

**Department of Literature and Languages
Annual Review, Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion, Post Tenure Review, and Full
Professor**

GENERAL CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY

Recognizing the evaluations of tenure, scholarship, and service is always a complex process, the faculty of the Department of Literature and Languages has agreed upon the following general criteria for yearly evaluation.

1. Teaching

Faculty must consistently meet the following teaching criteria each academic year to meet expectations.

- Taught assigned courses and updated them to reflect current research (if necessary).
- Created and used a Canvas page for every course.
- Received at least a 3.0 score on a 5.0 scale for each measure in student evaluations.
- Was available to students for office hours at least three hours a week as posted in the syllabi and on office door.
- Collaborated with the department and other faculty in course offerings and scheduling.
- Adhered to the university calendar for class times and final exams.
- Gathered and submitted SACS student assessment data as needed by the department.
- Served as a peer class observer.
- Had classes observed by a peer or peers and filed official records in compliance with the UT System.

Failure to meet all but one of the above criteria will result in an evaluation of does not meet expectations. Failure to meet three or more of the above criteria will result in an evaluation of unsatisfactory.

Faculty who meet all the above criteria and an additional two from the following list exceed expectations.

- Directed two or more GISs or served as a reader of two or more GISs in a semester.
- Directed a Master's thesis and served or served on a Master's thesis committee and as a director or reader of a GIS simultaneously in a semester.
- Received at least a 4.0 score on a 5.0 scale on each measure in student evaluations.
- Developed and executed a financially feasible study-abroad program from students' career advancement.
- Provided significant assistance or directions for a demonstrable undergraduate or graduate research project in addition to one or more GISs or Master's thesis.
- Developed a new course or new syllabus for departmental topics course (i.e. ENGL 4397 or 4365).

- Participated in a faculty workshop on teaching organized by the University, College, or Department.
- Other: (Detailed by the faculty member).

Since experiences in the classroom can vary widely from semester to semester, faculty may include a written supplement to the chair addressing any problems or issues with the above criteria (e.g. clearing up a misperception in student evaluations) with this document. The department chair will determine the significance of the supplement and may alter the evaluation accordingly.

2. Research/Scholarship (non-tenure-track, full-time lecturers are not evaluated in this category)¹

Faculty in the department must accomplish two of the following research/scholarship criteria each academic year to meet expectations.

- Present a peer reviewed paper, creative, or popular work at a professional association or organization conference.
- Make demonstrable and substantial progress on a journal article, a book chapter, or creative work.
- Made demonstrable progress on a monograph or creative work.
- Submitted a manuscript for publication in a peer-reviewed journal or as a chapter in a collection published by an academic press.
- Edited a scholarly book published by an academic press.
- Submitted or published other forms of writing by a reputable press, magazine, or journal; for example, a book review, short story, poem, personal essay, encyclopedia entry, etc.
- Submitted an application for a grant from an external source to fund research.
- Other: (as detailed by the faculty member).

Failure to meet two of the above criteria will result in an evaluation of does not meet expectations. Failure to meet two of the above criteria two years consecutively will result in an evaluation of unsatisfactory.

Faculty in the department who accomplish one of the following research/scholarship criteria in an academic year will exceed expectations.

- Published a monograph or creative work in a book format with a university or other scholarly/reputable press.
- Published a peer reviewed paper or creative work in a professional journal or as a chapter in a collection.
- Won a grant from an external source to fund research.
- Other: (as detailed by faculty member).

¹Tenured faculty whose teaching loads are a 4/4 full load or less per academic year with reassigned duties according to departmental policies may not be evaluated in this category.

Since experiences in publishing can vary widely from year to year, faculty may include a written supplement to the chair addressing any problems or issues with the above criteria (e.g. a paper that has been under review at a press for more than six months) with this document. The department chair will determine the significance of the supplement and may alter the evaluation accordingly.

3. Service

Faculty in the department must accomplish three of the following service criteria each academic year to meet expectations.

- Advised departmental majors/minors, either undergraduate or graduate.
- Served on departmental committee(s) as requested by the department chair.
- Served on a university or college committee or as an elected member of Faculty Senate.
- Attended a graduation ceremony
- Collaborated with the department and other faculty to complete committee work.

