

College of Sciences  
Department of Physics  
Faculty Post-Tenure Review Criteria,  
Policies and Procedures

## 1. PURPOSE

The Department of Physics in accordance with UTRGV policies (ADM 06-504) and UT System Regent's Rules supports a system of post-tenure review for all tenured faculty members. The purpose of the post-tenure review is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate, and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to UTRGV and to the State of Texas. All Physics faculty members are evaluated annually with a comprehensive post-tenure review occurring every **six years** following the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. When they coincide, the comprehensive review will include the Faculty Annual Review. When they coincide, the information provided for the review of an endowed position (e.g., endowed professor or endowed chair) may be incorporated into the appropriate elements of the comprehensive review. Under special circumstances, such as approved leave, each of these reviews may be delayed with the approval of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA).

## 2. PROCEDURES

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

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

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

### **3. CRITERIA**

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

Faculty post-tenure review criteria must include three basic competency areas – *teaching, research & scholarship*, and *service* – which must be evaluated in accordance with the faculty member's annual workload commitment in each competency area and responsibilities within the department, the college, and the university during the entire review period. In accordance with UTRGV policies and UT System Regent's Rules, four performance levels are used to evaluate each area of competence: *exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations*, and *unsatisfactory*.

### **4. DOCUMENT REVISION**

The current criteria can be revised as necessitated by submitting a request to the Dean. The Dean will review and forward the revised document for consideration of the upper administration. The departmental bylaws may also be consulted with as appropriate.

#### **4.1 Varying workload choice**

In case of different levels of workload choices over the period of evaluation, a weighted sum of the expected outcome consistent with the workload level will be used.

#### **5.1 Teaching**

Evaluation criteria for teaching effectiveness will typically include, but are not limited to, student evaluations of teaching, peer-review of teaching, teaching awards and honors, curriculum and course development (including online, hybrid, and distance education

classes), activities that promote student success, advising and mentoring activities and student/teacher training grant funding.

To *meet expectations* in teaching, a faculty member will typically achieve *all* of the following:

- Y Taught assigned workload consistent with the workload assignment.
- Y Obtained satisfactory student evaluation averaged over all classes taught
- Y Obtained satisfactory peer evaluation.

To *exceed expectations* in teaching, a faculty member typically should *meet expectations* in teaching and demonstrate other significant accomplishments, including (but not limited to) any one out of the following:

- Y Received external grant funding for student/teacher training.
- Y Won a significant teaching/mentoring award.
- Y Developed innovative teaching and other significant pedagogy.
- Y Textbook or a book chapter on pedagogy published.
- Y Taught at least three fully enrolled graduate classes or three large (>80 students) sections
- Y Received  $\geq 80\%$  average student evaluation over all the courses taught where the average student evaluation score is calculated as follows: E-score = (Number of students who participated in the evaluation ) \* overall rating) for each class taught; Final score = [(Total E-score over all classes)/(Total number of students who participated in the evaluation over all classes)] \* 100

## 5.2 Research & Scholarship

This section provides guidelines for evaluation in the form of criteria that may be used for judging faculty performance. The department recognizes that the qualitative nature of these criteria and the objectivity of evaluation are not mutually exclusive. While quantification sets a goal to achieve the department's mission and vision, categorically pre-set numbers may disincentivize self-driven achievement and hinder recognition of true excellence. To this end, the document provides *typical expectations* for each level of performance. The department chair and the departmental post-tenure committee will make a judicious decision of the overall productivity by taking variations around these typical expectations into account on a case-by-case basis while ensuring that these variations are never below the standards expected across the department.

Criteria for evaluating *research & scholarship* effectiveness include, but are not limited to, peer reviewed research publications (including pedagogy research) in quality journals in the field and other acceptable forms of scholarly output such as book chapters and books, patents, invited and contributed presentations at professional meetings/conferences and seminars, research grant proposals submitted and funded, number and performance of high school, undergraduate, and graduate students mentored in research, and relevant awards and honors.

