

## Handbook of Operating Procedures

### TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION

---

#### A. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to specify procedures regarding the annual review, comprehensive periodic evaluation, ~~post-tenure review~~, and promotion to the rank of professor at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV).

#### B. Persons Affected

This policy applies to all tenured faculty members of UTRGV.

#### C. Policy

1. ~~UTRGV is committed to serving society through the excellence of its faculty, students, and staff. To meet UTRGV's commitment to improving the quality of life of the Rio Grande Valley and beyond, faculty members are expected to perform at the highest levels in their respective disciplines and fields, continuously striving for distinction. Every UTRGV faculty member should present a distinguished record as a scholar, educator, and colleague. UTRGV faculty must attain a successful and high-quality record of research, scholarship, and/or creative work that projects a clear, coherent, and independent identity as a scholar. As educators, UTRGV faculty must establish a teaching profile that demonstrates growth, impact, and student success. With the awarding of promotion to the next rank, UTRGV expects that faculty members will continue providing intellectual leadership in their research and teaching, and model professionalism in all their work, including service and shared governance activities. It is the policy of UTRGV to cultivate tenured faculty who, through the performance of their duties, achieve these high standards and values with sustained commitment to professionalism and to UTRGV's mission. To this end, it is the policy of UTRGV to uphold academic freedom in the promotion decision and ensure that promotion of tenured faculty to the rank of professor is a recognition of and reward to faculty who have sustained meritorious records of professional accomplishment that contribute to the university's mission.~~

4-2. It is the policy of UTRGV to conduct ~~annual reviews and comprehensive~~ periodic performance evaluations of tenured faculty ~~in teaching, research, service, university-related patient care (as applicable), and/or university-related administration (as applicable).~~ It is the policy of UTRGV to conduct ~~these evaluations in ways that~~ provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; ~~to uphold academic freedom when evaluating tenured faculty;~~ to assist ~~tenured~~ faculty in enhancing professional skills and goals; 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.

2. ~~Promotion to the rank of professor is a recognition of and reward to faculty who have sustained meritorious records of professional accomplishment that contribute to the university mission.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.6", No bullets or numbering

## 1. General Principles

- a. Regents' Rule Precedence – This policy is intended to be consistent with the policies set forth in Rule 31007, Tenure; Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member; and Rule 31001, Faculty Appointments and Titles, of the *Rules and Regulations* of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System ("*Regents' Rules*").
- b. Values and Expectations – UTRGV adopts the Statement of Values and Expectations, pursuant to Rule 10901, Statement of U.T. System Values and Expectations, of the *Regents' Rules*.
- c. Ethics – UTRGV receives guidance for evaluation of professional ethics from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics, originally adopted in 1966, and revised in 1987 and 2009, in determining standards for professionalism.
- d. Academic Freedom – UTRGV receives guidance for evaluation of academic freedom from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (with 1970 Interpretive Comments) in defining and upholding the academic freedom of its faculty.

## 2. Categories of Performance

- a. Faculty– are evaluated based on s– will include a review of the faculty member's professional responsibilities—accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative-works, service/shared-governance, and, if applicable, university-related patient care as assigned per the faculty member's workload percentages. Activities in each category and factors that inform performance ratings are listed below and/or university-related administration. .
- b. Teaching
- Teaching activities may include, but are not limited to: (a) c
  - Glassroom (including traditional, online, and hybrid) and laboratory instruction; (b)
  - dDevelopment of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; (c)
  - dDevelopment or publication of instructional materials;
  - (d) sSupervision of undergraduate students, graduate students, medical students, or post-docs;
  - 4. (e) mMentoring and coaching students;
  - (f) eExperiential learning and community engagement activities pertaining to teaching/instruction, such as service learning, student research (including community-based research), and internships/co-ops;

- ~~(g) cCompetitive funding for instructional/pedagogical development;~~
- ~~implementation of tools/practices acquired through professional development workshops; and~~
- i. ~~(h) innovative teaching and pedagogy.~~
- ii. As educators, tenured faculty must establish a teaching profile that demonstrates growth, impact, and student success. UTRGV values and holds high expectations for the quality and impact of faculty members' teaching on student success. To that end, the categories of performance in Teaching are as follows: (a) pedagogy, (b) continued development of teaching skills, (c) use of peer feedback in teaching, which includes compliance with UTRGV's Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching (d) alignment of curricular practices to student needs, (e) engagement with student learning outside the classroom, and (f) participation in development of curricula.
- ~~Factors informing performance ratings include, but are not limited to, peer observation of teaching, pedagogical preparations, teaching-related awards, and student evaluation ratings over the full period under review.~~
- b. ~~Research/Scholarship/Creative, -Activities~~
- c. ~~Research/scholarship/creative activities are characterized by the creation and -dissemination of new knowledge or creative works and activities including, and may include but are but not limited to:~~

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.91" + Indent at: 1.16", Tab stops: 0.85", Left

**Formatted:** Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.91" + Indent at: 1.16", Tab stops: 0.85", Left + Not at 1.1"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.91" + Indent at: 1.16", Tab stops: 0.85", Left

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.3 pt

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.3 pt

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.3 pt

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.3 pt

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.3 pt

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.3 pt

**Formatted:** Right: 0", Line spacing: single, Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.91" + Indent at: 1.16", Tab stops: 0.85", Left + Not at 1.1"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.91" + Indent at: 1.16", Tab stops: 0.85", Left

**Formatted** ...

**Formatted** ...

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted** ...

**Formatted:** Font: Not Italic, Underline

**Formatted** ...

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.63", Hanging: 0.19"

**Formatted:** Underline, Font color: Text 1

**Formatted** ...

**Formatted:** Font: Italic, Font color: Text 1

**Formatted** ...

**Formatted** ...

—: (a) ~~all peer-reviewed publications of the faculty member's research that have been published or accepted for publication in department-determined appropriate outlets; within the evaluation period will count towards satisfying the expectations for tenure and promotion;~~

— ~~V(b) visual or other artistic contributions in competitive regional and national exhibitions;~~

— ~~A(c) adjudicated performances; (d)~~

— ~~Ddevelopment of intellectual property, such as patents and licenses; (e)~~

— ~~cCompetitive, external research funding; (f)~~

— ~~Gcommunity-based participatory research; and~~

i. ~~Q(g) other community-based research/scholarly/creative activities appropriate to the faculty member's academic discipline.~~

ii. Upon earning tenure, UTRGV faculty seeking promotion must sustain a successful and high-quality record of research, scholarship, and/or creative work that projects a clear, coherent, and independent identity as a scholar. The work of faculty in this area should lead to the advancement of knowledge. By achieving these expectations, the faculty member will have demonstrated intellectual leadership. UTRGV values and holds high expectations for the quality and productivity of tenured faculty seeking promotion in research, scholarship, and creative work. To that end, the categories of performance in Research are as follows: (a) significance and national reputation, (b) consistent and increasing record of accomplishment with increasing significance and impact, (c) sustainability of agenda and trajectory, (d) scholarly independence, and (e) quality and impact.

~~Factors informing performance ratings include, but are not limited to, the quality, significance, impact, and quantity of publications or creative works, as judged by peer review. For purposes of this standard, peer review includes review/adjudication by independent, external, nationally and internationally recognized experts in the faculty member's field. Departments should identify common publications and/or presses in the discipline that do not meet the peer review expectations and standards.~~

#### d. Service and Shared Governance

— ~~Service activities can may include, but are not limited to: (a) s~~

— ~~Service to students, colleagues, the department, college, and UTRGV; (b)~~

— ~~Sservice to the profession, including academic or professionally related service to disciplinary-based societies, editorial boards, and other educational entities; and, (c)~~

i. ~~Pprofessionally related service and outreach to the community, state, nation, and beyond,~~

**Formatted:** Right: 0", Space Before: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 9 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.85" + Indent at: 1.1", Tab stops: Not at 1.1"

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 9 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.85" + Indent at: 1.1"

**Formatted:** Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 9 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.85" + Indent at: 1.1", Tab stops: 0.6", Left + Not at 1.1"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.1 pt

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Normal, No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.1", Space Before: 0.8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Not Italic, Underline

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.63", Hanging: 0.25"

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Not Expanded by / Condensed by

ii. UTRGV expects faculty members to model professionalism in all their work, including service and shared governance activities. These activities are essential to the life of the university and an important component of faculty profiles. Faculty should conceive of their service and shared governance activities as occurring in three areas: the university and its students, university operations and shared governance, and the profession and community. Upon earning tenure, faculty must assume leadership roles in service toward university operations and shared governance and assume leadership roles in their respective disciplinary organizations. Documented and sustained leadership and impact in service and shared governance is an essential component to promotion to the rank of Professor. To that end, the categories of performance in Service and Shared Governance are as follows: (a) service and student success, (b) service to university operations and shared governance, and (c) service to the profession and the community.

