

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR FACULTY REVIEW,  
PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

The Department of Social Sciences maintains and expects high performance standards from all its faculty. Tenure track and tenured faculty, leaders and models for the University, have even greater responsibilities for quality teaching, research and service. Therefore, for quality assurance, all tenured and tenure-track faculty are evaluated on a regular basis through (1) an annual evaluation, (2) a pre-tenure or third year review, (3) during considerations for promotion to Associate Professor and for tenure, (4) during considerations for promotion to Full Professor, and (5) a Periodic Post-Tenure Review every sixth year following tenure. The following Guidelines address procedures for these evaluations and include suggestions for assessment criteria,

**Guidelines for Annual Evaluation**

Every tenured and tenure-track faculty member in the Department of Social Sciences will be evaluated through an annual performance review by the Chair. This review is a comprehensive assessment of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and collegial service and is in connection with the determination of merit raises.

Faculty members shall provide an annual self-evaluation which summarizes their year's activities from January 1 – December 31, along with evidence of teaching quality, research and publication, service, and other professional activities. Copies of published materials, letters indicating acceptance for publication, evidence of conference participation, service, etc. should accompany the self-evaluation. In addition, faculty shall insure that student evaluations from each class are on file in the Dean's Office and that syllabi for each class is on file with the Department secretary.

**Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review**

An evaluation is required of tenure-track faculty in the third year of tenure-earning service. If a faculty member transfers in tenure-earning time, those years are counted in determining when the third year review is to be conducted. This pre-tenure review or third year review constitutes a major assessment of the untenured faculty member's record of achievement and progress toward tenure. The goal of this review is one of collegial support and advice rather than adversarial examination and critique. The third year time frame gives chairs and other faculty a substantial period of performance upon which to judge achievement yet gives the junior faculty enough time before the sixth-year tenure review to address any areas of deficiency that may exist.

The faculty member under third-year review shall make available materials that demonstrate his or her achievements in teaching, research, and service. Such materials, are similar to those required for tenure review but somewhat more abbreviated and more informal. Materials typically include a current Vita, copies of research works whether in

progress or published, copies of previous annual self-evaluations, the Chair's annual evaluation report, and illustrations of service to the university and to the community at large. Student evaluations from class of the faculty member will also be available.

Tenured faculty will review these materials and meet to discuss their merits keeping in mind that while the goal of this review is one of mentoring it must also include a vote on whether the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The Chair may participate in the discussion, but may not participate in the final vote or in writing the report. The tenured faculty shall prepare a written report to the Chair covering the findings of the faculty reviews and characterizing the nature of the vote. The recommendation should indicate whether progress is satisfactory, needs improvement, or is unsatisfactory. The report shall be specific as to accomplishments, but more importantly, to expectations including areas that need improvement. Any recommendation of unsatisfactory should not be tied to a single factor, but should be an all-inclusive recommendation. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The Chair will then make a final recommendation that progress is satisfactory, needs improvement, or is unsatisfactory – adding, where appropriate, his/her own evaluation and suggestions. This recommendation, along with that of the faculty is forwarded to the candidate and to the Dean. The Dean will forward a memorandum to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that the third-year review has been conducted along with a summary of the recommendations by the Chair and the Department.

#### Proposed Timeline for Review

October	Faculty member is notified and begins assembly of materials.
January	The set of materials is made available to tenured faculty for their review.
March	Tenured faculty complete their review, vote and complete their report and recommendation to the Chair.
April	Chair completes his/her review and recommendations and forwards that report to the candidate and to the Dean.

**Department of Social Sciences Criteria  
for Tenure and Promotion**

Tenure and promotion within the academy is fundamentally a process of review by colleagues with the goal of preserving and strengthening the quality of the faculty. It is a faculty member's colleagues in the department and discipline who make the first and most important judgment whether a candidate's past accomplishments and future promise are deserving of the security of tenure and the honor of promotion. In making these judgments, it is essential that a candidate's colleagues exercise great diligence, reason, and fairness. To ensure that promotion and tenure decisions in the Department of Social Sciences reflect these qualities, the department establishes the following procedures and criteria.

Lecturers, visiting lecturers, part-time faculty members, adjuncts, and graduate students serving as research assistants are specifically not entitled to tenure. Such appointments are awarded on a contractual basis subject to the needs and resources of the University and the qualifications of the applicants available for the position, normally for a specified time period. They are administered through normal administrative channels. Administrative personnel, such as department heads, who hold academic rank in addition to the administrative titles are considered faculty members for these purposes, but administrative assignments are not subject to tenure.

