

**Policies for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Faculty Tenure & Promotion Review, Post-Tenure Review,
and Merit Determination**

Approved by WLS . April 17, 2017

Relevant Policies from the [Handbook of Operating Procedures \(HOP\)](#)

- [ADM 06-501](#) Faculty Workload
- [ADM 06-502](#) Annual Faculty Evaluation
- [ADM 06-504](#) Post-Tenure Review
- [ADM 06-505](#) Faculty Tenure and Promotion

EVPA's Review Guidelines & Materials

- [Pathways for Review Deadlines](#)
- [Format for Faculty Review Dossier](#)
- [Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#)
- [Selection of External Reviewers](#)
- [Summary of Teaching Evaluations](#)
- [Summary of Teaching Achievements](#)
- [Summary of Research/Scholarships](#)
- [Summary of Service](#)
- [Tenure-Track, Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Routing Form](#)
- [Annual Evaluation, Tenure-Track, Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Recommendation Form](#)
- [Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines](#)
- [Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers, Professors in Practice and Clinical Faculty](#)
- [Non-Tenure Track Annual Evaluation, Promotion Recommendation Form](#)
- [Non-Tenure Track Promotion Routing Form](#)

I. REVIEW PHILOSOPHY

The Writing & Language Studies Department (WLS) is a large academic unit composed of scholars working in several related yet substantially diverse fields of inquiry including Rhetoric and Composition, English and Spanish Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, English as a Second Language (ESL), English for Speakers of Other Languages, (ESOL), Modern Languages, and Spanish Creative Writing. This diversity makes it difficult to codify evaluation criteria that are equitable, insightful, and sufficiently specific enough to apply to all faculty members' activities, especially in the area of Research/Scholarship. Among WLS colleagues working in different disciplines, quantification of scholarly production alone is an unreliable evaluation criterion, since scholarship can take many forms and is subject to vastly different circumstances of scrutiny within professional communities. Furthermore, WLS faculty base substantive and meaningful evaluation of themselves and their departmental colleagues on impact of scholarly output and not on quantity alone.

The department therefore advocates a more general, multifaceted system of guidelines for performance evaluation which ensures that faculty activity in all disciplinary areas and of all ranks have sufficient opportunity to demonstrate both the quantity and the professional impact of their work. This philosophy is the foundation for all departmental evaluations: Annual Reviews, Tenure, Post-Tenure, and Promotion.

A generalized, quantitative criterion is established as a baseline for the level of activity that faculty members of each rank are expected to achieve as the minimum for an evaluation of **Meets Expectations** in the areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. This threshold is expressed differently for each of the three areas under review. In Teaching, it involves a faculty member's overall course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, and the quality and impact of various teaching enrichment activities; in Service, it involves a range of service activities; in Research/Scholarship, it involves a range of professional achievements of varied types. The department recognizes that professional achievements are not limited to publication alone but can be realized in different modes. This is particularly important for the equitable evaluation of Research/Scholarship in order to

accommodate the great diversity of scholarly activities pursued by faculty in this department. As a multidisciplinary Department of Writing & Language Studies, and in alignment with UTRGV's mission, research, teaching, and service activities that include effective and influential community engagement and collaboration within and across disciplines are vital and valuable areas of professional development. The departmental review committees will use the baselines outlined below as quantifiable guidelines for determining whether faculty members have met expectations.

More importantly, the departmental review committees are charged with ensuring that each faculty member's performance also reflects *quality* and *meaningful impact* on the field of study in which the faculty member is working. This can only be determined if faculty members actively demonstrate the impact of their Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities for the period under review through the Narrative Summaries submitted in each faculty member's review dossier.