Factors informing performance ratings in service include, but are not limited to, the quality, significance, and impact of the contributions to students, colleagues, the department, college, UTRGV, the community, and the profession.

e. University-Related Patient Care

i. Factors in evaluating patient care can include, but are not limited to:

i.

Patient satisfaction;

1. Patient Satisfaction;

2. Number of patient encounters;

2.

3. Telemedicine;

3.

4. UTRGV/community clinic work; and

4.

5. Work Relative Value Units (wRVUs).

f. University-Related Administration

2. Annual Review Schedule of Reviews

E.

3.

a. Pathways for Review Deadlines — The Provost/VP will post Pathways for Review Deadlines (Pathways) on their/the office's web site each year prior to the commencement of reviews and notify the

**Formatted:** Normal, Indent: Left: 0.94", No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Left, Indent: Left: 0.94", Hanging: 0.19", Right: 0", Line spacing: single, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 1.97" + Indent at: 2.1", Tab stops: 0.85", Left + Not at: 1.1"

**Formatted:** Indent: Hanging: 0.24", Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.35" + Indent at: 1.6"

**Formatted:** Font: Not Italic, Underline

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.56", Hanging: 0.19"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.94", Hanging: 0.19", Space Before: 0.05 pt, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 2.16" + Indent at: 2.28", Tab stops: 0.85", Left

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.5"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0 pt, Tab stops: Not at 1.1"

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.1 pt

**Formatted:** Tab stops: Not at 1.41"

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Tab stops: Not at 1.41"

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Underline

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1, Character scale: 100%

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.6", No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.35", Hanging: 0.25"

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1, Condensed by 0.4 pt

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

deans and department chairs of the posting. The Pathways will provide the schedule for each level of faculty performance review. It is the tenured faculty member's responsibility to be aware of and to follow all Pathways deadlines.

b. Annual Review

c.

d.

e. All tenured faculty will be evaluated for their work performance in teaching, research, service, and patient care, as applicable, each academic year following the schedule set forth in Pathways.

b.

e. The annual evaluation may not be waived for any tenured faculty member, but may be deferred in rare circumstances, such as when the review process will coincide with the faculty member's approved leave, except Faculty Development Leave — faculty on Faculty Development Leave are not eligible for a deferral. A deferral of more than one year from the scheduled review will not be granted.

c.

d. To receive a deferral, the faculty member must make a request in writing to their Department chair prior to the deadline established by the Provost VP and receive written approval by the chair, dean, and Provost VP or designees by the deadline.

e. Performance Ratings – Each review level shall rate the tenured faculty member in each evaluation category. Each review level shall combine those ratings in each category to provide an overall rating for the annual review period. The four ratings to choose from are:

i. Exceeds expectations – reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.

i.

ii. Meets expectations – reflects accomplishments commensurate with what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.

ii.

iii. Does not meet expectations – indicates a failure as defined by the unit beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.

iii.

**Formatted:** Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Justified, Right: 0.09", Space Before: 11.2 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.06 li, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Indent: Hanging: 0.24"

**Formatted:** Justified, Right: 0.09", Space Before: 11.2 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.06 li, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Justified, Right: 0.09", Space Before: 11.2 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.06 li, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Condensed by 0.4 pt

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Body Text, Justified, Right: 0.09", Space Before: 11.2 pt, Tab stops: Not at 1.16" + 1.16"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Normal, No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Right: 0.09", Space Before: 0 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.06 li, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85", Tab stops: 1.16", Left + 1.16", Left

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.85", No bullets or numbering

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Font: Not Italic

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Font: Not Italic

**Formatted**





request, they have five business days to respond and move the materials and evaluation to the Dean. After those five business days, the materials and evaluation auto-advance to the Dean. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of Department Chairs' annual evaluations is ten business days (five business days for the tenured faculty and five additional business days for the Department Chair.

iv. Reconsideration of the Dean's Annual Evaluation Performance Rating – From the time Deans submit their annual evaluation, tenured faculty will receive ten business days to request reconsideration. After those ten business days, the annual evaluation process ends. Within this window of ten business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information in their annual review materials. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Dean. From the time that Deans receive this request, they have ten business days to respond. The annual evaluation process ends after the Dean's response. Unless the outcome satisfies the conditions for appeal, the Dean's annual performance rating is final.

f. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Post tenure Review)

i. All faculty will undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation of their professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service, and patient care, as applicable, at least every six years after the award of tenure and following the schedule set forth in Pathways.

ii. The comprehensive periodic evaluation dossier will serve as the annual evaluation dossier.

iii. At the time of promotion to Professor, the six-year period will restart.

iv. The office of the Provost/VP will provide the deans' offices with the list of their faculty members who are due for a comprehensive periodic evaluation at least six (6) months prior to the date established in Pathways for the review(s) to begin. The deans' offices shall then notify their respective faculty members of their upcoming comprehensive periodic evaluation. Faculty members are also responsible for ensuring their comprehensive periodic evaluation is conducted at least every six years. If a faculty member is due for a comprehensive periodic evaluation but does not receive notice as provided by this section, it is the duty of the faculty member to immediately inform their chair and dean. The dean will review and reconcile records with the Provost/VP so that if the comprehensive periodic evaluation is due, it can be initiated in a timely manner.

v. The comprehensive periodic evaluation may not be waived for any tenured faculty member, but may be deferred in rare circumstances, such as:



- ~~1. when the review process will coincide with the faculty member's approved leave, except Faculty Development Leave — faculty on Faculty Development Leave are not eligible for a deferral;~~
  - ~~2. when the faculty member is on approved leave for more than four months during the six-year period;~~
  - ~~3. when the faculty member is on an approved leave of at least three months duration within the six months immediately prior to the date established in the Pathways for the review to begin; or~~
  - ~~4. when the faculty member is undergoing a review for appointment to an endowed position.~~
- ~~vi. To receive a deferral, the faculty member must make a request in writing to their chair prior to the deadline established by the Provost/VP and receive written approval by the chair, dean, and Provost/VP or designees by the deadline.~~
- ~~vii. A deferral of the comprehensive periodic evaluation of an active faculty member must not extend beyond one year from the scheduled review.~~

~~g. Promotion Review~~

- ~~i. The standard time in the associate professor rank for promotion to professor is six years.~~
- ~~ii. A tenured associate professor seeking promotion to the rank of professor may apply early if the faculty member believes their performance record substantially exceeds the department's evaluation guidelines for promotion to professor. To be considered for an early promotion review, the faculty member must submit the external review request and dossier in accordance with Pathways.~~
- ~~iii. Future considerations for the promotion to professor are not affected by a denial of an application for early promotion.~~
- ~~iv. The promotion review dossier will serve as the comprehensive periodic evaluation and annual evaluation dossiers.~~

~~2. Department Evaluation Guidelines~~

~~Each department must develop its own evaluation guidelines that address performance criteria, requirements, and procedures for the annual review of tenured faculty, the comprehensive periodic evaluation, and promotion to Professor. The department guidelines must be in accordance with Appendix A — Department Guideline Requirements and Appendix B —~~

~~Evaluation/Review Categories and Standards. A college may vote to develop guidelines that will be used by all departments within the college.~~

### ~~3. Annual Review~~

- ~~a. Dossier – The faculty member must compile and submit their dossier, meeting the requirements outlined in Appendix D – Dossier Requirements, by the deadline stated in Pathways.~~
- ~~b. Department Review Committee – A department committee will be established in accordance with Appendix E – Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review.~~
- ~~c. Department Committee and Chair Review – The faculty member will be evaluated at the department committee and chair levels. Each review level must include a written narrative providing an assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in each review category for their assigned duties (e.g., teaching, research, service, etc.). In each review category, the assessment should highlight strengths and weaknesses, provide recommendations for improvement, and provide recommendations for progress toward the next comprehensive periodic evaluation or promotion review.~~
- ~~d. Performance Ratings – Each review level shall also rate the faculty member in each evaluation category with one of the following four (4) ratings: exceeds expectations; meets expectations; does not meet expectations; or unsatisfactory. An overall rating must also be provided.~~
- ~~e. Dean Review of Evaluation – After the department chair's review, the results of the department committee and chair evaluations will be reported to the dean for review and approval. The dean's review is final except as provided below.~~
- ~~f. Reconsideration – A faculty member may request a reconsideration at the department committee and chair levels of review in accordance with the Request for Reconsideration section in Appendix E.~~

~~g. Appeal. If in the dean's review the overall performance rating is "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory," or does not meet expectations and that rating is inconsistent with the previous level Chair's Performance Rating, the tenured faculty member may appeal to the Provost/V~~P~~ who will review the information and provide a final decision. If the organizational structure does not support the levels of review provided for in the policy and the administrative leader of the unit has not designated an additional reviewer (such that an appeal to the Provost/V~~P~~ as provided above is not available), the faculty member may ask for reconsideration by the dean.~~

