

## **DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW**

*Approved by Department Vote on 23 October 2015.*

*Substantially revised and approved by Department Vote on March 6, 2016.*

*Amended by Department Vote on May 13, 2016.*

*Amended by Department Vote on May 12, 2017,*

*Approved by Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs on August 10, 2017.*

*Amended and substantially revised by Department Vote on April 17, 2020.*

*Amended by Department Vote on October 9, 2020.*

*Approved by Dean and Provost on May 14, 2021.*

*Amended and Department Vote on February 3, 2023*

The following guidelines for promotion and tenure provide the Political Science faculty with specific information regarding the performance expectations that will be applied in the three areas of evaluation for annual review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review: (1) teaching, (2) research/scholarship, and (3) service. These guidelines delineate the expectations of the Department of Political Science and provide a transparent statement of those expectations both for the faculty being evaluated and for the faculty reviewers.

The achievement of the minimum standards in these guidelines qualify a faculty member to be considered for tenure and promotion, although meeting these minimum standards will NOT automatically result in tenure or promotion.

**Table of Contents**

[CHAPTER I. GENERAL GUIDELINES & DEFINITIONS.....](#) - 3 -

[Section 1. General Guidelines .....](#) - 3 -

[Section 2. Definitions.....](#) - 5 -

[Section 3. Summary Review Categories .....](#) - 8 -

[CHAPTER II. EVALUATION STANDARDS.....](#) - 9 -

[Section 1. Teaching Effectiveness .....](#) - 9 -

[Section 2. Research & Publication .....](#) - 9 -

[Section 3. Service .....](#) - 12 -

[CHAPTER III. TEACHING TRACK.....](#) - 13 -

[Section 1. Teaching Effectiveness .....](#) - 13 -

[Section 2. Research and Publication.....](#) - 13 -

[Section 3. Service .....](#) - 13 -

[Section 4. Transition to the Teaching Track.....](#) - 14 -

[CHAPTER IV. LIST OF TEACHING, RESEARCH & PUBLICATION, AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES .....](#) - 16 -

[Section 1. Teaching Activities .....](#) - 16 -

[Section 2. Research & Publication Activities.....](#) - 18 -

[Section 3. Service Activities.....](#) - 20 -

[APPENDIX A.....](#) - 24 -

[DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE Policy on Peer Observation of Teaching.....](#) - 24 -

[APPENDIX B.....](#) - 26 -

[DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE Policy on External Review of Tenure and Promotion Candidates.....](#) - 26 -

[APPENDIX C: Guidelines For Annual Yearly Progress .....](#) 28

# CHAPTER I. GENERAL GUIDELINES & DEFINITIONS

## Section 1. General Guidelines

1. All Political Science faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor must have a doctorate or equivalent in political science or related discipline, or interdisciplinary program.
2. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated annually in accordance with UTRGV's Handbook of Operating Procedures ADM 06-502 Annual Faculty Evaluation<sup>1</sup> and ADM 06-505 Faculty Tenure and Promotion.<sup>2</sup> The first year evaluation of faculty with September 1 start dates will occur during the spring semester of their first academic year. All subsequent reviews will occur during the fall semester of each year thereafter.<sup>3</sup>
3. Each annual evaluation shall be cumulative in nature, which means that all relevant achievements and activities since the faculty member's most recent employment event (hiring, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor, or Post-Tenure Review) will be included in the faculty member's dossier.
4. The faculty member's annual evaluation folders shall include a current curriculum vita and a grid documenting the number of points earned in various categories. The material shall be submitted using the format and application provided by the university for the preparation and submission of faculty evaluation dossiers. Each faculty member shall be responsible for the preparation and submission of their own dossier, including ensuring that their dossier is complete and fully updated.
5. 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.
6. Unless noted otherwise in the document, the maximum points allowed for an activity throughout this document is the maximum allowed during each six year review period (i.e., promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, or Post-Tenure Review).
7. Each annual evaluation shall describe, quantitatively and qualitatively, the candidate's annual yearly progress<sup>4</sup> toward meeting the criteria for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review in the three areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service (see Appendices C.1., C.2., C.3). In making their assessment, the Annual Review Committee shall take into account the type of scholarly work being undertaken by the candidate, but it shall be the candidate's

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-502.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Available at <http://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-505.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Tenure-track faculty should follow the corresponding "First Year Tenure-Track Faculty Review Pathways" or the "Tenure-Track Pathways" see, UTRGV Pathways for Review Deadlines on the Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs website.

<sup>4</sup> See, Guidelines for Implementation of Yearly Annual Progress, included as Appendix C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this document.

responsibility to document and explain how the contents of their dossier provides evidence of annual yearly progress toward tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.<sup>5</sup>

8. A faculty member 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.<sup>6</sup>
9. Tenure-track faculty shall be informed in writing of their evaluation based on their performance as reflected in their dossier, in accordance with the pathways document, along with an indication of the review committee's assessment of whether the candidate is likely to complete the remaining probationary period successfully. Each level of review (i.e., committee and chair) must include a written narrative that highlights the strengths of the faculty member's performance, as well as recommendations for improvement, if deemed necessary, by the committee.
10. The fourth year of the tenure-track shall be a pre-tenure review. The 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 to receive a positive recommendation for tenure from the Tenure & Promotion Committee and Chair, respectively.
11. Faculty 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.
12. 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.
13. All Political Science faculty seeking promotion or tenure must meet the minimum approved requirements in teaching, research/scholarship, and service.
14. The minimum requirements for tenure include the minimum requirements for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.
15. It is the responsibility of the candidate 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 the Committee and/or Department Chair in the course of the evaluation process.

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, an individual who is working on a book manuscript, a large-scale longitudinal survey, or other multi-year research project may not have any publications for several years until the project is complete, but the individual must demonstrate annual yearly progress toward completion of the project, such as completed written book chapters, completed surveys, interviews, data collection, external grants, book or grant contracts, and scholarly conference presentations related to the project to "meet expectations."

<sup>6</sup> 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."

