TEACHING, LEARNING & CULTURE
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Post Tenure Review Criteria
Approved November 10, 2016
Revised August 9, 2017

CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW

These guidelines are in accordance with University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01, *Post-Tenure Review* **and govern tenured faculty members in the College of Education and Human Development. Much of the language in this document was taken almost verbatim from the University's document with some modifications to fit the context of the College of Education and Human Development and the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture.**

Post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected productivity. Post-tenure review is comprised of annual performance reviews by the department head (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation) as well as a review by a committee of peers that occurs at least once every six years.

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted **no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution**. The evaluation should be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service, and other assigned responsibilities, and must include peer review of the faculty member. The expectations of faculty at the periodic peer review must be aligned with the expectations established by the faculty and department head based on the A1 guidelines in effect for the year in which the performance originally reviewed.

While the annual review is a snapshot of faculty performance over a year (or three years in the area of scholarship the periodic peer review is a more comprehensive review and assesses faculty performance over a period of time (no more than six years) established by the department and written in the post-tenure review guidelines.

DEPARTMENT PROCEDURE

The Post Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) will be elected annually and comprised of four elected members of the tenured full professor faculty. The top three members with the most votes will comprise the PTRC. The fourth member elected will serve as an alternate should

1

one of the three committee members be unavailable to serve. All tenured faculty at the rank of full professor are eligible to appear on the ballot unless a faculty member is subject to post tenure review (PTR) during that year.

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

1. a current curriculum vitae highlighting accomplishments covered by the review period.
2. a personal statement of no more than 3 pages prepared by the faculty member detailing his or her accomplishments in teaching, research, and service and outreach.
3. evidence of teaching, research and service accomplishments covered by the review period.
4. any other documentation deemed relevant by the faculty member under review.
5. The department post tenure review committee (PTRC) will review the materials and render a recommendation of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of the three areas of responsibility. In the case of a satisfactory recommendation, the PTRC will include comments about the faculty member's identified areas of excellence and/or possibilities for future professional development.
6. If the committee determines that the performance is unsatisfactory the faculty member will be required to participate in the Professional Development Review.

12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review Standard Administrative Procedure

The report to the Dean for each "unsatisfactory" performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan, co-developed by the faculty member and department head, for near term improvement. If deemed necessary due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a "periodic review" (section 3).

If a faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" ranking in any single category, he or she must work with his or her department head to develop an improvement plan. For teaching this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g. research, scholarship and creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The ranking of "Needs Improvement" can stay as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the ranking will be changed to "Unsatisfactory".

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (section 2) or an "Unsatisfactory" Periodic Peer Review (section 3) or upon request of the faculty member (section 7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can

Draft for Faculty Review and Input

be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.

Draft for Faculty Review and Input

DEPARTMENT DESIGNATION OF RATING LEVELS FOR PEER POST TENURE REVIEW

Level 1: Does Not Meet Performance Standard – Unsatisfactory will initiate a professional development review.

Level 2: Meets Expected Performance Standard

Level 3: Exceeds Expected Performance Standard

Level 4: Exemplary Performance on Standard

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 evaluations.

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.

Teaching Designations

Level 1: Unsatisfactory. A faculty member whose teaching is unsatisfactory. 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 3. Some indicators of unacceptable teaching from peer and student evaluations may include but are not limited to:
- ☐ 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 student/s requests for assistance or advising, etc.
- ☐ Does not have an appropriate (as defined by the department, college and university) syllabus which is distributed at the first meeting of the class.
- ☐ Does not meets classes according to the university schedule unless there are extenuating circumstances.

☐ Is not available in his/her office during posted office hours (as specified by departmental policy).

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. There is substantial evidence of student complaints.

Level 2: Meets expectations. 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.

Satisfactory performance is typically demonstrated through activities such as but not limited to:

☐ Meets all university and department requirements for course syllabus.
☐ Meets and advises students during regularly held office hours as posted.
☐ Shows evidence of continuous improvement of existing course content and delivery for all courses taught as judged by departmental peers.
☐ 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)
☐ Participates in peer review of own teaching.
☐ 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, etc.).
☐ Sharing of Teaching Best Practices from Conferences or Workshops with CEHD Faculty at a Presentation or Brown Bag Lunch presentations.
☐ Positively engages students in the learning process.