~~i.~~

### ~~h. Annual Review Outcomes~~

- ~~i. Merit – The outcome of a faculty member's annual performance evaluations will may be considered in determining eligibility for a merit pay increase, should merit pay increase be available. To be eligible for a merit pay increase, the faculty member tenured~~

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.24"

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.24", Space Before: 1.05 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Right: 0.09", Line spacing: Multiple 1.06 li, Tab stops: 0.85", Left

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.88"

| faculty must be in good

k. standing, meet or exceed expectations, and meet the requirements outlined in the applicable merit guidelines.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.89", Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

ii. Support or Remediation – If the annual review raises concerns about the faculty member's performance in one or more areas, as indicated by Tenured faculty who receive a Performance Rating of "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory," in one or more Categories of Performance this may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support or remediation. The faculty member must be required by the Dean to an Annual Review Remediation Plan in consultation with their Department Chair and Dean. develop and submit an action plan by the deadline established by the Provost/VP to the chair and dean for their review and approval. The Dean must approve of the plan before the end of the semester in which the Performance Rating was given. The plan must shall address the performance weaknesses changes or concerns and any support necessary to increase to enhance or strengthen the tenured faculty member's performance in the designated area(s) (for example, teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research or service expectations). The Department Chair and Dean, in consultation with a peer review committee, will use the plan to measure the tenured faculty member's performance during the ensuing annual review process. For tenured faculty under an Annual Review Remediation Plan, the ensuing annual review process is as follows:

**Formatted:** Font: Not Italic

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.94", Hanging: 0.19", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 2.16" + Indent at: 2.28"

a. Tenured faculty must include their Annual Review Remediation Plan as part of their annual review materials that are otherwise specified in D.3.g. The plan may call for tenured faculty to provide additional materials.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.13", Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 2.44" + Indent at: 2.69"

b. A Peer Annual Remediation Committee forms according to the procedures outlined in D.4.j.i and D.4.j.ii. The actions of this committee follow the procedures in D.4.j.iii through D.4.j.vii. Tenured faculty submit their annual review materials to this committee as designated in Pathways.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.13", Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 2.44" + Indent at: 2.69"

c. The Peer Annual Remediation Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean shall use the plan in conjunction with the approved annual review guidelines to provide Performance Ratings in the Categories of Performance.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.13"

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.13", Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 2.44" + Indent at: 2.69"

d. Once the Peer Annual Remediation Committee submits its annual review to the Department Chair, the annual review proceeds as stipulated in D.3.h and D.3.i.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.13"

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.13", Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 2.44" + Indent at: 2.69"

e. This prescribed annual review process continues until performance is elevated to "meets" or "exceeds expectations." If the tenured faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory" rating while under the Annual Review Remediation Plan, then other disciplinary actions may result (see D.3.j.iii through D.3.j.v below).

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.13"

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1.13", Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 2.44" + Indent at: 2.69"

iii. Tenured faculty receiving a rating of "unsatisfactory" may, with Dean approval, draft (or continue with) a remediation plan and undergo the process in D.3.j.ii and/or be subject to appropriate administrative action. If the rating of "unsatisfactory" is a result of incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause, appropriate disciplinary action may be taken (see D.3.j.v below).

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.94", Hanging: 0.25", Right: 0.09", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 2.16" + Indent at: 2.28"

ii. ~~The faculty member's progress in response to the additional support will be monitored and addressed by the review levels in subsequent annual evaluations. The faculty member's progress towards meeting the goals of the plan shall be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions, as outlined below.~~

iii-iv. ~~Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (CPE) — A Tenured faculty member who receives a Performance Rating of a "unsatisfactory" rating for two consecutive annual reviews may be required to undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation CPE. The decision regarding whether to require the comprehensive periodic evaluation in this circumstance will be made by the dean after consultation with the Provost AVP.~~

iv-v. ~~Disciplinary Action — A Tenured faculty member may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including termination in accordance with Regents' Rules 31008 and 31102, for poor performance or when other good cause exists.~~

#### 4. ~~Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Post-Tenure Review) CPE~~

##### ~~Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Post-tenure Review)~~

a. ~~All tenured faculty will undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation (CPE) of their professional responsibilities in the Categories of Performance as applicable to their workload, which may include teaching, research/scholarship/creative-works, service/shared governance, and, if applicable, university-related patient care, as applicable, and/or university-related administration, at least every six years after the award of tenure and following the schedule set forth in Pathways.~~

a.

b. ~~The comprehensive periodic evaluation dossier CPE materials will serve as the annual evaluation dossier materials.~~

b.

a. ~~At the time of promotion to Professor, the six-year period will restart.~~

c.

b. ~~The office of the Provost AVP will provide the deans' offices Dean with the list of their faculty members who are due for a comprehensive periodic evaluation at least six (6) months prior to the date established in Pathways for the reviews (e) to begin. The deans' offices Dean shall then notify their tenured respective faculty members of their upcoming comprehensive periodic evaluation CPE. Tenured faculty members are also responsible for ensuring their comprehensive periodic evaluation is conducted at least every six years. If a faculty member is due for a comprehensive periodic evaluation CPE but does not receive notice as provided by this section, it is the duty of the faculty member to immediately inform their chair and dean. The dean will review and reconcile records with the Provost AVP so that if the comprehensive periodic evaluation CPE is due, it can be initiated in a timely manner.~~

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Condensed by 0.3 pt

Formatted: Normal, Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.94", Hanging: 0.25", Right: 0.09", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 2.16" + Indent at: 2.28"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.94", Hanging: 0.25"

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.94", Hanging: 0.25", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 2.16" + Indent at: 2.28"

Formatted: Font: Italic, Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font: Italic, Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.35", Hanging: 0.25"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.61", Hanging: 0.24"

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85", Tab stops: 0.85", Left

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.61", Hanging: 0.24"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.85", Right: 0", Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: 0.85", Left + Not at 1.16" + 1.16"

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Condensed by 0.1 pt

Formatted

Formatted: Left, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

Formatted

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted

d.

e. ~~The comprehensive periodic evaluation~~CPE may not be waived for any tenured faculty member, but may be deferred in rare circumstances, such as:

**Formatted:** Left, Indent: Left: 0.62", Hanging: 0.23",  
Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... +  
Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" +  
Indent at: 0.85"  
**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

1. when the review process will coincide with the faculty member's approved leave, except Faculty Development Leave — faculty on Faculty Development Leave are not eligible for a deferral;
  2. when the faculty member is on approved leave for more than four months during the six-year period;
  3. when the faculty member is on an approved leave of at least three months duration within the six months immediately prior to the date established in the Pathways for the review to begin; or
  4. when the faculty member is undergoing a review for appointment to an endowed position.
- e. ~~VP/VP~~
- f. To receive a deferral, the faculty member must make a request in writing to their chair prior to the deadline established by the Provost and receive written approval by the chair, dean, and Provost or designees by the deadline.
- g. A deferral of the comprehensive periodic evaluation CPE of an active faculty member must not extend beyond one year from the scheduled review.
- h. Guidelines – Following Provost procedures for approval, department, school, or college comprehensive periodic evaluation guidelines shall follow the guidelines for annual review. Guidelines should indicate clearly how previous performance ratings from the years under review are to be combined to issue an overall rating for comprehensive periodic evaluation. Guidelines for comprehensive periodic evaluation must identify if there are any cumulative benchmarks in the Categories of Performance that tenured faculty must meet to demonstrate the successful, high-quality record of sustained productivity and professionalism that is required of tenured faculty at UTRGV. Any cumulative benchmarks must relate to tenured faculty workload. Guidelines for comprehensive periodic evaluation should seek as much detail and documentation as needed to apply the standards of judgment, but not so much as to impose additional burdens.
- i. Tenured faculty appointed to administrative positions outside of their department shall include a letter from their supervisor evaluating the administrative component of their workload. Guidelines and evaluations using those guidelines must give appropriate consideration to the demands of the administrative assignment and the impact of these demands on level of research activity, courses taught, and the extent of service contributions.
- ii. Revisions to the comprehensive periodic evaluation guidelines will not be applicable to tenured faculty for two full academic years after official adoption unless the tenured faculty member chooses to be evaluated by the changes and affirms that choice in writing to their Department Chair.