Failure to meet two of above criteria will result in an evaluation of does not meet expectations. Failure to meet one of the above criteria will result in an evaluation of unsatisfactory.

Faculty who meet all of the above criteria and an additional three from the following list exceed expectations.

- Served as an official advisor to a campus student group or provided student services in addition to advisement.
- Was active in student recruitment activities (Patriot Preview Day, high school visits, Orientations days, etc) without reassignment as a director of graduate or undergraduate studies.
- Attended both graduation ceremonies in the academic year
- Reviewed a manuscript or textbook for an academic journal/press
- Other: (as detailed by the faculty member).

Since experiences in services can vary widely from year to year, faculty may include a written supplement to the chair addressing any problems or issues with the above criteria (e.g. advised more than fair share of students) with this document. The department chair will determine the significance of the supplement and may alter the evaluation accordingly.

THIRD YEAR (PRE-TENURE) REVIEW

The College of Arts and Sciences requires tenure-track faculty to be evaluated in their third year of tenure-earning service. The third-year review constitutes a major assessment of the untenured faculty member's record of achievement and progress toward tenure. Therefore, the input of senior faculty in the department or school is required. The purpose is to review the person's

activities in teaching, scholarship, service, and collegiality, and determine if the person is progressing normally towards a successful tenure review during the fifth or sixth year. The candidate is expected to familiarize him or herself with the criteria, policies, and procedures outlined in appropriate tenure documents at the departmental, school, college, and university levels (Handbook of Operating Procedures 3.3.4 and 3.3.5).

PROCESS

The third year review will begin at the Department or School, during the faculty member's third year of tenure-earning service. At least one month before the review, the chair shall request a current vita, copies of annual evaluations, evidence of teaching effectiveness, and names of faculty who have chaired committees they have served on. The vita should include citations of all scholarly activities.

It is not necessary for the faculty member to provide actual teaching evaluations by students or copies of published work unless specifically requested by the Committee, Chair, Director, or Dean. It is intended that the same type of materials be used in this review as for the actual tenure evaluation but in a somewhat condensed and shortened version.

To be maximally useful to the candidate and the Department, the review shall involve discussion among the entire tenured faculty excluding the chair. (In cases where the department has fewer than three tenured faculty (excluding the Chair), the chair, after consultation with the faculty member, shall invite tenured faculty from another department or School/College to participate in the review.)

In order for the review to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, the discussion shall conclude with a vote on whether or not the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure.

The tenured faculty shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the faculty review and characterizing the nature of the vote. The committee is to issue one of three recommendations:

- 1) Person is making satisfactory progress in teaching, scholarship, service, and collegiality.
- 2) Person is making satisfactory progress in some of these areas but needs to upgrade activity in a particular area. In these cases the committee should recommend what steps the candidate needs to take in order to improve progress. The committee may, in some cases, wish to recommend an additional review in the following year to see if progress is being made.
- 3) Person is not making satisfactory progress. It appears unlikely that, given the remaining probationary period, satisfactory progress will be made and the committee recommends termination.

The report will be signed by the Chair of the Evaluation Committee, and a vote of all members will be recorded. Individual votes should not be identified. A summary vote is sufficient. Whatever the results of the vote, faculty members under evaluation should understand that this

vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future. The report will be forwarded to the Department Chair as appropriate.

The Department Chair will then make a separate recommendation that progress is satisfactory, needs improvement, or is unsatisfactory with his or her own evaluation and suggestions. This recommendation, along with that of the committee and the candidate's current curriculum vitae, is to be forwarded to the candidate and to the Dean no later than May 1.

After completion of the review, the candidate may request a meeting with the Chair, Director, and/or Dean to discuss the review. Where the record is unsatisfactory, non-reappointment may be warranted. In that case, the faculty member will be notified no later than August 31 of the third year that his/her contract will be terminated at the end of the subsequent year.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

This document is supplemental to the requirements described in the UT Tyler HOP Sects 3.3.4 for tenure and 3.3.5 for promotion and the College of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion policies. It is believed that a clear statement of tenure expectations is valuable to both current and new faculty. Before articulating the expectations, guidance is offered about how this statement of expectations should be interpreted and applied.

