



Post Tenure Review Criteria  
Draft October 21, 2016

## **DEPARTMENT PROCEDURE**

The tenured faculty member will submit to the department head and the department post-tenure review committee a portfolio documenting performance. The portfolio should be comprised of the following:

- 1 a current curriculum vitae reflecting only the last six years.
- 2 annual performance reviews for each of the years under consideration.
- 3 a statement prepared by the faculty member detailing his or her accomplishments in teaching, research, and service and outreach.
- 4 student and peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.
- 5 any other documentation deemed relevant by the faculty member under review.
- 6 The department post tenure peer review committee (PTPRC) will review the materials and render a recommendation to the department head of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of the three areas of responsibility. In the case of a satisfactory recommendation, the PTPRC may elect to include comments about the faculty member's identified areas of excellence and/or possibilities for future professional development. In the case of a needs improvement or unsatisfactory recommendation, the PTPRC will make recommendations about the faculty member's future professional development.
- 7 The department head will submit an assessment of the faculty member indicating whether performance has been satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of three areas of responsibility over the past six years. The candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
- 8 The department head recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member and the dean.

The dean will review the evaluations prepared by the department head and provide his or her own written assessment of the candidate's overall performance to include budget considerations for professional development costs if recommended in a professional development plan. The dean will send this written evaluation to the candidate, department head, and dean of faculties/provost. The college and the dean of faculties will each maintain a copy

of the evaluation in the candidate's permanent personnel files.

Address Item 2.4 and 2.5 of the University Standard Administrative Procedure (p. 2)

Address the professional development review (Item 4) of the University Standard Administrative Procedure (p 4-6) for those who accumulate three consecutive unsatisfactory reviews

Is there a point value for the various activities under teaching, research, and service? Or is based solely on a qualitative assessment?

Let's discuss tomorrow

## DESIGNATION OF RATING LEVELS

**Level 1:** Does Not Meet Performance Standard - Unsatisfactory

**Level 2:** Below Expected Performance Standard – Needs Improvement

**Level 3:** Meets Expected Performance Standard - Satisfactory

**Level 4:** Exceeds Expected Performance Standard - Satisfactory

**Level 5:** Meritorious Performance on Standard - Satisfactory

The following profile of activities are not intended to be either definitive or exhaustive. However, the use of these activities and the college evaluation guidelines should help assure the availability of significant information to persons responsible for making such judgments.

### TEACHING

Teaching evaluations are a necessary, but not a sufficient component of assessing overall teaching performance. When assessing teaching scores, other factors can be considered, including the courses taught and trends in teaching rating scores. In addition, faculty development efforts to improve teaching and courses should be recognized as part of the evaluation process.

It is recommended that the maximum a faculty member's teaching performance rating can be raised based on teaching development activities is one Level. For example, if the department head/PTPRC reviews the annual teaching activities and teaching narrative provided by a faculty member and determines that the faculty member merits a Level 3 (Meets Expected Performance Standard) teaching score for the year, the head/PTPRC may then consider raising the faculty member's evaluation based on faculty development activities during the year (e.g. Montague-CTE Scholars, Faculty Fellow for Innovation in High Impact Practices, Teaching Award/s, Quality Matters Course Development, etc.). However, the department head/PTPRC should limit the increased rating due to development activities to a maximum of one level. In the example provided above, a rating of 3 could only be raised to a 3.5 or 4 based on instructional or teaching/course innovation and development activities.

### Teaching Designations

**Level 1:** A faculty member whose teaching is not acceptable. The faculty member is judged as having significant problems as judged by his/her peers and head and is failing to meet the teaching expectations identified in Level 2. Some indications of unacceptable teaching from peer and student evaluations may include: the faculty member makes no effort to improve teaching, the faculty member is not prepared for classroom or on-line instruction/activities, does not demonstrate mastery of the subject matter, shows little enthusiasm for the subject matter or

classroom/on-line teaching interaction, does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner, does not manage the classroom or on-line environment well, is not responsive or available to students, etc. This level of performance often leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department head and by teaching evaluations consistently below the department and college averages. This professor should not be in the classroom at Texas A&M University.