16. In case of foreign language publications, the Annual Review Committee, Tenure and Promotion Committee, or Post-Tenure Review Committee may request a translation of the publication from qualified sources within or outside the University in consultation with the candidate being reviewed; the department will cover any cost(s) associated with this request.
17. Applications for early tenure or promotion (i.e., before the normal six year review period) are generally discouraged and will be considered only in cases of exceptional research/scholarship as determined by the departmental evaluation process.
18. All publications and activity points in teaching, research/scholarship, and service accumulated at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley's legacy institutions will carry forward and count toward tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley.
19. The honorific title of Emeritus Faculty may be conferred on a retired faculty member of the Department of Political Science who has made a significant contribution to the Department and University. The nomination and review process shall be conducted in accordance with the UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures*, Section ADM 06-402, "Emeritus Faculty."

## **Section 2. 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. It is recognized that individual journals and publishers categorize the publication status of peer reviewed articles and books in different ways. Consequently, to avoid confusion or misunderstanding in annual evaluation, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews in the Department of Political Science, the following terms shall mean:
  - a. *Revise and resubmit.* A manuscript has been deemed worthy of an additional peer review after the author(s) makes substantial revisions to the manuscript. There is no commitment to publish the manuscript, but only a commitment to review the manuscript after revisions are completed by the author(s). This process normally entails an additional round of anonymous or blind peer reviews.
  - b. *Conditional acceptance.* A manuscript has been accepted for publication after minor revisions by the author(s). This process normally entails a final review by an editor to ensure that the requested revisions have been completed by the author.
  - c. *Acceptance.* A manuscript has been accepted for publication in its current form, but is not yet in the production stage.
  - d. *Forthcoming.* An accepted manuscript is undergoing copy editing by the publisher.
  - e. *In press.* Galley proofs of an accepted manuscript are available from the publisher.
  - f. *Published.* A manuscript has been published when it is officially available online or in hard copy.

Each stage of the publication process should be verified by a letter from an editor, a copy-edited manuscript, a copy of galley proofs, or an online (link) or hard copy of the published manuscript.

All faculty in the Department are encouraged to use these definitions when categorizing manuscripts on the Faculty Profile Tool (FPT) and on their Curriculum Vitae.

3. It is recognized that there are various grades of peer review and that individual journals and publishers implement peer review in different ways and with different degrees of rigor and anonymity. For purposes of annual evaluation, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review in the Department of Political Science, the following definitions of peer review shall be used in evaluating all publications, regardless of the publication platform, including hard copy, electronic, digital, and online:
  - a. Double-Blind Peer Review. Double-blind peer review means that the identity of both the author and the reviewer is kept hidden from the other party. If the authors' identity is unknown to the reviewer, it will prevent the reviewer from forming any bias based on ethnicity, race, nationality, gender, age, rank, institutional affiliation, or academic reputation. Double-blind peer review is considered the 'gold standard' of peer review. If the faculty member can document that an article, book chapter, book, or handbook/encyclopedia entry was double-blind reviewed, it shall be accepted as peer reviewed.
  - b. Single-Blind Peer Review. Single-blind peer review means that the identity of the reviewer is kept hidden from the author (except with the reviewer's explicit written consent). Single-blind peer review is an increasingly common practice among university presses and reputable commercial presses, as well as many reputable scholarly journals. If the faculty member can document that an article, book chapter, book, or handbook/encyclopedia was single-blind reviewed, it shall be accepted as peer reviewed.
4. If the faculty member can document that an article, book chapter, or entry in any of the following types of publishing outlets was peer reviewed by at least two persons (editors and/or outside reviewers), and that the journal or publisher is reputable (see No. 5 below), it shall be accepted as peer reviewed even though the review was not a double-blind or single-blind review:
  - a. Editorial Review:
    - i. There are reputable journals where manuscripts are reviewed by two or more members of the editorial board. These journals may or may not also send manuscripts out for anonymous double-blind peer review by one or more persons.
    - ii. There are edited books where individual chapters are reviewed by one or more editors. These book chapters may or may not be sent out for anonymous double-blind peer review by one or more persons.
    - iii. There are chapters in academic handbooks and entries in scholarly encyclopedias where individual contributions are reviewed by one or more

editors. These book chapters may or may not be sent out for anonymous double-blind peer review by one or more persons.

- b. *Invited Submissions.* Faculty members are sometimes invited to submit articles to journals or chapters to edited books. A person is usually invited to contribute an article to a journal or a chapter to an edited collection based on their expertise or reputation so, of course, the review is not anonymous or double-blind. Nevertheless, if the faculty member can document that an invited article or book chapter was in fact rigorously peer reviewed by at least two persons, and that the journal or publisher is reputable, it may be accepted as peer reviewed even though the review was not a double-blind or single-blind review.
  - c. *Proposal Review.* Some book publishers have moved to a system of sending out 5- to 10-page book proposal for peer review, but the full book manuscript (or a chapter in an edited book) is never actually peer reviewed. These books (and chapters) may receive credit for points as non-peer reviewed publications, but they will not count toward the minimum number of publications required for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.
  - d. *Predatory Journals and Publishers.* Articles and books published by so-called predatory journals, pay-to-play journals or publishers, and books by vanity publishers will not be accepted as peer reviewed even if the publishing entity nominally subjects manuscripts to peer review.
  - e. *Subventions.* It is increasingly common in the social sciences and humanities for university presses and reputable scholarly journals to ask for subventions. A subvention is a payment to the publisher to partially underwrite the cost of publishing a scholarly book.
5. *Reputable Peer Review Journal.* When the majority of a review committee or the Department Chair has questions about the quality of a journal, the term “reputable” shall include, but not be limited to (1) journals and book chapters that are sponsored by a regional, national, or international scholarly or professional association, (2) journals and book chapters published by an established university press (this does not include journals or book chapters published by universities or academic units in lieu of an affiliated press), and (3) journals and book chapters published by a recognized commercial publishing house, such as Sage, Routledge/Taylor & Francis, Basil Blackwell, Brill Publishers, John Wiley & Sons, Peter Lang Publishing Group, De Gruyter, Elsevier, Rowman and Littlefield, and Continuum/Bloomsbury. If a publication meets any of the three criteria above, then no faculty member shall be required to provide additional documentation of a journal’s reputation. If a publication does not meet any of the three criteria above, then a faculty member may attempt to establish the high quality of a publication by supplying copies of the peer reviews, showing the reputation of authors previously published in the journal, and the reputation of the journal's editors and editorial board members. Reputation and quality may also be established by showing evidence that a journal appears on an international journal list, such as Scimago, ISI Web of Knowledge, or J-STOR.
6. The term “transdisciplinary” refers to research, publications, conference presentations, and other academic activities conducted by scholars from different disciplines working jointly to create new

conceptual, theoretical, methodological, and translational innovations that integrate and move beyond discipline-specific approaches to address a common problem.