At the most general level the criterion for tenure is a record of professionalism indicated by substantial achievement in teaching, research, and service and a pattern of performance indicative of a lifetime of continued accomplishment and productivity. In addition to demonstrating quality in these traditional areas, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate professional collegiality. These categories are common to most universities and it is important that the faculty have a common understanding about the meaning of the criteria and their relative applicability.

In the 2000 Revision of the *Handbook of Operating Procedures*, Section 3.05 (D), these key terms are discussed in the following manner:

**Teaching.** To qualify for tenure, faculty members must have a consistent pattern of effectiveness in teaching. Tenure will not be granted unless the candidate is deemed to be a strong teacher and demonstrates a commitment to lifelong improvement of his or her teaching skills. Thus it is vital that information concerning teaching effectiveness, gathered from multiple and flexible assessment methods, be part of the tenure application.

**Research/Creative Activity.** The purpose of research/creative activity is to make a substantive contribution to the body of knowledge and understanding in one's discipline. For tenure to be granted, a faculty member must have established a strong, consistent, and progressive program of research/creative activity through which the faculty member is expected to continue making contribution throughout his or her career.

**Service.** To qualify for tenure, the candidate must display evidence of commitment to service to the university and to the profession and/or civic community.

**Collegiality.** The University of Texas at Tyler defends the concept of academic freedom, which assures each faculty member the freedom to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, program, and policies, and guarantees faculty the right to support any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Collegiality is a professional, not personal, criterion relating to the performance of duties within a department. Collegiality should not be confused with sociability, likeability or conformity to certain views. Instead collegiality addresses such issues as the candidate's compatibility with department missions and goals, an ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the Department and College, a willingness to engage in shared governance, and a high standard of professional integrity in dealing with colleagues and students.

The University subscribes to the following description of collegiality from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement on professional ethics:

As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

## **Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

The Department of Social Sciences has followed the criteria established by the University and by the College of Arts and Sciences in that the highest priority for tenure considerations is given to teaching performance. Increasingly, the university values Scholarship with nearly equal emphasis to teaching. Research/professional development is the second priority and Service is the third priority. Faculty should seek to excel in all areas but all faculty must demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in all areas of responsibility. More specifically, members of the Department of Social Sciences apply the following criteria to a tenure application.

### **A. Teaching**

Teaching is the primary mission of the University of Texas at Tyler and all its programs. Therefore all candidates for tenure must be effective teachers and be committed to lifelong improvement of their teaching skills. The Department also recognizes that teaching occurs outside the classroom as well as within it through formal and informal interactions with students, advising, etc. While effective teaching is the most important criterion for tenure, it is also the most difficult to measure. Therefore, the candidate for tenure may wish to submit evidence gathered from multiple sources. Note that of the examples listed below those marked with an asterisk have become expected in the tenure application materials.

- \*A statement of teaching philosophy.
- \*Course materials; including syllabi, assignments, examinations, course packs, etc.
- \*Student course evaluations.
- Peer assessments based on in-class observations.
- Unsolicited student and alumni comments such as notes, letters, etc.
- Evidence of pedagogical skill development such as attendance at teaching workshops.
- Effective service as an advisor to undergraduates and/or graduate students, including service as member or chair of graduate student thesis committees.
- Demonstrated patience and respect for students, including willingness to work with students as needed outside of the classroom.

- Evidence of extension of teaching students outside the classroom such as advising, club sponsorship, internship supervision, field trips, etc.
- Evidence of new course development and existing course improvement.
- Evidence from any assessment developed by the department, college, or university.

## B. Scholarship

The Department of Social Sciences recognizes that it is the responsibility of all university faculty members to make a substantive contribution to the body of knowledge and understanding in their discipline. The scholarship criterion for tenure is a strong, consistent, and progressive program of research activity shared with appropriate audiences. The candidate's history of research activity and productivity should predict continual contributions throughout his or her career.