1. The tenure and promotion guidelines set by the College and/or The University of Texas system may change during a faculty member's probationary period. The faculty member will be notified of such changes and will be expected to meet any new guidelines unless otherwise notified in writing by the Dean.
2. These expectations are not a statement of minimum standards. However, meeting or exceeding the expectations does not automatically guarantee a positive tenure recommendation. Instead, these expectations are intended to guide performance and decision making, leaving room for consideration of all relevant factors.
3. These expectations are based on the assumption that untenured faculty will be on no more than a "3-3" teaching load in each of the years prior to the tenure decision.
4. These expectations are designed for faculty applying for tenure at the beginning of the sixth year following their date of hire. Other factors such as employment at other universities or previous employment at UT Tyler in a non-tenure track position may create exceptions to the presented guidelines. These exceptions must be specified in the initial contract/offer letter, and approved by the Dean and Provost.

As per HOP 3.3.5.5b

Associate Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is recognition that the faculty member has a clearly defined record of strong teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity, a commitment to continued growth in both activities and a commitment to responsible and conscientious participation in service activities.

A strong record of achievement in teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity requires evidence. Evidence of strong research/scholarship/creative activity is documented not only through peer-reviewed publications, professional presentations, exhibits, performances, etc. but also through input of colleagues in the department as well as peer recognition of the candidate's reputation by independent scholars outside of the University.

External letters of review from peers outside the University will be required for faculty members applying for Associate Professor and/or tenure who began their service at U. T. Tyler on or after August 1, 2007. All departmental/school and college tenure and promotion policies must adhere to this same implementation date.

PROCESS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Because the tenure process is a collegial one, the judgment of both faculty colleagues and responsible administrators is required. There should be no recommendation regarding tenure without formal consultation with the tenured faculty of the department/school and/or college in which the faculty member will hold rank. To that end, each department/school and/or college shall adopt procedures governing the consideration of faculty member seeking tenure. At minimum, such procedures shall include the following:

- a. All cases for tenure shall pass sequentially through the recommendation levels as described below.
- b. Faculty eligible to vote are those with tenure in the case of a faculty member being consideration 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.
- c. The tenured faculty of the department shall vote by secret ballot on the tenure of the faculty member being considered. The outcome of the vote and the vote count shall be recorded.
- d. A college committee of tenured faculty shall vote by secret ballot on the tenure of a faculty member being considered. The outcome of the vote and the vote count shall be recorded.
- e. The appropriate administrator at each level of review shall inform the faculty member in writing of the vote or recommendation before the file is sent forward to the next level.

f. No person shall serve as a voting member of any tenure committee during an academic year in which he or she is under consideration for tenure, nor shall any individual make a vote or recommendation on his or her tenure nomination.

g. Voting members shall leave the room during deliberations on a faculty member with whom they share a significant personal or professional relationship and shall abstain from voting or making a recommendation concerning that faculty member

The institutional tenure decision-making process begins with the faculty member being considered and ends with the President. A faculty member should consult the dean regarding the timetable for the process.

a. Request for Early Decision

Faculty members may request consideration of an early tenure decision by presenting a written request to the department chair by June 1, prior to the academic year during which the tenure decision is to be made. If the Department chair makes a positive recommendation to the dean for early tenure, it must be justified with evidence that the candidate meets the written criteria established for those who apply for tenure during their sixth year of service. If the Department chair denies the faculty member's request for early tenure, the faculty member may request that the dean review the department's decision. The dean will not recommend early tenure unless the evidence of accomplishment meets the written criteria established for those who apply for tenure during their sixth year of service. There is no appeal beyond the College dean.

A denial of early tenure shall not prejudice action on tenure at the completion of the usual probationary period.

b. Faculty Responsibility

It is the responsibility of all faculty to be aware of departmental, college, U. T. Tyler and U. T. System rules and regulations regarding tenure. The faculty member who is to be considered begins compiling his or her files in the summer. The documentation of professional accomplishments shall be submitted in accordance with the criteria, standards and guidelines established by the department and/or college.

