

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY

**MARVIN D. and JUNE SAMUEL BRAILSFORD
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

PROMOTION AND TENURE MANUAL

Revised: August 15, 2022

Revised August 10, 2023

Table of Contents

- I. INTRODUCTION**
- II. IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDELINES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA**
- III. STATEMENT OF ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS**
- IV. SUMMARY OF MID-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS**
- V. SUMMARY OF TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS (ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR)**
- VI. SUMMARY OF PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS (ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR)**
- VII. SUMMARY OF POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS**
- VIII. SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL TRACK (APT) FACULTY PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS**
- IX. FACULTY PORTFOLIO**
- X. EVALUATION OF TEACHING, RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES, AND SERVICE**

I. INTRODUCTION

The Brailsford College of Arts and Sciences (BCAS) at Prairie View A&M University (PVAMU) is comprised of departments with diverse academic disciplines that belong individually to one of these three fields of study: the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural and Mathematical Sciences. The entire faculty of the BCAS is committed to achieving excellence in teaching, research, and service.

The criteria and guidelines described in this document are supplementary to the University's Promotion and Tenure Manual and its Faculty Handbook. The contents of the BCAS Manual do not replicate elements of the University Manual nor those of the Faculty Handbook unless necessary. This Manual focuses on guidelines, procedures, and criteria specific to BCAS only. Applicants and faculty members involved in all aspects of the promotion and tenure process must be familiar with the rules and procedures established by the University. Applicants for mid-tenure, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure reviews are strongly advised to attend the workshops conducted by Academic Affairs and BCAS, which provide updated information and criteria concerning the portfolio and its contents.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDELINES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA

The provisions contained in this manual apply to all faculty of the BCAS undergoing mid-tenure, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure reviews. It is the responsibility of all parties participating in these processes to ensure the guidelines in this manual are followed. The faculty member undergoing the process must provide evidence of meeting the standards set in this manual.

III. STATEMENT OF ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

All faculty members must undergo an annual review of their performance. The results of the annual performance review shall provide the basis for all reviews conducted in connection with mid-tenure, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure applications. The Head of each academic Department/Division or direct supervisor shall annually evaluate the performance of each faculty member. After completing the evaluation, the Department/Division Head is expected to provide meaningful written and oral feedback about the faculty member's cumulative performance for that year. The review process considers the faculty member's accomplishments in each evaluation performance category--teaching, research, and service. The annual review should describe stellar achievements and, in case of deficiencies in any of the performance areas, recommendations for the improvement of performance shall be made. In essence, the annual performance evaluation serves as a way of evaluating prudently a faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The annual review should provide a scheme for faculty success through a thorough and candid analysis of each aspect of the faculty member's performance.

If and when necessary, the Dean may also review the annual evaluation for each faculty member and may add comments to it that either support or amend the direct supervisor's evaluation. Each

faculty member's annual review results should be kept as part of the record in the faculty member's personnel file. Copies of annual reviews shall be made available to faculty undergoing mid-tenure, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure reviews for inclusion in the portfolio.

In any given year, a Department/Division Head or direct supervisor or the college Dean may recommend to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) that the probationary appointment of a tenure-track faculty member be terminated, based on unsatisfactory performance reviews; however, the final decision regarding the termination of the probationary appointment of a tenure-track faculty member must be made by the Provost with the concurrence of the President. The process of notification shall take place in accordance with the timelines and provisions specified in System Policy 12.01, Section 4.2.

IV. SUMMARY OF MID-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

The purpose of the mid-tenure review is to assess the progress a tenure-track faculty member has made toward meeting the standards set by the University to qualify for consideration of tenure and/or promotion. All tenure-track faculty members at PVAMU are typically expected to go through a mid-tenure performance review after the conclusion of the third year of their probationary period.

By June 1, the BCAS Dean's Office will inform, via a written memorandum, each faculty member who must undergo the mid-tenure review in the upcoming academic year (typically in the fourth year of the probationary period).

Each faculty applicant for mid-tenure review must submit an electronic portfolio in PantherFolio in accordance with the due dates announced by the Office of Academic Affairs. The contents of the portfolio should include all the elements in this Manual's Section IX Faculty Portfolio, along with any benchmark performance criteria established by the department/division.