### 5.2.1. Nature and quality of publications

The committee members will reflect upon quality of papers published, impact of research, and submitted grants in their review. In case of large collaborations, individual contributions may be supported by indicators such as MOU review reports, corresponding author status, etc.

To *meet expectations* in research & scholarship, a faculty member will typically achieve the following, with specific numbers depending upon the faculty member's % research appointment:

- Y X peer-reviewed research publications in quality journals in the field.
- Y Y externally-funded research grant proposals submitted or already a PI or co-PI on an existing externally funded grant or a senior person with a definite budget on an existing significant externally funded research grant.
- Y Z scholarly presentations made by the faculty member or by high-school, undergraduate, and/or graduate students mentored by the faculty member at conferences or invited talks at major institutions. (Faculty members may request substitution of scholarly presentations with additional publications and/or conference proceedings.)
- Y Mentored W or more graduate students successfully through completion of a Master's or Ph.D. thesis or undergraduate students through the completion of an Honors thesis or demonstrated evidence of strong research mentoring through W or more publications with student co-authors.

The X, Y, Z, W numbers are given below for each level of research commitment.

24 LHE per academic year, any two of X=2, Y=1, Z=2, W=1.

21 LHE per academic year, any *two* of X=3, Y=1, Z=3, W=1.

18 LHE per academic year, *any three* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=4, Y=1, Z=5, W=2.

15 LHE per academic year, *any three* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=5, Y=1, Z=6, W=2.

12 LHE per academic year, *any three* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=6, Y=1, Z=8, W=2.

9 LHE per academic year, *any three* of (or some reasonable combination thereof as per the departmental committee's and the department chair's judgement call) X=7, Y=1, Z=10, W=3.

6 LHE per academic year, *any three* of X=8, Y=1, Z=12, W=4.

To *exceed expectations* in research & scholarship, a faculty member should have met expectations in research & scholarship and demonstrated one other significant accomplishment, including (but not limited to) those from the list below.

- Y Published one or more papers in a top-tier journal in quality journals in the field.
- Y Received external grant funding as a PI or as a co-PI/senior person with significant allocated budget for research expenditure.
- Y One or more invited scholarly presentations at national/international conferences or invited seminars at other universities/institutes/national labs.
- Y An award received by the faculty member or by a high school, undergraduate, or graduate student mentored by the faculty member at national/international conferences.
- Y Won a significant research-related award.
- Y Was granted a patent.
- Y Developed a new laboratory or program with significant research and mentoring impact.

### **5.2.2. Exceptional scholarship recognition**

Publication(s) in exceptional top tier journals (e.g. Nature, Science, Physical Review Letters or other high impact journals), obtaining patents, receiving significant grants as PI or co-PI, publication of a book and equivalent achievements will be recognized by the departmental post-tenure committee and the Department Chair by waiver of other evaluation criteria and by recommending for ‘exceeds expectation.’

### **5.3 Service**

Evaluation criteria for service effectiveness should include, but not limited to, both the quantitative and qualitative assessments of the faculty member’s contributions to student, staff, faculty, department, college, university, profession, and community success. Quantitative metrics of service activities may include numbers of committees, student recruitment events, judging events, community outreach and engagement events, journal articles reviewed, grants reviewed, editorships of journals, etc. Qualitative metrics of service effectiveness should describe the faculty member’s initiatives and contributions, leadership roles, mentorships and development of junior faculty, impact, and relevant recognitions and awards received.

Faculty members will be evaluated based on their Service commitment.

