DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT, & PROMOTION OF LECTURERS

Approved by Department Vote on May 12, 2017.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

1. All Lecturers, including Senior Lecturers, 3-Year Lecturers, and 1-Year Lecturers shall be evaluated annually in accordance with the Department of Political Science Evaluation Criteria and Standards for Annual Review, Reappointment, & Promotion of Lecturers and according to the schedule established each year in the UTRGV Provost’s Pathways Document.

2. For Lecturers with multi-year appointments (i.e., 2 to 3 years), each subsequent annual evaluation shall be cumulative in nature, i.e., all relevant achievements and activities since the faculty member’s last major review (e.g., reappointment or promotion) will be included in the faculty member’s dossier.

3. The candidate’s annual evaluation folder shall include a current curriculum vita, copies of teaching evaluations, syllabi, and testing instruments, and proof of service, as well as any other materials the candidate considers relevant to documenting their academic performance. The dossier shall include a grid documenting the requisite number of points in various categories. The organization of materials in the folder shall be in the same format as required for tenure and promotion evaluation folders.1

4. Each faculty member is required to maintain a cumulative and annual total of activity points awarded to them each year in each category of evaluation and to include this information in their dossier.

5. Each annual evaluation shall describe, quantitatively and qualitatively, the candidate’s annual yearly progress2 (see Definition 2) toward meeting the criteria for reappoint and/or promotion in the two areas of teaching effectiveness and professional service (see Appendix A.1).

6. A lecturer may submit evidence of research, publication, and other professional achievements, which the Annual Review Committee may take into consideration, although

---

1 Available at http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/UTRGV-Format-for-Faculty-Review-Dossier.pdf
2 See, Guidelines for Implementation of Annual Yearly Progress, included as Appendix A.1 of this document.
Lecturers are not required to be active in this category of evaluation.

7. A Lecturer who receives an evaluative rating of unsatisfactory, does not meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for annual yearly progress shall automatically receive the same evaluative rating for purposes of merit pay in that year.3

8. Lecturers shall be informed in writing of their evaluation based on their performance as reflected in their dossier, in accordance with the Pathways document. Each level of review (i.e., committee and chair) must include a written narrative highlighting strengths of the faculty member’s performance, as well as recommendations for improvement, if deemed necessary, by the committee.

9. Lecturers can appeal the results of the annual review in writing at each level of department review. If the faculty member making an appeal is not satisfied with the department committee or chair level evaluation after an appeal, the faculty member may request a review by a college committee, who will make a recommendation to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

10. All Lecturers seeking reappointment and/or promotion must meet the minimum approved requirements in teaching effectiveness and professional service.

11. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide a complete annual review dossier adhering to University and Departmental requirements. Department mentors and the Department Chair should provide guidance in this process. Additional documentation may be requested by the Committee and/or Department Chair in the course of the evaluation process.

**DEFINITIONS**

1. All references to quantitative “student evaluation ratings” shall be on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being the lowest possible rating and 5.0 being the highest possible rating.

2. The specific requirements for exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, and unsatisfactory in a category of evaluation are defined in “Guidelines Toward Annual Yearly Progress,” which is incorporated into this document as Appendix A.1).

3. For a Summary Rating of Exceeds Expectations in an Annual, Reappointment, or Promotion Review, a Lecturer must exceed expectations in Teaching Effectiveness and at least meet expectations in Professional Service.

4. For a Summary Rating of Meets Expectations in an Annual, Reappointment, or Promotion Review, a Lecturer must at least meet expectations in both Teaching Effectiveness and

---

3 UTRGV HOP ADM 06-502.5.a: “The outcome of each faculty member’s annual performance evaluation will be used in determining the amount of merit awarded to the faculty member, should merit pay be available.”
Professional Service.

5. For a Summary Rating of Does Not Meet expectations in an Annual, Reappointment, or Promotion Review, a Lecturer must meet expectations in Teaching Effectiveness and not meet expectations in Professional Service.