**Formatted:** Left, Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.22" + Indent at: 1.47"

**Formatted:** Left, Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.22" + Indent at: 1.47"

**Formatted:** Left, Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.22" + Indent at: 1.47"

**Formatted:** Left, Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.22" + Indent at: 1.47"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Left, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Normal, Indent: Left: 0.61", Space Before: 0 pt

**Formatted:** Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.63", Hanging: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Left, Right: 0.09", No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: 0.85", Left + 0.85", Left

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Right: 0.09", Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 0.97" + Indent at: 1.22"

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial

**Formatted**

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering



- [illegible]

will receive two business days to advance their materials to the Department Chair. After two business days, the review will auto-advance to the Department Chair. Tenured faculty may add new information to their materials during those two business days. Tenured faculty are not able to appeal or request reconsideration of the peer review committee evaluations.

k. Review Levels – Materials submitted for comprehensive periodic evaluation shall be reviewed by the peer review comprehensive periodic evaluation committee, the Department Chair, and Dean. The Dean sends a report to the Provost for approval.

l. Request for Reconsideration of Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation – Tenured faculty may request a reconsideration of the comprehensive periodic evaluation recommendation made by the Department Chair and Dean. For all other levels of review, tenured faculty are given two business days from the time that the evaluation is posted to move their materials to the next level of review. Tenured faculty may add new information to their materials during those two business days. Their materials auto-advance after two business days. For reconsideration requests of the Department Chair and Dean evaluations, the written request for reconsideration must state grounds for the request and include supporting evidence that will be included in the comprehensive periodic evaluation. The written response to the tenured faculty member must address the substance of the reconsideration request, explaining why the evaluator found the request either to be convincing or unconvincing. The tenured faculty member will have the opportunity to view the response.

i. Reconsideration of Department Chairs' Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation – From the time Department Chairs submit their evaluation, tenured faculty will receive five business days to either request reconsideration or advance their recommendation to the Dean. After five business days, the materials will auto-advance to the Dean. Within this window of five business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Department Chair. From the time that Department Chairs receive this request, they have five business days to respond and move the materials to the Dean. After those five business days, the materials auto-advance to the Dean. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of Department Chairs' evaluation is ten business days (five business days for the tenured faculty and five additional business days for the Department Chair).

ii. Reconsideration of Dean's Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation – From the time that the evaluation is submitted by the Dean, tenured faculty will receive ten business days to either request reconsideration or accept the Dean's evaluation. Within this window of ten business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Dean. From the time the Dean receives this request, the Dean has ten business days to respond. After those ten business days, the Dean's evaluation and response is final. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of the Dean's evaluation is twenty business days (ten business days for the tenured faculty and ten additional business days for the Dean).

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Justified, Right: 0.09", Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Left, Right: 0.09", No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: 0.85", Left + 0.85", Left

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Justified, Right: 0.09", Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Left, Right: 0.09", No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: 0.85", Left + 0.85", Left

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Right: 0.09", Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 0.97" + Indent at: 1.22"

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 1.47", Right: 0.09", No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: 0.85", Left + 0.85", Left

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Right: 0.09", Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 0.97" + Indent at: 1.22"

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial Nova, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** Normal, Indent: Left: 0.63", Hanging: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

m. Outcomes

- i. Merit – The outcome of a tenured faculty member's CPE may be considered in determining eligibility for a merit pay increase, should a merit pay increase be available. To be eligible for a merit pay increase, faculty must be in good standing, "meet" or "exceed expectations," and satisfy the requirements outlined in the applicable merit guidelines.
- ii. If the outcome of the CPE is "exceeds expectations" or "meets expectations" then the tenured faculty member will not undergo another CPE for six years unless a CPE is required as a result of subsequent annual reviews.
- iii. Remediation Plan – Tenured faculty who receive a Performance Rating of "does not meet expectations" in one or more Categories of Performance may be required by the Dean to draft a CPE Remediation Plan in consultation with their Department Chair and Dean. The Dean must approve of the plan before the end of the semester in which the Performance Rating was given. The plan shall address the changes and support necessary to increase the tenured faculty member's performance (for example, teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research or service expectations). The Department Chair and Dean, in consultation with a peer review committee, will use the plan to measure the tenured faculty member's performance during the ensuing annual review process. For tenured faculty under a CPE Remediation Plan, the ensuing annual review process is as follows:
  1. Tenured faculty must include their CPE Remediation Plan as part of their annual review materials that are otherwise specified in D.3.g. The plan may call for tenured faculty to provide additional materials.
  2. A Peer CPE Remediation Committee forms according to the procedures outlined in D.4.j.i and D.4.j.ii. The actions of this committee follow the procedures in D.4.j.iii through D.4.j.vii. Tenured faculty submit their annual review materials to this committee as designated in Pathways.
  3. The Peer CPE Remediation Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean shall use the plan in conjunction with the approved annual review guidelines to provide Performance Ratings in the Categories of Performance.
  4. Once the Peer CPE Remediation Committee submits its annual review to the Department Chair, the annual review proceeds as stipulated in D.3.h and D.3.i.
  5. This prescribed annual review process continues until performance is elevated to "meets" or "exceeds expectations." If the tenured faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory" rating while under the CPE Remediation Plan, then they are subject to the Short-Term Development Plan or other disciplinary actions (see D.4.m.v below).
- iv. Unsatisfactory Performance and Short-Term Development Plan – Tenured faculty who receive a Performance Rating of "unsatisfactory" in one or more Categories of Performance in their CPE as a result of incompetence, neglect of

duty, or other good cause, may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action (see D.4.m.v below). Tenured faculty receiving a Performance Rating of “unsatisfactory” in one or more Categories of Performance in their CPE or while under a CPE Remediation Plan may be required to draft a Short-Term Development Plan in consultation with their Department Chair, Dean, and Provost. The Provost must approve of the plan before the end of the semester in which the Performance Rating was given. The plan establishes long-term objectives for developmental improvement and specifies meaningful short-term criteria for assessing progress towards these long-term objectives. Meaningful short-term criteria refer to performance benchmarks that will return the tenured faculty member to satisfactory performance when met. The plan must establish meaningful criteria to be met by the next annual review and then meaningful criteria for the following annual review. The Short-Term Development Plan encompasses a cycle of two annual evaluations, but the Provost may establish a plan that extends for a longer period of time with meaningful criteria for each annual review under the plan. The Department Chair and Dean, in consultation with a peer review committee, will use the plan to measure the tenured faculty member’s performance during the ensuing annual review process. For tenured faculty under a Short-Term Development Plan, the ensuing annual review process is as follows:

1. Tenured faculty include their Short-Term Development Plan as part of their annual review materials that are otherwise specified in D.3.g. The plan may call for tenured faculty to provide additional materials.
2. A Peer Short-Term Development Committee forms according to the procedures outlined in D.4.j.i and D.4.j.ii. The actions of this committee follow the procedures in D.4.j.iii through D.4.j.vii. Tenured faculty submit their annual review materials to this committee as designated in Pathways.
3. The Peer Short-Term Development Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean shall use the plan in conjunction with the approved annual review guidelines to provide Performance Ratings in the Categories of Performance.
4. Once the Peer Short-Term Development Committee submits its annual review to the Department Chair, the annual review proceeds as stipulated in D.3.h and D.3.i.
5. This prescribed annual review process continues for the duration approved by the Provost. Tenured faculty failing to satisfy the criteria of the Short-Term Development Plan may be subject to other disciplinary action (see D.4.m.v below).

- v. Disciplinary Action – A tenured faculty member may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including termination in accordance with Regents’ Rules 31102 and 31008 Termination of a Faculty Member for poor performance or when other good cause exists.

—The Provost will send a summary of the institutional CPE outcomes to the University of Texas System.

**Formatted:** Justified, Line spacing: single, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85", Tab stops: 0.85", Left + 0.85", Left + Not at 1.16" + 1.16"

—The standard time in the associate professor rank for promotion to professor is six years. Promotion to professor is an acknowledgment that tenured associate professors have (1) performed with excellence and leadership in all areas of responsibility, (2) produced quality, significant, and impactful work that demonstrates scholarly growth beyond what was accomplished to earn tenure, and (3) demonstrated their reliability that this excellence, leadership, and growth will continue after promotion.

—

b.

C.

e. Guidelines – Following Provost procedures for approval, colleges, schools, and departments may draft and distribute Evaluation Guidelines articulating disciplinary criteria for promotion to full professor for the purpose of faculty mentoring. Such criteria should address all faculty performance categories using the template “Promotion to Full Professor Guidelines for Associate Professors,” draw on national practices in the discipline, and align with the Categories of Performance in this policy.

ii. College, school, and department Evaluation Guidelines are advisory and do not substitute for or take precedent over the individualized review and decision of evaluators designated in Pathways.

iii. As the faculty members of the university develop, definitions of excellence and expectations for promotion should change. If a tenured faculty member's accomplishments do not keep pace with evolving standards of performance for promotion, then that individual may not be awarded promotion.

