

**College of Sciences
University of Texas - Rio Grande Valley**

**Faculty Tenure and Promotion Review Criteria,
Policies and Procedures**

1. PURPOSE

The College of Sciences (COS) in accordance with UTRGV policies and UT System Regent's Rules supports a system of tenure and promotion for all tenure-track and tenured faculty. The purpose of tenure is to retain the best qualified faculty to help develop and execute UTRGV's mission. All tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually and are subjected to a comprehensive pre-tenure review in their 4th year and a comprehensive tenure and promotion review in their 6th year. This schedule may be adjusted if a time-credit was granted towards tenure at the time of hire. Tenured Associate Professors are also evaluated annually and may be eligible for promotion six years after their last promotion. Faculty may request consideration for early tenure and promotion but this is limited to consistent exceptional performance. Under special circumstances, such as approved leave, each of these reviews may be delayed with the approval of the EVPAA.

2. PROCEDURES

Following the UTRGV Pathways for Review Deadlines available on the EVPAA's website, full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty members submit their Faculty Review Dossiers (FRD) for consideration of tenure and/or promotion in accordance with guidelines at: <https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/files/documents/faculty-resources/utrgv-format-for-faculty-review-dossier.pdf>. Faculty members 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 as outlined by the university web documents.

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

In accordance with University policies and UT System Regent's Rules, each FRD for tenure and promotion will be independently reviewed by the departmental/school Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review Committee (TPPTRC), the department chair/school director, and if applicable also the College TPPTRC, the Dean, and the EVPAA. The department/school TPPTRC must be composed of *all* tenured faculty above the rank being reviewed in the department/school. The chair of the departmental/school TPPTRC is elected by the committee members, and must be a full professor. The department chair/school director will submit an independent review to the college TPPTRC/Dean and does not serve on the departmental/school

TPPTRC. Depending on the year of review, the college TPPTRC/Dean will conduct their own independent reviews. Each review level must include a written narrative highlighting strengths and weaknesses, as well as recommendations for tenure and promotion. Depending on the year of review, after the college TPPTRC and Dean have completed their reviews, all reviews are then forwarded to the EVPAA who conducts his/her own independent review and an independent review by the University-level Tenure and Promotion Committee.

3. CRITERIA

Each department/school is responsible for developing separate criteria for tenure and promotion of Assistant Professors to Associate Professors, and promotion of tenured Associate Professors to full Professors, which must be reviewed and approved by the department chair/school director, the Dean, and the EVPAA to ensure consistency with current COS policies and expectations, UTRGV policies, priorities and mission, and UT System Regent's Rules. In cases where a department/school does not have an approved review criteria for tenure and promotion of Assistant Professors or promotion of Associate Professors to full Professors, the COS criteria and requirements outlined in this document will be used for the review.

According to the UT System Regent's Rules, the granting of tenure is not solely a reward for performance during the probationary period, rather it is a deliberate act that takes into consideration both the past and potential for future performance of the faculty member. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, successful applicants for tenure and promotion must demonstrate a high potential for continued excellence and commitment to the profession and to UTRGV's mission. In addition to a consistent record of research and scholarly productivity including grant funding and successful mentoring of graduate students, an associate professor must demonstrate a high level of intellectual maturity and commitment to scholarly activities to warrant promotion to full professor. National and international recognition of faculty member's scholarly contributions, citations of publications, and impact on the profession are important considerations for promotion to full professor.

Faculty tenure and promotion criteria includes three basic competency areas – *teaching*, *research & scholarship*, and *service* – which must be evaluated in accordance with the faculty member's annual assignments (% appointment in each competency area) and responsibilities within the department/school, the college, and the university during the entire review period. To be recommended for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate is required to meet both the departmental/school and college expectations outlined in the departmental/school documents and this college document.

The departmental/school and college tenure and promotion criteria could be revised as necessitated by submitting a request to the Dean who would review and forward the request for consideration of the EVPAA.

3.1. TENURE AND PROMOTION OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

3.1.1. Teaching

Metrics for *teaching* effectiveness should include, but not limited to, student evaluations of teaching and course syllabi, peer-review of teaching, teaching awards and honors, curriculum and course development (including online, hybrid, and distance education classes), activities that

promote student success including the use of technology and innovative pedagogy, advising and mentoring activities, and student/teacher training grant funding.

