School director, the dean, and the EVPAA. Such appointments include service as associate director, undergraduate or graduate coordinator, director of a formally recognized center, etc. Such service appointees receive a maximum of one course release per semester depending upon the scope of the work and therefore could carry up to 20% additional *service* appointment/commitment. These faculty members also maintain a standard base service appointment, a 40% teaching appointment, and a standard research and scholarship appointment. Annual expectations for the additional *service* appointment/commitment must be clearly defined and communicated to the appointee prior to making such an appointment and to the departmental Annual Review Committee, Tenure & Promotion Review Committee, and Post-Tenure Review Committee. Administrative appointments are also considered service appointments. Appointments including Associate Deans, Department Chairs and School Directors are given two course releases per semester and therefore carry a 40% administrative appointment. These faculty members also maintain a standard base service appointment, a 20% teaching appointment, and a standard 30% research and scholarship appointment. The relative percentage of teaching and research appointment may be negotiated at the time of acceptance of these well-recognized administrative appointments. Faculty members holding these extra service/administrative appointments are evaluated by the School committees (for the standard basic service) and the School Director (for both the standard basic service and for any departmental committee service assignments), and by the Dean. Faculty holding college or university level administrative/service appointments are evaluated by the Dean and/or faculty member's immediate supervisor with respect to their service.

To ***Meet Expectations*** in service with more than the standard service appointment, the faculty member should produce *all* of the following:

- Satisfactory accomplishment of all the tasks of the appointment
- Timeliness of responses and reporting
- Positive impact of the activities on the students, faculty, department/school, college, university and/or the community

To ***Exceed Expectations*** in service with more than standard service appointment, the faculty member should fulfill all the requirements for *Meets Expectations* outlined above and demonstrate *any two* of the following:

- Conducted a comprehensive review of tasks/processes/procedures and improved and/or established new procedures/processes to accomplish tasks more efficiently
- Provided extraordinary/visionary/servient leadership in the administrative position/service activity that galvanized students, faculty, staff, administrators and/or community members to work together and/or perform at a higher level.
- Obtained extraordinary results such as, but not limited to, substantially increasing the size of the graduate program, undergraduate enrollment, number students engaged in experiential learning, student success in bottle neck courses, etc.
- Won a service award related to the appointment/service activity

A **“Does Not Meet Expectations”** rating will be given if some activity is reported but falls short of satisfying the criteria for “Meet Expectations”. A faculty member will receive an **“Unsatisfactory”** rating in service if the faculty member fails to meet expectations for the faculty

member's unit, rank, including contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

Overall Evaluation for SMSS Post-Tenure Review

Exceeds Expectations

This rating will be assigned to the faculty member who is notably performing at "Exceeds Expectations" in at least Teaching or Research and "Meets Expectations" on the other areas based on this document's criteria⁷.

Meets Expectations

This rating will be assigned to the faculty member who is notably performing at "Meets Expectations" in all three areas based on this document's criteria

Does Not Meet Expectations

This rating will be assigned to the faculty member who "Does Not Meet Expectations" in any one or more areas based on this document's criteria.

Unsatisfactory

A faculty member will receive an "**Unsatisfactory**" rating in overall if the faculty member fails to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, including contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

Appeals

The overall rating and narrative statements are all subject to appeal. Submission and processing of appeals will be done according to time limits set in the administrative calendar. Appealing faculty must state grounds for the appeal and provide supporting materials. The outcome of the appeal may either uphold the original review or accede to some or all requests stated in the appeal.

Faculty Applying both for Promotion to Full Professor and Post-Tenure Review

If a faculty member is applying for Promotion to Full Professor at the same time he/she is submitting a Post Tenure Dossier, then the faculty will be reviewed both for the Full Professor promotion application and for the Post Tenure review by the Promotion Committee. If a faculty member receives a recommendation from any evaluation level to promote to Full Professor that should result in an automatic "Exceeds Expectations" overall rating for Post Tenure review.

Document review, revisions/amendments

⁷ Note, the faculty performing at "Exceeds Expectations" in Service area and "Meets Expectations in Teaching and Research will be assigned a "Meets Expectations" rating

The SSMS Post Tenure Review Criteria, Policies and Procedures document will be reviewed when and if a petition for such is supported by a majority of the tenured faculty. The Post-tenure document will be reviewed by a faculty committee of the tenured faculty elected by the tenured faculty using secret ballot. The size and structure of the committee will be decided by the tenured faculty. In such a case, the revised Post-tenure document will be approved by a majority vote of the tenured faculty. All faculty will be afforded a reasonable time window during which they can cast their vote to ratify the document. The document will then be ratified by all other review levels in accordance with UTRGV HOP. If any changes are introduced to the document during the approval process by upper levels of review, the revised document must be approved by the School tenured faculty again by majority vote, in accordance to the continuing faculty consultation principle of shared governance. Upon approval of a revised document, each faculty member may opt to use any approved version of the document that was in effect during the evaluation period.