II. REVIEW PROCEDURE

- A. **Dossier Submission.** All faculty members submit one review dossier annually in alignment with the EVPAA's guidelines, pathways, and timelines. This one dossier will suffice for all review processes, including annual, tenure, post-tenure, and promotion.
- B. **Dossier Content.** The faculty dossier will follow the format and include the items outlined in the document [Format for Faculty Review Dossier](#) developed and posted by the Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Student Success, and P-16 Integration. Faculty should include supporting documentation for activities in the dossier, and they should be prepared to provide any missing items or additional documentation at the request of reviewers.
 - I. **Narrative Summaries.** The narrative summaries of teaching, research/scholarship, and service are particularly important and should include discussions of achievements and their impact (see III.A. below).
 - II. **Professional Growth Plans.** According to the HOP ADM 06-502 policy on annual review, all full-time faculty should include in their dossier "[a] work plan for next academic year that covers all three areas of review (Teaching, Research/scholarship, and Service) and corresponds to the department's guidelines/criteria." According to guidelines in the Institutional Format for Faculty Review Dossier, "The purpose of the professional development plan is to help ensure that the faculty member, the department and the Dean have a congruent understanding of the nature of a faculty member's responsibilities and the general level of performance expected in the three areas of review. The professional development plan is not a contract: achieving all of the stated goals does not in and of itself guarantee a faculty member tenure or promotion, nor does deviation from the plan in and of itself justify action against the faculty member." In alignment with these policies, then, **3-year lecturer dossiers** should include a 3-year professional growth plan that lecturers update each year as they approach their application for reappointment and promotion. **Tenure-track dossiers** should include a 6-year professional growth plan that assistant professors update each year as they approach tenure and promotion application.
- C. **Dossier Delivery.** Faculty will submit dossiers following the process described in the EVPAA's Guidelines: http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/EVPAA/faculty-resources/UTRGV-Format-for-Faculty-Review-Dossier.pdf.
- D. **Dossier Submission Dates and Timeline.** The dates for dossier submission and the timeline for completion of each level of the review process will follow the [Pathways for Review developed and announced annually by the Office of the EVPAA](#).

III. REVIEW COMMITTEE

- A. **Formation.** The departmental Faculty Review Committee is composed of at least six tenured faculty members (elected by blind vote of tenure-track and tenured faculty) and at least four 3-year lecturers

(elected by blind vote of lecturers with at least 2 consecutive semesters in WLS) so as to provide representation of the departmental faculty in terms of rank, campus, and discipline. The Department chair will make sure that all elected committee members are able to serve before finalizing the Review Committee.

1. The Department Chair cannot be a member of the Faculty Review Committee that handles tenure, promotion, post-tenure, and annual review.
2. During years when tenured faculty are applying for promotion to full professor, there must be three full professors on the committee. If three full professors are not elected as part of the six tenured faculty, the chair will add full professors who got the next highest votes from the election until three full professors are on the committee.
3. The committee must include at least one member from each disciplinary area of the department represented by the candidates under review; if the elected committee does not include one member from each area, a second blind vote will elect an eligible member from the unrepresented area.
4. Before dossiers are reviewed, the Review Committee will choose one of the elected committee members at Full Professor rank to remove him/herself from the Review Committee so that s/he will serve on the College Review Committee and be able to vote.
5. Based on the number of dossiers, the Committee Chair can ask the Department Chair to add, based on the voting results, more than the minimum number of committee members.
6. The committee members will serve for one full academic year.
7. The committee members will elect one of their number to serve as Chair. The Chair is responsible for verifying the completeness of dossiers and requesting missing documents if necessary, appropriately distributing dossiers among committee members, holding committee meetings for review discussion, distributing paper and electronic copies of committee reviews, managing any department committee-level appeals by faculty, initiating routing forms, and arranging for departmental review and certification of tenure application dossiers.