Level 3: Exceeds expectations. A faculty member who exceeds expectations typically has teaching evaluations above the department and college averages in addition to other quality indicators. In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for teaching, example of activities such as those listed below but not limited to, can be used as evidence of teaching exceeding expectations.

☐ Participates 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 2 activities.
☐ Mentors graduate students teaching undergraduate courses.
☐ Participates effectively in an effort targeting the integration of disciplines

Draft for Faculty Review and Input

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

- ☐ Incorporation of high impact learning practices in courses
- ☐ Effectively supervises Thesis/Dissertation committees, or participates in the departmental Honors' Programs or tutoring/mentoring undergraduate research students.
- ☐ Effectively supervising Directed Study/Internship.
- ☐ Have teaching evaluations judged by departmental peers as above average.
- ☐ Have a larger than normal number of assigned preparations per year (3 or more).
- ☐ Receive departmental teaching honors.
- ☐ Readily available to students at times other than posted office hours for discussion and mentoring.
- ☐ Participate in faculty development activities focused on teaching judged as above average by peers.
- ☐ Participate in peer review of teaching by outside experts.

Level 4: Exemplary. A faculty member who is clearly exemplary in the classroom compared with his or her colleagues. This person exhibits many of the following traits but not limited to: 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 4 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.).
- ☐ Receives recognition for excellence in teaching by external professional organization or society.
- ☐ Developing and successfully delivering a new course 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). Additional activities not specified here can be discussed with the peers, program leaders and DH to determine whether they would count as significant enough to meet this criterion.
- ☐ 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 set a goal to maintain a journal list organized into four levels as follows:

1. Elite Journals – the top journals in the field, typically rated as "A" journals as evidenced by circulation, impact factor, Eigen factor etc.
2. Top Journals –high quality journals or journals that are the top journals related specialties ("best-in-class"). These are typically B+ to A- journals as evidenced by circulation, impact factor, Eigen factor, editorial board, editorial team, citation rate, etc.
3. High Quality Journals – the next tier of journals that are solid journals in the field. These are typically B level journals as evidenced by number of years in operation, breadth of readership or quality of the editorial board.
4. Acceptable Journals – the remaining journals in the field.

Our goal is to honor faculty selected choice for journal publications while at the same time encouraging impactful research that informs knowledge generation and discovery and/or influences practice within a field of study.

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 cognate, 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 journal outlets not in their specific discipline and works with co-authors from other departments, colleges, or universities will be considered exemplary.

Research Designation

Level 1: No evidence of research activity. Unsatisfactory performance in this category.

Level 2: A faculty member in this level performs satisfactorily and meets expectations. Research is adequate and earns a mean of 2 or more publications during a

rolling 3-year period across the evaluation period and submits extramural grants and contracts annually as PI or Co-Pi. In addition to meeting the minimum expectations for research, the faculty member is judged as achieving a positive outcome with regard to mentoring students related to research and scholarship.

Attainment indicators of satisfactory performance in research include but are not limited to:

- ☐ Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed journal.
- ☐ Submission of manuscript for a book to a publisher
- ☐ Submission of 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 or contract 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.
- ☐ Obtained invited published papers.
- ☐ Invitation as keynote speaker at major research conferences, seminars, symposia.
- ☐ Submission of required IRB to conduct research.
- ☐ Submission of external research grant proposal judged as being significant by peers and department head as Pi or Co-Pi.
- ☐ 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 2 peer reviewed journal articles as described in the A1 document

Level 3: Exceeds Expectation. Evaluation in level 3 is earned by satisfactory achievement at level 2 in addition to research indicators that exceed expectations that include but are not limited to:

- ☐ Publication of a manuscript in a high impact top tier journal.
- ☐ Publication of two or more articles in acceptable peer reviewed.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ Publication of instructional software judged as significant by the faculty's peers.
- ☐ Pi or Co-Pi of an awarded external research grant at the national, state, or foundation level.

Draft for Faculty Review and Input

- ☐ Collaborated with 2 or more students on a publication.
- ☐ Co-Presented 2 or more papers at the national or international level with graduate or undergraduate students.