At no time after the deadline for submission of the materials may additional materials to be used in the review process be placed into or withdrawn from the file without the permission of the dean.

A faculty member being reviewed may withdraw from further consideration for tenure promotion at any point in the process by submitting to the dean a written request for withdrawal. Withdrawal from consideration of tenure 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. Departmental Recommendation

The departmental recommendation for or against tenure is the responsibility of the tenured faculty. For all cases of tenure that are reviewed at the departmental level, there shall be a recommendation and a record of votes of faculty qualified to participate. That recommendation and vote shall be forwarded to the department chair.

d. Department Chair

The vote of the qualified faculty in the department is advisory to the department chair. After making an independent judgment on the tenure, the chair shall submit his or her

recommendation and written summary to the chair of the college committee. The department chair will notify the affected faculty member if his or her recommendation differs from that of the department faculty. In cases where the chair's recommendation and that of a departmental faculty differ, the faculty may submit a dissenting report to the college committee.

e. College Committee

Committee members shall individually review the file of the faculty member being reviewed, taking into consideration the departmental criteria and guidelines for tenure. The recommendation of the members and a vote count are recorded and forwarded by the committee chair to the dean along with the file of the faculty member and the department chair's recommendation and summary.

Committee members shall leave the room during deliberations on a faculty member with whom they share a significant personal or professional relationship and shall abstain from voting on or making a recommendation concerning that faculty member.

f. Dean

The dean, after review of the faculty member's file and, if appropriate, consultation with the department faculty, department chair and college committee, prepares his or her recommendation. Before submitting the recommendation to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean will notify the affected faculty member of his or her recommendation and provide him or her a copy of the college committee's recommendations.

g. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

After review of all materials and consultation with the dean and any other appropriate individuals or groups, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will prepare his or her recommendation regarding tenure. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will notify the candidate of his or her recommendation. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' recommendation, along with all previous recommendations, shall be forwarded to the President.

h. President

After review of all recommendations, the President will prepare his or her recommendation regarding tenure. The President will notify the affected faculty member of his or her recommendation and provide the candidate an opportunity, within two weeks of notice, to discuss the recommendation. Recommendations for tenure are then forwarded to the U. T. System for appropriate review and required action.

As per HOP 3.3.5.6:

External Letters of Review

A recommendation for tenure and/or promotion must include supporting evidence that the individual's contributions have had an impact on the discipline; that is, the research/scholarship/creative activity should have made a significant contribution to the candidate's discipline and be recognized by professional colleagues. To that end, the dossier for tenure and/or promotion of all candidates after the implementation dates described in Section D.4. above must include a minimum of three (3) outside review letters, with a minimum of one (1) letter from the candidate's list of external reviewers.

Letters of review should be solicited from disinterested scholars of appropriate rank or stature not affiliated with U.T. Tyler who serve in the faculty member's field of training, specialty, or a closely related field. Individuals who may have a bias or perceived bias, such as dissertation committee members, co-authors, classmates, former students, research collaborators, departmental colleagues, and friends should not serve as external reviewers.

Reviewers will be nominated by the department chair and the candidate. The candidate should provide the department chair with the names of at least five (5) potential reviewers as well as a statement of their credentials and clarifying the nature of any prior contact the candidate has had with any suggested reviewer. The department chair will likewise compile a list of at least five (5) additional qualified reviewers. Chairs will also disclose their relationships with potential reviewers to the dean of the college. The final selection will be made by the dean of the college. The dean will select three (3) potential reviewers from each list (candidate and chair), resulting in a total of six (6) potential reviewers. Understanding that not all reviewers will agree to participate or that reviews will not arrive in a timely manner, the final list will contain no fewer than five names. At least two (2) reviewers must be from the candidate's list. The final list of names of external reviewers is to be kept confidential from the candidate.

The department chair shall contact the external reviewers to request their willingness to participate in the external review process. If the reviewers agree to participate, the department chair shall prepare and mail letters requesting outside reviews. Letters shall follow the standard template approved by the University. In the case where an insufficient number of reviewers are unable to participate, alternate reviewers may be selected by the dean.