B. Review Types. The Faculty Review Committee is responsible for 5 types of review.

1. The committee will evaluate all complete dossiers for **Annual Review**, distributing dossiers so that faculty are evaluated by colleagues at or above their rank. Reviewing members will discuss these evaluations and will sign their respective final reviews.
2. The full committee will review complete dossiers for **3-year lecturers applying for promotion** who are entering their third year in their contract, distributing them so that faculty are evaluated by colleagues at or above their rank. Reviewing committee members will discuss these evaluations and will sign the final reviews.
3. The tenured members of the committee will review complete dossiers for **tenure-track faculty applying for tenure and promotion**. Tenured committee members will discuss these evaluations and sign the final reviews. Applications for tenure and promotion require department level certification because the department committee is less than a committee of the whole. All tenured members of the department must certify that they have reviewed the dossier by recording their vote and signing the signature sheet for the routing form.
4. The full-professor members of the committee will review complete dossiers for **tenured faculty applying for promotion to full professor**. Full-professors members will discuss these evaluations and sign the final reviews.
5. Post Tenure Review: Tenured faculty on the committee will evaluate faculty PTR dossiers.

IV. REVIEW GUIDELINES

A. Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching. For lecturers, tenure-track faculty, and tenured faculty, teaching will be evaluated on the basis of peer evaluations of teaching, official course evaluations administered by the university, and the quality and impact of teaching enrichment activities (including the quality and revision of teaching materials) reported by each faculty member. All three elements contribute to and reflect a faculty member's performance in teaching for the period under review.

1. Faculty members shall provide peer observations according to the timeline published in the document [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#) and posted by the Office of the EVPAA. The frequency of observation cited there is the following:
 - All **tenure-track faculty** shall be observed at least once per academic year.
 - All **tenured faculty** shall be reviewed at least once every three years.
 - Faculty members with the rank of Lecturer I, Lecturer II, and Lecturer III, or Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, and Clinical Associate Professor shall be observed at least once per academic year.
 - Faculty members with the rank of Senior Lecturer and Clinical Professor shall be observed at least once every three years.
2. Teaching evaluations administered by the university shall be assessed for a baseline evaluation as follows:
 - Exceeds Expectations: 90-100% of Students Agree/Strongly Agree
 - Meets Expectations: 80-89% of Students Agree/Strongly Agree
 - Does Not Meet Expectations: 70-79% of Students Agree/Strongly Agree
 - Unsatisfactory: 0-69% of Students Agree/Strongly Agree

However, course evaluations provide only one perspective—that of the students—on a faculty member's teaching performance. Peer evaluations of teaching provide professional perspective on teaching expertise and are equally important in judging baseline performance. As such, scores on course evaluations administered by the university will not be the sole criterion on which to base overall evaluations of teaching performance.

The Faculty Review Committee will assess the *quality* and *impact* of each faculty member's teaching by reviewing the teaching enrichment activities reported for the period under review. Appendix 1 provides a list of possible teaching enrichment activities that faculty members should report on and describe in their dossiers. The *impact* of a faculty member's teaching performance is greater when it includes diversified teaching enrichment and pedagogical activities that are designed to increase student success. Incorporating experiential learning and community engagement and adapting courses for different student populations are highly encouraged.

B. Guidelines for Evaluation of Research/Scholarship. The Faculty Review Committee will consider scholarly activities like, but not limited to, those listed in Appendix 2 when assessing Research/Scholarship. Examples of professional achievement in Research/Scholarship include, but are not limited to, publications, presentations, and external grant proposals with positive reviews and/or funding. The *baseline* for meeting expectations in Research/Scholarship varies according to a faculty member's workload determination and tenure status for the period under review.

1. **3-year and 1-year lecturers** with a 4/4 workload have the remainder of their workload designated for research and/or service activities that contribute to their individual professional growth and the

department's overall health. Research/scholarship that informs and strengthens lecturers' teaching is encouraged, but not required.

2. **Tenure-track faculty** are expected to actively engage in research/scholarship while working toward tenure. The baseline evaluation of research/scholarship for tenure-track faculty is specified further in section V and reflects a trajectory of professional development over the course of the probationary period. Tenure-track faculty should show evidence of development throughout the probationary period.
3. **Tenured faculty** are expected to maintain an active research/scholarship agenda after the achievement of tenure. The trajectory and intensity of their professional activities may shift as a result of the expanded service and administrative commitments which tenured faculty are asked to perform for the university.