To *meet expectations* in *teaching* requires that *all* the following criteria are met by the faculty member with a 20-60% teaching appointment:

- Taught assigned workload consistent with workload distribution (i.e. % teaching appointment) annually
- Attended assigned courses on time, arranged for a replacement or notified the class if unable to meet on a scheduled class meeting, notified the department chair/school director of a missed class meeting, or did not arbitrarily cancel classes without proper notification
- Regularly utilized allotted course period; i.e. did not regularly dismiss classes significantly early
- Provided a clear, concise course syllabus no later than the end of the first week of classes
- Used tests or other quantitative evaluation procedures
- Assigned grades based solely on performance of students on quantitative evaluations,
- Demonstrated comprehensive and current knowledge of course content
- Maintained a professional attitude and appearance in the classroom
- Maintained regular office hours and encouraged students to use this time to seek help and to resolve questions or concerns
- Received satisfactory student evaluations (i.e. faculty member strives to achieve at least 80% on the agree and/or strongly agree category on average in all classes)
- Received satisfactory peer review of teaching reports on at least the two most recent evaluations
- Demonstrated evidence of genuine effort to engage students in learning in and outside the classroom
- Mentored at least one graduate student through the completion of a Masters thesis OR two undergraduate students through the completion of an Honors thesis OR six undergraduate/high school students in research with evidence for scientific presentations given by the students or authorship/co-authorships on refereed publications

3.1.2. Research & Scholarship

Metrics for *research & scholarship* effectiveness must include peer-reviewed research publications (including pedagogy research) and other acceptable forms of scholarly output such as book chapters and books, patents, invited and contributed presentations at professional meetings/conferences, seminars, research grant proposals submitted or funded, number and performance of high-school, undergraduate, and graduate students mentored, and relevant awards and honors received. In case of large collaborations and multi-author papers, exact contribution of the faculty member and of all co-authors needs to be clearly defined. Reviewers will reflect on the quality of papers published, impact of research and submitted grants in their review.

To *meet expectations* in *research & scholarship* requires that *all* the following conditions are met for the basic 30% research appointment [i.e. 18 LHE per academic year] *over the review period*:

- Five peer-reviewed papers in quality journals from research conducted at UTRGV unless credit towards tenure was received at the time of hire. An exceptional quality publication

in top ranking, high impact journal such as Science, Nature, or equivalent could be considered equal to two standard publications; an awarded patent or an awarded significant grant at UTRGV can also be substituted for a refereed publication; however all substitutions are limited to no more than two publications and a faculty member must have a minimum of three refereed publications in good quality journals if any substitutions are claimed

- Three scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at the national or international level scientific meetings
- Three research presentations made by high-school/undergraduate/graduate students mentored by the faculty member
- Evidence of seeking externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI/senior person with a separate research budget for the faculty member

3.1.3. Service

Metrics for *service* effectiveness should include both the quantitative and qualitative assessments of faculty member's contributions to student, staff, faculty, department, college, university, profession, and community success. Quantitative metrics of service activities may include numbers of committees, student recruitment events, judging events, community outreach and engagement events, journal articles reviewed, grants reviewed, editorships of journals, etc. Qualitative metrics of service effectiveness should describe the faculty member's initiatives, leadership roles, mentorships and development of junior faculty, vision and commitment, impact, and relevant recognitions and awards received.

To *meet expectation* in *service* requires that the faculty member with a 10% *service* appointment meets *all* the following annually over the last four-years of the review period:

- Positive contribution to at least one committee at any level within the university per year
- Positive contribution to at least one students' or faculty's success activity per year
- Positive contribution to at least one professional and/or community service activity per year
- Compliance with all departmental, college, university, and UT System Regent's policies

3.1.4. Eligibility for consideration of tenure and promotion of an assistant professor

To be recommended for tenure and promotion consideration at any review level, an Assistant Professor must have met the departmental and college *expectations* in all three competency areas on the final comprehensive review. According to UTRGV HOP ADM 06-505 meeting the above basic evaluation requirements/criteria does not ensure tenure or promotion; however, failure to meet these basic evaluation standards/criteria will result in ineligibility for tenure or promotion consideration.

At least five external letters from experts in the candidate's field of study with no conflict of interest with the candidate are required. The candidate must send to the department chair 5-8 names of external experts who can evaluate the candidate's scholarship contributions. The department chair will select 3-4 names from the list and request review letters from them. In addition, the department chair will contact an equal number of external experts not solicited by

the candidate to ask for review letters. The external review letters will be taken into full consideration in evaluating a candidate's research and scholarship.

3.2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

3.2.1. Teaching

Metrics for *teaching* effectiveness should include student evaluations of teaching, peer-review of teaching, teaching awards and honors, curriculum and course development (including online, hybrid, and distance education classes), activities that promote student success including the use of technology and innovative pedagogy, advising and mentoring activities, and student /teacher training grant funding.

