

College of Sciences
School of Earth, Environmental and Marine Sciences
Faculty Post-Tenure Review Criteria, Policies and Procedures

1. PURPOSE

The College of Sciences (COS) in accordance with UTRGV policies (ADM 06-504) and UT System Regents Rules supports a system of post-tenure review for all tenured faculty. The purpose of the post-tenure review is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate, and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to UTRGV and the State of Texas. All COS faculty are 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 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 Provost.

2. PROCEDURES

Following the UTRGV Pathways for Review Deadlines available on the Provost's website, full-time tenured faculty members submit their Faculty Review Dossiers (dossier) for post-tenure review in accordance with UTRGV Guidelines. The dossier must include the following: 1) a self-evaluation summary that includes a statement of the significance and impact of achievements in *teaching, research & scholarship*, and *service*, 2) a current curriculum vita, 3) summaries of standard course evaluation reports for courses taught during the review period, 4) a development plan for all three areas of faculty evaluation during the review period, and 5) copies of approved annual workload forms provided by the COS Dean including annual percent appointments in *teaching, research & scholarship*, and *service*. Faculty members may also include additional material in support of their application. The material to be included and the organization of the dossier should conform to the Instructions for Preparation of FRD. Please refer to the website: <http://www.utrgv.edu/files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-format-for-faculty-review-dossier.pdf>.

Each faculty member slated for post-tenure review is required to submit his/her completed dossier to the appropriate department chair/school director no later than the due date. Faculty holding joint appointments shall submit their dossiers 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 appointment to obtain input on faculty member's performance from the minority appointment department/school chair/director and include it in his/her dossier.

In accordance with UTRGV policies and UT System Regent's Rules, each dossier for post-tenure review will be independently reviewed by the departmental Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review Committee (TPPTRC), the Department/School Chair, and if applicable also the College PTPTRC, the Dean, and the Provost. For post-tenure reviews, the departmental TPPTRC must be composed of *all* tenured full professors in the department except the faculty member undergoing the post-tenure review. The chair of the departmental TPPTRC is elected by the committee members, and must also be a full professor. The Department Chair will submit an independent review to the Dean and does not serve on the departmental or college TPPTRC. The Dean will conduct his/her own independent review. In case a faculty member appeals the departmental TPPTRC, Department Chair or Dean's review, the Dean may seek input from the college TPPTRC. All reviews are then forwarded to the Provost to take appropriate action. Each review level must include a written narrative highlighting strengths and weaknesses, as well as recommendations for post-tenure action.

3. CRITERIA

Each department/school is responsible for developing criteria for post-tenure review of Associate and full Professors, which must be reviewed and approved by the department chair/school director, the Dean, and the Provost 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 post-tenure review the COS criteria and requirements outlined in this document will be used for the review.

In addition to meritorious accomplishments during the review period, applicants for post-tenure review must demonstrate a high potential for continued excellence and commitment to the profession and to the UTRGV's mission. Continued research and scholarly productivity including grant funding and successful mentoring of graduate students, national and international recognition of faculty member's scholarly contributions, citations of publications, and impact on the profession are important considerations in the post-tenure comprehensive review.

Faculty post-tenure criteria must include 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. In accordance with UTRGV policies and UT System Regent's Rules, four performance levels are used to evaluate each area of competence: *exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations*, and *unsatisfactory*.

3.1. 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, student/teacher training grant funding, and the number of weighted student credit hours (SCHs) generated.

Criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness should include, but are not limited to, 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, advising and mentoring activities and student/teacher training grant funding.

The goals of the peer review of teaching are to improve teaching and student learning while serving as a tool for mentoring. 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.. The guidelines for peer review of teaching can be found at <http://www.utrgv.edu/provost/files/documents/faculty-resources/utrgv-guidelines-for-faculty-peer-observation%20of%20teaching.pdf>

To *meet expectations in teaching* faculty member will have met the criteria consistent with his/her % teaching appointment level as outlined below:

For 20-60% Teaching commitment all of the following are met:

- 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 strives to achieve at least 4.0 average in all classes)
- Received satisfactory teaching peer review 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/Ph.D. dissertation 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-authorship on refereed publications

For 70-80% Teaching commitment all of the following are met:

- 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 strives to achieve at least 4.0 average in all classes)
- Consistently received satisfactory teaching peer review reports and evidence of reflection and incorporation of any suggestions made in the peer reviews into his/her teaching practice
- Demonstrated evidence of genuine effort to engage students in learning in and outside the classroom

To *exceed expectations* in *teaching* faculty member will have met the *meets expectations* criteria consistent with his/her % teaching appointment as outlined above AND additional activities as stipulated below:

For 20-60% Teaching commitment any *two* of the following additional activities are achieved:

- Developed a new course, revised an existing course, or contributed to some curriculum development activity
- Published a textbook, a book chapter, or a peer-reviewed article related to teaching
- Developed or implemented an innovative pedagogy method such as inquiry-based learning, challenge-based instruction, flipped classroom, or other methods
- Mentored two or more graduate students through the completion of a Masters thesis OR four or more undergraduate students through the completion of an Honors thesis OR eight or more undergraduate/high school students in research with evidence for scientific presentations given by the students or authorship/co-authorship on refereed publications
- Received external grant funding for student/teacher training
- Won a significant teaching/mentoring award.