6. For a Summary Rating of Unsatisfactory in an Annual, Reappointment, or Promotion Review, a Lecturer must not meet expectations in Teaching Effectiveness.
TEACHING

The minimum teaching requirements to meet expectations for Annual Review, Reappointment, and Promotion for Lecturers are: (1) the satisfaction of the minimum criterion of Activity 1 below, (2) an overall student evaluation rating of 3.5, (3) the accumulation of at least 2.5 activity points per year from the Activities outlined below, and (4) evidence of peer observation of teaching.⁴

The minimum teaching requirements to exceed expectations for Annual Review, Reappointment, and Promotion for Lecturers are: (1) the satisfaction of the minimum criterion of Activity 1 below; (2) an overall student evaluation rating of 4.5, (3) the accumulation of at least 3.5 activity points per year from the Activities outlined below, and (4) evidence of peer observation of teaching.⁵

The Department Promotion and Tenure committee will be responsible for evaluating the quality of each activity, including but not limited to verifying that each activity was accomplished, judging the activity by standards of the department’s policy, and guidance by the American Association of University Professor recommendations (e.g., in the case of workshops, the regional level of the workshop, and the quality of the program).

Activities:

1.  No more than 10% of the average of responses of the student evaluations for the evaluation period as a whole falling below the neutral category (e.g., below 3 on a 1 to 5 point scale with 5 being the highest possible rating).

2.  A faculty member shall be awarded activity points for teaching as follows:

   “70% to 79% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (0.5 points per semester).

   “80% to 89% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (1.0 points per semester).

   “90% to 100% of all responses on the student evaluation forms, for each semester of the evaluation period, falling in the Agree and/or Strongly Agree categories (1.5 points per semester).

The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information in addition to student evaluations. The

---

⁴ See Appendix A.1. of Evaluation Criteria and Standards for Annual Review, Reappointment, & Promotion of Lecturers. Point requirements are pro-rated for one-year lecturers and for first year of 3-year lecturer contracts (when individuals are reviewed for only one semester’s work).

⁵ See Appendix A.1. of Evaluation Criteria and Standards for Annual Review, Reappointment, & Promotion of Lecturers. Point requirements are pro-rated for one-year lecturers and for first year of 3-year lecturer contracts (when individuals are reviewed for only one semester’s work).
relevant review committee and the Department Chair will also take into account the following considerations in evaluating teaching effectiveness, where applicable:

- The quality and rigor of course tools, such as examinations, syllabi, written assignments (e.g., papers, white papers), oral presentations in the class, and other course assignments,
- Clarity of classroom materials and presentations (e.g., PowerPoints),
- The use of teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content,
- The clarity and specificity of course goals and learning objectives,
- The fostering of an appreciation for different points of view,
- The complexity of the subject matter and its level of difficulty for students,
- Whether the course is required or elective,
- Whether the course provides a service to non-majors.

Individual faculty are responsible for providing a narrative (and supporting documentation, if applicable) that will allow the relevant review committee to incorporate these considerations into its evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.

3. Attendance at teaching workshops and/or seminars on appropriate course areas, including online teaching training and certification(s):
   a. “Lunch-time” sessions (0.5 points),
   b. COLTT Online teaching certification (2.0 points),
   c. Quality Matters online teaching certification (2.0 points),
   d. Center for Teaching Excellence Learning Communities, 3 or more sessions on one topic) (2.0 points),
   e. New Faculty Orientation (2.0 points if attended at least 75% of activities)
   f. Other teaching training activities to be calculated as:
      i. Less than 2 hours with no individual work (0.5 points),
      ii. more than 2 hours with assessment and/or individual work included (2.0 points).

4. Development of teaching materials, such as banks of test questions, computer exercises, workbooks that are available for use by the entire department, etc. (1.0 point each).

5. Development of new undergraduate courses (2.0 point each) with credit awarded only after course has been approved by the department curriculum committee and taught for the first time by the faculty member who developed the course.

6. New course preparations, i.e., teaching a previously existing course for the first time (1.0 point per course).
7. Arranged courses, independent study, student research for academic presentation, chairing an Honors project (1.0 point each).

8. Recognitions, honors, and awards (up to a maximum of 6.0 points):
   a. by The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (1.0 point each),
   b. by The University of Texas System (2.0 points each),
   c. by statewide (3.0 points each) or national private or non-profit entities (4.0 points each).

9. Incorporation of experiential learning pedagogy(ies) into classes, including but not limited to service learning, community engagement, etc. (0.5 points per semester per class up to a maximum of 2 points per year if approved by the UTRGV Office of Student Engagement; otherwise at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee).