7. The term “interdisciplinary” refers to research, publications, conference presentations and other academic activities that are wholly or partially outside the disciplinary field of an individual’s PhD.
8. An “applied policy report” or “white paper” refers to work that is often categorized as “grey literature.” It is sponsored or funded by a government, private, or non-profit organization to support informed decision-making by public and private officials. It may apply scholarly concepts, draw on scholarly literature, and collect primary and/or secondary data to analyze a particular problem and results in a written report submitted to the sponsoring organization. While this type of report may be subject to intense outside scrutiny by the media, legislators, business executives, the general public, and sponsoring organizations, it does not undergo the same type of double-blind academic peer review process employed by scholarly journals or university presses.

### **Section 3. Summary Review Categories**

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 Appendices C.1, C.2, and C.3.

1. For a Summary Rating of Exceeds Expectations in an Annual Review, Tenure or Promotion decision, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must exceed expectations in Research & Scholarship and 1 other category 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, Tenure and Promotion decision, 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, Tenure and Promotion decision, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must not meet expectations in any 1 category of evaluation.
4. For a Summary Rating of Unsatisfactory in an Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion decision, or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must not meet expectations in any 2 categories of evaluation.



## **CHAPTER II. EVALUATION STANDARDS**

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 and judging the activity by standards of the department's policy..

Unless otherwise noted, the evaluation standards apply to faculty at all levels of review (tenure and promotion to associate professor, promotion to full professor, and post-tenure review).

A candidate for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor must successfully complete the probationary (pre-tenure) period. Early promotion and tenure requests are allowed but discouraged. To qualify for tenure and promotion, the candidate must meet or exceed expectations in Teaching Effectiveness, Research & Scholarship, and Service.

A candidate for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor should successfully complete a minimum of 6 years at the Associate Professor rank. While early promotion requests are allowed they are discouraged by the Department and the University.

Post-Tenure Review is normally completed every six years after a major employment event (tenure and promotion to associate professor, promotion to full professor, or the most recent post-tenure review). Post-Tenure Review may occur concurrently with an evaluation for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

### **Section 1. Teaching Effectiveness**

To meet or exceed expectations, the faculty member must meet the following criteria:

1. No more than 10% of the average of responses to the student evaluations for the evaluation period as a whole fall below the neutral category (i.e., below 3), and
2. Provide evidence of peer observation of teaching (see Appendix A).

In addition, the faculty member must:

1. Maintain an overall student evaluation rating of:
  - a. 3.8 to 4.49 to meet expectations
  - b. 4.5 to 5.0 to exceed expectations,
2. Accumulate sufficient points from the Teaching Activities in Chapter IV, Section 1:
  - a. 12 points to meet expectations
  - b. 15 points to exceed expectations

### **Section 2. Research & Publication**

The publication of a peer reviewed scholarly book (excluding a textbook, an edited book of readings, a popular book, anthology, vanity press or similar type publication) will substitute for four (4) peer-reviewed articles and book chapters.

The publication of a peer reviewed edited book will substitute for two (2) peer reviewed articles. Serving as co-editor = 1.5 peer reviewed articles and serving as associate editor or assistant editor = 0.5 peer reviewed articles.

All publications must be included in the candidate's dossier.

The Tenure & Promotion Committee will evaluate the quantity and quality of the individual's research and scholarship and, may waive the minimum quantitative standards for publication in recognition of the exceptional quality or impact of the individual's publications.

### **Section 2.1. Tenure & Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:**

To earn tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor a faculty member must have:

1. Reputable peer reviewed publications with the following stipulations:
  - a. Four (4) publications to meet expectations,
  - b. Five (5) publications to exceed expectations,
  - c. No more than two (2) of the publications may be peer-reviewed book chapters, all others must be in reputable peer-reviewed academic journals;
  - d. The faculty member shall be the sole or lead author:
    - i. On at least one (1) of the four (4) publications to meet expectations
    - ii. On at least two (2) of the five (5) publications to exceed expectations,
2. The accumulation of sufficient Activity points from the Research and Publication Activities listed in Chapter IV, Section 2,
  - a. 15 points to meet expectations,
  - b. 20 points to exceed expectations; and
3. A written Significance Narrative describing the significance of the faculty member's publications to the discipline of political science and/or the applicant's field of expertise.

### **Section 2.2. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor and Post-Tenure Review**

For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor or to successfully pass Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must have:

1. Reputable peer reviewed publications with the following stipulations:
  - a. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor:
    - i. Four (4) publications to meet expectations,
    - ii. Five (5) publications to exceed expectations,

- iii. No more than two (2) of the publications may be peer-reviewed book chapters, all others must be in reputable peer-reviewed academic journals;
    - iv. The faculty member shall be the sole or lead author:
      - 1. On at least one (1) of the four (4) publications to meet expectations
      - 2. On at least two (2) of the five (5) publications to exceed expectations,
  - b. Post-Tenure Review:
    - i. Two (2) publications to meet expectations,
    - ii. Three (3) publications to exceed expectations,
    - iii. No more than one (1) of the publications may be peer-reviewed book chapters, all others must be in reputable peer-reviewed academic journals;
    - iv. The faculty member shall be the sole or lead author:
      - 1. On at least one (1) of the two (2) publications to meet expectations
      - 2. On at least two (2) of the three (3) publications to exceed expectations,
- 2. The accumulation of sufficient Activity points from the Research and Publication Activities listed in Chapter IV, Section 2:
  - a. 20 points to meet expectations,
  - b. 24 points to exceed expectations.
- 3. A narrative assessment of the impact of their research. Candidates have flexibility in terms of how they assess the impact of their research and publication, as well as how they measure its national and international visibility. Candidates shall speak to the quality of their work in addition to simple counting of presentations or citations. Evidence of research impact may include the following (documentation of these must be provided in the dossier):
  - a. Citations in the *Social Sciences Citation Index*, *Arts & Humanities Citation Index*, [www.scholar.google.com](http://www.scholar.google.com), [www.academia.edu](http://www.academia.edu), [www.researchgate.net](http://www.researchgate.net), or comparable indices.
  - b. The quality and reputation of book publishers.
  - c. The quality of journals, including rankings, circulation (numeric and geographic), and whether journals are sponsored by an academic or professional organization.
  - d. The number and quality of reviews and citations of an applicant's publications.
  - e. The number of requests for copies of article reprints and conference papers.
  - f. Book sales data, including course adoptions.
  - g. Number of name listings on the Internet.