1. Tenured faculty appointed to administrative positions outside of their department shall include a letter from their supervisor articulating the administrative component of their workload. Evaluations must give appropriate consideration to the demands of the administrative assignment and the impact of these demands on level of research activity, courses taught, and the extent of service contributions.
  2. Revisions to the college, school, or department Evaluation Guidelines will not be applicable to tenured faculty for two full academic years after official adoption unless the tenured faculty member chooses to be mentored or advised by the changes and affirms that choice in writing to their Department Chair.
- f. Dossier – Tenured faculty applying for promotion to professor create a dossier of the materials that form the basis for the review at all levels of evaluation. The dossiers of tenured faculty must provide clear documentation of their effort and success in the Categories of Performance. In Teaching, a successful profile that documents growth, impact, and student success will include evidence of ongoing development and improvement in teaching quality, which should result in both student success and a positive and professional reputation as an educator. In Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Work, documenting this achievement requires more than enumerating a list of scholarly products. Tenured faculty must demonstrate their achievement in ways that allow for rigorous evaluation of the quality and impact of their work by professional peers both internal and external to the university. In Service and Shared Governance, tenured faculty must document the outputs and outcomes of their effort and leadership, and when participating in shared governance, they must document their role in the development of policies and decision-making that affect UTRGV. It is important that tenured faculty members under consideration for promotion make every effort to ensure that the material contained in the dossier is complete, accurate, professional in presentation, and submitted by the deadline contained in Pathways.
- a. The faculty member must compile and submit their dossier meeting the requirements outlined in Appendix D by the deadline stated in Pathways.
- b. Review-Promotion to Full Evaluation and Advisory Committee (PFEAC)s – Review committees will be established in accordance with Appendix E
- g.
- i. Tenured faculty shall have a Promotion to Full Evaluation and Advisory Committee (PFEAC) formed one academic year before tenured faculty apply for promotion. The Department Chair, in consultation with the tenured faculty member, appoints three to five full professors whose research expertise is related to the tenured faculty member's expertise. PFEAC should be composed of full professors from within the tenured faculty member's department but may also include full professors from cognate fields within the college and/or university. A majority of PFEAC members must be full professors from within the same department as the tenured faculty member unless the department lacks the requisite number of full professors. The chair of PFEAC must be a full professor from within the same department unless no full professors exist. In addition,

**Formatted:** Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

**Formatted:** Right: 0.09", Tab stops: 0.85", Left + 0.85", Left

**Formatted:** Not Expanded by / Condensed by

**Formatted:** Justified, Numbered + Level: 3 +  
Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment:  
Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.85", No bullets or  
numbering

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Right: 0.1", Line spacing:  
Multiple 1.06 li, Tab stops: 0.85", Left + 0.85", Left

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.75", No bullets or  
numbering



PFEAC shall have a full professor, non-voting Equal Opportunity Liaison (EOL). The EOL attends all meetings of PFEAC and has access to the dossier and all former evaluations. Neither Department Chairs nor Associate Deans may be members, chairs, or EOLs of PFEAC.

- ii. The tenured faculty under review shall be provided with an opportunity to meet with the peer review committee. The purpose of PFEAC is to advise the tenured faculty member about the content and structure of the promotion dossier.
- iii. PFEAC is responsible for making the recommendation for promotion to the Department Chair. All members of PFEAC must participate in committee discussions and formulate committee recommendations. Proxy voting is not permitted. Abstentions should be exercised only in limited and usual circumstances, such as when a conflict of interest has been reported to the Department Chair or College Dean, or other applicable administrator (see section D.7).
- iv. Any minority reports shall be included with the submission of the promotion recommendation. A minority report is a separate report prepared by the member(s) of the committee representing the minority if they disagree with the recommendation of the majority.
- v. From the time PFEAC submits its promotion recommendation, tenured faculty will receive two business days to advance their dossier to the Department Chair. After two business days, the review will auto-advance to the Department Chair. Tenured faculty may add new information to their dossier during those two business days. Tenured faculty are not able to appeal or request reconsideration of PFEAC's promotion recommendation.

h. External Reviews – Tenured faculty submitting their dossiers for promotion must follow UTRGV's External Review Selection Guidelines.

- i. Additional Evidence in Categories of Performance – Once tenured faculty submit their dossier, they may request to update information contained in their dossier at any time during the review process by contacting their Department Chair. The opportunity to update dossiers is independent of any request for reconsideration or appeal during the review process. Newly included materials cannot be reconsidered by previous review levels.

Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review.

- c. Department Committee, Chair, and Dean Reviews – The faculty member will be evaluated at the department committee, chair, and dean levels. Each review level must include a written narrative providing an assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in each review category (e.g., teaching, research, and service). In each review category, the assessment should highlight strengths and weaknesses, provide recommendations for improvement, and recommendations for progress toward the next post-tenure or promotion review.
- d. Performance Ratings – Department-level reviews will rate the faculty member in each evaluation category and with an overall rating for the annual evaluation period with one of the following four (4) ratings: exceeds expectations; meets expectations; does not meet

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 0.63", Hanging: 0.25", Right: 0.09", Tab stops: 0.88", Left + Not at 0.75"

Formatted: Justified



expectations; or unsatisfactory. The department committee, chair, and dean will also provide an overall rating for the comprehensive evaluation period.

- n. Review Levels – Tenured faculty dossiers for promotion shall be reviewed by PFEAC, their Department Chair, Dean, the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Provost.
- e. Additional Evidence of Work Performance – If the department review committee, chair, or dean concludes that the faculty member “does not meet expectations” or is “unsatisfactory” in any category, they may ask the faculty member to provide further evidence of contributions or activity in any areas of concern.
- o. Request for Reconsideration of Promotion Recommendation – Tenured faculty may request a reconsideration of the promotion recommendation made by the Department Chair and Provost. For all other levels of review, tenured faculty are given two business days from the time that the review is posted to move their dossier to the next level of review. Tenured faculty may add new information to their dossier during those two business days. The dossier auto-advances after two business days. For the reconsideration requests of the Department Chair and Provost recommendations, the written request for reconsideration must state grounds for the request and include supporting evidence that will be included in the tenured faculty member’s dossier. The written response to the tenured faculty member must address the substance of the reconsideration request, explaining why the evaluator found the request either to be convincing or unconvincing. The tenured faculty member will have the opportunity to view the response.
  - i. Reconsideration of Department Chair’s Promotion Recommendation – From the time Department Chairs submit their promotion recommendation, tenured faculty will receive five business days to either request reconsideration or advance their recommendation to the Dean. After five business days, the dossier will auto-advance to the Dean. Within this window of five business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information in their dossier. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Department Chair. From the time that Department Chairs receive this request, they have five business days to respond and move the dossier to the Dean. After those five business days, the dossier auto-advances to the Dean. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of Department Chairs’ promotion recommendation is ten business days (five business days for the tenured faculty and five additional business days for the Department Chair).
  - ii. Reconsideration of Provost’s Promotion Recommendation – From the time that the promotion recommendation is submitted by the Provost, tenured faculty will receive ten business days to either request reconsideration or accept the Provost’s recommendation. Within this window of ten business days, tenure-track faculty may request reconsideration and include new information in their dossier. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Provost. From the time the Provost receives this request, the Provost has ten business days to respond. After those ten business days, the Provost’s recommendation, and response if necessary, is sent to the President. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of the Provost’s recommendation for promotion is twenty business days (ten business days for the tenure-track faculty and ten additional

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Justified, Numbered + Level: 3 +  
Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment:  
Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

business days for the Provost).

~~f. President's Review – The Provost will make a recommendation to the President, who will make the final decision. This decision will be reported to the UT System, as applicable. This decision will be timely communicated to the tenured faculty member. A faculty member may request a reconsideration at each of the above levels of review in accordance with the Request for Reconsideration section in Appendix E – Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review.~~

~~a. –~~

~~g. Appeal – If the faculty member is not satisfied with the results of the evaluation, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost/VP who will review the file, including evaluations provided by the previous review levels, and provide a final decision.~~

~~b. –~~

~~h. The dean will communicate the results of the comprehensive periodic evaluations to the Provost and VP or their designee for review and appropriate action.~~

~~e. –~~

~~i. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Outcomes~~

~~–~~

~~i. Merit – The outcome of a faculty member's comprehensive periodic evaluation may be considered in determining eligibility for a merit pay increase, should a merit pay increase be available. To be eligible for a merit pay increase, faculty must be in good standing, meet or exceed expectations and meet or exceed the requirements outlined in the applicable merit guidelines.~~

~~–~~

~~ii. Remediation Plan – If a faculty member receives a rating of "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory" in any of the evaluation areas, the faculty member must develop and submit an action plan by the deadline established by the Provost/VP to the chair and dean for their review and approval. The plan must address the performance weaknesses or concerns and any support to enhance or strengthen the faculty member's performance in the designated area(s). The faculty member's progress towards meeting the goals of the plan shall be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions, as outlined below. If the comprehensive periodic evaluation is "unsatisfactory" in any of the areas, the dean, in consultation with the department chair may recommend a change in the faculty member's workload or recommend additional actions to the Provost/VP.~~

~~–~~

~~iii. Disciplinary Action – A faculty member may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including termination in accordance with Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member, of the Regents' Rules for poor performance or when other good cause exists.~~

**Formatted:** Justified, Right: 0.09", Line spacing: single, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

d. The Provost will send a summary of the institutional comprehensive review outcomes to The University of Texas System.