**Level 2:** The activities listed in Level 2 define the below expectations for teaching. A faculty member who earns a Level 2 rating may meet the minimum expectations for teaching, but their teaching still needs improvement and observation. This level of performance occasionally leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department head and by teaching evaluations below the department and college averages. The faculty member does meet all of the following minimum expectations:

- ✓ Having an appropriate (as defined by the department, college and university) syllabus which is distributed at the first meeting of the class.
- ✓ Meeting with the class at the scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances.
- ✓ Incorporating library, enrichment, and technology resources into appropriate courses to enhance student learning and engagement.
- ✓ Adhering to college and department policies regarding student evaluations and obtaining adequate student evaluations in all courses taught without consistent serious problems as judged by departmental peers.
- ✓ Being available in his/her office during posted office hours (as specified by departmental policy) unless there is an unavoidable conflict.
- ✓ Returning examinations and assignments with feedback to students in a timely manner.
- ✓ Submitting textbook requests, course grades, and syllabi in a timely manner.

**Level 3:** A faculty member in this Level performs satisfactorily and meets expectations based on student evaluations and a peer review of the relevant teaching materials. Teaching evaluation scores are typically near the department and college averages. In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, the faculty member is judged as providing a positive learning environment which is conducive to student learning. This faculty member would

benefit from developing behaviors such as those described in Level 4 and 5.

Satisfactory performance is typically demonstrated through activities such as:

- ✓ Showing evidence of continuous improvement of existing course content and delivery for all courses taught as judged by departmental peers.
- ✓ Being prepared for the classroom or on-line teaching/learning environments (speaking to the topic area, demonstrating preparation through logical and informative lectures, class exercises, discussion forums, blogs or other related technologically mediated pedagogical tools) Note - this could be measured by peer review or through student evaluations.
- ✓ Participation in a faculty development initiative focused on teaching improvement requiring low levels of time, effort, or formality. (e.g. 1 hour workshop; having a colleague watch a class and provide informal feedback, peer teaching observation, etc.).
- ✓ Sharing of Teaching Best Practices from Conferences or Workshops with CEHD Faculty at a Presentation or Brown Bag Lunch presentation.

**Level 4:** A faculty member who is recognized by peers and students in valid documented evaluations as an above average or exceeds expectations teacher typically has teaching evaluations above the department and college averages.

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, a significant level or number of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of teaching exceeding expectations.

- ✓ A sustained record of teaching demonstrating teaching judged as above average by departmental peers
- ✓ Participating effectively as the subject in a teaching improvement effort involving classroom visitations with feedback or participation in multiple faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement. These efforts are characterized as requiring more formality, effort, and rigor than Level 3 activities.
- ✓ Preparing a course that they are teaching for the first time.
- ✓ Effectively teaching extremely large sections. (The PTPRC will judge whether the sections taught would constitute a large section. Evidence from the Faculty Annual Evaluation Form will be used in making this determination. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to make the case that a course should be considered a large section.)
- ✓ Participating effectively in an effort targeting the integration of

disciplines of fields of study in courses. Cross disciplinary integration of teaching or co-teaching with other faculty.

- ✓ Demonstrating significant incorporation of high impact learning practices in courses taught
- ✓ Effectively supervising Thesis/Dissertation committees, participating in the departmental Honors' Programs or tutoring/mentoring undergraduate research students.
- ✓ Effectively supervising Directed Study/Internship judged as significant by departmental peers.
- ✓ Having teaching evaluations judged by departmental peers as above average.
- ✓ Having a larger than normal number of assigned preparations per year (3 or more).
- ✓ Receiving departmental teaching honors.
- ✓ Being readily available to students at times other than posted office hours for discussion and mentoring.
- ✓ Participating in faculty development activities focused on teaching judged as above average by peers.
- ✓ Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts.

**Level 5:** A faculty member who is clearly meritorious in the classroom compared with his or her colleagues. This person exhibits many of the following traits: attends seminars or colloquia for improvement; tries new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom; shares successful techniques with colleagues; and receives teaching evaluations significantly higher than department and college averages. A faculty member that receives a Level 5 typically includes regular peer review of teaching in their annual development activities.

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, a significant number or level of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of excellent teaching:

- ✓ Receiving a University Distinguished Professor Award or other CEHD teaching award judged as significant by departmental peers (Awards that last more than 1 year, such as a University Distinguished Professor Award, can be included as part of the faculty narrative for the entire term of the award.)
- ✓ Developing and successfully delivering a new courses at the request of the department or college in support of the department or college mission judged as being significant by departmental peers and head.
- ✓ New contributions to interdisciplinary/interdepartmental curriculum

- integration judged as significant by departmental peers and head.
- ✓ Teaching evaluations judged by departmental peers as excellent reflecting the incorporation of high impact teaching/learning practices.
  - ✓ A teaching portfolio demonstrating materials and methods judged by departmental peers as excellent. Such a portfolio should contain documented evaluations of classroom performance; attendance at seminars or colloquia for improvement of teaching; and other materials expected in an excellent teaching portfolio. Participation in a faculty development initiative focused on teaching improvement.
  - ✓ Participation in faculty development initiatives focused on teaching improvement judged as significant by department and college peers (e.g. Master Teacher Conferences, Quality Matters Certified Courses, Montague-CTE Scholars, Faculty Fellow for Innovation in High Impact Practices).
  - ✓ Participating in peer review of teaching by colleagues or outside experts judged as significant by peers.