The mid-tenure review portfolio is initially reviewed by the Departmental/Division Mid-Tenure Committee (DMTC). The DMTC consists of three or five tenured faculty members from the department/division. The members of such a committee are appointed by the Department/Division Head, in consultation with the Office of the Dean, and in accordance with the University's Promotion and Tenure Manual. In appointing the members of such committee, the Department/Division Head designates a Chair, who plays a major part in leading the review process.

In the case of a department with fewer than three tenured faculty members, the DMTC may include tenured faculty members from disciplines closely related to the faculty member undergoing mid-tenure review. In such a case, the Department/Division Head of the applicant will reach out to the external Department/Division Head asking the latter to appoint tenured faculty to serve as external member(s) on the DMTC.

After reviewing the applicant's mid-tenure portfolio, based on the guidelines provided in the University's Promotion and Tenure Manual, the DMTC submits to the Department/Division Head the required completed forms.

The Department/Division Head will thereafter review the faculty's mid-tenure review portfolio, relevant material from the Departmental/Division personnel file, and the recommendation from the DMTC. The Department/Division Head will proceed with preparing recommendations with a letter identifying the strengths and/or deficiencies of the applicant including all the required forms completed and forward the applicant's portfolio to the BCAS Dean by the announced deadline. In the same vein, the College Mid-Tenure Review committee appointed by the Dean does its own evaluation, adhering to the guidelines provided in the University Manual.

The Dean's evaluation is the final phase of the review process. The Dean rates the applicant based on the submitted materials contained in the portfolio and evaluations/recommendations provided by Department/Division Head and department and college Mid-Tenure Review committees and produces an independent written evaluation of the applicant. The Dean ultimately shall communicate his/her evaluation to the applicant in a formalized way by the prescribed date, with a copy of the same evaluation forwarded to the immediate supervisor concerned. The Dean's final communication can be one of these statements:

- That the applicant has made adequate progress toward tenure and/or promotion;
- That the applicant has some deficiency requiring improvement; or
- That the applicant has failed to demonstrate adequate progress so much that he/she will be offered a terminal, nine-month appointment.

In the case of the third option, the applicant may file an appeal to the Provost contesting the Dean's decision at which time the University's grievance procedures concerning academic freedom can be actuated.

V. SUMMARY OF TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS

It is mandatory for a tenure-track faculty member to undergo a tenure review typically at the end of their fifth year (hereafter referred to as a mandatory review). It is possible that a faculty member can be hired initially as an Associate Professor without tenure and in such cases, a tenure review using the same process as the one used for an Assistant Professor must be performed.

Likewise, faculty can submit an early tenure application as early as the beginning of their 4th year of service at PVAMU provided that they have been approved by their dept head and dean prior to submission of the application. In that case, the faculty member will undergo only the early tenure review, and not the mid-tenure review. These two reviews are different processes with different performance expectations and different outcomes. A mid-tenure review assesses if the faculty member is making adequate progress toward meeting the performance expectations for tenure, but the early tenure review is an assessment of whether the faculty member has significantly exceeded the department, college, and university standards of achievement for tenure in teaching, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service. While the performance expectation bar is much lower for the mid-tenure reviews, the early tenure's criterion is much higher. Thus, early tenure is granted rarely simply because of the higher standards of achievement required in the three critical areas of performance. Incidentally, if an early review does not result in a favorable decision for tenure, a review is conducted again at the mandatory time.

By June 1, the BCAS Dean's Office will inform, via a written memorandum, each faculty member in the College who must undergo a mandatory tenure and promotion review in the upcoming academic year.

Each faculty applicant for tenure/promotion review must submit an electronic portfolio in PantherFolio in accordance with the due dates announced by the Office of Academic Affairs. The contents of the portfolio should include all the elements in this Manual's Section IX Faculty Portfolio, along with any benchmark performance criteria established by the department/division.

The portfolio is initially reviewed by the Departmental/Division Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC). The DTPC consists of three or five tenured faculty members from the department/division. The members of the DTPC are appointed by the Department/Division Head, in consultation with the Office of the Dean, and in accordance with the University's Tenure and Promotion Manual. In appointing the members of the DTPC, the Department/Division Head designates a Chair, who plays a major part in leading the review process.

