

# **College of Science and Technology (COST)**

## **Guidelines for Scholarship Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review**

**Approved: November 11, 2020**

**2020 revision**

### **Purpose:**

The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for tenure-track faculty, department heads, and the Tenure & Promotion Committee regarding expectations for promotion with tenure to Associate Professor and Professor and for post-tenure review. Superseding documents include the faculty handbook, SAP 12.99.99.T0.01 (Performance Development and Evaluation of Faculty), Rule 12.03.99.T1 (Faculty Academic Workload and Reporting Requirements), SAP 12.02.99.T0.01 (Procedures for Implementing Tenure), System Policy 12.01 (Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure), and System Policy 12.06 (Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness). This document provides guidelines and expectations for scholarship only.

The standard work assignment for tenure track faculty is 12 load hours for teaching and 20% of effort directed toward scholarship. Faculty with alternate teaching loads will have an adjusted level of scholarship expectations based on their scheduled teaching load.

### **Promotion Guidelines:**

When evaluating faculty, the Tenure & Promotion Committee and department heads shall conform to the Performance Indicators of Scholarship within this document, taking into consideration issues of both quality and frequency of production, where relevant, that are consistent with the university's mission, vision, and resources to support scholarly and creative work. Accordingly, all parties should consider a broad range of scholarly products that achieve the mission and vision of the department, college and university.

Reflecting the nature of Tarleton State University as a regional comprehensive university, the criteria for successful tenure and promotion is excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Engagement in scholarly activities is intended to produce a more informed and engaging teacher. The primary goal of scholarly activities should be to provide Tarleton students with opportunities to gain advanced research experience. However, we must recognize that it can be very difficult to afford opportunities to engage students, particularly undergraduate students, in some research areas.

Candidates for tenure and promotion are responsible for assembling portfolios presenting clear evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The submitted materials should be well-written and describe the scope and impact of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service contributions. Department-level annual reviews should provide clear and accurate guidance to ensure that faculty are on trajectories to meet the expectations of tenure and promotion, as well as provide documentation of unique circumstances to the Tenure & Promotion Committee.

Teaching loads vary among departments and individuals; therefore, scholarly expectations shall be evaluated on a sliding scale based on the average teaching load described below. The provost, dean, and department head will ensure that a tenured or tenure-track faculty member does not have a 5-year

average teaching load exceeding 13.5 hours (calculated as per the definition of load hours on page 6). Such unusually high teaching loads might happen on an occasional basis, but it should not be the norm for any faculty member. If a faculty member requests to teach an overload for overload pay, research expectations will not be reduced.

Faculty receiving release time for administrative duties will use their administrative release as equivalent to the designated course contact hours. For example, a department head receiving six hours of release would have 6 load hours from the teaching assignment and 6 equivalent hours from the administrative release resulting in a 12 hour equivalent teaching load.

Faculty should focus their efforts on producing tangible research outcomes, such as conference presentations, journal publications, grant submissions & awards, etc. Evaluation of scholarly products should consider both the quality and frequency of their production consistent with the nature of Tarleton State University as a regional comprehensive university.

Faculty are expected to conduct themselves collegially and professionally as to support student success, academic and departmental goals, and enhance the reputation of the department, college, and university. This includes but is not limited to fiscally responsible budget practices, professionalism in interpersonal interactions, and timely submission of deliverables.

A point system is used to quantify Performance Indicators of Scholarship in order to provide clarity regarding the relative value of scholarly products. These expectations are the minimum needed to be considered for promotion and tenure for tenure track faculty, see Tarleton SAP 12.99.99.T0.01, section 3.4 for additional details. Perceived weaknesses in one area (teaching, scholarship, or service) may be offset by strengths in another. This list of Performance Indicators is not comprehensive. Actual ranking of the scholarly products as level I, II, or III is the purview of the department head, with appropriate input from the faculty and dean. The quality of each product will be taken into consideration when determining the appropriate category for each.

For purposes of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, only published or presented products will be considered as outcomes for scholarship. A published product is one that has been accepted in final form by the editor of the publisher. Work that has been submitted but is still under review (or revised and resubmitted) does not constitute publication. These products must have been completed while at Tarleton State University. Under some circumstances, faculty receive credit for time in a previous position as credit towards tenure. When this occurs, some research products generated during this time may be considered.