To *meet expectations* in service with basic service appointment faculty member will typically achieve *all* the following:

- Y Compliance with all departmental, college, university, and UT System policies
  - Y Positive contribution to one committee at any level, including approved ad hoc ones, in the university per year and positive contribution to at least one professional or community service activity per year
- Or

Positive contribution to more than one committee at any level, including approved ad hoc ones, in the university per year

Overall, faculty members at the basic service appointment are expected to have positive contributions to at least two service activities per year

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

- Y Significant achievement in leadership of a committee at any level within the university
- Y Significant achievement in leadership of an uncompensated professional service activity
- Y Significant achievement in leadership of an uncompensated community service activity

The departmental post-tenure committee will decide about the impact and significance of these activities. Moreover, the evaluation committee may place a faculty member in the area of 'exceeds expectations' in Service if the faculty has a positive contribution to a number of University committees and/or professional service activities and/or community service activities, which clearly exceeds the basic service commitment.

Service appointments that are in excess of the basic level as defined above (with a corresponding decrease in teaching load) must be approved by the Department Chair and the Dean. Such appointments include service as Associate Department Chair, Undergraduate or Graduate Coordinator, Director of a formally recognized center, etc. Such service appointees receive a maximum of one course release per semester depending upon the scope of the work. These faculty members also maintain a basic service commitment, with a 12 LHE per academic year teaching commitment, and a research and scholarship commitment corresponding to 9-hour workload per academic year. Annual expectations for the additional *service* commitment must be clearly defined and communicated to the appointee prior to making such an appointment and to the departmental Annual Review Committee (ARC), Tenure & Promotion Review Committee (TPRC), and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC).

Administrative appointments are also considered service appointments. Appointments including Associate Deans, Department Chairs and School Directors are given two course releases per semester. These faculty members also maintain a basic service commitment, with a 6 LHE per academic year teaching commitment, and a research and scholarship commitment corresponding to 9-hour workload per academic year.

The relative percentage of teaching and research appointment may be negotiated at the time of acceptance of these well-recognized administrative appointments. Faculty members holding these extra service/administrative appointments are evaluated by the department committees and the Department Chair, and by the Dean. Faculty holding

college or university level administrative/service appointments are evaluated by the Dean and/or faculty member's immediate supervisor with respect to their service.

To *meet expectations* in service commitment above the basic, a faculty member typically should produce *all* the following:

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

To *exceed expectations* in service commitment above the basic, a faculty member typically should fulfill all the requirements for the *meets expectations* outlined above and demonstrate *any one* of the following:

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

## 6. OVERALL RATING

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

A faculty member who receives *does not meet expectations* in two lead competency areas will receive an overall *unsatisfactory* rating. *Unsatisfactory* rating means failing to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, or contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

## 7. OUTCOMES OF POST-TENURE REVIEW

Outcomes of the post-tenure review described here are based on the UTRGV Post-Tenure Review Policy (ADM 06-504) guidelines. If the final result of the comprehensive performance review is *exceeds expectations*, or *meets expectations*, the faculty member will not undergo another comprehensive performance review for six years unless a comprehensive review is required as a result of subsequent annual reviews.

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

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

If the comprehensive performance review is *unsatisfactory* in any of the 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 Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA). If the overall result of a comprehensive performance review results in an overall *unsatisfactory* rating, this may result in an additional review by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), or designee to determine if good cause exists for termination under Regents' Rules 31008 and 31102. An *unsatisfactory* rating means failing to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, or contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. Each department/school that specifies the standards for exceeding, meeting, and failing to meet expectations should also specify the criteria for performance that is unsatisfactory.

## 8. APPEALS

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

## 9. APPENDIX

LHE=3 for 3 credit undergraduate classes with  $\geq 10$  students

LHE=4.5 for 3 credit graduate classes with  $\geq 5$  students



LHE=2 for a 1 credit 3 contact hour lab

LHE= 3 for a 2 credit 3 contact hour lab

LHE=0.6 per graduate student supervision or independent study

LHE=0.3 per 3-credit undergraduate student research or independent study

LHE= 0.5 per 3 credit graduate thesis class

LHE=1.0 per 3 credit doctoral thesis class