The *impact* of a faculty member's research/scholarship is greater when it includes diversified achievements and initiatives which impact more than one of a range of different groups: the university, the community, and the faculty member's discipline at large.

C. Guidelines for Evaluation of Service. The Faculty Review Committee will consider service activities like, but not limited to, those listed in Appendix 3 when assessing a faculty member's Service. The *baseline* for meeting expectations in Service varies according to a faculty member's workload determination and tenure status for the period under review:

1. are expected to serve primarily within the department with service and/or scholarly activities that complement their teaching duties and individual scholarly interests.
2. **Tenure-track faculty** are expected to not take on extensive service commitments while working toward tenure. They should prioritize impactful research, publication, and presentations. Tenure track service should complement their development as scholars.
3. **Tenured faculty** are expected to have expanded service commitments to the department, the college, and the university. They are more likely to serve nationally and/or internationally within their disciplines, for example as officers of professional organizations or on the editorial boards of journals.

The *impact* of a faculty member's service is greater when it includes service at multiple levels, both within the university and externally.

D. Summary Ratings. Faculty members will receive an evaluative rating of **Exceeds expectations**, **Meets Expectations**, **Does Not Meet Expectations**, or **Unsatisfactory** for each of the three categories of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. Based upon these three separate ratings, one Summary Rating for each faculty member is determined according to the following guidelines:

1. For a Summary Rating of **Exceeds Expectations** in an Annual Review, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must exceed expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation and at least meet expectations in the remaining category of evaluation.
2. For a Summary Rating of **Meets Expectations** in an Annual Review, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must at least meet expectations in all 3 categories of evaluation, but not meet the standard for Exceeds Expectations.
3. For a Summary Rating of **Does Not Meet Expectations** in an Annual Review, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member has not met expectations in one category of evaluation.
4. For a Summary Rating of **Unsatisfactory** in an Annual Review, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member has failed to meet expectations in at least two categories of the evaluation.

V. Tenure & Promotion

A. **Procedure.** All tenure-track and tenured faculty members shall submit one review dossier annually for evaluation.

1. **It is the responsibility of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion to provide a complete tenure and promotion dossier** adhering to university and departmental requirements. Departmental mentors and the Department Chair should provide guidance in this process. Additional documentation may be requested by any reviewer at any level in the course of the evaluation process.
2. **Tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated annually** in accordance with UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures* ADM 06-502, ADM 06-504, and ADM 06-505. The evaluation for any faculty member in their first year of tenure track status will occur during the spring semester of the first year and during the fall semester of each year successively thereafter until the final tenure evaluation.
3. **Each subsequent annual evaluation shall be cumulative in nature**, i.e., all relevant achievements and activities for the entire time the faculty member has been on tenure track, or in rank as a tenured faculty member, will be included in each year's annual evaluation file.
4. **Each annual evaluation shall describe, quantitatively and qualitatively, the candidate's annual yearly progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure** in the three areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. In making this assessment, the Faculty Review Committee shall take into account the type of scholarly work being undertaken by the candidate, but it shall be the candidate's responsibility to document and explain how the contents of their dossier provides evidence of annual yearly progress toward tenure. This should be done in the *Applicant Statement and Self-Evaluation* and *Narrative Summaries* of the faculty member's dossier.
5. **Tenure-track faculty shall be informed in writing of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee's evaluation** based on their performance as reflected in their dossier, in accordance with the departmental evaluation guidelines, along with an indication of the Committee's decision regarding whether the candidate is likely to be successful in their bid for tenure. 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 reviewers.
6. **The Department Chair will meet with each tenure-track faculty member annually** after completion of the Chair's evaluation to discuss the candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to demonstrate consistent progress toward the achievement of tenure, and the Chair is expected to facilitate this by providing guidance about strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for continued progress.
7. **The fourth year of the tenure-track shall be a pre-tenure review.** The Department Annual Review Committee and the Chair shall clearly state their assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure and identify any remaining activities to be completed by the sixth year on the tenure track in order to receive a positive recommendation for tenure from the Annual Review Committee and Chair, respectively.