APPENDIX



Division of Academic Affairs

Institutional Format for Faculty Review Dossier

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-EVALUATION¹ (updated yearly)
- 1.2 DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA
- 1.3 CURRICULUM VITAE^{**} (updated yearly)

2. FACULTY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN²

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^{**} ([link to template](#))
- 4.2 TABULAR SUMMARY OF TEACHING ACHIEVEMENTS^{**} ([link to template](#))
- 4.3 NARRATIVE SUMMARY
- 4.4 PEER REVIEW / OBSERVATIONS³

5. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP

- 5.1 TABULAR NUMERIC SUMMARY^{**} ([link to template](#))
- 5.2 NARRATIVE SUMMARY
- 5.3 EXTERNAL REVIEWS / ASSESSMENTS^{*}

6. SERVICE

- 6.1 TABULAR NUMERIC SUMMARY ([link to template](#))
- 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

UT System Regents Rules

Rule 31102: Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Sec. 1 Statutory Requirements.

In accordance with the Texas Education Code Section 51.942, the Board of Regents is required to adopt rules and procedures providing for a periodic performance evaluation process for all tenured faculty. The Board is required to seek advice and comment from the faculty before adopting any rules pursuant to that section. The advice and comment from the faculty on the performance evaluation of tenured faculty shall be given the utmost consideration by the Board.

Sec. 2 Importance of Tenure.

The Board of Regents recognizes the time-honored practice of tenure for university faculty as an important protection of free inquiry, open intellectual and scientific debate, and unfettered criticism of the accepted body of knowledge. Academic institutions have a special need for practices that protect freedom of expression, since the core of the academic enterprise involves a continual reexamination of ideas. Academic disciplines thrive and grow through critical analysis of conventions and theories. Throughout history, the process of exploring and expanding the frontiers of learning has necessarily challenged the established order. That is why tenure is so valuable, not merely for the protection of individual faculty members but also as an assurance to society that the pursuit of truth and knowledge commands our first priority. Without freedom to question, there can be no freedom to learn.

Sec. 3 Purpose of Evaluation.

The Board of Regents supports a system of periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty. Periodic evaluation is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. The purpose of 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. The Board is pledged to regular monitoring of this system to make sure that it is serving its intended purposes and does not in any way threaten tenure as a concept and practice. In implementing the plan, institutions shall maintain an appropriate balance of emphasis on teaching, research, service, and other duties of faculty.

Sec. 4 Institutional Policies.

Each institution of The University of Texas System shall have an institutional policy and plan consistent with the following guidelines for the periodic (annual and comprehensive) performance evaluation of tenured faculty. Institutional policies in accordance with the model policy shall be developed with appropriate faculty input, including consultation with and guidance from faculty governance organizations, and shall be included in each institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures after review and appropriate administrative approval and submission to the Board of Regents for review and final approval. Nothing in these guidelines or the application of institutional evaluation policies shall be interpreted or applied to infringe on the tenure system,

academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights nor to establish new term-tenure systems or to require faculty to reestablish their credentials for tenure.

Sec. 5 Minimum Elements.

Institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures policies should include the following minimum elements for periodic evaluation:

5.1 Annual Reviews.

Annual reviews are not the comprehensive periodic evaluations required under Texas Education Code Section 51.942. Annual reviews should focus on individual merit relative to assigned responsibilities in accordance with Regents' Rule 30501.