#### 6. Promotion to Professor

- a. ~~Dossier~~ The faculty member must compile and submit their dossier meeting the requirements outlined in Appendix D by the deadline stated in Pathways.
- b. ~~Review Committees~~ Review committees will be established in accordance with Appendix E ~~Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review.~~
- c. ~~External Reviews~~ Faculty going up for promotion are required to include external reviews of their research in accordance with the department guidelines, or in departments without such guidelines, in accordance with the university guidelines (*Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure*) posted on the Provost's website. The process for obtaining external reviews should start in the long semester prior to the application year as outlined in Pathways.
- d. ~~Review Levels~~ The faculty member will be evaluated at the department committee, chair, college committee, dean, university committee, and Provost/VP levels. Each level of review must include a written narrative providing an assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in each review category. In each review category, the assessment should highlight strengths and weaknesses, provide recommendations for improvement, and provide a recommendation regarding promotion. In the promotion review, the department committee, chair, and dean will provide performance ratings for the comprehensive period and the annual evaluation period, following the guidelines for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Section D.5.d). All levels of review are not required if the organizational structure does not support it.
- e. ~~Additional Evidence of Work Performance~~ Once the promotion dossier is submitted, the faculty member may request to update information such as publications or grants with the permission of the departmental committee or chair. Each level of review may also submit a request through the faculty portfolio system for additional information from the faculty member to be included in the dossier. The correspondence and the additional information shall be included with the dossier for subsequent review levels to consider.
- f. ~~Request for Reconsideration of Promotion Decisions~~ A faculty member may request a reconsideration at each of the above levels of review in accordance with the Request for Reconsideration section in Appendix E.
- g. ~~President's Review~~ The Provost/VP will make a recommendation to the President, who will make the final decision. This decision will be reported to UT System, as applicable. This decision will be timely communicated to the faculty member.

**Formatted:** Character scale: 100%

**Formatted:** Font color: Text 1

**Formatted:** Normal, No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.35" + Indent at: 0.6"

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.35", Hanging: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 0.6"

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.35" + Indent at: 0.6"

**Formatted:** Right: 0", Line spacing: single, Tab stops: Not at 0.85" + 0.85"

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.35" + Indent at: 0.6"

**Formatted:** Justified, Tab stops: Not at 0.75"

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Left, Right: 0", Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.35" + Indent at: 0.6"

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.35" + Indent at: 0.6"

**Formatted:** Right: 0", Line spacing: single, Tab stops: Not at 0.85"

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Space Before: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.35" + Indent at: 0.6"

**Formatted:** Right: 0", Space Before: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, Tab stops: Not at 0.85"

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Right: 0", Line spacing: single, Tab stops: Not at 0.85" + 0.85"

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Right: 0", Line spacing: single, Tab stops: Not at 0.85" + 0.85"

**Formatted**

**Formatted:** Right: 0", Line spacing: single, Tab stops: Not at 0.85"

#### 7.6. Disputing ~~Review/Evaluation~~ Results

This policy provides the procedures for disputing professional judgements provided by reviewer(s) in the reviews addressed by this policy; thus, such disputes must be brought in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in this policy. Complaints concerning other matters addressed by UTRGV or UT System rules or (e.g., discrimination or sexual misconduct) must be brought in accordance with the applicable policy and its procedures (e.g., [UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures Policy ADM 03-100 Non-discrimination and Complaint Procedure](#) or [ADM 03-300 Sexual Misconduct](#)). A grievable action or decision for which there is no other applicable procedure may be brought under [ADM 06-111 Faculty Grievances](#). A faculty member may consult with their chair, dean or designee, or the ~~Office of the~~ Faculty Ombuds with questions about applicable procedures.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.35", Hanging: 0.25", Space Before: 0 pt, Tab stops: Not at 0.6"

#### 7. Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Standards, and Confidentiality

- a. All individuals involved in the review process are expected to maintain the confidentiality of the material under review, the substance of review committee discussions, and the final recommendation. Records related to the review process will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. Any person who knowingly and intentionally makes an unauthorized disclosure of review information is subject to disciplinary action.
- b. It is incumbent on each person involved in the review process to adhere to the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct, focus on factual information, avoid practices that would conflict with the ability to be fair and unbiased, and guard against inaccuracies caused by either undue emphasis or omission of information. This requirement includes:
  - i. The responsibility of each reviewer to identify a situation that would implicate a potential conflict of interest or violation of policy as soon as it arises by reporting it to the appropriate Chair and Dean so that a determination can be made,
  - ii. The responsibility of each reviewer to ensure that they do not participate in a review in violation of Rule 30106, Nepotism, of the Regents' Rules, which prohibit a reviewer from reviewing and taking employment actions with respect to family relations. For example, when the faculty member undergoing review has a family relation with the Department Chair or the Dean, the level where the conflict of interest exists will be skipped, and the file will move to the next level, and
  - iii. The responsibility of each reviewer to ensure that they do not participate in a review in violation of UTRGV and UT System rules including a review in violation Rule 30104, Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, and Outside Activities, of the Regents' Rules, which prohibit an employee from having a direct or indirect interest, including financial and other interests, or engaging in a business transaction or professional activity, or incurring any obligation of any nature that is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of the employee's duties in the public interest.

**Formatted:** Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.35" + Indent at: 0.6"

**Formatted:** Justified, Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.61" + Indent at: 0.85"

**Formatted:** Numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.91" + Indent at: 1.16"

#### **F.E. Definitions**

1. Academic year – the period from September 1 through the following August 31.
2. College – an academic unit organized within UTRGV, which is usually comprised of many departments or provides programs in multiple academic specialties/professional instruction. This academic unit may be referred to as a college or school, and is led by a dean reporting to a designated Provost or Vice President (VP).
3. Department – an academic unit organized within a college, usually devoted to a particular academic discipline. This academic unit may be referred to as a department or school and the unit's head (usually a chair or director) reports to the dean of the college.
4. Department Chair – administrative leader of an academic unit appointed by the dean with the concurrence of the appropriate Provost or VP; may refer to the chair of a department, the director of a school, or other equivalent academic unit.
5. Department Evaluation Guidelines – the guidelines developed by the department or college in accordance with this policy that specify performance criteria, requirements and procedures related to the performance reviews of faculty.
6. Pathways for Review Deadlines or Pathways – The schedule distributed by the Provost or VP each year that provides the dates for each level of faculty performance review, e.g., department committee, chair, dean, etc.
7. Vice President (VP) – The Vice President with administrative authority regarding the faculty in a college.

**G.F. Related Statutes or Regulations, Rules, Policies, or Standards**

[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 10901, Statement of U. T. System Values and Expectations](#)

[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 30501, Employee Evaluations](#)

[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31001, Faculty Appointments and Titles](#)

[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member](#)

[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31102, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)

[Texas Education Code Section 51.942, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)

[Texas Government Code Section 552.102, Public Information Exception: Confidentiality of Certain Personnel Information](#)

[AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#)

**H.G. Dates Reviewed or Amended**

July 15, 2019 – Amended.

September 7, 2022 – Amended and restated in its entirety ADM 06-504 Post-Tenure Review (which focused only on comprehensive periodic evaluations) to address tenured faculty annual reviews (incorporating relevant elements of ADM 06-502 Annual Faculty Evaluation), comprehensive periodic evaluations (post-tenure reviews), and reviews for promotion of tenured associate professors to the rank of professor (incorporating relevant elements of former ADM 06-505 Faculty Tenure and Promotion), and re-naming appropriately.

Formatted: Justified

Handbook of Operating Procedures

APPENDIX A  
DEPARTMENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

**Commented [MC1]:** Appendix A removed. Information pertaining to department guidelines in D.3.f.

1. Development and Approval

- a. An elected committee of full-time faculty will develop the department evaluation guidelines. Eligibility requirements for membership on this committee will be specified in approved department or college policies or procedures.
- b. The department evaluation guidelines committee will submit the guidelines to the voting faculty, as defined by the department's or college's policies or procedures, for review and approval. After faculty approval, the committee will submit the recommended guidelines to the chair(s). The chair will make a recommendation to the dean. If the chair and the dean recommend approval, the dean will promptly submit their recommendations to the Provost for review and a decision. If either the chair or dean do not recommend approval, they must provide their reasons for withholding approval to the voting faculty. The department evaluation development committee will reconvene. The chair or dean should meet with this committee to attempt to resolve the issues with the proposed evaluation guidelines. Any new proposed evaluation guidelines will be submitted to the voting faculty for review and approval. If the differences are not resolved within 60 days from the dean's initial response to the department, the dean will make a recommendation to the Provost regarding the adoption of the department evaluation guidelines.
- c. The elected faculty committee for the development of department evaluation guidelines, the chair, and dean will review the guidelines no less than every six years. The process above will be used regarding any changes proposed by the evaluation guidelines committee, chair, or dean to the department evaluation guidelines. If the department guidelines committee, chair, and dean agree that no changes to the evaluation guidelines are recommended, the dean will promptly submit the recommendation to the Provost for review and a decision.