In the case of a department with fewer than three tenured faculty members, the DTPC may include tenured faculty members from disciplines closely related to the applicant's discipline, in which case they should be recruited from other departments of the University. The Department/Division Head of the applicant undergoing such a review is expected to reach out to the external Department/Division Head requesting the appointment of a tenured faculty from the external department who will serve on the DTPC.

The DTPC reviews the applicant's portfolio, writes a summary of the evaluation, completes all the necessary forms, and submits the overall report to the Department/Division Head.

The Department/Division Head reviews the following materials: faculty's portfolio, relevant material from department personnel file, and recommendation of the DTPC. The Department/Division Head thereafter prepares a recommendation with a letter identifying the strengths and/or deficiencies of the applicant documented on the required forms and submits this evaluation to the Dean.

The Dean appoints the members of the College Tenure and/or Promotion Committee (CTPC), which consists of three or five tenured faculty members who did not serve on the DTPC. The CTPC reviews the following materials: the portfolio, all materials reviewed by the applicant's DTPC, and Department/Division Head's recommendation. The CTPC reviews the applicant's portfolio, writes a summary of the evaluation, completes all the necessary forms, and submits the overall report to the Dean.

The Dean reviews the portfolio and all related materials submitted by the DTPC, Department/Division Head, and CTPC, and relevant materials from the Dean's office personnel file. The Dean submits his/her own evaluation of the applicant to the Provost, along with the faculty's portfolio, and all the recommendations from the DTPC, Department/Division Head, and CTPC.

If, at any stage in the review process, there is a negative recommendation, the faculty member must be promptly informed by the Department Head or the Dean. The faculty member will have up to ten business days to respond formally to such recommendation.

The faculty member receiving tenure and/or promotion will be formally notified prior to the commencement of the fall semester following the initial submission of the portfolio.

All review committee materials and deliberations must be treated as confidential. Violations of confidentiality are regarded as official misconduct.

VI. SUMMARY OF PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS (ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR)

There are specific eligibility requirements that must be met to attain the highest rank of full professorship, the most crucial of which is that a faculty member should have typically served seven years in the rank of Associate Professor. Generally, the following steps or measures must be strictly followed to conduct the review process to its conclusion. Faculty seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor must notify their Department/Division Head and BCAS Dean's office of their intention to apply for such promotion by June 1.

Each faculty applicant for promotion to full professor must submit an electronic portfolio in PantherFolio in accordance with the due dates announced by the Office of Academic Affairs. The contents of the portfolio should include all the elements in this Manual's Section IX Faculty Portfolio, along with any benchmark performance criteria established by the department/division.

The portfolio is initially reviewed by the Departmental/Division Tenure and/or Promotion Committee (DTPC). The DTPC should consist of three or five tenured faculty members from the Department/ Division. For any application seeking promotion to Full Professor, the DTPC must consist only of Full Professors. The members of the DTPC are appointed by the Department/ Division Head, in consultation with the Office of the Dean, and as stated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the case of a department with fewer than three tenured full professors, the DTPC may include tenured full professors from other BCAS departments and PVAMU colleges. In that case, the Department/Division Head of the applicant undergoing such a review is expected to reach out to the external Department/Division Head asking the latter to appoint among the tenured faculty within the unit the external member(s) who will serve on the DTPC.

The DTPC reviews the applicant's portfolio, writes a summary of the evaluation, completes all the necessary forms, and submits the overall report to the Department/Division Head.

Following the departmental/division submission, the Department/Division Head reviews the following materials: faculty's portfolio, relevant materials from the department/division personnel file, and recommendation of DTPC. The Department/Division Head thereafter prepares a recommendation with a letter identifying the strengths and/or deficiencies of the applicant documented on the required forms and submits this and the DTPC evaluations to the Dean.

The Dean appoints the members of the College Tenure and/or Promotion Committee (CTPC), which consists of three or five tenured faculty members, with the rank of Full Professor. The CTPC reviews the following materials: all materials reviewed by the applicant's DTPC and Department/Division Head's recommendation. The CTPC submits its recommendations with all the required forms completed and a summary report included to the Dean.

The Dean reviews the portfolio, all related materials and recommendations submitted by the DTPC, the Department/Division Head, the CTPC, and all relevant materials from the applicant's personnel records filed in the Dean's office. The Dean then submits to the Provost the following: faculty's portfolio, the recommendations from the DTPC, Department/Division Head, the CTPC, and the Dean's own evaluation of the applicant.