- (a) Review Categories. Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories: a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory. Expectations shall be set by institutional policy according to the faculty member's rank, discipline, and institution.*
- (b) Scheduled Reviews. Evaluation of tenured faculty shall be performed annually. 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 for 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.*
- (c) Responsibilities Reviewed. The evaluation shall include review of the faculty member's professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service, patient care, and administration. Institutional policies shall detail the criteria and factors to be evaluated.*
- (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 teaching evaluations. The faculty member may provide copies of a statement of professional goals, and any other additional materials the faculty member deems appropriate.*
- (e) Review of Evaluation. In accordance with institutional policy, initial evaluation of the faculty member's performance may be carried out by the department, department chair (or equivalent), dean, or peer review committee, but in any event must be reported to the chair (or equivalent) and dean for review. Evaluation shall include review of the current curriculum vita, student and any peer evaluations of teaching for the review period, and all materials submitted by the faculty member.*
- (f) Communication of Results. Results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty member, the department chair/dean, the chief academic officer, and the president for review and appropriate action.*
- (g) Uses. Possible uses of the information contained in the report include the following:
 - (1) The evaluation may be used to determine salary recommendations, nomination for awards, or other forms of performance recognition.**

- (2) *For individuals whose performance indicates they would benefit from additional institutional support or a remediation plan, the evaluation shall be used to provide such support or a remediation plan (e.g., teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues/service expectations). Schools/colleges and/or departments, in consultation with a peer committee, shall monitor individuals receiving such support for evidence of improvement and, if there is insufficient improvement, shall take action under (4) or Section 5.3, below, if appropriate.*
- (3) *Individuals whose performance is unsatisfactory may be subject to further review and/or to appropriate administrative action. Institutional policies shall provide procedures for appeals.*
- (4) *Individuals whose performance is unsatisfactory for two consecutive annual reviews may be subject to a comprehensive review (Section 5.2, below) or action under (3) above or Section 5.3 below, if appropriate.*
- (5) *If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action may be taken under Section 5.3 below.*

5.2 Comprehensive Periodic Evaluations.

Comprehensive periodic evaluations are required in compliance with Texas Education Code Section 51.942.

- (a) *Review Categories. Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories: a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory. Expectations shall be set by institutional policy according to the faculty member's rank, discipline, and institution.*
- (b) *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.*
- (c) *Responsibilities Reviewed. The evaluation shall include review of the faculty member's professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service, patient care, and administration. Institutional policies shall detail the criteria and factors to be evaluated.*
- (d) *Notice of Evaluation. Reasonable individual notice of at least six months of intent to review shall be provided to a faculty member.*
- (e) *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. 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.*
- (f) *Review of Evaluation. In accordance with institutional policy, initial evaluation of the faculty member's performance may be carried out by the department, department chair (or equivalent), dean, or peer review committee, but in any event must be reported to the chair (or equivalent) and*

dean for review. Evaluation shall include review of the current curriculum vita, student and any peer evaluations of teaching for the review period, annual reports for the review period, and all materials submitted by the faculty member.

- (g) *Peer Review.* Comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall include peer review. The members of peer review committees shall include representatives of the college/school or department and will be appointed, on the basis of their objectivity and academic strength, by the dean or chair in consultation with the tenured faculty in the college/school or department or pursuant to other process as defined in institutional policies. The faculty member shall be provided with an opportunity to meet with the committee or committees.
- (h) *Communication of Results.* Results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty member, the department chair/dean, the chief academic officer, and the president for review and appropriate action.
- (i) *Uses.* Possible uses of the information contained in the report include the following:
 - (1) The evaluation may be used to determine salary recommendations, nomination for awards, or other forms of performance recognition.
 - (2) For individuals whose performance indicates they would benefit from additional institutional support or a remediation plan, the evaluation shall be used to provide such support or a remediation plan (e.g., teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues/service expectations). Schools/colleges and/or departments, in consultation with a peer committee, shall monitor individuals receiving such support for evidence of improvement and, if there is insufficient improvement, shall take action under (3) or Section 5.3, below, if appropriate.
 - (3) Individuals whose performance is unsatisfactory may be subject to further review and/or to appropriate administrative action. Institutional policies shall provide procedures for appeals.
 - (4) If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action may be taken under Section 5.3 below.

5.3 Termination or Other Appropriate Disciplinary Action.

For tenured faculty members for whom incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is found, review to determine if good cause exists for termination under the current Regents' Rules and Regulations shall be considered, in accordance with the due process procedures of the Regents' Rules and Regulations, Rule 31008. If disciplinary action other than termination is considered appropriate, such faculty members shall have access to procedures that include notice of the specific charges and a hearing prior to the imposition of disciplinary action.

Sec. 6 Follow-up Review.

The acceptance and success of periodic evaluation for tenured faculty will be dependent upon a well-executed, critical process and an institutional commitment to assist and support faculty development. Thus, remediation and follow-up review for faculty, who would benefit from such support, as well as the designation of an academic administrator with primary responsibility for monitoring such needed follow-up activities, are essential.