2. Performance Criteria and Standards

- a. The department evaluation guidelines must articulate performance criteria and standards for each applicable evaluation for tenured faculty (annual, comprehensive periodic and promotion), tenure-track faculty (annual and tenure and promotion) and non-tenure-track faculty (annual and promotion). The guidelines must be in accordance with the general policy principles, including those for tenure and promotion, as applicable, and institutional goals. Departmental evaluation guidelines for the applicable evaluation and evaluation period must:
  - i. describe the performance criteria for each applicable evaluation category in accordance with Appendix B—Evaluation/Review Categories and Standards (e.g., teaching, research, service, patient care);



- ii. discuss the levels of work meriting each performance rating in accordance with Appendix C – Definitions of Performance Ratings;
- iii. provide for how ratings in each review category will be determined for faculty with different workload distributions;
- iv. describe how the overall rating will be determined;
- v. discuss the levels of work meriting promotion considering the purpose of promotion -- to recognize and reward faculty with records of sustained meritorious professional accomplishments and who also demonstrate potential for continued contributions to UTRGV's mission and vision in compliance with the following requirements:
  - 1. the faculty member must have demonstrated a consistent record of performance and productivity in the areas under review accounting for the interconnectedness of these activities;
  - 2. the faculty member must have demonstrated a high potential for continued excellence and effectiveness;
  - 3. the faculty member must have demonstrated effective teaching if teaching is an assigned duty;
  - 4. the faculty member seeking promotion to full professor must have demonstrated substantial service beyond the assistant professor level during the evaluation period, including but not limited to significant service roles outside UTRGV at the national or international levels, if service is assigned;
  - 5. performance standards for promotion to the rank of professor, as outlined in this policy and department evaluation guidelines, will apply regardless of the length of time in the rank of associate professor, and
  - 6. failure to meet the evaluation standards and criteria as determined by institutional policy and processes will result in ineligibility for or denial of promotion;
- vi. specify the procedures and expectations for the following:
  - 1. peer observation of teaching, if teaching is an assigned duty; at a minimum, department guidelines must follow the requirements outlined in the UTRGV Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching;
  - 2. student course evaluation data and student comments, if teaching is an assigned duty; and

3. ~~selection of external reviewers for the promotion review; at a minimum, department guidelines must follow the requirements outlined in the [UTRGV Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure](#).~~
- b. ~~Revisions of a department's evaluation standards and criteria will not be applicable to faculty for two full academic years after official adoption unless the faculty member chooses to be governed by the changes and affirms that choice in writing to the chair.~~
- c. ~~If multiple departments are combined into a single department, then faculty of the combined department will have the choice of being evaluated by the legacy criteria of the appropriate department. The process to develop unified criteria should be completed within two academic years after the formation of the new department.~~
- d. ~~If a department is divided into two or more departments, the promotion criteria of the new departments will be the same as the criteria of the parent department or school unless otherwise approved by the faculty of the new department following procedures described above in [Appendix A.1](#).~~

Handbook of Operating Procedures

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND STANDARDS

~~Evaluation or Review Categories—Faculty evaluations will include a review of the faculty member's professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service, and patient care as assigned per the faculty member's workload percentages. Activities in each category and factors that inform performance ratings are listed below.~~

~~5. Teaching~~

~~a. Teaching activities may include, but are not limited to:~~

~~1. Classroom (including traditional, online, and hybrid) and laboratory instruction;~~

~~2. Development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods;~~

~~3. Development or publication of instructional materials;~~

~~4. Supervision of undergraduate students, graduate students, medical students, or post-docs;~~

~~5. Mentoring, advising, and coaching students;~~

~~6. Experiential learning and community engagement activities pertaining to teaching/instruction, such as service learning, student research (including community-based research), and internships/co-ops;~~

~~7. Competitive funding for instructional/pedagogical development;~~

**Commented [MC2]:** Appendix B will be removed completely and the evaluation categories is now D.2 - Categories of Performance.

**Formatted:** Justified, Indent: Left: 0.1", Right: 0.1", Space Before: 12.25 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.06 li

8. ~~Implementation of tools/practices acquired through professional development workshops; and~~

9. ~~Innovative teaching and pedagogy.~~

b. ~~Factors informing performance ratings include, but are not limited to, peer observation of teaching, pedagogical preparations, teaching-related awards, and student evaluation ratings over the full period under review.~~

6. ~~Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities~~

a. ~~Research/scholarship/creative activities are characterized by the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or creative works and activities including, but not limited to:~~

1. All peer-reviewed publications of the faculty member's research that have been published or accepted for publication in department-determined appropriate outlets within the evaluation period will count towards satisfying the expectations for tenure and promotion;

2. Visual or other artistic contributions in competitive regional and national exhibitions;

3. Adjudicated performances;

4. Development of intellectual property, such as patents and licenses;

5. Competitive, external research funding;

6. Community-based participatory research; and

7. Other community-based research/scholarly/creative activities appropriate to the faculty member's academic discipline.

b. Factors informing performance ratings include, but are not limited to, the quality, significance, impact, and quantity of publications or creative works, as judged by peer review. For purposes of this standard, peer review includes review/adjudication by independent, external, nationally and internationally recognized experts in the faculty member's field. Departments should identify common publications and/or presses in the discipline that do not meet the peer review expectations and standards.

7. Service

a. Service activities can include, but are not limited to:

1. ~~Service to students, colleagues, the department, college, and UTRGV;~~
2. ~~Service to the profession, including academic or professionally related service to disciplinary-based societies, editorial boards, and other educational entities; and~~
3. ~~Professionally related service and outreach to the community, state, nation, and beyond.~~
- b. ~~Factors informing performance ratings in service include, but are not limited to, the quality, significance, and impact of the contributions to students, colleagues, the department, college, UTRGV, the community, and the profession.~~
8. ~~Patient Care~~
- a. ~~Factors in evaluating patient care can include, but are not limited to:~~
1. ~~Patient satisfaction;~~

2. ~~Number of patient encounters;~~
3. ~~Telemedicine;~~
4. ~~UTRGV/community clinic work; and~~
5. ~~Work Relative Value Units (wRVUs).~~



**Handbook of Operating Procedures**

**APPENDIX C**

**DEFINITIONS OF PERFORMANCE RATINGS**

1. *Exceeds expectations*—reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
2. *Meets expectations*—reflects accomplishments commensurate with what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
3. *Does not meet expectations*—indicates a failure as defined by the unit beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.
4. *Unsatisfactory*—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, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. It also means failing to meet expectations based on findings of professional misconduct.

**Commented [MC3]:** Appendix C removed and section included in D.3.e.

Handbook of Operating Procedures

APPENDIX D  
DOSSIER REQUIREMENTS

**Commented [MC4]:** Removal of appendix D.  
Information now in D.3.g.

1. *Scope of Documents and Information in Dossier*
  - a. *Tenured and Non-Tenure Track Annual Review* — The dossier must include the applicable work, documents, and information for the academic year(s) under review.
  - b. *Tenure track Annual Review and 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review* — The dossier must include the applicable work, documents, and information for the full probationary period.
  - c. *Promotion Review* — The dossier must include the faculty member's applicable work, documents, and information for at least the review periods listed below, and as described in the department's guidelines:
    - i. if tenured, review period for promotion to full professor is since the submission of the dossier for tenure.
    - ii. if tenure track, review period for tenure and promotion to associate professor is the full probationary period.
    - iii. if non-tenure track, review period for promotion is since the submission of the dossier for the previous promotion, or if this is the first promotion, since hire.
  - d. *Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation* — The dossier must include the applicable work, documents, and information since the submission of their dossier for their last major review, e.g., tenure, promotion, or comprehensive periodic evaluation.
2. Review dossiers must include the following, related to the faculty member's title, rank, and assigned responsibilities:
  - a. All faculty must include:
    - i. A current curriculum vitae
    - ii. Summaries of professional accomplishments in:
      1. Teaching
      2. Research and scholarship
      3. Service
      4. Patient Care

- iii. ~~Peer evaluations of teaching as per the department guidelines, or in the case of departments without such guidelines, UTRGV's Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching.~~
- iv. ~~A summary statement of professional goals, or a proposed professional development plan, leading to the next comprehensive and/or promotion review. This is optional for faculty in a terminal rank (Professor, Senior Lecturer, Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice).~~
- v. ~~Any other materials or supporting documentation as per the department or college criteria.~~
- vi. ~~Faculty portfolio system-generated reports:~~
  - 1. ~~Student evaluations of teaching~~
  - 2. ~~Workload document~~
  - 3. ~~Previous department-level evaluation(s)~~
- b. ~~For all promotion reviews, as well as the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, the following materials are also required:~~
  - i. ~~A narrative of professional accomplishments for the entire review period related to the faculty member's individual goals (as stated in number iv., above) and the department's guidelines/criteria.~~
  - ii. ~~For tenure and promotion reviews to Associate Professor and Professor, the dossier must also include external review reports.~~
- 3. ~~Faculty will use the faculty portfolio system(s) designated by UTRGV to submit their material.~~
- 4. ~~Dossier Preparation~~

