

Guidelines for Three-Year Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

Approved by College Faculty Council March 9, 2009

This document adheres to the UT System policies and incorporates the processes in the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOOP). The information provided in HOOP, which can be found at <http://admin.utep.edu/Default.aspx?tabid=30381>, should be consulted by the faculty affected by this document for more information.

The three-year evaluation process should have the following characteristics:

1. ***Supportive of Faculty Development:*** The evaluation process should provide feedback and constructive advice.
2. ***Transparent Process with Adequate Feedback:*** To ensure that the evaluation is constructive in nature, meaningful dialogue between the faculty member, and the Chair and College Administration is essential. During the evaluation process, the faculty member should be made aware of whether his or her progress is in line with the expectations of the Department and College as well as what remedial actions should be taken to improve the chances of earning tenure.
3. ***Correlation between Three-Year Evaluation and Annual Evaluations:*** The three-year evaluation should not conflict with the directions provided by the Chair and College Administration at the time of hiring of the faculty member. The annual evaluation process should provide necessary guidance to the tenure-track faculty member to help him or her achieve a favorable three-year evaluation.
4. ***Correlation between Three-Year Evaluation and Tenure Process:*** The process of preparing the three-year evaluation package and the subsequent evaluation should be as similar as possible to the tenure and promotion process for the benefit of the faculty being evaluated.
5. ***Uniform Structure across College of Engineering:*** A uniform structure and process is desirable for equity among Departments. The Committee recommends that the College Promotion and Tenure Committee review and provide written recommendations to the Dean.
6. ***Reasonable Effort:*** The preparation of the third-year review materials should not require undue effort. These guidelines suggest maximum lengths for sections of the review materials.

Three-Year Evaluation Process

The three-year evaluation process is outlined in Table 1. The process should be completed during the third full year after the employment of the faculty member.

Table 1 - Proposed Cycle of Three-Year Evaluation Process

Item	When	What	Who
1	September 15	Letter from College Administration advising faculty member and Chair about upcoming three-year evaluation	Dean
2	February 15	Schedule all meetings for review process described in Items 4, 5, 6	Chair, Dean
3	March 1	Faculty Three-Year Dossier is Delivered to Chair	Faculty
		Self-Evaluation based on Dossier	Faculty
4	March 15	Recommendation by Department Tenured Faculty Committee	Tenured Faculty
5	March 31	Evaluation of Faculty member performance by Chair, based on the dossier, self-evaluation and Tenured Faculty recommendations	Chair
6	April 15	Evaluation by College Tenure and Promotion Committee ¹	College Tenure and Promotion Committee
7	April 30	Development of Remediation Plan (if necessary)	Faculty and Chair
8	May 20	Review and Comments by the Dean	Dean
9	May 30	Final Evaluation and Recommendations to Faculty	Dean & Chair

¹ Faculty may request meeting with the Promotion and Tenure Committee members (without the presence of his or her Department representative) to present the Dossier and share concerns

Three-Year Evaluation Dossier

The faculty member being evaluated must first review the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines document to understand the criteria required for achieving promotion and tenure.

It is extremely important that each candidate for three-year review prepare and present for evaluation a complete, well-organized, well-documented, and clear application file so as to accurately reflect the record of the candidate. The file should be a digital document, with a table of contents, and sections clearly marked.

The suggested three-year evaluation dossier should be organized under the following headings in this order. However, this list should not be interpreted to exclude the incorporation of additional, important material. Where appropriate, limits on number of pages for sections are suggested; note that these are suggested *maxima* and that shorter sections, as appropriate, are encouraged.

1. GENERAL DOCUMENTS

1.1. Curriculum Vitae

1.2. Statement of Philosophy on the following activities as they relate to the Department, College and University's mission (Suggested page limit: 5 pages)

1.2.1. Teaching

1.2.2. Research

1.2.3. Service

1.3. Faculty self-evaluation with respect to progress toward achieving career goals related to teaching, research and service.

1.4. Faculty evaluation summaries for the last three years

2. TEACHING ACTIVITIES

2.1. Professional Information

2.1.1. List of courses taught

2.1.2. New courses and/or major course revisions

2.1.3. Teaching load information, including level and class size

2.1.4. Evidence of curriculum development, including sample syllabi and course materials (Suggested page limit: 2 pages, plus syllabi and course materials)

2.1.5. Evidence of use of technology to complement instruction (Suggested page limit: 1 page)

2.1.6. Professional development in teaching, including workshops and seminars presented and attended (Suggested page limit: 1 page)

2.2. Evidence of Teaching Quality

2.2.1. Student evaluations and comments, tabulated and summarized (place actual student evaluations in an appendix)

2.2.2. Theses and dissertations supervised (Suggested page limit: 2 pages)

2.2.3. Honors and awards to supervised students (Suggested page limit: 1 page)

2.2.4. Career achievements of mentored students (Suggested page limit: 1 page)

2.2.5. Community and/or school-based projects guided and produced in connection with courses (Suggested page limit: 1 page)

2.2.6. Letters from UTEP peers who have observed classes or reviewed course materials

2.2.7. Honors or awards for teaching excellence (Suggested page limit: 1 page)

2.2.8. Extramural funds awarded for instructional, innovation, facilities, student support (Suggested page limit: 2 pages)

3. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

3.1. Evidence of Success in Research and Publications

3.1.1. Statement of areas of research interest

3.2. Evidence of Success in Securing Extramural Funding to Support Research

3.2.1. Proposals funded

3.2.2. Proposals submitted

3.3. Evidence of Involving Students in Research

3.3.1. Number of students supported from extramural funding

3.3.2. Articles co-authored with students (Suggested page limit: 1 page)

3.3.3. Presentations by students involved in research in national and international conferences (Suggested page limit: 1 page)

4. SERVICE

4.1. Evidence of Service to University

4.1.1. Service on departmental, College, or University committees (Suggested page limit: 2 pages)

4.1.2. Student advising

typos fixed March 2018, March 2023