- h. Evidence documenting that an individual's work is being incorporated into course syllabi at other institutions of higher education.
- i. External letters of support from recognized scholars who are familiar with the individual's scholarship.
- j. Letters of support from government and school officials, private business and non-profit executives, or other community leaders who are familiar with the impact of the individuals applied policy scholarship, consulting activities, and public service.
- k. Number of invited talks to professional and academic organizations.
- l. Foreign translations of publications.
- m. The number of media citations and appearances related to one's scholarship.
- n. Invitations to teach or speak at other institutions of higher education.
- o. Consultantships with non-university organizations.

### **Section 3. Service**

The Department Annual Review Committee, the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Department Chair will evaluate the quality as well as the quantity of service activities.

#### **Section 3.1. Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

To earn tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor a faculty member must have accumulated sufficient points from the Service Activities listed in Chapter IV, Section 3:

1. 20 points to meet expectations
2. 25 points to exceed expectations

#### **Section 3.2. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor and Post-Tenure Review**

For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor or successfully pass Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must have accumulated sufficient points from the Service Activities listed in Chapter IV, Section 3:

1. 25 points to meet expectations for promotion to Professor; 30 points for Post-Tenure Review
2. 40 points to exceed expectations for promotion to Professor; 60 points for Post-Tenure Review

## **CHAPTER III. TEACHING TRACK**

A faculty member on the Teaching Track is required to teach 4 reference courses per semester or the equivalent of a 4-4 course load per academic year. Faculty on the Teaching Track will have a workload effort of 80% Teaching, 10% Research, and 10% Service.

### **Section 1. Teaching Effectiveness**

1. A faculty member on the Teaching Track shall be evaluated in the Teaching Effectiveness category according to the same criteria and standards established for all other tenured faculty.

### **Section 2. Research and Publication**

A faculty member on the Teaching Track will be evaluated in Research and Scholarship as follows:

1. Teaching Track faculty do not need to publish while on the teaching track, but they must maintain a reduced research agenda through conference presentations, book reviews, and other scholarly activities listed in Chapter IV, Section 2.
2. Teaching Track faculty can meet expectations for the purpose of annual merit evaluations by accumulating 10 research activity points from the list of Research and Scholarly Activities in each 6-year evaluation cycle. The points required annually will be pro-rated based on the guidelines in Appendix C.2 or Appendix C.3 for purposes of annual review.
3. Teaching Track faculty can exceed expectations for the purpose of annual merit evaluations by accumulating 14 research activity points from the list of Research and Scholarly Activities in each 6-year evaluation cycle. The points required annually will be pro-rated based on the guidelines Appendix C.2 or Appendix C.3 for purposes of annual review.
4. An individual cannot meet expectations for purposes of promotion to Full Professor without the minimum number of scholarly publications required by the department's evaluation criteria and standards. Points do not carry over from one evaluation cycle to the next evaluation cycle, but publications from one evaluation cycle may carry forward to the next evaluation cycle for purposes of applying for promotion to Full Professor. Publications that have been carried from one evaluation cycle into the next evaluation cycle terminate for the purpose of applying for promotion to Full Professor after the second evaluation cycle.

### **Section 3. Service**

1. A faculty member on the Teaching Track is required to accumulate 13 points from the Service Activities listed in Chapter IV, Section 3 to meet expectations by year 6 of the evaluation cycle.

The points required annually will be pro-rated based on the guidelines in Appendix C.2 or Appendix C.3 for purposes of annual review.

2. A faculty member on the Teaching Track is required to accumulate 20 points from the Service Activities listed in Chapter IV, Section 3 to exceed expectations by year 6 of the evaluation cycle. The points required annually will be pro-rated based on the guidelines in Appendix C.2 or Appendix C.3 for purposes of annual review.

#### **Section 4. Transition to the Teaching Track**

1. A tenured faculty member may request to be evaluated on the Teaching Track in the next academic year by submitting a written request to the Annual Review Committee from September 1<sup>st</sup> to October 7<sup>th</sup>. The request to be evaluated on the Teaching Track shall specify whether the faculty member will begin work on the Teaching Track in the Spring semester of the current academic year or the Fall semester of the next academic year.
  - a. The Annual Review Committee shall be required to make a recommendation to the Chair on a faculty member's request to move to the Teaching Track within 5 calendar days of its receipt by the Annual Review Committee. The Annual Review Committee shall make a recommendation to the Chair to accept or reject a request to move to the Teaching Track.
  - b. The Chair shall be required to approve or reject a faculty member's request to move to the Teaching Track within 5 calendar days of receiving a written recommendation from the Annual Review Committee.
2. Upon a recommendation from the Annual Review Committee, the Chair may require that a tenured faculty member move from the Research Track to the Teaching Track if:
  - a. The faculty member does not meet expectations in the Research category for any two of three consecutive years in a 6-year evaluation cycle, or
  - b. the Annual Review Committee and the Chair concur that a faculty member will not have the required number of publications to merit promotion to Full Professor or to pass Post-Tenure Review by the end of their current 6-year evaluation cycle.
3. A faculty member on the Teaching Track may return to the Research Track, but only in the academic year immediately following the completion of a major performance review (i.e., promotion to Full Professor or Post-Tenure Review). To return to the Research Track:
  - a. a tenured faculty member must request to move from the Teaching Track to the Research Track by submitting a written request to the Annual Review Committee from September 1<sup>st</sup> to October 7<sup>th</sup>. The request to move to the Research Track shall specify whether the faculty member will move to the Research Track in the Spring semester of the current academic year or the Fall semester of the next academic year.
  - b. the Annual Review Committee shall determine whether the faculty member has a research agenda, and a sustained record of publications and other research accomplishments sufficient to likely meet expectations in the Research/Publications category in their next

major review (i.e. promotion to Full Professor or Post-Tenure Review) and within the normal 6-year review cycle,

- c. the Annual Review Committee shall be required to make a recommendation to the Chair on a faculty member's request to move back to the Research Track within 5 calendar days of its receipt by the Annual Review Committee. The Annual Review Committee shall make a recommendation to the Chair to accept or reject a request to move back to the Research Track.
  - d. if the Annual Review Committee recommends a return to the Research Track, the Department Chair must also concur with the Annual Review Committee's recommendation and approve the faculty member's request to move back to the Research Track. The Chair shall be required to approve or reject a faculty member's request to move back to the Research Track within 5 calendar days of receiving a written recommendation from the Annual Review Committee.
4. A faculty member must have been on the Teaching Track for a minimum of two academic years (4 regular semesters) prior to a major evaluation (i.e., promotion to Full Professor or Post-Tenure Review) to be evaluated on the Teaching Track at the end of a 6-year review cycle.
  5. For purposes of Promotion to Full Professor or Post-Tenure Review, a faculty member must transition to the Teaching Track no later than the beginning Year 3 (September 1) of any evaluation cycle to be reviewed as a Teaching Track faculty. A faculty member who transitions to the Teaching Track in Years 4, 5, or 6 of their evaluation cycle will be evaluated as a Research Track faculty member.