### **Implementation Dates:**

The 2020 revision of this document will take effect for faculty submitting their portfolio during or after the Fall 2025 semester. Faculty submitting their portfolios prior to Fall 2025 may use the 2014 version of this document. During this transition period, faculty have the option of using the 2020 revision if they desire. In this case, the faculty must clearly indicate their selection of the 2020 revision in their evaluation portfolio.

**Table 1. Scholarship expectations for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure**

<b>5 Yr Average Teaching Load<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Required Points</b>	<b>Research Expectations</b>
6 ±1.5	35	At least 3 products from Level I
9 ±1.5	25	At least 2 products from Level I
12 ±1.5	15	At least 1 product from Level I

<sup>1</sup>Faculty with average teaching loads midway between two categories will have intermediate research expectations.

**Table 2. Scholarship expectations for promotion to Professor**

<b>5 Yr<sup>2</sup> Average Teaching Load<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Required Points</b>	<b>Research Expectations</b>
6 ±1.5	40	At least 4 products from Level I
9 ±1.5	30	At least 3 products from Level I
12 ±1.5	20	At least 2 products from Level I

<sup>1</sup>Faculty with average teaching loads midway between two categories will have intermediate research expectations.

<sup>2</sup>In situations where it has been more than five years since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, only products generated during the most recent six years will be counted in the portfolio for promotion to the rank of Professor.

**Table 3. Scholarship expectations for post-tenure review**

<b>5 Yr Average Teaching Load<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Required Points</b>	<b>Research Expectations</b>
6 ±1.5	35	At least 3 products from Level I
9 ±1.5	25	At least 2 products from Level I
12 ±1.5	15	Only Level II or III products required

<sup>1</sup>Faculty with average teaching loads midway between two categories will have intermediate research expectations.

## **Performance Indicators of Scholarship for Departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geosciences, Physics and Mathematics**

### **Level I (4 pts each): Peer-reviewed products that were made possible because of the applicant's academic expertise (student engagement is highly encouraged)**

- Lead or co-author on a peer-reviewed publication in a discipline-appropriate journal
- Lead or co-author on a discipline-appropriate book (including a textbook)
- Lead or co-author on a discipline-appropriate book chapter (part of an edited volume)
- Lead or co-author on a substantial, discipline-appropriate technical report to a government agency or private industry
- PI or co-PI on a funded competitive, external grants  $\geq$ \$60,000 (total project dollars, cumulative across multiple grants of  $\leq$ \$60,000)
- PI or co-PI on a submitted competitive, external grant  $\geq$ \$200,000 (total project dollars)
- Inventor or co-inventor of a discipline-appropriate patent
- Other completed products of this scale as agreed upon by the department head and/or dean

### **Level II (2 pts each): Products of scholarly activity of lesser significance with an external audience (beyond Tarleton)**

- Presentation of research findings at regional/national/international meetings
- PI or co-PI on a funded non-competitive, extramural grant
- PI or co-PI on a funded competitive, extramural grant of  $<$ \$60,000 (total project dollars, cumulative across multiple grants)
- PI or co-PI on a competitive, extramural grant that was not funded and  $<$ \$200,000 (total project dollars)
- Mentor of a student presenting research findings at a regional/national/international meeting
- Presentation at a professional seminar or workshop (with an external audience)
- Key personnel or senior personnel on a funded grant (other than PI or co-PI)
- Other completed products of this scale as agreed upon by the department head and/or dean

### **Level III (1 pt each): Products of scholarly activity with an internal audience (within Tarleton)**

- An internally funded faculty or student research grant
- Mentor of a student presenting research findings at an organized Tarleton event
- Presentation at a professional seminar or workshop (with an internal audience)
- Other completed products of this scale as agreed upon by the department head and/or dean

#### Notes:

- 1) The point system allows for points to be awarded for both the submission and awarding of the same grant.
- 2) The total dollar value of the grant will be used to determine whether the appropriate level, not the individual year budgets.