To *meet expectations* in *teaching* a faculty member with a 20-60% workload in teaching should have achieved *all* the following during the review period:

- Taught assigned workload consistent with workload distribution (i.e. % teaching appointment) annually
- Attended assigned courses on time, arranged for a replacement or notified the class if unable to meet a scheduled class, notified the department chair/school director of a missed class meeting, or did not arbitrarily cancel classes without proper notification
- Regularly utilized allotted course period; i.e. did not regularly dismiss classes significantly early
- Provided a clear, concise course syllabus no later than the end of the first week of classes
- Used tests or other quantitative evaluation procedures
- Assigned grades based solely on performance of students on quantitative evaluations,
- Demonstrated comprehensive and current knowledge of course content
- Maintained a professional attitude and appearance in the classroom
- Maintained regular office hours and encouraged students to use this time to seek help and to resolve questions or concerns
- Received satisfactory student evaluations (i.e. faculty member strives to achieve at least 80% on the agree and/or strongly agree category on average in all classes)
- Consistently received satisfactory peer review of teaching reports and evidence of reflection and incorporation of any suggestions made in the peer reviews into his/her teaching practice
- Developed a new course, revised an existing course, or contributed to some curriculum development activity,
- Demonstrated evidence of genuine effort to engage students in learning in and outside the classroom
- Mentored at least two graduate students through the completion of a Masters thesis OR four undergraduate students through the completion of an Honors thesis OR eight undergraduate/high school students in research with evidence for scientific presentations given by the students or authorships/co-authorships on peer-reviewed publications in quality journals

3.2.2. Research & Scholarship

Metrics for *research & scholarship* effectiveness for associate professors vary with % research appointment/commitment and should include, but not limited to, peer reviewed research publications (including pedagogy research) in quality journals in the field and other acceptable forms of scholarly output such as book chapters and books, patents, invited and contributed presentations at professional meetings/conferences and seminars, research grant proposals submitted and funded, number and performance of high school, undergraduate, and graduate students mentored in research, and relevant awards and honors. The committee members and external reviewers will reflect up on quality of papers published, impact of research and submitted grants in their review. In case of large collaborations and multi-author papers, exact contribution of the faculty member and of all co-authors needs to be clearly defined. *Note that less than 30% research appointments are permitted only after the faculty member has completed the first six years since his/her promotion to Associate Professor.*

To *meet expectations* in *research & Scholarship* a faculty member with 10% research & scholarship workload commitment should have achieved *all* of the following:

- One peer-reviewed research publication in a quality journal in the field
- Two or more external research grant proposals submitted as a PI/Co-PI/Senior Person with a separate budget or be a PI or Co-PI/Senior Person with a budget on a funded grant
- Three scholarly presentations delivered at a local, state, national or international conference, or delivered seminar/colloquium at other universities (including co-authored student presentations at such conferences); Faculty members may request substitution of scholarly presentations with additional publications and/or conference proceedings.

To *meet expectations* in *research & Scholarship* a faculty member with 20% research & scholarship commitment should have achieved *all* of the following:

- Three peer-reviewed research publications in quality journals in the field
- Three or more external research grant proposals submitted as a PI/Co-PI/Senior Person with a separate budget or be a PI or Co-PI/Senior Person with a budget on a funded grant
- Five scholarly presentations delivered at a state, national or international conference, or delivered seminar/colloquium at other universities (including co-authored student presentations at such conferences); Faculty members may request substitution of scholarly presentations with additional publications and/or conference proceedings.

To *meet expectations* in *research & scholarship* a faculty member with the basic 30% research appointment should have achieved *all* of the following:

- Five refereed research papers published in quality journals. An exceptional quality publication in top ranking, high impact journal such as Science, Nature, or equivalent could be considered equal to two standard publications. Each formally issued patent from the work conducted at UTRGV will count as a publication.
- Strong evidence of consistently seeking funding through external research grants as PI or co-PI/senior person with a separate research budget for the faculty member.
- Three scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks at major institutions.
- Four research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member.

To *meet expectations* in research & Scholarship a faculty member with 40% research appointment should have achieved *all* the following scholarly activities:

- Six refereed research publications in quality journals. An exceptional quality publication in top ranking, high impact journal such as Science, Nature, or equivalent could be considered equal to two standard publications. Each formally issued patent from the work conducted at UTRGV will count as a publication.
- Evidence of externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI/senior person with a separate research budget for the faculty member.
- Four scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks at major institutions; Faculty members may request substitution of scholarly presentations with additional publications and/or conference proceedings.
- Six research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member

To *meet expectations* in research & Scholarship a faculty member with 50% research appointment should have achieved *all* the following scholarly activities:

- Eight refereed research publications in quality journals OR 8 publications in quality journals and obtained major externally-funded grant(s) as PI or co-PI with an allocated budget. An exceptional quality publication in top ranking, high impact journal such as Science, Nature, or equivalent could be considered equal to two standard publications. Each formally issued patent from the work conducted at UTRGV will count as a publication. Each formally issued patent from the work conducted at UTRGV will count as a publication.
- Externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI/senior person with a separate research budget for the faculty member.
- Four scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks at major institutions; Faculty members may request substitution of scholarly presentations with additional publications and/or conference proceedings.
- Eight research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member.