# **CHAPTER IV. LIST OF TEACHING, RESEARCH & PUBLICATION, AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES**

## **Section 1. Teaching Activities**

1. A faculty member shall be awarded activity points for teaching as follows:
  - a. 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 for each semester).
  - b. 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 for each semester).
  - c. 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 for each 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 relevant review committee and the Department Chair will also take into account the following considerations in evaluating teaching effectiveness, where applicable:

- a. 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,
- b. Clarity of classroom materials and presentations (e.g., PowerPoints),
- c. The use of teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content,
- d. The clarity and specificity of course goals and learning objectives,
- e. The fostering of an appreciation for different points of view,
- f. The complexity of the subject matter and its level of difficulty for students,
- g. Whether the course is required or elective,
- h. 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.



2. Attendance at teaching workshops and/or seminars sponsored by the UTRGV Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) or Center for Online Teaching & Training (COLTT), including: (up to a maximum of 10 points):<sup>7</sup>
  - a. Basic Blackboard training (2.0 points),
  - b. other Blackboard trainings such as Panopto, Bb Collaborate, Grade Center, etc. (0.5 points),
  - c. Quality Matters certification (2.0 points),
  - d. Quality Matters updates (0.5 points),
  - e. Center for Teaching Excellence Learning Communities with 3 or more sessions on one topic (2.0 points),
  - f. New Faculty Orientation (2.0 points if attended at least 75% of activities),
  - g. Zoom training (0.5 point),
  - h. Other teaching training activities to be calculated as:
    - i. less than 2 hours (0.5 points)
    - ii. more than 2 hours (2.0 points)
3. New Courses and Course Material
  - a. New course development (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)
    - i. New undergraduate courses (1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points per cycle)
    - ii. New graduate courses (1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points per cycle)
  - b. Development of teaching materials, such as banks of test questions, computer exercises, workbooks, etc. (1 point each up to a maximum of 4 points per cycle).
  - c. New course preparations, i.e., teaching a previously existing course for the first time (1.0 point per course up to a maximum of 3 points).
4. Teaching-Related Activities (up to a combined maximum of 4.0 points per academic year):
  - a. supervising an Independent study (1.0 point),
  - b. supervising student research for academic presentation (1.0 point),
  - c. chairing an undergraduate Honors project (1.0 point),

---

<sup>7</sup> Unless noted otherwise in the document, the maximum points allowed for an activity throughout this document is the maximum allowed during each six year review period (i.e., promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, or Post-Tenure Review).

- d. chairing a Master's thesis committee (or equivalent) (1.0 point),
  - e. serving on a doctoral dissertation committee at UTRGV or elsewhere (1.0 point each per year),
  - f. serving on a Master's thesis committee (0.5 points),
  - g. supervising a research intern (0.25 points per year)
5. Recognitions, honors, and awards (up to a maximum of 6 points per 6-year review cycle):
- 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).
6. Special Teaching Activities
- a. Incorporation of experiential learning pedagogy(ies) into classes, including but not limited to service learning, community engagement, etc. (0.5 points per semester up to a maximum of 4 points, if approved by the UTRGV Office of Student Engagement; otherwise at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee).
  - b. Teaching abroad (1.0 points per semester up to a maximum of 4 points in each 6-year review cycle).
  - c. Special teaching modalities
    - i. Teaching an online class during a regular semester session (0.25 points per class per semester up to a maximum of 4 points in each 6-year review cycle).
    - ii. 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).
    - iii. 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).

## **Section 2. Research & Publication Activities**

1. Publications:
- a. Publication of a peer reviewed book (excluding a textbook, book of readings, anthology, vanity press, or similar type publication) beyond the required minimum (see above, section 2.1.1.a., 2.2.1.a.i., or 2.2.1.b.i) (12 points).
    - i. When an existing published book authored or co-authored by a faculty member is re-published in a 2<sup>nd</sup> or later edition (2.0 points).

- ii. Each review of an authored or co-authored book in a scholarly journal (0.1 points per review) as a reward for recognition of the book by the scholarly community.
  - b. Publication of a reputable peer reviewed journal article(s) or book chapter(s) beyond the required minimum (see above, section 2.1.1.a., 2.2.1.a.i., or 2.2.1.b.i) (4 points each). This activity includes transdisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary publications.
  - c. Publication of a book review in a professional or scholarly journal (1 point per activity up to a maximum of 3 points annually).
  - d. Publication of a review essay (i.e., it has a title and is a multi-book review essay) in a professional or scholarly journal (2.5 points per activity up to a maximum of 2.5 points annually).
  - e. Encyclopedia and Handbook articles (2.5 points if peer reviewed and 1.0 point if not peer reviewed).
  - f. Publication of a textbook (7 points per book).
    - i. Publication of a chapter in a textbook (1 point per chapter).
  - g. Publication of a non-peer reviewed book by a scholarly or commercial press recognized for its scholarly publications (5.0 points).
  - h. Editorship of a book of readings or anthology (4 points per book); associate or -assistant editor (2 points per book).
  - i. Publication of a non-peer reviewed journal article, book chapter, or article in proceedings (2.5 points per activity).
  - j. Publication of an article in a professional or trade journal, or author of an externally funded applied policy report (2 points per activity).<sup>8</sup>
2. Scholarly Presentations:
- a. Paper presented to a professional or scholarly conference (2 points per paper).
  - b. Co-authored paper presentation at a professional or scholarly conference when not present (0.25 points per paper for a regional conference and 0.5 points per paper for a national or international conference).
  - c. Presentation to a local (RGV) conference (1.0 point per paper).
  - d. Presentation at a research panel/workshop/roundtable at a professional or scholarly meeting (1.0 point per presentation up to a maximum of 3.0 point annually).
3. Grant Activity (application, funding, or appointment materials must be placed in the dossier):
- a. Applying for an external research grant as a principal or co-principal investigator (3 points per grant).