For 70-80% Teaching commitment any *two* of the following additional activities are achieved:

- Taught or co-taught one or more graduate courses
- Developed a new course, revised an existing course, or contributed to some curriculum development activity

- Published a text book
- Developed or implemented an innovative pedagogy method such as inquiry-based learning, challenge-based instruction, flipped classroom, or other methods
- Mentored a student through the completion of a Masters or Honors thesis under his/her supervision OR served as a member on two Masters or Honor thesis committees OR mentored four or more undergraduate/high school students in research evidenced by research presentations on co-authorship on publications
- Received external grant funding for student/teacher training
- Won a significant teaching/mentoring award

3.2. Research & Scholarship

Metrics for research & scholarship effectiveness vary with % research 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 will reflect upon 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.

To meet expectations in research & scholarship faculty member will have met the criteria consistent with his/her % research appointment level as outlined below:

For 10% research commitment all of the following are met:

- Published or accepted at least 2 articles in refereed journals related to research or teaching, including up to one publication equivalent. Publication equivalents include publication of teaching pedagogical works in refereed journals, funded external grant, book chapter, or peer-reviewed conference proceeding. 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
- One or more external research grant proposals submitted as a PI/Co-PI/Co-I /Senior Personnel (Faculty Associate) or be a PI or Co-PI/Co-I/Senior Person on a funded grant
- Two scholarly presentations delivered at a local, state, national or international conference, or delivered seminar/colloquium at other university (including co-authored student presentations at such conferences).

For 20% research commitment all of the following are met:

- Published or accepted at least 3 articles in refereed journals related to research or teaching, including up to one publication equivalent. Publication equivalents include publication of teaching pedagogical works in refereed journals, funded external grant, book chapter, or peer-reviewed conference proceeding. 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

- Two or more external research grant proposals submitted as a PI/Co-PI/Co-I /Senior Personnel (Faculty Associate) or be a PI or Co-PI/Co-I/Senior Person on a funded grant
- Three scholarly presentations delivered at a local, state, national or international conference, or delivered seminar/colloquium at other university (including co-authored student presentations at such conferences).

For 30% *research* commitment *all* the following are met:

- Published or accepted at least 4 articles in refereed or peer-reviewed journals, including up to two publication equivalents. Publication equivalents include publication of teaching pedagogical works, and/or funded external grants and/or book chapters (up to one), and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings (up to one). 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.
- Four or more external research grant proposals submitted as a PI/Co-PI/Co-I/ Senior Personnel (Faculty Associate) or be a PI or Co-PI/Co-I/Senior Personnel on a funded grant
- Three scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks including at major institutions.
- Three research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member.

For 40% *research* commitment *all* the following are met:

- Five research publications in refereed or peer-reviewed journals including up to two publication equivalents. 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, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research)
- Four 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

For 50% *research* commitment *all* the following are met:

- Six research publications in refereed or peer-reviewed journals including up to two publication equivalents. 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.

- At least two significant externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research).
- Five scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks at major institutions.
- Five research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member.

For 60% *research* commitment *all* the following are met:

- Seven research publications in refereed or peer-reviewed journals including up to two publication equivalents. 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.
- At least three significant externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research).
- Six scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks at major institutions.
- Six research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member.

For 70% *research* commitment *all* the following are met:

- Eight research publications in refereed or peer-reviewed journals including up to two publication equivalents. 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.
- At least four significant externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research).
- Seven scholarly presentations made by the faculty member at national and international conferences or invited talks at major institutions.
- Seven research presentations made by high-school, undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member.

For regular and research intensive appointments, research expectations change with change in teaching load. For example, for course releases totaling 12 LHEs given for research purposes raises the publication expectation by one. Workload buyout provided by grants or contracts will not be counted as course release and will not raise the publication expectation.

To exceed expectations in research & scholarship faculty member will have met the *meets expectations* criteria consistent with his/her % research appointment as outlined above AND additional activities as stipulated below:

For 10% research & scholarship appointment produce at least *one* additional activity from the list below:

- One additional research publication in a refereed or peer-reviewed journal in the field
- Obtained an external research grant as PI or Co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research)
- An award received by the faculty member or by a high school, undergraduate or graduate student mentored by the faculty member at regional/local/state/national/international conference

For 20% research & scholarship appointment produce at least *one* additional activity from the list below:

- One additional research publication in a refereed or peer-reviewed journal
- Obtained an external research grant as PI, or Co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research)
- An award received by the faculty member or by a high school, undergraduate or graduate student mentored by the faculty member at regional/local/state/national/international conference

For 30% research & scholarship appointment produce any *two* additional activities from the list below:

- One additional research publication in a refereed or peer-reviewed journal
- Obtained significant external funding as PI or Co-PI, senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research)
- Delivered two or more additional invited scholarly presentations at national or international conferences
- Won a significant research-related award