Reviewers will be provided with the candidate's c.v., appropriate reprints and other representations of the candidate's scholarship, and a summary of the candidate's teaching and service responsibilities since arriving at U.T. Tyler. The contents of all outside review letters will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law and University regulations.

Candidates will be informed when reviews are received and may have access to them. The department chair will place all reviews into the candidate's dossier before the departmental committee begins its review. Outside letters received after the departmental committee begins its deliberations will not be included in the review process without the approval of the dean.

The department chair shall prepare a summary of the outside review process that will be included in the candidate's dossier. This summary shall list the name, position, and organization of each person from whom evaluations were requested. For those whose letters are included in the dossier, the summary shall include relevant information about the reviewers' professional/academic qualifications for evaluating the candidate for tenure and/or promotion.

If the candidate for promotion is a department chair, then the dean of the college will be substituted for department chair in the process above.

Content and Organization of the Tenure and Promotion Dossier

College of Arts and Sciences, University of Texas at Tyler

Record of Review Form (download separately as a Word document) Fill out draft by hand; give to dean for review before making final. Once approved, type and insert as first page of first volume.

Table of Contents (follow outline below starting with “I”)

I. Curriculum Vitae

When listing work/teaching experience, be sure not to leave any gaps in time.

For co-authored material, please describe briefly the portion that is yours, for example, “chapters 2, 4, 7” or “lit. review and Findings sections.” Also, where appropriate, indicate whether you were junior author or senior author

List research beginning with the most current. Be sure to provide complete bibliographical information. Refereed work must be separated from non-refereed work.

II. Copy of Departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

III. Official Recommendation Statements: recommendations submitted by departmental tenure committee, department chair, and letters of all outside reviewers for candidates for promotion to the rank of professor. Unofficial recommendations are not to be included.

IV. Annual Evaluations and Third Year Reviews

Include each annual evaluation received and the evaluation(s) you received as part of your Third Year Review

V. Teaching

- A. Teaching Philosophy Statement (1 ½ page maximum)
- B. Summary of Teaching Responsibilities (courses by semester)
- C. Any Teaching Awards Received
- D. Teaching Enhancement (D and E can be combined.)
Describe how you have used student evaluations to improve instruction.
List workshops, panels, training sessions, etc. on teaching you have attended in past two years.
- E. Workshops, panels, papers, etc. presented on teaching in your field.
- F. Use of technology in the classroom.

VI. Research.

- A. Statement about research/creative activity (1 ½ page maximum)---focus, accomplishments, plans for the future, role of relationship of research to teaching and service.
- B. List any general awards for research/creative activity.

LIST THE ITEMS BELOW SEPARATELY (Lists start with most recent to oldest)

- C. Books, edited books, textbooks. Include any citations (Social Science Citation Index), professional reviews, and awards received for specific books.
- D. Refereed Journals. Include complete bibliographical citation including page numbers. Also, if appropriate, indicate whether you were junior author or senior author. If article has been cited in the works of others, note those citations. For faculty in the

- final arts, this section could include any of the following: juried shows, invitational exhibitions, solo exhibitions, curated exhibitions, successful auditions, inclusion in collections, participation in portfolios, residencies, gallery lectures, visiting artist positions, exhibition jurying. PLEASE NOTE: Do not include thesis or dissertations (anywhere)
- E. Book Chapters. Include complete bibliographical citation including page numbers. Indicate whether invited or refereed. Also, if appropriate, indicate whether you were junior author or senior author.
 - F. Conference Papers. Indicate whether invited or refereed. Also, if appropriate, indicate whether you were junior author or senior author.
 - G. Grants and Grant Products. Give names of all individuals involved in the grant and their role (eg., PI, co-PI, etc.)
 - H. Encyclopedia/Handbook Entries. Include complete bibliographical citation including page numbers.
 - I. Computer programs, software, and other electronic media.
 - J. Other non-refereed materials: Conference panels and workshops; book reviews; annotated bibliographies; non-juried/non-refereed creative works; other non-refereed publications; bulletins and technical reports

***Please note:** If you have materials accepted but not yet in print or not yet presented (ie., "in press"), they must be accompanied by a receipt/reply from the publisher/conference/grantor that the materials has been accepted or accepted contingent on further revisions. Also, list separately any materials submitted, but not yet accepted. If you list such materials, you must include your transmittal letter to the publisher/conference/grantor and/or a reply from the same indicating receipt of the material submitted.