**Performance Indicators of Scholarship for School of Engineering  
(Department of Engineering and Computer Science &  
Department of Engineering Technology)**

**Level I (4 points each)**

- Lead or co-author on a competitive peer reviewed publication in a regional, national, or international journal
- Characterize new material, process or procedure that is relevant to an industrial need with a letter from a company identifying its value to them
- Lead or co-author on a competitive peer reviewed publication in national or international conference proceedings
- Lead or co-author on a discipline appropriate book or textbook from a nationally recognized publisher
- Lead or co-author on a discipline appropriate book chapter from a nationally recognized publisher (part of an edited volume)
- Lead or co-author on a substantial, discipline-appropriate technical report to a government agency or private industry
- Industrial study or design with a letter from a company identifying its significant value of the report to them
- PI or co-PI on funded competitive, external grants  $\geq$ \$60,000 (total project dollars, cumulative across multiple grants of  $\leq$ \$60,000)
- PI or co-PI on submitted (but not funded) competitive, external grant  $\geq$ \$200,000 (total project dollars)
- Inventor or co-inventor on a discipline-appropriate patent
- Other completed products of this scale as agreed upon by the department head and/or dean

**Level II (2 points each)**

- Publications in trade periodicals and journals that help practicing professionals reproduce the results of application in industries
- Presentation (only) of research findings at regional, national, or international meetings
- PI or co-PI on funded competitive, extramural grants of  $<$ \$60,000 (total project dollars, cumulative across multiple grants)
- Submission of a state, national or international level external grant for research, research instrumentation or workforce development which was either not funded or is in review
- Contributor to a competitive peer reviewed publication in local or regional conference proceedings
- Key personnel or senior personnel on a funded grant (other than PI or co-PI)
- Industry and user group conference presentation
- Other completed products of this scale as agreed upon by the department head and/or dean

**Level III (1 point each)**

- Obtaining grants through internal (Tarleton State) research opportunities (e.g., SRG)
- Presentation (only) at local conference
- Contributor to a non-peer reviewed publication or presentation in local or regional conference
- Presentations by mentored undergraduates for their research
- Presentations at professional seminars and workshops
- Mentor for a funded undergraduate/graduate research activity
- Other completed products of this scale as agreed upon by the department head and/or dean

Notes:

- 1) The point system allows for points to be awarded for both the submission and awarding of the same grant.
- 2) The total dollar value of the grant will be used to determine whether the appropriate level, not the individual year budgets.

## **Definitions** (for purposes of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review)

**Policy:** Texas A&M System Policies guide the System by incorporating the Board of Regents' philosophies, expectations, and priorities. System Policies create administrative structures, set priorities, delegate authority, assign responsibility, ensure accountability, and define reporting requirements.

**Regulation:** System Regulations include specific directives, procedures, and reporting requirements needed to implement System Policies and include interpretations where issues are not covered or are unclear in System Policies.

**Rule:** Texas A&M System Member Rules are used as governance documents for the Member and consist of matters unique to the Member that are not specifically addressed in System Policies and Regulations. Rules must be consistent with and are subordinate to System Policies and System Regulations.

**Standard Administrative Procedure (SAP):** Standard Administrative Procedures are a set or system of rules that govern the procedures for managing an organization. These procedures are meant to establish efficiency, consistency, responsibility, and accountability. SAPs must be consistent with and are subordinate to System Policies and System Regulations.

**Teaching Load hours:** A measure that represents an hour of scheduled instruction given to students. For the calculation of load hours, each credit of a lecture course equates to one load hour. A 3 credit hour lecture will equal 3 load hours. For laboratory courses, the scheduled weekly time for the laboratory meeting period will be multiplied by 0.75 to compute the load hours for the laboratory course. Thus, a lab with a weekly scheduled lab session of 3 hours will equal 2.25 load hours. Thesis and special problems courses will be included based on the total number of generated credits hours divided by three with a maximum of 3 load hours for all such assignments in the given semester ( $\#$  of enrolled students  $\times$  credit hours for course)/3. Thus, a one course equivalent can be achieved via the thesis and special problems courses.

**Average teaching load:** The average of a faculty member's 9 month load over the evaluation period.

**Digital Measures:** Software package to document teaching, scholarship, and service activities and to demonstrate compliance with proper faculty credentials.

**Performance Indicators of Scholarship:** The level and type of scholarly products and activities that are measured during promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

**Peer-reviewed publication:** A paper that is published in a journal that uses peer-review as part of the decision-making process for accepting or rejecting submitted manuscripts.