If, at any stage in the review process, there is a negative recommendation, the faculty member must be promptly informed by the Department Head or the Dean. The faculty member will have up to ten business days to respond formally to such recommendation.

The faculty member who applied for promotion to the rank of Full Professor will be notified of the outcome of the evaluations and recommendations prior to the start of the fall semester.

All review committee materials and deliberations must be treated as confidential. Violations of confidentiality are regarded as official misconduct.

VII. SUMMARY OF POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

The post-tenure review process is mandatory and applies to both Associate and Full Professors who have been awarded tenure. This review takes place every five years and runs independently from the application for promotion to Full Professor.

By June 1, the BCAS Dean's office will inform, via a written memorandum, each faculty member who must undergo a mandatory post-tenure review by the end of the following academic year.

Each faculty applicant for post-tenure review must submit an electronic portfolio in PantherFolio in accordance with the due dates announced by the Office of Academic Affairs. The contents of the portfolio should include all the elements in this Manual's Section IX Faculty Portfolio, along with any benchmark performance criteria established by the department/division.

The portfolio is initially reviewed by the Departmental/Division Post-Tenure Committee (DPTC), which consists of three or five tenured faculty members from the department/division. In the case of receiving a post-tenure portfolio from a Full Professor, the DPTC must consist only of Full Professors. The members of the DPTC are appointed by the Department/Division Head, in consultation with the Office of the Dean, and in accordance with the University's Promotion and Tenure Manual. The DPTC may include tenured faculty members from other BCAS departments and PVAMU colleges. It should be noted here that, in the case of a department with fewer than three tenured faculty members, the Department/Division Head of the applicant undergoing such a review is expected to reach out to the external Department/Division Head (including from other colleges) asking the latter to

appoint among the tenured faculty within that unit the external member(s) who will serve on the DPTC.

The DPTC reviews applicant's portfolio, prepares their evaluation letter with justification following the Post-Tenure Review guidelines offered by the University, along with the necessary forms completed, and submits their report to the Department/Division Head.

The Department/Division Head reviews the following materials: faculty's portfolio, relevant material from department personnel file, and recommendation of the DPTC. The Department/Division Head then submits a recommendation to the BCAS Dean, with a letter justifying the recommended action, including the completed forms necessary for submission.

The Dean appoints the members of the College Post-Tenure Committee (CPTC), which consists of three or five tenured faculty members. The CPTC reviews the following materials: the applicant's post-tenure portfolio, recommendation submitted by the DPTC, and Department/Division Head's recommendation. CPTC submits its recommendations with all the required forms completed and a summary report included to the Dean.

The Dean reviews all materials and the recommendations submitted by CPTC, the Department/Division Head, and DPTC, and any relevant materials from the Dean's office personnel file. The Dean submits to the Provost the following: faculty's post-tenure portfolio, all the recommendations from DPTC, Department/Division Head, and CPTC, and the Dean's own evaluation of the applicant.

Faculty members who submit post-tenure portfolios will be notified of the evaluation and recommendations prior to September of the subsequent fall semester. In the case of marginal or unsatisfactory rating in any of the areas of teaching, research, or service, the Dean or the Dean's office will set up a meeting with the faculty applicant to discuss outcomes and develop an improvement plan. In the case of dissatisfaction with the outcome of the review, the faculty member in question can file an appeal to the Dean, who may appoint an ad hoc post-tenure review panel. Further appeal may be made by the faculty member to the Provost if the issue is not resolved in which case the Provost may establish a review panel consisting of members among the Faculty Senate or a panel whose members may be appointed jointly by the Provost and the Speaker of the Faculty Senate.

All review committee materials and deliberations must be treated as confidential. Violations of confidentiality are regarded as official misconduct.

VIII. SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL TRACK (APT) FACULTY PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty, commonly referred to as non-tenure track faculty, are expected to go through the review process for promotion as are other ranks of faculty applying for the same. Engaged mainly in teaching or research and holding non-tenure track appointments, APT faculty typically assume position titles and academic ranks that may include Lecturers (Lecturer I, Lecturer II, Lecturer III); Instructional Faculty (Laboratory Instructor, Instructor); Assistant Professor of Practice;

Associate Professor of Practice; Professor of Practice; Clinical Instructor; Clinical Assistant Professor; Clinical Associate Professor; Clinical Professor; Research Assistant Professor; Research Associate Professor; and Research Professor. Although their roles may not align with the expectations typically prescribed for tenure-track faculty, such as conducting highly specialized research in formal disciplines, undergraduate and graduate teaching and advising, or because they may not necessarily hold the terminal degree in some cases, APT faculty are still accorded the privilege of career advancement and thus eligible for promotion.