VII. Service

- A. Statement on service activities and relationship to teaching and research.
- B. Service to Profession (Academic, Disciplinary)
 - Memberships in organizations; offices held. Other relevant service activities
 - Journal editor; manuscript reviewer; conference paper reviewer
 - Other contributions
- C. Curriculum Development
 - New courses developed
 - Participation on curriculum development committees
 - Lab manuals, workbooks, etc. prepared for courses
- D. Advising -- Statement on advising activities, including graduate students (half page)
- E. Professional Practice (may not be applicable to all disciplines)
 - Consulting and clinical practice
 - Service on agencies, boards, professional (non-academic) organizations
 - technology transfer work

workshops, seminars, etc. for professionals
other contributions

F. University

List membership on all department, college, and university committees along with leadership roles, significant activities
Other contributions

G. Public Schools

Describe service activities involving public schools

I. Community

Describe service activities involving the community at large.

VIII. ADDENDA (Put into separate notebook.)

- A. Syllabi used in each separate course you have taught in all semesters preceding the beginning of the tenure and promotion evaluation process.
- B. Sample of handouts, tests, teaching materials from only the last full academic year.
- C. Student evaluations for courses taught only during the last full academic year. (put the balance of evaluations into an envelope in case anyone wants to see them.)
- D. Books published (since appointment to UT Tyler faculty or promotion to the rank of associate professor only)
- E. Copies (not the journals themselves) of all materials published since appointment to UT Tyler faculty or promotion to the rank of associate professor only). For articles and chapters, do not include original journal or book. Photocopy the relevant article or chapter and note bibliographic information on the title page.
- F. Unsolicited letters, e-mails, etc.

THINGS NOT TO INCLUDE

Solicited letters/recommendations from any source unless approved by dean.

Research in progress.

Rationale

Developing tenure expectations is important for a variety of reasons. Some of the more important reasons include:

- A clear statement of research expectations is important to the CAS's effort to move to the next level of national recognition.
- Teaching excellence remains central to our mission. A clear statement of teaching expectations reaffirms our commitment to teaching excellence.
- Documentation of clear tenure expectations is an important factor in our ongoing continuous improvement efforts.

- A clear statement of tenure expectations will guide the performance of untenured faculty.

There can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when achieved, guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure. Tenure is not a right to which a faculty member is entitled, nor is tenure granted simply as a result of a record of satisfactory annual evaluations.

To be tenured, faculty must achieve a strong record in:

- 1) teaching
- 2) research/scholarship/creative activity
- 3) service to the University, profession, and/or community
- 4) collegiality.

Teaching shall be weighted the most heavily in tenure decisions (around 40%); research/scholarships/creative activity shall have the second most weight (around 30%); service to the university should be considered third (around 15%); and collegiality should be considered fourth (around 15%).

While a strong record is expected in all 3 areas, the faculty member further is expected to demonstrate “outstanding” achievement in either teaching or scholarship. (See below for further clarifications).

Meeting all other requirements for tenure and promotion as set forth in the HOP and annual evaluation criteria, tenure-track professors in the department of Literature and Languages will also have met the following:

Teaching

All faculty members seeking tenure are expected to have demonstrated teaching competence in multiple levels of a department’s course offerings. “Teaching” is defined as creating and delivering content for courses, mentoring and advising students, attending teaching development activities, and participating in course development and assessment (as needed). Teaching competence is observed through syllabi and course materials, student evaluations, observations, and other materials that may reveal teaching skills. Faculty are encouraged to develop a teaching dossier with multiple indicators of teaching success

It is explicitly noted that untenured faculty members often develop as they gain experience. Candidates must show solid improvement in teaching during the probationary years. At the same time, tenure decisions will be based on an overall pattern of teaching evaluations rather than on the evaluations received from any single course or section

Faculty members are also encouraged to engage in innovative teaching practices. Not all of these innovations will be successful, but efforts to improve teaching practices will be valued as evidence of commitment to teaching effectiveness.