---

<sup>8</sup> Faculty may choose to report an applied policy report as Research or as Service, but not both.

- b. Serving as the principal or co-principal investigator on an externally funded grant (4 points in the first year for receiving the grant and 2 points for managing the grant in each subsequent year of a multi-year grant). Funding approval documentation must be placed in the dossier.
  - c. Serving as a Research Collaborator on an externally funded grant (1.0 point per year).
  - d. Serving as the principal or co-principal investigator on a research grant awarded by the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley or University of Texas System (1.0 point per grant per year). Professional development grants and awards will not receive credit (e.g., Office of Global Engagement Global Opportunity Grants, Advance stipends and awards, Faculty Affairs Faculty Travel Support Program).
- 4. Honors, recognitions, and awards for research, but not to include non-competitive internal awards (up to a maximum of 6 points per review cycle):
  - 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 private or non-profit entities (3.0 points each)
  - d. by national and international private or non-profit entities (4.0 points each).
- 5. Development of copyrighted software or “game” for use in a pedagogical, academic, or professional capacity (2 points per item).
- 6. Publication of a translation of an original English work into a foreign language (or vice versa) (1 point per activity).
- 7. Electronic publication of an authored contribution to a nationally or internationally recognized blog/news media (e.g., The Conversation, Monkey Cage, Huffington Post) (0.25 points per activity).
- 8. Attendance at research workshops, seminars, or trainings (up to a maximum of 4 points per 6-year evaluation cycle):
  - a. Lunch time sessions organized by the Office of Research (0.5 points),
  - b. Keys to Research certification (1.0 point),
  - c. Other research training activities:
    - i. Less than 2 hours (0.5 points),
    - ii. More than 2 hours (1.0 point).

### **Section 3. Service Activities**

- 1. Committee service
  - a. Chair of the Faculty Senate, Associate Dean, Center Director, Department Chair (4.0 points per year).
  - b. For the following positions and activities (3.0 points per activity per year):

- i. Associate Department Chair,
    - ii. Chair of the Annual Review Committee,
    - iii. Chairs of Search & Screen Committees,
    - iv. Chair, Program Evaluation & Assessment Committee,
    - v. Other committee chairs at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee based on annual workload.
  - c. For the following positions and activities (2.0 points per activity per year):
    - i. Member of the Annual Review Committee,
    - ii. Member of a Search & Screen Committee,
    - iii. Other committee memberships at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee based on annual workload.
  - d. For the following positions and activities (1.5 points per activity per year):
    - i. Chair of a Department committee (other than Annual Review Committee and Search and Screen Committees, see No. 2 above),
    - ii. Chair of a College or University committee,
  - e. Member of a Department committee, including committees in other departments and degree programs (other than Annual Review Committee and Search and Screen Committees, see 1.c. above), College level committees, and University level committees (1.0 point per committee per year).
2. Service to the department
- a. Graduate Program Director (3 points),
  - b. Secretary to the Department (3 points),
  - c. Department Library Liaison (1.5 points),
  - d. Department Web Liaison (1.5 points),
  - e. Department Social Media Liaison (1.5 points),
  - f. Program Coordinator/Director (1.5 points),
  - g. Member of the Faculty Senate (1.5 points)
  - h. Official Faculty Mentor to a faculty member at UTRGV (provide evidence of mentorship in the narrative) (1.0 point per mentee per year).
  - i. Official supervisor and instructor of record for a department teaching assistant (0.5 points per teaching assistant per semester up to a maximum of 2.0 points per academic year).
  - j. Summer teaching (1.0 point per course taught).

3. Service to the university community

- a. Member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (1.5 points),
- b. Chair of a University-wide initiative or organization (1.5 points),
- c. Sponsor/Advisor of a student organization (1.5 points),
- d. 10 hours of student advisement in an academic year. Advisement refers to developmental advising and not meeting with students about coursework, etc. Student advising will be awarded points only if relevant to teaching and research in Political Science (1.0 point per year up to a maximum of 4.0 points for the evaluation period).
- e. Attendance at trainings provided by the Center for Diversity and Inclusion, which promote cultural diversity and cultural competence to support students at UTRGV:
  - i. Ally Safe Zone Advocate training (1.0 point),
  - ii. Dream Zone Advocate training (1.0 point),
  - iii. Other training or workshops (0.5 points).

4. Service to the discipline

- a. Publication-related:
  - i. Referee for scholarly journal article or grant/research proposal (0.50 points per article/proposal).
  - ii. Referee for a complete book manuscript (1.00 points).
  - iii. Referee for a book proposal (0.25 points).
  - iv. Editor or managing editor of an academic journal (4.0 points);
  - v. Guest editor of an academic journal (1.0 points per issue);
  - vi. Associate editor or book review editor of an academic journal (0.5 points per year);
  - vii. editorial board member (0.25 points per year).
- b. Conference-related:
  - i. Conference Organizer (2 points),
  - ii. 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).
- c. Chair or President of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization (2 points),

- d. Officer (below the rank of chair/president) of a professional organization or a professionally related community organization (1.5 points),
  - e. Member of an external review committee for a department or academic program at a university other than UTRGV (2 points),
  - f. External reviewer for a tenure and/or promotion case at a university other than UTRGV (2 points).
5. Community service
- a. Discipline-related presentations to a unit of UTRGV or community organizations (0.25 points per presentation up to a maximum of 4 points annually).
  - b. Writing an opinion piece or editorial for a newspaper (0.25 points per activity up to an annual maximum of 1 point)
  - c. On-going partnership (meetings, consultations) with community-based organization(s) to be documented via written report of activity and letters of acknowledgment from the organizations involved. Community involvement will be awarded points only if it is professionally relevant to teaching and research in Political Science (1.0 point per 10 hours of engagement, maximum 2.0 points per year and 4.0 points for the evaluation period).
  - d. Testimony before governmental panels, including legislative committees, administrative organizations, and judicial bodies (2 points per activity).
  - e. Author of an applied policy report or research-based 'white paper' that is sponsored, prepared for, or funded by a governmental, private, or non-profit organization (2.0 points per activity).<sup>9</sup>
  - f. Media citations and interviews (e.g., quotes in newspaper, radio, television) (0.1 points each not to exceed 5 points per year).