From year to year, Academic Affairs may undertake a special initiative for APT faculty promotion. When that occurs, such faculty who are eligible will receive an email from Academic Affairs indicating they may apply for promotion. A copy of the email, with instructions and a deadline, will also be sent to the Department/Division Head and Dean.

Each APT faculty applicant for promotion must submit an electronic portfolio in PantherFolio in accordance with the due dates announced by the Office of Academic Affairs. The contents of the portfolio should include all the elements in this Manual's Section IX Faculty Portfolio, along with any benchmark performance criteria established by the department/division.

The portfolio is initially reviewed by the Departmental/Division Academic Professional Track Committee (DAPTC). The DAPTC consists of three or five tenured and APT faculty members from the department/division. The members of the DAPTC are appointed by the Department/Division Head, in consultation with the Office of the Dean, and in accordance with the University's Promotion and Tenure Manual. In appointing the members of the DAPTC, the Department/Division Head designates a Chair, who plays a major part in leading the review process.

In the case of a department with insufficient tenured and APT faculty members, the DAPTC may include tenured/APT faculty members in disciplines closely related to the applicant's discipline, in which case they should be recruited from other departments of the University. The Department/Division Head of the applicant undergoing such a review is expected to reach out to the external Department/Division Head requesting the appointment of tenured/APT faculty from the external department who will serve on the DAPTC.

The DAPTC reviews the applicant's portfolio, writes a summary of the evaluation, completes all the necessary forms, and submits the overall report to the Department/Division Head.

The Department/Division Head reviews the following materials: faculty's portfolio, relevant material from department personnel file, and recommendation of the DAPTC. The Department/Division Head thereafter prepares a recommendation identifying the strengths and/or deficiencies of the applicant documented on the required forms and submits this evaluation to the Dean.

The Dean appoints the members of the College Academic Professional Track Committee (CAPTC), which consists of three or five tenured and APT faculty members who did not serve on the DAPTC. The CAPTC reviews the following materials: the portfolio, all materials reviewed by the applicant's DAPTC, and Department/Division Head's recommendation. The CAPTC reviews the applicant's portfolio, writes a summary of the evaluation, completes all the necessary forms, and submits the overall report to the Dean.

The Dean reviews the portfolio and all related materials and recommendations submitted by the DAPTC, Department/Division Head, and CAPTC, and relevant materials from the Dean's office personnel file. The Dean submits the completed evaluation of the applicant to the Provost, along with the faculty's portfolio, and all the recommendations from the DAPTC, Department/Division Head, and CAPTC.

The APT member receiving promotion will be formally notified prior to the commencement of the fall semester following the initial submission of the portfolio.

All review committee materials and deliberations must be treated as confidential. Violations of confidentiality are regarded as official misconduct.

IX. FACULTY PORTFOLIO

All applicants undergoing a review at any level, mid-tenure, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure, are required to submit an electronic portfolio in PantherFolio containing the listed items below.

Submission of an incomplete portfolio will constitute a fundamental failing that may lead to an unfavorable review outcome. Fulfilling the University's basic guidelines regarding submission of a portfolio must be the essence of the review process. If and when an applicant submits an incomplete portfolio, however, the Chair of the departmental committee conducting the review shall inform the Department/Division Head of that applicant's failure to follow the guidelines and recommend to the latter the type of action that must be taken to remedy the situation. Electronic portfolio contents must adhere to the University guidelines, and be submitted in accordance with the following:

- A. Cover Letter – No more than 3 pages**
Self-evaluation (why I should be tenured/promoted?)
- B. Summary statement of achievements at PVAMU during the evaluation period**
 - a. **In Teaching**
 - b. **In Research**
 - c. **In Service**
- C. Current Curriculum Vitae (Resume)**
- D. Copies of Faculty Performance Evaluation Documents at PVAMU during the evaluation period**
- E. Teaching**
 - 1. Summary statement of teaching responsibilities and activities during the evaluation period
 - 2. Statement of teaching philosophy
 - 3. Examples of infusion of technology in teaching
 - 4. Examples of course syllabi for no more than five preps