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 review

A “strong” record of teaching will include at least 3 of the following:

1. A record of a score of 3.25-3.5 or above on a scale of 5 in each category of teaching evaluation
 - a. If there are areas of under-performance, a record of consistent improvement should be seen, ideally of .25 points per semester
2. Course materials, including representative syllabi, assignments, and representative student work, should show development over time and should represent course at all levels the department offers.
3. Materials from new courses developed.
4. Materials from courses taught.
5. Service as an advisor with no documented cases of mishandling student advising
6. Participation in and/or leadership of faculty development workshops relating to teaching

An “Outstanding” record of teaching could include any of the following:

1. Scores of 4.0 or above in all areas of teaching evaluations
2. Receipt of a competitive teaching or advising award should be considered as proof of substantial effectiveness in teaching

Scholarship

“Scholarship” refers to published additions to one’s field of study. To receive promotion/tenure, the faculty member is expected to demonstrate, through published research, the ability to perform basic research in his or her discipline including conceptualization, building theory, and appropriate methodology.

Because promotion and tenure uses past performance as an indicator of future performance, evidence of a consistent pattern of ongoing research is required.

The evaluation of research will include an external review from peers outside the University. The process for selecting outside reviewers is discussed in the HOP sections 3.3.4 and 3.3.5.

The quality of research is valued over the quantity of publications.

A “strong” record of scholarship may include:

1. at least 3 “academic publications” as defined under “Publication” below
 - i. Articles should be in discipline-recognized journals with national distribution.
 - ii. Collections or other book-length projects should be with reputable national or academic publishers. A signed book contract should not be weighted equally as an existing book.
 - iii. Favorable reviews of works could be considered as strengthening the status of applicant’s publications. A critically or monetarily successful book may outweigh fewer publications.
 - iv. Publications by vanity or self-publishing outlets or predatory journals that charge fees for publication will not be accepted.
2. 3-5 “Other Scholarship” as detailed below.

An “outstanding” record of scholarship may include:

1. At least 5 “academic publications”
2. 5-8 “Other scholarship”

Publications:

- a. Academic publications
 - i. Journal articles
 1. Substantive pieces, often at least 6000 words
 - a. Some fields require shorter or longer works; consideration should be given to a specific field to which the work makes contributions.
 2. Blind peer-reviewed
 3. Journals with acceptance of twenty-five percent are expected
 4. Publication in a journal with an acceptance rate of 10% or less can equal 2 publications in journals with higher acceptance rates.
 - ii. An article on teaching is acceptable so long as it is of quality and appears in a form mentioned in i-iii.
 - iii. Book Chapters
 1. Contributions should be substantive, usually at least 6000 words.
 2. Books published by recognized academic presses and edited by persons within the field
- b. Creative Publications:
 - i. Works of fiction, creative non-fiction, poetry, memoir, essays or hybrid work
 - ii. Creative publications will not replace academic publications for non-creative writing track applicants (but they can be considered as additions to one’s other scholarship.)
- c. Other Publications (not as weighted as journal articles):
 - i. Conference Proceedings
 - ii. Book reviews
 - iii. Reference entries

- d. A book or book-length project published by a university press or a respected academic press
- e. Creative writing track applicants should have at least twelve publications of individual submissions in any genre in national, well-respected journals or magazine. This number is a guideline, as there are vast differences between types of creative work and publication venues. Book-length publications can replace the number of required journal publications.

Note 1: Publishing in “predatory journals” (those listed by Beall’s or predatoryjournals.com) will not be considered in tenure and promotion. Self-plagiarism will also exclude one from tenure considerations.

Note 2: Candidates must account for the percentage contributed to co-written pieces. It is recognized that word counts for contributions are not easily created, so contributions should be agreed upon by both parties and stated in a signed statement included with the publication.