For 40% research appointment produce any *two* additional activities from the list below:

- One additional research publication in a top-tier journal OR two additional publications in refereed or peer-reviewed journals
- Obtained significant external funding as PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research)
- Delivered two or more additional invited scholarly presentations in national or international conferences
- Won a significant research-related award

For 50% research appointment produce any *two* additional activities from the list below:

- One additional research publication in a top-tier journal OR two additional research papers in refereed or peer-reviewed journals
- Obtained more than 2 two significant external research grants as PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research)
- Delivered two or more additional invited scholarly presentations in national or international conferences
- Won a significant research-related award

For 60% research appointment produce any *two* additional activities from the list below:

- Two additional refereed research publications in top-tier journals OR three additional research papers in refereed or peer-reviewed journals
- Obtained more than 3 significant external research grants as PI or co-PI with an allocated budget
- Delivered at least three additional invited scholarly presentations in national or international conferences
- Won a significant research-related award

For 70% research appointment produce any *two* additional activities from the list below:

- Two additional refereed research publications in top-tier journals OR four additional research papers in refereed or peer-reviewed journals
- Obtained more than 4 significant external research grants as PI or co-PI, or senior investigator (with a defined substantial role and budget for research)
- Delivered at least four additional invited scholarly presentations in national or international conferences
- Won a significant research-related award

3.3. Service

Metrics for service effectiveness should include, but not limited to, both the quantitative and qualitative assessments of the 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 and contributions, leadership roles, mentorships and development of junior faculty, impact, and relevant recognitions and awards received.

Faculty members must be evaluated based on their % service commitment. Associate Professors should only be assigned a 10% basic service commitment unless otherwise approved by the Department Chair, the Dean and/or the Provost.

To *meet expectations* in service with 10% basic service appointment faculty member should produce *all* the following:

- Positive contribution to at least one committee at any level in the university 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 policies

To *exceed expectations* in service with 10% basic service appointment faculty member should fulfill all the requirements for the *meets expectations* outlined above AND demonstrate *any two* of the following:

- Leadership of a significant committee at any level within the university
- Leadership of an impactful professional service activity
- Leadership of an uncompensated impactful community service activity
- Leadership of a students' or faculty' success activity

Service appointments that are in excess of 10% (with a corresponding decrease in teaching load) must be approved by the School Chair, the Dean, and the Provost. Such appointments include service as associate school 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 with >10% service appointment faculty member 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

To *exceed expectations* in service with >10% service appointment faculty member should fulfill all the requirements for the *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

4. OVERALL RATING

An *overall exceeds expectations* rating on the post-tenure review can be earned by receiving *exceeds expectations* rating in any two competency areas (*teaching, research & scholarship* and *service*) and at least *meets expectations* rating in the third. An *overall meets expectations* rating is earned by receiving a *meets expectations* rating in all three competency areas or an *exceeds expectations* in one and *meets* in the other two. An *overall does-not-meet expectations* rating will be assigned when a faculty member receives *does not meet expectations* in any one or more of the competency areas. In such cases a remedial plan developed in consultation with the faculty member, department chair and the dean should be provided.

A faculty member who receives *does not meet expectations* in two lead competency areas will receive an overall *unsatisfactory* rating. *Unsatisfactory* rating means failing to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, or 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.

5. OUTCOMES OF POST-TENURE REVIEW

Outcomes of the post-tenure review described here are based on the UTRGV Post-Tenure Review Policy (ADM 06-504) guidelines. If the final result of the comprehensive performance review is *exceeds expectations*, or *meets expectations*, the faculty member will not undergo another comprehensive performance review for six years unless a comprehensive review is required as a result of subsequent annual reviews. Irrespective of the rating, each associate professor undergoing a post-tenure review should meet with the Dean and the Department Chair/School Director to discuss the outcome of the post-tenure review and develop an action plan towards achieving promotion to full professor.

If a faculty member receives a rating of *does not meet expectations* or *unsatisfactory* in any of the three evaluation areas, the faculty member must also develop an action plan to be reviewed and approved by the chair and dean, to address any weaknesses or concerns and enhance or strengthen the faculty member's portfolio in the designated area(s). The faculty member's progress towards meeting the goals of the plan will be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions.

If a faculty member receives a rating of *does not meet expectations* on the comprehensive performance, it may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support, such as pedagogy assistance, counseling, mentoring in research and service activities, or adjustment of assigned duties. Such arrangements will be built into the action plan.

If the comprehensive performance review is *unsatisfactory* in any of the three competency areas, the dean in consultation with the department chair may recommend a change in the faculty member's workload or recommend additional actions to the Provost.

If the overall result of a comprehensive performance review is an *unsatisfactory* rating, this may result in an additional review by the Provost, or designee to determine if good cause exists for termination under Regents' Rules 31008 and 31102.

An *unsatisfactory* rating means failing to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, or 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. Each department/school that specifies the standards for exceeding, meeting, and failing to meet expectations should also specify the criteria for performance that is unsatisfactory.

6. 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.