5. Examples of materials from classes (assignments, tests, etc.)
6. Summaries of all Student Opinion Surveys during the evaluation period
7. Peer evaluations/classroom teaching observations
8. Participation and contributions to assessment
9. Other items from teaching activities

F. Research/Scholarly/Artistic/Creative Activities

1. Summary statement of activities during the evaluation period
2. Description of research projects
3. List of funded projects with amounts and sources
4. Scholarly and academic publications excluding self-publishing
5. Presentations and professional conference papers
6. Artistic and creative activities
7. Research advisor/mentor activities with undergraduate and/or graduate students
8. Other research/scholarly/creative activities

G. Service

1. Summary statement of service rendered to the department, college, university, and community during the evaluation period
2. Service to national and international conferences, scientific communities, and organizations
3. Service to internal and external advisory boards (IBC, IRB, and such)
4. Service to departments, colleges, university, and other institutions
5. Service as faculty advisor to student organizations
6. Service as academic advisor
7. Other service activities

H. Other

1. Awards, honors, citations, recognitions, and commendations from local, national, and international venues
2. Memberships in professional societies (related to the one's discipline)
3. Offices held in professional societies
4. Professional meetings attended in the last five years
5. Other supporting material

X. EVALUATION OF TEACHING, RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES, AND SERVICE

For mid-tenure, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure reviews, the BCAS deploys a point-based rating system to evaluate faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Teaching is rated between 40-50 points, research between 30-50 points, and service between 10-20 points. The sum of points in all three areas should equal 100 points. The cumulative point rating of the faculty member undergoing a review is determined to be in one of the five ranked categories: significantly exceeds expectations, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, partially meets expectations, does not meet expectations. For APT promotion review, applicants should consult

with their Department/Division Head to decide on percentages for these three areas. The sum of all three areas should equal 100% and be divided based on the type of APT appointment the applicant has, e.g., a Lecturer may focus more on teaching and service while a Professor of Practice may focus on research.

Teaching, research, and service are separately evaluated in accordance with the following:

Significantly Exceeds Expectations	The average review score is 90 points or higher
Exceeds Expectations	The average review score is 80 – 89 points
Meets Expectations	The average review score is 70 – 79 points
Partially Meets Expectations	The average review score is 60 – 69 points
Does Not Meet Expectations	The average review score is less than 60 points

The specific points for each category are provided in Appendix E.

The following table shows the minimum expected cumulative performance for consideration of positive recommendations towards tenure and/or promotion.

Action	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Promotion to Associate Professor	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Promotion to Professor	Significantly Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
	Exceeds Expectations	Significantly Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

A. TEACHING [Worth 40-50% of the overall evaluation]

Teaching performance is evaluated at each level of review. Teaching is understood to include a variety of activities, the most significant of which are effective overall classroom performance, including such specific factors as preparation for courses, staying current in the discipline, instructional innovation, curriculum improvement and development, course content and requirements, advising, tutoring, and other professional endeavors directly related to student development.

Materials that demonstrate excellence in teaching are to be submitted with the portfolio. Such materials should represent evidence of accomplishments embodying basic faculty responsibilities, such as completing all attendance and grade reporting requirements by the designated deadlines, submitting all course syllabi and faculty CVs as necessary to meet all departmental, institutional, and external requirements, just to name a few. Also included is evidence of teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and/or graduate and professional levels

(including student and peer evaluations, quality, and faculty use of the syllabus, student, and peer evaluations); classroom and laboratory instruction, as well as examples of clinical placements, distance education, and online teaching. Furthermore, evidence of curriculum development, including development of new courses (e.g., online, and blended), effective classroom and laboratory instruction, using innovative teaching methods, and successful research output on pedagogy, together with publication of instructional materials, should be exhibited. Moreover, proof of mentorship and advising activities, including supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate students, and direction of dissertations and theses, must be fully accounted for. Above all, evidence confirming effectiveness in addressing issues raised by students, along with professional development towards enhancement of teaching, should also be produced. Essential elements necessary for enhancement of the teaching profession, such as collegiality, and collaboration in joint efforts with both internal and external peers, should be illuminated in the submission of materials, as well. Also essential are proofs of effective communication with students, peers, and others, and of adherence to the best standards of professionalism in and outside of the teaching setting. More importantly, one must present as supporting evidence any awards, honors, and other recognitions received.