Since research and scholarship takes many forms, the department declines to quantify this criterion. The Department recognizes that specialties within the social sciences can vary with regard to research and publication; nevertheless, peer review by one's professional colleagues is recognized as a high standard. The following guidelines are offered as ways a candidate may convince his or her colleagues that the criterion is met. For tenure consideration, a candidate's entire record of research and publication will be considered, regardless of time and place produced. Review of scholarship for tenure may include but is not limited to such items as the following:

- A pattern of presenting papers at professional meetings and moving them on to publication.
- Research products put before international and national audiences
- Research products published in refereed journals
- Research products which are part of a focused program of developing expertise and recognition
- Research products that demonstrate that the candidate is capable of assuming the sole or primary role in carrying out research.
- Research products that have contributed to the field (e.g. works cited with details on the number, the context, and by whom; evaluations by others, grant applications, etc.)
- Professional development requiring research activity and shared with appropriate audiences including students.

### C. Service

The Department of Social Sciences recognizes that social scientists have valuable skills and an obligation to provide service. Therefore to qualify for tenure, the candidate must be a collegial member of the Department and display evidence of commitment to service to the university and to the profession and /or the civic community. The candidate should also acquire a reputation for diligence and good judgment. Evidence of such attributes may include, but not be limited to the following:

- Membership and leadership in such university, college, and departmental committees and activities as may be appropriate and a reputation for diligence and good judgment.
- Demonstrated readiness to take the initiative and to pursue important assignments with enthusiasm and effectiveness.
- Membership and leadership in local or regional community groups and a reputation for diligence and good judgment.
- Research carried out for the benefit of the community, whether published or not.
- Membership and leadership in relevant professional associations.
- Supporting colleagues within the Department and university in their on-going research efforts by offering both general responses and suggestions for editorial revision to their colleagues' research reports, papers, manuscripts, etc.
- Development of grants and programs that benefit the university and the community.
- Normally, compensated service or research solely for the advancement of private interests will not be counted as service; however, where the activity is related to and requires the faculty member's professional expertise and research, such activity may be submitted with description for consideration in merit review.

### **Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor**

As with promotion to Associate Professor, the criteria for promotion to Full Professor emphasizes distinction in teaching, research and service over the span of his or her academic career and a history of collegial support to his or her colleagues. Promotion to full professor is recognition of the candidate's academic maturity and requires evidence, through peer recognition, of contributions and leadership to and beyond the University community. The candidate should provide evidence of research activity that contributes to shaping the intellectual development of the candidate's discipline(s), and, provide evidence of leadership roles in teaching and service to the university and to the community at large.

**Teaching:** The candidate for promotion to full professor should be evaluated on the basis of a broader range of activities than his or her classroom teaching. Much of the institution's leadership in program and curriculum development can be expected to come from those progressing through the rank of Associate Professor and towards the rank of Professor. Candidates are expected to have a record of instructional accomplishments that go beyond the classroom such as, in: mentoring students, enhancing the instructional abilities of other faculty, successfully designing programs and curricula, taking a leadership role on curriculum and related committees, building graduate programs, supervising master's theses, unusual successes in working with students in disciplinary or professional clubs, building success internship or other programs, etc.

**Research:** The candidate's research work should make a significant contribution the appropriate discipline, be original and continuous, and be broadly disseminated and well-received by peers. Candidates for Full Professor may, as appropriate, request letters of evaluation from outside reviewers in the discipline to attest to the quality of the candidates' published work or external grants.

**Service:** In addition, criteria for promotion to Full Professor include those accomplishments expected of Associate Professors that are not expected of Assistant Professors such as responsibility for program development, student recruitment, supervision of theses and dissertations, chair of departments, coordinate programs, attract external funding, and other institutional responsibilities. Leadership roles in professional organizations, community organizations, are examples of service external to the University.

**Collegiality:** The candidate for Full Professor is expected to be a model and a mentor for junior faculty. He or she is expected to take leadership roles in developing and supporting department and university goals, working cooperatively with other faculty, setting standards for professional integrity, etc.

**Application and Review Procedures for Applicants  
to Associate and/or Full Professor**

A. The Candidate's Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of all faculty to be aware of departmental, College, University and System rules and regulations regarding tenure and promotion. The tenure and promotion decision-making process begins with the candidate and ends with the President. Candidates should consult the Dean regarding the timetable for the process. Faculty members at the tenure-track, assistant professor level must be considered for tenure by the end of their sixth year.

B. Nomination for Tenure and Promotion

The Dean will initiate the tenure and promotion process each year by calling for nominations near the start of the Fall semester. Nominations may be made to the Department Chairperson by the faculty member seeking promotion, or by other faculty members in the Department. The nominee may withdraw his or her nomination at any stage of the review process without prejudice by submitting to the Dean a written request for withdrawal. Withdrawal from consideration of tenure by a candidate who is in the sixth year of the probation period may be done only by formal resignation, which is effective no later than the end of the subsequent, or seventh, year.