## **RESEARCH**

For purposes of categorizing research or scholarly contributions and assisting in the objective assessment of scholarship, the department will work to maintain a journal list organized into four levels as follows:

1. Elite Journals – the top 3-5 journals in the field, typically rated as “A” journals
2. Top Journals – the next 10-15 journals that are considered to be high quality journals or journals that are the top journals of discipline sub-specialties (“best-in-class”). These are typically B+ to A- journals.
3. High Quality Journals – the next 20+ journals that are solid journals in the field. These are typically B level journals
4. Acceptable Journals – the remaining journals in the field.

In all cases these are to be peer or editor- reviewed outlets. While each cognate area has the discretion to develop a journal list consistent with the mission of the, the department journal lists should be reasonably consistent with peer institutions or colleges with similar missions and program characteristics. Consistent with our college’s goal of encouraging and supporting cross-disciplinary research, faculty members can receive credit for cross-disciplinary research that appears in other journal outlets with co-authors from other departments, colleges, or universities.

### **Research Designation**

## **Level 1**

No evidence of research activity. Unsatisfactory performance in this category.

## **Level 2**

The below expectation and needs improvement for research activity may be met with at least one of the following activities:

- ✓ Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed journal.
- ✓ Submission of manuscript or instructional software to publisher.
- ✓ Submission of paper to peer-reviewed academic, professional, or pedagogical meeting.
- ✓ Documented progress on or completion of a manuscript/working paper.
- ✓ Submission of an external grant proposal.
- ✓ Funding of an internal grant request.
- ✓ Attendance at a research development workshop, seminar, or conference.  
The faculty member should describe the impact of the development activity in their narrative of research and scholarship.
- ✓ Invited published papers.

## **Level 3**

Achievement of at least three of the following results in each year of the review period: Satisfactory performance in this category.

- ✓ Submission of external research grant proposal judged as being significant by peers and department head.
- ✓ Presentation of peer-reviewed paper, workshop, symposia, poster-session, etc., at an acceptable academic, professional, or pedagogical conference or meeting.
- ✓ Invited published papers judged by peers as requiring significant effort or having a significant impact based on quality or publication outlet.
- ✓ Publication of a case or paper in peer-reviewed meeting proceedings or book.
- ✓ Publication of chapter in scholarly book, professional book or textbook.
- ✓ Publication of book review in peer-reviewed journal
- ✓ Publication of editorials or research comments in professional or academic publication.
- ✓ Publication of peer reviewed journal article

## **Level 4**

Evaluation in Level 4 is earned by achievement of four of the following results in

each year of the review period: Satisfactory performance in this category.

- ✓ Publication of a High Quality Journal article.
- ✓ Publication of two Acceptable Journal articles.
  
- ✓ Publication of peer-reviewed research monograph
- ✓ Publication of a new edition of a scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as significant by department peers and head.
- ✓ Publication of instructional software judged as significant by the faculty's peers and department head.
- ✓ Funding of external research grant judged as significant by departmental peers and department head.

### **Level 5**

Evaluation in Level 5 is earned by achievement of four of the following results in each year of the review period: Satisfactory performance in this category.

- ✓ Publication of an Elite Journal article earns a Level 5 rating for three consecutive years during the review period.
- ✓ Publication of one Top Journal article.
- ✓ Publication of a new scholarly book, professional book or textbook judged as significant by department peers and head.

## **SERVICE AND OUTREACH**

### **Service Designations**

#### **Level 1**

There is no evidence of service or outreach at this level. The faculty member does not meet at least one of the Level 2 requirements for Service and Outreach: Unsatisfactory performance in this category.

#### **Level 2**

A rating of below expectations for service and outreach include but are not limited to the following activities. A faculty member that achieves a rating of below expectations for service and outreach within the department will meet two of the following expectations: Needs improvement in this category.

- ✓ Effective service on one college level committee.
- ✓ Effective service on one departmental committee.
- ✓ Regular attendance at department and college meetings (more than half of

- scheduled meetings).
- ✓ Being a member in a professional organization.

