Baylor University
Robbins College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Health Human Performance & Recreation

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Revisions Approved by the Office of the Provost, June 27, 2022—James Bennighof

Introduction

The faculty in the Department of Health, Human Performance, and Recreation (HHPR) represent a number of disciplines. These disciplines include athletic training, exercise physiology, public health, sport pedagogy, sport nutrition, sport sociology/psychology, and recreation & leisure services. As a result, faculty members have a diverse array of professional interests and teaching, research, and service expectations. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate that their academic maturity, imagination, initiative and leadership are adequate to sustain continued production of quality teaching, scholarly work, and student mentoring*. The department's tenure and/or promotion evaluation will consider the candidate's discipline and the typical publication and granting patterns at research universities.* The following section provides typical baseline standards that indicate a candidate is ready to be considered for tenure and promotion. These criteria are based on the mission and goals of Baylor University and the Robbins College of Health and Human Sciences as outlined in the *Pro Futuris* Vision Statement and the Baylor University Faculty Handbook.

This list of performance criteria is intended to guide Assistant Professors on the tenure track to establish themselves as emerging national/international scholars and teachers. Additionally, the criteria articulate our performance guidelines to one another in order to understand our own expectations. Faculty members in HHPR realize that as support for faculty increases and programs are developed, tenure and promotion expectations may also change. Consequently, faculty members within the Department of HHPR will re-evaluate the departmental tenure and promotion criteria every 5-7 years.

Rationale and Context for Tenure and Promotion Scholarship Performance Standards

Several factors must be considered when examining HHPR faculty members' credentials and scholarly productivity. First, the HHPR faculty is extremely diverse. Therefore, our standards reflect a good deal of flexibility in order to accommodate different types of contributions resulting from the many different fields, and resulting workloads and expectations in HHPR. As specific examples, HHPR faculty scholarly productivity may be affected by time demands of supervising field experiences/internships (e.g., athletic training and sport pedagogy), a more limited number of journals in some specific fields (e.g., athletic training and biomechanics), and somewhat limited external funding possibilities in some areas (i.e., recreation, and sport pedagogy).

Faculty workloads in HHPR may vary and **should be considered when examining a faculty member's scholarly record for tenure and promotion.** It is the department's expectation that faculty members will be assigned workloads that allow for the development of research and teaching portfolios worthy of tenure and promotion.

Thus, the department's tenure and promotion standards are to be adjusted somewhat to fit the specific load, specialty areas, and other unique considerations to be made on an individual basis. *In this sense, the department's tenure and promotion standards are not absolute in terms of any numeric expectations as may be suggested in other parts of this document, though such numeric guidelines serve as a starting point for discussion between tenure candidates and the tenured faculty.*

I. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
A.   <u>Teaching Expectations</u> (Teaching & Related Scholarly Work)

Faculty members are expected to document a consistent record of quality teaching and development in teaching. Documentation should include peer and/or department chair evaluations, student evaluations, artifacts of instruction (such as syllabi, class assignments, instructional development, student work, and student course evaluations, formal and informal), evidence of reflection and growth in teaching through curriculum and instructional development, and professional development. Evidence of teaching quality, as required by University policy, must include a systematic assessment of student opinion and peer teaching evaluations.

1. Quality of Teaching

Indicators of teaching quality, either in classes involving groups of students or in work with individual students, *may* include, but are not limited to, the following characteristics:
- Goals and learning objectives are stated. These goals and objectives take into consideration the disciplinary curriculum of which the experience is a part and are relevant to accreditation and licensure guidelines.
- Teaching shows responsiveness to information gathered from student course evaluations and peer teaching evaluations.
- Teaching shows constant incorporation of recent scholarship in content and pedagogy, including appropriate application of information technology.
- Teaching shows responsiveness to student diversity and to the differing prior knowledge, needs, and interests of students.
- Teaching leads to student learning that gives evidence of critical and creative thinking and is consistent with the goals of the learning experience.
- Mentoring of students encourages them to succeed in achieving program goals and objectives and student educational goals and career aspirations, and results in increased student retention, when appropriate.

- Mentoring and advising of students leads to their demonstration of professional leadership and development through presentations, publication, professional recognition, and/or other indicators appropriate to their level.
- Faculty members implement professional programs that are indicative of best instructional practices (e.g., following practices advocated by national accrediting bodies or other similar organizations).