Level 4: Exemplary evaluation in level 4 is earned by achievement of indicators in level 3 and level 4, but not limited to the following:

- ☐ Provide academic leadership as an appointed editor, co-editor, associate editor or assistant editor of a peer-reviewed, association journal
- ☐ Sustained record of continuous extramural funding that supports the faculty research enterprises and graduate students.
- ☐ Achieving i10 or H factor index of published manuscripts.
- ☐ Publication of three Top Journal articles on a running 3-year time-frame during the evaluation period.
- ☐ Publication of a new scholarly book, professional book or textbook recognized within the field of study.
- ☐ Earned a Research Award at the college, university, national, international, or state level
- ☐ Mentored a student who won a research award or recognition at the college, university, state, national, or international level.

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 majority of the level 2 requirements for Service and Outreach: Unsatisfactory performance in this category.

Level 2: Satisfactory. A rating of satisfactory for service and outreach include but are not limited to the following activities:

- ☐ Regularly participated in service on program level committee.
- ☐ Regularly participated in service on one departmental committee.
- ☐ Regularly participated in service on one college level committee.
- ☐ Regularly participated in service on one university standing committee.
- ☐ Regular attendance at department and college meetings (more than half of scheduled meetings).
- ☐ Attending graduation as the departmental representation or to hood a graduating student.
- ☐ A member in a professional organization.

Level 3: Exceeds expectations. In addition to meeting the level 2 expectations for service, exceeds expectations includes a significant level or number of professional or service activities can be used as evidence of meeting expected performance indicated but not limited to the following:

Draft for Faculty Review and Input

Professional Activity

- ☐ Attendance at one or more professional meeting on average for the evaluation period.
- ☐ Participation in a professional development activity. Professional activities are those activities which contribute to the teaching and/or research capabilities of the faculty member.
- ☐ Participating in a faculty internship, externship, or involvement in a project.
- ☐ Organizing a conference workshop, session, or panel.
- ☐ Book and manuscript reviewer.
- ☐ Active engagement at multiple professional conferences across the evolution period.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ Serving as a keynote speaker or distinguished lecturer at national or regional conference.
- ☐ Effectively serving on the editorial board of a journal.

Service

- ☐ Community service to educational institutions, children and families or other related sector.
- ☐ Actively serving on one (i.e., the group met at least once per semester or that the position required some work) University committees and/or College.
- ☐ Student placement or recruitment activity.
- ☐ Serving as a session head, moderator, or panel discussant (or similar role) serving in a voluntary capacity at a significant national or regional conference.
- ☐ Serving as a reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal.
- ☐ Serving as a proposal reviewer for a national, international, or multi-state regional conference.
- ☐ Service activities (campus organization advisor/sponsor, workshop or seminar organizer, Residential Learning Communities leader, etc.)
- ☐ Effective departmental leadership.
- ☐ Effective leading of a special departmental project.
- ☐ Effective service as advisor to an active club or student organization.
- ☐ Effective Alumni relations/fund-raising activity.
- ☐ 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.
- ☐ Serving as a expert consultant to community, State, and national agencies.
- ☐ Engaging in an above average number of unreported service activities (e.g. supervising undergraduate research, leading informal education efforts within the community, speaking engagements, extra classes without compensation, guest lectures in a colleague's class, etc.)

Draft for Faculty Review and Input

Level 4 Exemplary. 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 exemplary performance. A faculty member earning a Level 4 in service will meet the expectations for service (Level 3) and typically be engaged in Level 4 service activities:

A significant level and number of professional or service activities listed below can be used as evidence of exemplary performance. A faculty member earning a Level 4 in service will meet the expectations for service and typically be engaged in Level 2 and 3 service activities. A faculty member earning a Level 4 in service must also be engaged in some internal service activities for the department or college, university, and national or international engagement.

- ☐ Professional ActivityOrganizing and successfully delivering a conference, symposia, or colloquia.
- ☐ Serving as an elected or appointed 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.
- ☐ Serving on an appointed editorial board as editor.
- ☐ Serving on a national, international, or state grant review panel.
- ☐ Performing external reviews of faculty or programs at other universities.
- ☐ Serving as outside peer reviewer for faculty awards, tenure and promotion, and other significant peer reviews.

Service
- ☐ Effectively leading 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.
- ☐ Effectively heading an active university committee or task force.
- ☐ Serving as a Faculty Speaker or Senator who 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 with evidence of co-constructed products such as courses, grant proposals, or published articles.

Draft for Faculty Review and Input