C. Tenure and Promotion Administrative Procedures

Faculty eligible to vote are those of higher rank than the candidate for promotion and those with tenure in the case of a candidate for tenure. Where there are fewer than three eligible faculty in a department, the dean, in consultation with the candidate, will select eligible faculty from similar or related departments. The Chair of the Department will call a meeting of the eligible faculty to discuss the qualifications of the candidate and to vote on the application. The faculty will have reviewed the candidate application materials prior to the discussion.

Voting members shall leave the room during deliberations on candidates with whom they share a significant personal or professional relationship and shall abstain from making recommendation concerning that candidate. The vote will be by secret ballot. The Chair does not vote. According to Section 3.05 (D) of the HOP, although the recommendation for tenure of an assistant professor shall be concurrent with the recommendation for promotion to associate professor, a recommendation for promotion does not necessarily entail a recommendation for tenure. Recommendation for promotion and tenure must be voted separately.

The outcome of the vote count shall be recorded along with any written comments. The Department Chair shall notify the nominee of the vote and his or her recommendation. The deliberations at all levels shall be strictly confidential, and only the Department Chair or Dean may communicate the formal recommendations to the candidate and to the next level.

The Department Chair will forward the results of the vote along with his or her recommendation to the College of Arts and Sciences Evaluation Committee. If the Chair is the nominee, the faculty will forward the results of the vote directly to the College Committee. In cases where the Chair's recommendation and that of the department differ, the department faculty may submit a dissenting report to the College Committee. Nevertheless, it is expected that the successful applicant will have received the support of the Department.

#### Proposed Timeline for Review

- Summer - The applicant should begin compiling his or her dossier for consideration in the Fall term.  
Chair requests letters of recommendation from external reviewers.
- August - The applicant will put forward his/her name as a candidate for promotion to the Department and to the Dean of the College by the deadline established by the Dean.  
External reviewers submit letters of recommendation.
- September - The applicant compiles a portfolio of accomplishment by the deadline established by the College Committee for Promotion and Tenure. This application file should be complete and organized in such a manner as to facilitate review.
- October - Tenured faculty members in the Department of Social Sciences will complete their review of the applicant's file, discuss their evaluation in a department meeting and vote on the candidate.  
Chair will submit his/her recommendation to the Dean.
- November- The College Committee for Promotion and Tenure makes its recommendation to the Dean.
- December - Dean forwards his/her recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### **Periodic Post-Tenure Review**

## **Procedures and Criteria**

Post-Tenure Review is a comprehensive evaluation that provides a continuing assessment of the faculty. Its purpose is to insure that high standards continue in teaching, research and service. Each tenured faculty member in the UT system is evaluated every six years. In the Department of Social Sciences this assessment is made by the Chair.

A lottery determined the order of review for faculty already tenured when the post tenure process was initiated. Other faculty will be reviewed during the sixth year after their tenure year or in the sixth year after a review for promotion or a special position. Faculty will receive reasonable notice of at least six months before upcoming post-tenure review.

By February 1 the candidate will provide to the Chair copies of the previous annual evaluations, a current vita, and a statement by the faculty member that summarizes his or her accomplishments since the last evaluation. The Chair will make a recommendation and submit the results in writing to the faculty member and to the Dean by May 1. If in the opinion of the Chair and the Dean the result of the review is satisfactory, no further action will be taken except for determining merit raises and other forms of recognition.

If in the opinion of the Chair or the Dean the results of the review is unsatisfactory and the Dean determines that more intensive review of a faculty member is needed, or if the faculty member requests it, the Dean, in consultation with the faculty member, shall appoint a peer committee whose members shall be representative of the College and who will be appointed on the basis of their objectivity and academic strength. The committee shall be comprised of faculty of the same or higher rank as the faculty member being reviewed. The committee may request further information from the faculty member under review and the faculty member will be provided with the opportunity to meet with the review committee. The committee shall report its findings within six months to the faculty member, and the Department Chair and the Dean.

The six-year review may be deferred in rare circumstances, such as overlap with approved leave (deferment for the period of the approved leave), promotion to the rank of Professor (deferment for six years). All person holding academic tenure are subject to the six-year review including administrators such as department chairs, deans, vice presidents and the President.