2. “Other” Scholarship:

- a. While these other activities may be considered when fewer than two articles are present, they cannot outweigh “academic publications.”
 - i. Presentations at professional academic conferences, excluding conferences for graduate students.
 - ii. Seeking and receiving external grant support
 - iii. Reviewing manuscripts for journals, publishers, or grant agencies
 - iv. Textbooks

Service

“Service” is one’s contribution to the governing, operation, and advancement of the department, the university, the community at large, and the field one studies beyond scholarly contributions. Service expectations will vary in nature across departments and across the probationary period of an untenured faculty member’s career. Generally, new faculty members should expect to be protected from service commitments during their first year or two (depending on departmental needs) and to engage in limited service activities prior to tenure.

“Service” includes:

- 1. Participation in or leadership of committees on the departmental or university level (at least one per academic year)
- 2. Representing the university to local, state or national groups
- 3. Advising of student organizations
- 4. Review activities for major journals or conferences
- 5. Participation in professional organizations

A “strong” record may include 2-3 of the following:

- 1. serving on at least 1 department or college level committees

2. serving on at least 1 university level committee
3. representing the university at a local group
4. active participation in a regional or national organization

An “outstanding” record may include:

1. serving on multiple department or college level committees
2. chairing a college or department level committee
3. representing the university at a state or national group meeting
4. holding office in a regional or national organization
5. organizing a conference
6. reviewing for a journal or an academic press

Collegiality:

The CAS promotes strong collegiality. As defined in the HOP, “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” (HOP, 3.3.4).

All faculty are expected to demonstrate collegiality. An ongoing and systematic effort to engage in collegial behavior is a requirement for tenure and promotion.

1. Respect for other colleagues
2. Collaboration with the department and other faculty in course offering and scheduling
3. Collaboration with colleagues in team efforts to accomplish departmental tasks according to assigned timeline
4. Compliance with procedures and protocols to conduct business

Note: Faculty members with re-assigned time for specific tasks (e.g. Writing Center Director, Composition Director, or Undergraduate Director) will be evaluated yearly by the Chair as to the effectiveness and contribution of the work on those tasks. These evaluations from the Chair should be weighed in the consideration of tenure and promotion.

POST TENURE REVIEW

The department will follow the U.T. Tyler Handbook of Operating Procedures (3.3.6) for Post Tenure Review.

CRITERIA FOR FULL PROFESSORSHIP

This document has been prepared collaboratively based on the agreement among tenured faculty.

A candidate for full professorship must "Meets Expectations" or "Exceeds Expectations" on the teaching and service areas of annual and post-tenure reviews in the Handbook of Operating Procedures (see 3.3.2 and 3.3.6) since gaining promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, the candidate should have at least a scholarly monograph and three articles beyond those used for earning promotion to Associate Professor. The following articulates the criteria for the book and articles.

Book

Quantity:

1. The candidate should have at least a scholarly monograph in press by the time of application. "Scholarly monograph" in this context includes, but is not limited to, a single- or co-authored study and excludes an edited scholarly collection;
2. The monograph should be of 150 or more printed pages, excluding the index and bibliography.
3. A book considered equivalent to a scholarly monograph in content and length, including, but not limited to, a translation or a biography with a critical introduction of 20 pages or more in a manuscript presenting substantive research can be considered.

Quality:

1. Blind peer reviewed before publication.
2. Published by a university press or a credible academic press.
3. Positively reviewed by peer specialists in an academic journal or journals of book reviews.
4. A textbook could count as an equivalent to a scholarly book, but must be essential and influential in the field, highly creative and intellectual, well-received nationally, and published by a reputable academic press. In addition, it must demonstrate an impact on the field by reaching a yearly national sale of 500 copies or more beyond the UT Tyler campus.

Article

Quantity:

1. At least three articles published in academic journals or in edited scholarly collections after tenure and prior to application.
2. The manuscript for each article should be twenty-five pages or more, excluding the bibliography.

Quality:

1. Blind peer review.
2. Published by a journal of an acceptance rate at 15% or lower if only a single journal article is included in the application file.

3. Or published by a journal with an acceptance rate of 15-25% if the candidate has consistently published journal articles or more than required minimum amount.
4. A scholarly collection that includes the article should be published by a university press or a reputable academic press and reviewed by peer specialists in academic journals or journals of book reviews.
5. An article on teaching that meets the criteria of quality aforementioned.