B. **Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for Tenure and Promotion.** The minimum teaching requirements to meet expectations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor AND for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor are:

- At least an overall student evaluation rating of Meets Expectations using the departmental criteria for assessing Teaching effectiveness on student evaluations stated in III.B
- Peer evaluations which consistently attest to the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.
- A range of diversified and impactful Teaching Enrichment activities throughout the course of the candidate's probationary period. (see Appendix 1 for *Teaching Enrichment Activities*).

The Department Promotion and Tenure committee will be responsible for evaluating the quality of each item, including but not limited to, verifying that each reported teaching enrichment activity was accomplished and judging the impact of these reported activities.

C. Evaluation of Research/Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion. The minimum professional achievements required to meet expectations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are:

- at least FOUR (4) written peer reviewed impactful professional achievements, including 3 peer reviewed journal articles or their equivalent, or a peer reviewed book.
- a history of diversified and impactful professional activities from the list in *Appendix 2: Research/Scholarship Activities* reported during the probationary period
- *Personal Statement and Reflection* and *Summary Narrative* documents describing the significance and impact of the faculty member's scholarly achievements.

As stated above in *IV.B Guidelines for Evaluation of Research/Scholarship*, **tenured faculty** are expected to maintain an active research/scholarship agenda after the achievement of tenure. However, the trajectory and intensity of their professional activities may shift as a result of the expanded service and administrative commitments which tenured faculty are asked to perform for the university.

The minimum professional achievements required to meet expectations for promotion from **Associate Professor to Full Professor** are:

- at least FIVE (5) written peer reviewed impactful professional achievements, including 4 peer reviewed journal articles or their equivalent.
- a history of diversified and impactful professional activities from the list in *Appendix 2: Research/Scholarship Activities* reported during the probationary period
- *Personal Statement and Reflection* and *Summary Narrative* documents describing the significance and impact of the faculty member's scholarly achievements since their last promotion.

D. Evaluation of Service for Tenure & Promotion. The minimum service requirements to meet expectations for promotion from **Assistant Professor to Associate Professor AND for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor** is:

- At least an overall rating of Meets Expectations using the departmental criteria for assessing Service

The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for evaluating the quality as well as the quantity of the service activities according to the criteria stated in *III.D Guidelines for Evaluation of Service*.

VI. MERIT DETERMINATION

As stated in 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." In any year when merit pay is available, 80% of the merit pay awarded to the Department of Writing & Language Studies will be distributed equally to eligible faculty who, at minimum, **meet expectations** in all categories of annual evaluation (according to individual workloads) for the year under review. The remaining 20% of the merit pay awarded to the department will be distributed equally to eligible faculty who **exceed expectations** in all categories of annual evaluation (according to individual workloads) for the year under review.

APPENDIX 1
Teaching Enrichment Activities

The following is a list of teaching enrichment activities that dossier reviewers will consider when assessing the impact of teaching for all reviews. The items are not exhaustive, nor have we listed them in any order of preference. **Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the impact and significance of these activities in their review narratives.**

1. Contributions to curriculum and course development, such as designing and implementing writing assessments and learning outcomes assessments
2. Creation of web-based distance learning course(s)
3. Teaching of Learning Communities course and/or other involvement in student retention initiatives or programs
4. Awards and honors for teaching excellence
5. Mentoring of students
 - a. Mentoring of Teaching Assistants
 - b. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students who make presentations at state, regional, and/or national conferences
 - c. Graduate thesis committee member
 - d. Chair of graduate thesis committee
 - e. Chair of undergraduate thesis committee
 - f. Undergraduate thesis committee member
6. Evidence of professional development in the area of teaching (attending professional teaching development seminars and integrating new material into courses)
7. Evidence of innovative responsibilities in teaching (community service learning, field trips, designing & teaching in study abroad, performances, travels with students for academic or cultural purposes, creation of a lecture series, teaching online and reduced seat courses for the benefit of students, designing and using innovative teaching in the classroom.)
8. Contributions to English teacher education student success, including serving as coordinator of TExES certification training, leading review sessions, and implementing curricular changes to ensure student success
9. Teaching contributions to WAC and WID initiatives