### **Level 3**

In addition to meeting the level 2 expectations for service, a significant level or number of professional or service activities can be used as evidence of satisfactorily meeting expected performance such as the following: Satisfactory performance in this category.

#### Professional Activity

- ✓ Attendance at one professional meeting
- ✓ Participation in a professional development activity related to the Faculty Development Plan from the previous year. Professional activities are those activities which contribute to the teaching and/or research capabilities of the faculty member. It must be a documented activity which is/was approved by the departmental head.

#### Service

- ✓ Community service judged as significant by departmental peers and department head.
- ✓ Effectively serving on one or more active (i.e., the group met at least once per semester or that the position required some work) University committees and/or College judged as being significant by departmental peers and head.
- ✓ Student placement or recruitment activity judged as significant by departmental peers.
- ✓ Serving as a session head, moderator, or panel discussant (or similar role) serving in a voluntary capacity at a significant national or regional conference.
- ✓ Undercompensated service activities (campus organization advisor/sponsor, workshop or seminar organizer, Residential Learning Communities leader, etc.)

### **Level 4**

In addition to meeting the minimum expectations of service, a significant level or number of activities such as those listed below can be used as evidence of exceeds expectations performance. A faculty member earning a Level 4 in service will meet the minimum expectations for service (Level 3) and typically be engaged in some Level 4 service activities: Satisfactory performance in this category.

#### Professional Activity

- ✓ Participating in a faculty internship, externship, or involvement in a project judged as significant by departmental peers.
- ✓ Organizing a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as significant by department peers and head.
- ✓ Book and manuscript reviewing judged as significant by departmental peers.
- ✓ Attendance at multiple professional conferences.
- ✓ Holding an elected office or serving as a member on an active committee or board of a professional organization (i.e., the group met at least once during the year or that the position required some work).
- ✓ Obtaining and maintaining significant professional certifications as judged by department peers and head.
- ✓ Serving as a keynote speaker or distinguished lecturer at national or regional conference judged as significant by department peers and head.
- ✓ Effectively serving on the editorial board of a journal.

### Service Activity

- ✓ Effectively heading an active departmental committee or task force that is judged as significant by departmental peers.
- ✓ Effectively leading a special departmental project judged as significant by the departmental head.
- ✓ Effectively serving as advisor to an active club or student organization as determined by the members of that club or student organization.
- ✓ Alumni relations/fund-raising activity judged as significant by departmental peers.
- ✓ Participation on a department or university standing or faculty council committee that required a significant amount of time and effort.
- ✓ Serving as an elected member of a departmental committee.
- ✓ Engaging in an above average number of unreported service activities (e.g. Faculty advisor in student organization, supervising undergraduate research, leading informal education efforts within the community, speaking engagements, extra classes without compensation, guest lectures in colleague class, etc.)

### **Level 5**

A significant level and number of professional or service activities listed below can be used as evidence of meritorious performance. A faculty member earning a Level 5 in service will meet the expectations for service and typically be engaged in Level 3 and 4 service activities. A faculty member earning a Level 5 in service must also be engaged in some internal service activities for the department or college, university, and national or international engagement: Satisfactory performance in this category.

### Professional Activity

- ✓ Effectively serve as the editor or assistant editor of a peer-reviewed journal
- ✓ Organizing and successfully organizing and delivering a conference, symposia, or colloquia judged as significant by departmental peers.
- ✓ Effectively serving as an officer in or heading a significant state or national committee as judged by departmental peers.
- ✓ Effectively serving as a track, theme, or strand head at a national or regional conference.
- ✓ Organizing and successfully presenting a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as outstanding by departmental peers.

### Service

- ✓ Effectively heading a college level committee, task force, or similar working group of peers, submitting an annual or final report summarizing the activities and accomplishments of the committee.
- ✓ Effectively serving as advisor to a significant active club or student organization where a significant time commitment is required: i.e., working with a student group on a major project as determined by the members of the student group or club.
- ✓ Serving effectively as a program director without release time.
- ✓ Effectively heading an active university committee or task force.
- ✓ Serving as a Faculty Senator that regularly attends meetings.
- ✓ Engaging in a significant number of unreported service activities (e.g. Faculty advisor in student organization, supervising undergraduate research, leading informal education efforts within the community, speaking engagements, extra classes without compensation, guest lectures in colleague class, or other similar service oriented activities etc.)
- ✓ Serving as a faculty mentor for a college or department faculty member. This level of mentoring would typically be characterized by a close working relationship between the mentor and mentee and require significant time and effort while engaged in a formal and rigorous teaching and research development process.