B. RESEARCH [Worth 30-50% of the overall evaluation]

Reasonable and rigorous scholarly and creative artistic work (“research”) should be demonstrated in accordance with standards established by the department/division. Research at the BCAS consists of faculty’s professional output at local, regional, national, and international levels. Research may include individual and collaborative scholarly work or creative art accomplishments, as well as other expectations according to the discipline or the faculty member’s expertise. These activities will account for between 30-50% of the evaluation in the review process.

The expectations for scholarly and creative artistic output will vary by the department or division which is responsible for defining the value of various forms of output. Examples of research include, but are not limited to:

- Publishing books, chapters, and peer-reviewed journal articles;
- Presenting posters, papers, and research findings at local, national, and international venues;
- Collaborating on research projects across disciplines and domestic and international institutions;
- Invitations as a featured speaker, presenter, and performer at local, national, and international venues;
- Performing and contributing to recitals and other artistic expressions;
- Participation in various forms of art, including musical concerts and other artistic expressions; and
- Creating new artistic expressions for publication, such as music and other works art.

C. SERVICE [Worth 10-20% of the overall evaluation]

Service includes any professional activities that contribute to the accomplishment of the internal and external service mission of the department, college, or university. Examples of service activities include active participation on and contribution to committees, holding offices in professional organizations, leadership or membership on conference/workshop organizing committees, sponsoring or advising student organizations, as well as organizing conferences, chairing conference sessions, and serving as a discussant. Portfolios must include evidence of service such as copies of appointment letters, agenda, minutes, performance endorsement letters from committee chairs, thank you letters, etc.

APPENDIX A
BCAS MID-TENURE, TENURE, PROMOTION & POST-TENURE
REVIEW WORKSHEET

A. Teaching	Weight	Rating (1-5)	Weighted Score
1. Summary statement of teaching responsibilities and activities during the evaluation period	3		
2. Departmental/division-level teaching evaluation (see Annual Performance Evaluations)	3		
3. Statement of teaching philosophy	2		
4. Examples of infusion of technology and/or innovation in teaching	2		
5. Examples of course syllabi for no more than five preps	2		
6. Examples of up to date/relevant materials from classes (assignments, tests, etc.)	2		
7. Summaries of all Student Opinion Survey (SOS) during the evaluation period	2		
8. Peer evaluations/classroom teaching observations	2		
9. Participation and contributions to assessment	2		
10. BONUS. Other items from teaching activities:			
a. Open Educational Resources (OER) development /New course development (including special topics courses)	1		
b. Continuing training and professional development in pedagogy	1		
c. Mentoring students and independent study activities, student theses, service learning, travel/study abroad activities for students	1		
d. Other	1		
Total Weighted Score – Teaching			/100

B. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities	Weight	Rating (1-5)	Weighted Score
1. Summary statement of research/scholarly/creative activities during the evaluation period	3		
2. Departmental/division-level research/scholarly/creative activities evaluation (see Annual Performance Evaluations)	3		
3. Description of research projects	2		
4. List of funded projects with amounts and sources	2		
5. List of submitted external grant proposals	1		
6. Scholarly and academic publications excluding self-publishing	2		
7. Artistic and creative activities	2		
8. Presentations and professional conference papers	2		
9. Attending professional conferences	1		
10. Research advisor/mentor activities with undergraduate and/or graduate students	2		
11. BONUS. Other items from research/scholarly/creative activities			
a. Entrepreneurial initiatives in research	2		
b. Publication of scholarly or creative work with students	1		
c. Other	1		
Total Weighted Score – Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities			/100

C. Service	Weight	Rating (1-5)	Weighted Score
1. Summary statement of service rendered to the department, college, university, and community during the evaluation period	5		
2. Departmental/division-level service performance evaluation (see Annual Performance Evaluations)	5		
3. Service to national and international conferences, scientific communities, and organizations; to internal and external advisory boards (IBC, IRB, and such)	2		
4. Service to other departments and colleges	2		
5. Service to the BCAS and PVAMU	2		
6. Service to other institutions	2		
7. Service as faculty advisor to student organizations or as academic advisor	2		
8. BONUS. Other service activities	2		
Total Weighted Score – Service			/100