To *meet expectations* in research & Scholarship a faculty member with 60% research appointment should have achieved *all* the following scholarly activities:

- Ten refereed research publications in quality journals OR 10 publications in quality journals and obtained major externally-funded grant(s) as PI or co-PI with an allocated budget. An exceptional quality publication in top ranking, high impact journal such as Science, Nature, or equivalent could be considered equal to two standard publications. Each formally issued patent from the work conducted at UTRGV will count as a publication. Each formally issued patent from the work conducted at UTRGV will count as a publication.
- Externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI/senior person with a separate research budget for the faculty member.

- Five scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks at major institutions; Faculty members may request substitution of scholarly presentations with additional publications and/or conference proceedings.
- Ten research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member.

To *meet expectations* in research & Scholarship a faculty member with 70% research appointment should have achieved *all* the following scholarly activities:

- Twelve refereed research publications in quality journals OR 12 publications in quality journals and obtained major externally-funded grant(s) as PI or co-PI with an allocated budget. An exceptional quality publication in top ranking, high impact journal such as Science, Nature, or equivalent could be considered equal to two standard publications. Each formally issued patent from the work conducted at UTRGV will count as a publication. Each formally issued patent from the work conducted at UTRGV will count as a publication.
- Externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI/senior person with a separate research budget for the faculty member.
- Six scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks at major institutions; Faculty members may request substitution of scholarly presentations with additional publications and/or conference proceedings.
- Twelve research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member.

3.2.3. Service

Metrics for *service* effectiveness should include both the quantitative and qualitative assessments of faculty member's contributions to student, staff, faculty, department, college, university, profession, and community success. Quantitative metrics of service activities may include numbers of committees, student recruitment events, judging events, community outreach and engagement events, journal articles reviewed, grants reviewed, editorships of journals, etc. Qualitative metrics of service effectiveness should describe the faculty member's initiatives, leadership roles, mentorships and development of junior faculty, vision and commitment, impact, and relevant recognitions and awards received.

Faculty are evaluated based on their %Service commitment. Assistant Professors and Associate Professors should only be assigned a 10% basic Service commitment unless otherwise approved by the Department Chair, the Dean and/or the EVPAA.

To *meet expectation* in *service* requires that the faculty member with a 10% Service appointment meets *all* the following annually over the review period:

- Served as an effective member of at least one committee annually and a committee chair for two or more significant committees at any level in the University during the review period,
- Consistent and sustained leadership of a student or faculty success activity,
- Compliance with all departmental, college, university, and UT System policies.

Service appointments that are in excess of 10% (with a corresponding decrease in teaching load) must be approved by the department chair, the dean, and the EVPAA. Such appointments include service as associate department chair, 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 10% base service appointment, a 40% teaching appointment, and a 30% 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 (ARC), Tenure & Promotion Review Committee (TPRC), and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC). 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 10% base service appointment, a 20% teaching appointment, and a 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 department committees (for the 10% basic service) and the department chair (for both the 10% 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 faculty member with >10% service appointment should produce *all* 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

3.2.4. Eligibility for consideration of promotion of an associate professor to full professor

To be recommended for consideration of promotion to full professor at any review level, an Associate Professor must have met the departmental and college *expectations* in all three competency areas on the final comprehensive review. According to UTRGV HOP ADM 06-505 meeting the above basic evaluation requirements/criteria does not ensure promotion to full professor; however, failure to meet these basic evaluation standards/criteria will result in ineligibility for consideration of promotion at the time of review. In addition to a consistent record of research and scholarly productivity including grant funding and successful mentoring of graduate students, an associate professor must demonstrate a high level of intellectual maturity

and commitment to scholarly activities to warrant promotion to full professor. National and international recognition of faculty member's scholarly contributions, citations of publications, and impact on the profession are important considerations for promotion to full professor.

At least five external review letters are required. The candidate must send the department chair 5-8 names of external experts who can evaluate the candidate's scholarship contributions. The department chair will select 3-4 names from the list and request review letters from them. In addition, the chair will contact an equal number of external experts not solicited by the candidate to ask for review letters. The external review letters will be taken into full consideration in evaluating a candidate's research and scholarship.

In case a promotion is denied post-tenure review clock starts immediately and a comprehensive post-tenure review occurs after 6 years. However, the faculty member may request consideration for promotion any time during this period following the annual UTRGV personal action timetable.

5. APPEALS

All faculty have the right to appeal decisions involving tenure and promotion recommendations at any level by filing a written request for reconsideration within ten (10) working days of receiving a written copy of the evaluation at that level.