---

<sup>9</sup> Faculty may choose to report an applied policy report as Research or as Service, but not both.

# APPENDIX A

## DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE Policy on Peer Observation of Teaching<sup>10</sup>

**Purpose:** As part of Political Science faculty members' desire to continuously improve their courses for our students, the faculty believe that teaching may be reviewed using: 1. student evaluations of the course, 2. continued participation in the various endeavors of mentoring our students, designing new courses, revising current courses for reduced seats and/or online delivery, etc., 3. peer observation of teaching and review of course materials. This policy is to formalize the peer observation and review of course materials.

**Objective:** This policy affects all full-time faculty including 1- and 3-year lecturers, tenure-track, and tenured faculty. Each faculty member will be observed and his/her course materials reviewed by peers on the following schedule:

Tenured Faculty and Senior Lecturers: At least once every three years; dossiers compiled for promotion to the rank of professor and post-tenure review must include Peer Observation of Teaching forms from at least two (2) peer reviews.

Tenure-Track Faculty: Every year.

Three-year appointment lectures: Every year.

One-year appointment lecturers: Every year.

Faculty may request additional observation as desired and those on tenure-track are encouraged to do so. Faculty will select the course for which that observation is to take place among those he or she is teaching including any type of course—face-to-face, reduced seat, or fully online.

**Selection of Observer:** Faculty may select from one of the following options for observation:

- a. Faculty being observed may choose any member of the Political Science Department.
- b. Faculty may ask the Department Chair to select randomly any faculty member.
- c. Faculty may request a team of reviewers including any two or all of the above options to conduct the observation.

**The Observation:** Observers should be contacted regarding an observation request early in the semester. The formative observation consists of four activities: a meeting between instructor and

---

<sup>10</sup> UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures* ADM 06-505 E.1.b.iii states: "Tenure-track (TT) faculty are required to include evidence of at least one peer observation of teaching per year, along with the faculty member's self-reflection from the observation in their dossier as per the department guidelines. In departments without such guidelines, faculty shall follow university guidelines posted on the appropriate EVP's website." See, UTRGV Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs, "Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching," [https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/\\_files/documents/faculty-resources/guidelines\\_for\\_faculty\\_peer\\_observation\\_of\\_teaching.pdf](https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/guidelines_for_faculty_peer_observation_of_teaching.pdf)



observers(s) prior to the observation, at least one classroom or online visit, a review of course material (syllabi, methods of assessment, assignment sheets, notes, etc.), and a final informal oral discussion between the faculty member being observed and the observer(s) where the bulk and details of the formative assessment are presented.

### **Peer Observation of Teaching Form**

After the observation, the observer fills out the Political Science Department's Peer Observation of Teaching Form, which will include the dates of all classroom observations and meetings between the observer and the faculty member who was observed that were part of the peer observation process. Both faculty members sign this form, and a copy must be placed in the observed faculty member's annual review folder, as well as any tenure and/or promotion dossier that the candidate submits.

### **Faculty Member Report**

The observed faculty member will also prepare a Faculty Member Report, which includes:

1. Name and signature of faculty member,
2. Name and signature of peer observer,
3. Name and course number of observed class,
4. Date of any pre-observation meeting,
5. Date of observation(s),
6. Date of any post-observation meeting,
7. A brief written narrative (not to exceed one page) by the faculty member describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any plans for improvement or development.

A copy of the Faculty Member Report must be placed in the observed faculty member's annual review folder, as well as any tenure and/or promotion dossier that the candidate submits.

### **Peer Observer Evaluation**

The observed faculty member may request a written Peer Observer Evaluation from the observer summarizing the observation process and providing an assessment of the observed faculty member's teaching, which the faculty member may include in tenure and/or promotion dossiers. A Peer Observer Evaluation should include all four aspects of the observation described above, and should address the following questions:

- Does the instructor clearly define and explain the course objectives and expectations?
- Is the instructor prepared to teach for each instructional activity?
- Does the instructor communicate information effectively?
- Does the instructor encourage students to take an active role in their own learning?
- Is the instructor available to students, either electronically or in person?

**Online Courses:** Faculty may replace one peer observation by participating in an online review of their course using a method employed by the Center for Online Learning and Technology for course reviews. Faculty who teach all their courses online will be evaluated online.

*Approved by Department Vote October 23, 2015. Amended on March 4, 2016.*

# APPENDIX B<sup>11</sup>

## DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE Policy on External Review of Tenure and Promotion Candidates

In the spring semester of the academic year before a candidate's final year on the tenure track, the candidate, Department Chair, and the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee will compile a list of at least six names to contact for external reviews of the candidate's research and publications. These potential reviewers will be contacted by the Department Chair no later than May 15<sup>th</sup> prior to the candidate's review year.

### Selection of Reviewers

1. The candidate will supply a list of six (6) potential reviewers, with brief reasons for each choice, and his/her relationship to each reviewer. The candidate may provide a listing with a brief explanation of any external peers whom he or she prefers not to be contacted by the Chair.
2. Peer reviewers, with well-established expertise in the field of the candidate, will be selected as follows:
  - a. The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee will prepare a list of proposed reviewers. The list will include the entire list supplied by the candidate plus up to an additional four (4) potential reviewers recommended by the Tenure and Promotion Committee.
  - b. The candidate will be informed of all the names on the list and will have the opportunity to comment on them.
  - c. The Tenure and Promotion Committee, in consultation with the Department Chair, will select at least four (4) reviewers from that list to include at least three (3) names from the list provided by the candidate. The candidate's listing of those he/she wishes to be excluded will normally be honored by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Chair.
  - d. The names and affiliations of the reviewers selected will not be divulged to the candidate and will remain confidential.
3. The Department Chair will request written peer reviews from the selected reviewers to be placed in the candidate's dossier. A copy of the review letter will be included in the candidate's dossier. The reviewer's contact information, along with the reviewer's CV will be included in the dossier for all levels of review.
4. All review levels must ensure that all identifying information/material of the external reviewers is removed from the dossier before allowing the candidate to access or review the dossier.