10. Study abroad or teaching abroad (1.0 points per semester).

11. Teaching an online class during a regular semester session (0.25 points per class per semester up to a maximum of 2.0 points in each 3 year evaluation cycle).

12. Teaching a course during a regular semester via Interactive Television (ITV) that involves holding at least five (5) regular classes on a campus that is not the faculty member’s assigned home campus (0.5 points per course per semester).

13. Teaching a face-to-face course during a regular semester at a site or campus that is not the faculty member’s assigned home campus (1.0 points per course per semester).

SERVICE

The minimum service requirement to meet expectations for Annual Review, Reappointment, and Promotion for Lecturers is the accumulation of an average of at least 1.0 service point per year from the Activities listed below.

The minimum service requirement to exceed expectations for Annual Review, Reappointment, and Promotion for Lecturers is the accumulation of an average of at least 2.0 service points per year from the Activities listed below.

The Department Annual Review Committee will evaluate the quality as well as the quantity of the service activities.

Activities:

1. Chair of the Faculty Senate, Associate Dean, Center Director (4.0 points per year).

2. Secretary to the Department (3.0 points per year).

3. Department Web Liaison (2.0 points per year).
4. Department Social Media Liaison (1.5 points per year),

5. Chair of a College or University Committee, Member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, Chair of a University-wide initiative or organization, Conference Organizer, Chair or President of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization, Department Library Liaison, or program coordinator for an international program (1.5 points each per year).

6. Chair of a Department committee, member of the Faculty Senate, Sponsor/Advisor of a student organization; Officer (below the rank of chair/president) of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization; Program Coordinator (1.5 points each per year).

7. Member of a Department committee, including committees in other departments and degree programs, college level committees, and university level committees (1.0 point per committee per year). The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair will have discretion to make upward adjustments to point awards in years when specific committees carry a heavier than usual workload.

8. Referee for scholarly journal or grant/research proposal (0.50 points per article/proposal).

8. Referee for a complete book manuscript (0.75 points).

10. Editor or managing editor of an academic journal (4.0 points); guest editor of an academic journal (1.0 points per issue); associate editor or book review editor of an academic journal (0.5 points per year); editorial board member (0.25 points per year).

11. Discipline-related presentations to units of UTRGV or community organizations (0.25 points per presentation up to a maximum of 2 points annually).

12. Serving as panel chair (0.25 points per activity) or discussant (0.50 points per activity) at a professional or scholarly conference (up to a maximum of 1 point per year).

13. Writing an opinion piece or editorial for a newspaper (0.25 point per activity up to an annual maximum of 1.0 point).

14. 10 hours of student advisement in an academic year. Advisement refers to developmental advising and not meeting with students about coursework, etc. (1 point per year up to a maximum of 2 points per year).

15. On-going partnership (meetings, consultations) with community-based organization(s) to be documented via written report of activity and letters of acknowledgment from the organization(s) involved (1 point per 10 hours of engagement, maximum 2 points per year).

16. Testimony before governmental panels, including legislative committees, administrative organizations, and judicial bodies (2.0 points per activity).
17. Author of an applied policy report or research-based ‘white paper’ that is sponsored by, prepared for, or funded by a governmental, private, or non-profit organization (2.0 points per activity).

18. Media citations and interviews (e.g., quotes in newspaper, radio, television) (0.1 point each not to exceed 5.0 points per year).

19. Serving as a peer observer and writing a peer observation report for another faculty member (1.0 point per peer observation report)

20. Teaching summer session courses (1.0 point per course).

**APPENDIX A.1. GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS TOWARD REAPPOINTMENT AND/OR PROMOTION FOR LECTURERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Year</th>
<th>Summary Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Requirement - Student Evaluations</td>
<td>&lt;10% below neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation Rating*</td>
<td>3.5 to 4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Requirement - Student Evaluations</td>
<td>&lt;10% below neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation Rating*</td>
<td>4.5 to 5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Activity Points (cumulative)***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Annual Review Committee has flexibility to deviate from this guideline based on factors such as teaching load, class size, type of class (e.g., required statistics), quality of syllabi and testing instruments, rigor of grading, and peer observation.

***Faculty are required to maintain a cumulative total of activity points awarded to them each year in each category of evaluation and include this information in their dossier for purposes of contract renewal and promotion.*