~~Faculty may contact the Office of Faculty Success and Diversity for assistance in preparing their dossier or to participate in scheduled workshops.~~

Handbook of Operating Procedures

APPENDIX E

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND REQUIREMENTS REGARDING THE REVIEW

1. Review Committees – Guiding Principles

a. Department Annual Reviews

- i. Committees must include three or more full-time faculty members;
- ii. Reviews must be done by committee members at an equivalent or higher rank than the faculty being reviewed;
- iii. Committees should include reviewers of similar faculty titles (to the faculty being reviewed) and a combination of faculty across titles and ranks who are eligible to serve;
- iv. Tenured faculty are eligible to review faculty of all titles.

b. Department Action Reviews (3<sup>rd</sup>-Year, Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation)

- i. Committees must include three or more full-time faculty members;
- ii. Reviews must be done by committee members at a higher rank than the faculty being reviewed with the exception of the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation of full professors, which should be done by full professors;
- iii. Committees should include reviewers of similar faculty titles (to the faculty being reviewed) and a combination of faculty across titles and ranks who are eligible to serve;
- iv. Tenured faculty are eligible to review faculty of all titles;

v. Department committees reviewing faculty for tenure and promotion to associate professor shall have no fewer than three members but must include at least 1/3 of all the tenured professors appointed at least half time in the department if there are more than 10 who so qualify, with eligibility as defined in the department's approved written policies or procedures. This committee will be elected by the voting members of the department faculty.

- 1. When the department promotion committee is comprised of less than a committee of the whole, all tenured faculty with at least a half-time appointment in the department shall have access to the dossiers of faculty members who are applying for tenure. The committee will report its recommendations and justifications to all tenured faculty in the department, who shall vote (following department policies

**Commented [MC5]:** No longer needed. Relevant information included in policy above.

~~or procedures) on whether to recommend that the faculty member be granted tenure and promoted.~~

- ~~2. Promotion from associate to full professor will follow the same procedures with the reviewers limited to full professors.~~

~~c. Department Committee Formation~~

- ~~i. Review committees are elected by the department faculty by the date listed in the Pathways. The composition of each committee must be voted on by the full-time faculty and must comply with the department guidelines. In instances where the composition of the department does not align with the requirements outlined in the department's guidelines, the faculty may elect to alter the committee composition.~~
- ~~ii. All ranks being reviewed are eligible to vote on committee membership;~~
- ~~iii. Committee members do not need to be eligible to review all department faculty; all reviews must still include three or more faculty reviewers;~~
- ~~iv. For tenure-track and tenure and promotion reviews, when there are fewer than three tenured faculty members eligible to review the faculty member(s) undergoing review, the dean will invite eligible tenured faculty members from other departments to participate as members of the department review committee. All tenured faculty in the department will have an opportunity to recommend outside faculty to serve on the committee; the dean will make the selection after consulting with the department chair.~~
- ~~v. If there is only one eligible faculty member from the department/school to serve on the faculty review committee, that faculty member will serve as the chair of the review committee.~~

~~d. College Committee Requirements~~

- ~~i. The College Tenure and Promotion Committee shall have at least one representative from each department, elected by the department tenured and tenure-track faculty, and will be composed only of tenured faculty members appointed at least half time in the College.~~
- ~~ii. In colleges where a faculty member is seeking promotion to professor, if the College Tenure and Promotion Committee has member(s) who are not full professors, the college shall form a separate committee of full professors to consider the promotion to full professor following the same process as indicated in [Appendix E.1.c.iv](#).~~

~~e. University Tenure and Promotion Committee Requirements~~

- ~~i. The Faculty Senate shall recommend two tenured professors from each college by the deadline established in Pathways to form a pool from which the Provost will select members to serve on the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.~~

- ~~ii. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee shall include at least one tenured professor from each college who is appointed at least half time in the respective college.~~
- ~~iii. The Provost may select no more than two additional members from a list of eligible tenured professors throughout UTRGV.~~
- ~~iv. Members of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee shall each serve three-year terms. Terms will be staggered to ensure continuity.~~
- ~~v. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee shall elect a chair from among its members at the rank of full professor.~~
- ~~f. The chair of each review committee must be elected by the committee members.~~
- ~~g. Faculty members with part-time administrative positions are eligible to serve on review committees, with the exception of the department chair and associate deans who may be involved in the evaluation review as part of their administrative duties.~~

## ~~2. Requirements Regarding the Review~~

### ~~a. Schedule of Reviews~~

- ~~i. Each level of review shall be conducted in accordance with the timelines provided in Pathways.~~
- ~~ii. Each level of review shall not begin until the preceding level is complete.~~
- ~~iii. All levels of review stated in this policy are not required if not supported by the institutional organizational structure; when the organizational structure does not allow for a specific review level, the administrative leader of the unit may designate an additional reviewer which, if designated, will be shown in Pathways.~~

### ~~b. Criteria and Standards~~

~~All levels of review will use the department's evaluation guidelines as the basis upon which to evaluate a faculty member.~~

### ~~c. Review of Files and Voting~~

#### ~~i. Committee Reviews~~

- ~~1. All those involved in the review process are responsible for reading all materials, reviewing and evaluating the faculty member's performance on each of the performance criteria, and participating in committee discussions and formulating of committee recommendations.~~

~~2. Proxy voting is not permitted.~~

~~3. Abstentions should be exercised only in limited and unusual circumstances, such as when a conflict of interest has been reported to the chair, dean or other applicable administrator in accordance with [Appendix E.3.b.i](#).~~

~~4. Any minority reports shall be included with the submission of the evaluation. A minority report is a separate report prepared by the member(s) of the committee representing the minority if they disagree with the performance evaluation given by the committee majority.~~

~~ii. Faculty with Joint Appointments—Committee Review~~

~~The performance reviews provided for in this policy will be conducted by the home department. If the faculty member or chair believe that they would benefit from the input of the other department, either may submit a written request to the dean with the rationale for the request. If the dean determines that the home department would benefit from the input of the other department the dean will request a review from the appropriate department review committee to be shared with the home department committee and chair.~~

~~iii. All Reviewers~~

~~1. Previous levels of evaluation shall be considered by the subsequent reviewers.~~

~~2. Reviews from previous review cycles should be considered during subsequent reviews.~~

~~3. A person is only eligible to participate in the discussion and vote exactly one time, and only on the lowest available review level. They must recuse themselves from participating in voting and discussion at higher review levels but will be available for consultation.~~

~~4. The reviewers' narratives should focus only on performance; they must not include speculation regarding the reason for performance.~~

~~d. [Request for Reconsideration](#)~~

~~Faculty may request a reconsideration of their evaluation as provided in the main body of the policy.~~

~~i. Request—A request for reconsideration must be submitted in writing no more than ten business days after the faculty member has been notified of the recommendation. The written request for reconsideration must state grounds for the request and include supporting evidence that will be included in the faculty member's dossier.~~

~~ii. Response—The review level receiving the request will submit a written response to the faculty member within ten business days of receipt of the request. The response should address the substance of the reconsideration request, explaining why the committee or evaluator found the request either to be convincing or unconvincing. The response will be sent to the faculty member and placed in his or her evaluation dossier before forwarding the materials to the next level of evaluation.~~

~~iii. Newly included materials cannot be reconsidered by previous review levels.~~

~~e. Appeal~~

~~An appeal to the Provost/VP, as outlined in this policy, must be submitted within ten business days of receiving the response regarding the decision being appealed.~~

~~3. Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Standards, and Confidentiality~~

~~a. All individuals involved in the review process are expected to maintain the confidentiality of the material under review, the substance of review committee discussions, and the final recommendation. Records related to the review process will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. Any person who knowingly and intentionally makes an unauthorized disclosure of review information is subject to disciplinary action.~~

~~b. It is incumbent on each person involved in the review process to adhere to the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct, focus on factual information, avoid practices that would conflict with the ability to be fair and unbiased, and guard against inaccuracies caused by either undue emphasis or omission of information. This requirement includes:~~

~~i. the responsibility of each reviewer to identify a situation that would implicate a potential conflict of interest or violation of policy as soon as it arises by reporting it to the appropriate chair and dean so that a determination can be made;~~

~~ii. the responsibility of each reviewer to ensure that they do not participate in a review in violation of Rule 30106, Nepotism, of the Regents' Rules, which prohibit a reviewer from reviewing and taking employment actions with respect to family relations. For example, when the faculty member undergoing review has a family relation with the department chair or the dean, the level where the conflict of interest exists will be skipped, and the file will move to the next level; and~~

~~iii. the responsibility of each reviewer to ensure that they do not participate in a review in violation of UTRGV and UT System rules including a review in violation Rule 30104, Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, and Outside Activities, of the Regents' Rules, which prohibit an employee from having a direct or indirect interest, including financial and other interests, or engaging in a business transaction or professional activity, or incurring any obligation of any nature that is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of the employee's duties in the public interest.~~