### The Review Process

---

<sup>11</sup> See, UTRGV, Division of Academic Affairs, "Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure," available at [https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/files/documents/faculty-resources/guidelines\\_for\\_external\\_reviewers.pdf](https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/files/documents/faculty-resources/guidelines_for_external_reviewers.pdf)

The external reviewers will provide an evaluation of the candidate's achievements in the category of research/scholarship only. The Department Chair will provide the external reviewers with copies of relevant publications, a copy of the candidate's curriculum vita, a summary of the candidate's workload in terms of teaching (class sizes, number of course preparations, etc.) and service, and information about the level of support (travel funds, course releases, etc.) the University has provided to support the candidate's research. External reviewers should address the question of whether the publication(s) represent a contribution to the scholarship in the candidate's field. External reviewers should be asked to provide at least a one to two paragraph evaluation of the candidate's research record. Reviewers will send their reviews to the Department Chair.

It is possible that fewer than three reviews will be received in a timely fashion. If the candidate met his or her responsibility in terms of submitting appropriate names for reviewers, the fact that fewer than three reviews are obtained can in no way be held against the candidate by internal reviewers.

Once reviews have been chosen for inclusion, the department chair will add the reviews, together with a current curriculum vita of the reviewers, to the candidate's final review dossier after the candidate has submitted that dossier to the Department Chair and before the dossier is submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee during the candidate's final review year.

### **The Role of the External Reviews**

The external reviews of a candidate's scholarly accomplishments are intended to be just one facet of the candidate's dossier. They are intended to provide internal reviewers with some additional insight into the candidate's record, but are not to be viewed as more significant than the internal reviews, especially those at the department level, where faculty have a richer perspective of the candidate's overall performance in terms of the three areas of review: teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

## APPENDIX C: Guidelines For Annual Yearly Progress

Faculty are required to provide an annual report of activity points earned each year and a report of cumulative points earned in each 6-year evaluation cycle in the manner agreed upon by the department.

These guidelines are based on the total number of points required at the end of each 6-year evaluation cycle as given in Chapter II, above. These guidelines are meant to provide guidance to faculty members and to the Annual Review and Tenure and Promotion Committees to consider when evaluating whether a faculty member exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations, or if their performance is unsatisfactory. The committees have the discretion to deviate from these guidelines, but must provide an explanation for doing so in their report.

Definitions of the summary review ratings are provided in Chapter I Section 3, above.

<b>Guidelines for Progress Toward Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor</b>						
<b>Teaching</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;10% negative responses on student evaluations</li> <li>• Overall course rating over 3.5</li> <li>• 12 total activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;10% negative responses on student evaluations</li> <li>• Overall course rating of 4.5 or above</li> <li>• 15 total activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	2	4	6	8	10	12
Exceed expectations	4	6	8	10	12	15
<b>Research and Scholarship</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals or 1 peer-reviewed book published by a reputable publisher</li> <li>• 1 lead or sole authored publication</li> <li>• 15 activity points</li> <li>• Narrative describing the significance of their research</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals or 1 peer-reviewed book published by a reputable publisher</li> <li>• 2 lead or sole authored publication</li> <li>• 20 activity points</li> <li>• Narrative describing the significance of their research</li> </ul>					
<b># Publications</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	0	1	1	2	3	4
Exceed expectations	1	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	2	4	6	8	10	12
Exceed expectations	4	6	8	10	12	15
<b>Service</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25 activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	1	1	4	10	15	20
Exceed expectations	2	5	10	15	20	25

<b>Guidelines for Progress Toward Promotion to Full Professor</b>						
<b>Teaching</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;10% negative responses on student evaluations</li> <li>• Overall course rating over 3.5</li> <li>• 12 total activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;10% negative responses on student evaluations</li> <li>• Overall course rating of 4.5 or above</li> <li>• 15 total activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	2	4	6	8	10	12
Exceed expectations	4	6	8	10	12	15
<b>Research and Scholarship</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals or 1 peer-reviewed book published by a reputable publisher</li> <li>• 1 lead or sole authored publication</li> <li>• 20 activity points</li> <li>• Narrative describing the significance of their research</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals or 1 peer-reviewed book published by a reputable publisher</li> <li>• 2 lead or sole authored publication</li> <li>• 24 activity points</li> <li>• Narrative describing the significance of their research</li> </ul>					
<b># Publications</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	0	1	1	2	3	4
Exceed expectations	1	2	2	3	4	5
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	2	6	10	14	18	20
Exceed expectations	4	8	12	16	20	24
<b>Service</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25 activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	4	8	12	16	20	25
Exceed expectations	6	13	20	26	33	40

<b>Guidelines for Progress Toward Post-Tenure Review</b>						
<b>Teaching</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;10% negative responses on student evaluations</li> <li>• Overall course rating over 3.5</li> <li>• 12 total activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;10% negative responses on student evaluations</li> <li>• Overall course rating of 4.5 or above</li> <li>• 15 total activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	2	4	6	8	10	12
Exceed expectations	4	6	8	10	12	15
<b>Research and Scholarship</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals or 1 peer-reviewed book published by a reputable publisher</li> <li>• 1 lead or sole authored publication</li> <li>• 20 activity points</li> <li>• Narrative describing the significance of their research</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals or 1 peer-reviewed book published by a reputable publisher</li> <li>• 2 lead or sole authored publication</li> <li>• 24 activity points</li> <li>• Narrative describing the significance of their research</li> </ul>					
<b># Publications</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	0	0	1	1	1	2
Exceed expectations	0	1	1	2	2	3
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	2	6	10	14	18	20
Exceed expectations	4	8	12	16	20	24
<b>Service</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25 activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	5	10	15	20	25	30
Exceeds expectations	10	20	30	40	50	60

<b>Guidelines for Teaching Track</b>						
<b>Teaching</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;10% negative responses on student evaluations</li> <li>• Overall course rating over 3.5</li> <li>• 12 total activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;10% negative responses on student evaluations</li> <li>• Overall course rating of 4.5 or above</li> <li>• 15 total activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	2	4	6	8	10	12
Exceed expectations	4	6	8	10	12	15
<b>Research and Scholarship</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	1	3	5	7	9	10
Exceed expectations	2	4	6	8	11	14
<b>Service</b>						
	Minimum requirements to meet expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 activity points</li> </ul>					
	Minimum requirements to exceed expectations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25 activity points</li> </ul>					
<b>Activity points</b>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Meet expectations	1	1	4	10	15	20
Exceed expectations	2	5	10	15	20	25