APPENDIX 2

Research/Scholarship Activities

The following is a list of research/scholarship activities that dossier reviewers will consider when assessing the impact of research/scholarship for all reviews. The items are not exhaustive, nor have we listed them in any order of preference. **Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the impact and significance of these activities in their review narratives.**

1. Refereed academic journal articles published in recognized scholarly journals at the state, regional, national, or international level
2. Book chapters or other scholarly/creative work published by academic presses with a national or international reputation for quality publications or small presses with a well-established reputation for high quality publications
3. University Press monographs or some other refereed monograph published by an academic press
4. Textbooks published by academic or commercial presses with national or international reputation for quality publications, if the textbook requires substantial original contributions by the faculty member
5. Edited collections of scholarly essays. A faculty member will also receive credit for serving as primary editor of a scholarly or creative literary journal or for serving as primary editor of an edited collection of stories, poems, or nonfiction essays
6. Creative writing – novels, short stories, poems, non-fiction essays, plays, etc. – published in refereed journals, as a university press book, or by a reputable commercial press
7. Refereed conference papers based on original research presented at state, regional, national, or international academic conferences
8. Readings of creative works – novels, short stories, poems, non-fiction essays, plays, etc. – at state, regional, national, or international programs or events
9. Concordances (refereed)
10. Bibliographies, book length (refereed)
11. Book reviews published in recognized scholarly journals at the state, regional, national, or international level
12. Encyclopedia and reference book entries
13. Translations
14. Positively peer-reviewed external grants regardless of funding
15. Contributions to audio-visual or computer-based media that require discipline-related expertise (e.g., tutorial and documentary videos, corpora and databases, scholarly-focused blogs, web design)

APPENDIX 3

Service Activities

The following is a list of service activities that dossier reviewers will consider when assessing the impact of service activities for all reviews. The items are not exhaustive, nor have we listed them in any order of preference. **Faculty members should report all of their activities and highlight the impact and significance of these activities in their review narratives.**

1. Service to the Department
 - a. Standing department committees
 - b. Advisor, student organization
 - c. Ad hoc committee member
 - d. Search committee member
 - e. Chair of committee for any activity listed above
 - f. Mentoring new faculty
 - g. Administrative duties

2. Service to the College or University
 - a. Faculty Senate
 - b. Standing college committees
 - c. Standing university committees or councils
 - d. Advisor, student organization
 - e. Ad hoc committee member
 - f. Chair of committee for any activity listed above
 - g. University Task Force
 - h. Facilitator

3. Community Service
 - a. Active participation in discipline--related community organizations
 - b. Participation in local boards and committees in the area of disciplinary expertise
 - c. Work activity related to K-12 schools and educational organizations
 - d. Professional consulting in the community
 - e. Presentations, workshops, conferences or seminars within the community
 - f. Providing free expertise to non-profit organizations
 - g. Community-oriented programs and festivals (e.g., HESTEC, International Week, FESTIBA, MultiLingua Fest, etc.)

4. Service to Professional Organizations
 - a. Editing or reviewing articles or manuscripts for publication by a scholarly journal or press
 - b. Organizing, chairing, or service as commentator of a panel at an academic conference
 - c. Serving as an officer of a professional organization
 - d. Active membership in professional and educational associations
 - e. Participation at professional meetings
 - f. Participation on boards and committees of professional organizations
 - g. Assistance to professional groups, organizing seminars, workshops, etc.