2. Development of Teaching

Indicators of growth or development in teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following characteristics:

- Faculty stay current with best practices and trends within their disciplines in order to meet requirements for licensure and adhere to professional standards.
- Growth in teaching is supported by effective participation in program decision-making processes about curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
- Growth in teaching is promoted through refinement and development of curricula, including preparation of new courses, active participation in Professional Development Schools, revision of existing courses, and engagement in scholarly strategies such as service learning, action research, or publications and presentations about teaching practice.
- Growth in teaching is promoted through innovation in methods of instruction such as team teaching, and engaging in scholarly strategies that involve innovative methods of teaching.
- Mentoring and advising of undergraduate/graduate students leads to products (such as portfolios, dissertations, examination results, grant submissions, publications, presentations, and teaching) of recognized quality.

3. Evidence of Participation in Student Mentoring

Candidates are expected to demonstrate evidence of providing guidance and leadership to students. Examples include:

- Service on dissertation, thesis, and undergraduate thesis committees;
- Service on internship and/or comprehensive exam committees;
- Joint authorship or joint presentations with students; and
- Student advising and mentoring progress toward graduation.

4. Department Peer Review Guidelines

In accordance with Baylor University tenure policy requiring submission of peer reviews of teaching over a period of at least 3 years as part of a candidate's tenure notebook/supporting materials, the HHPR Department requires adherence to the following guidelines for the peer review process:

- Completion of at least 5 peer reviews, 3 of which must occur in the last 3 years of the probation period.
- Peer reviews should be conducted using the HHPR Peer Teaching Evaluation form (see **Appendix A**).
- Information from peer reviews should be shared with the HHPR tenured faculty at each of the candidate's annual tenure review meetings. Copies of the Peer Teaching Evaluation forms should be kept in the candidate's tenure notebook and made available for review.

B. <u>Scholarship Expectations</u> (Research & Scholarly/Creative Contributions)

1. **Grant Procurement**

In some HHPR disciplines, scholarly impact and reputation is not dependent on the amount of research funds secured. In all fields research support demonstrates the proposed work to be original and significant. Therefore, a demonstrated ability to obtain external funding serves as an indicator of the candidate's research abilities, quality, impact and reputation. High levels of funding are one factor in evaluating a faculty member for tenure or promotion with external measures of quality of scholarship ultimately being determinative.

Grant writing to external funding agencies is required with the expectation of at least four submissions during the tenure period with evidence of continued efforts to obtain funding. All forms of external funding are supported and encouraged in the Department of HHPR. When appropriate and where possible, research grants with facility and admininstraiotn costs (F&A) included are encouraged.

Successful candidates for tenure should have obtained at least one external funding mechanism and shown consistent effort in attempting to obtain external grants/contracts during their probationary period.

Furthermore, candidates who received substantial startup packages (e.g., equipment, summer salary, funds for pilot projects, etc.) (greater than $25,000) are expected to obtain external funding greater than or equal to their startup package.

2. Productivity

Based on a standard 2-2 teaching load with no additional administrative responsibilities, the minimum standard productivity rate in HHPR is 2-3 peer-reviewed journal publications per year (resulting in at least 12 publications over the period of time on the tenure track) and evidence of scholarly engagement at national or international conferences through annual presentations. Tenure candidates should provide evidence of a trajectory of quantity and quality of their publications over the length of the tenure period that indicates continued success. Scholarly output should reflect a clear and focused research agenda.

Thus, the actual expected productivity (to account for variations in disciplines, administrative duties, grant productivity and requirements, and quality of publication) standard is to be determined by ongoing evaluation by the HHPR tenured faculty, department chair, and the dean. It is the responsibility of the candidate to document the quality of publication outlets with respect to factors such as impact factor, circulation of journal, reputation, rejection rate, eigenfactor, article influence score, size of circulation, number of peer reviewers, etc. It is the responsibility of HHPR tenured faculty within the candidate's discipline to provide guidance and assessment of the quality of publication outlets. External reviewers also address such factors in assessing quality. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion will count articles in press toward his/her total number of publications.

3. Quality of Publications

It is expected that a majority of the candidate's publications be in high quality journals within the candidate's discipline and that a majority of the publications exhibit academic leadership (e.g., first author publications, corresponding author, or mentorship of students as first author). Individual faculty members must be able to document the impact of the scholarship produced (e.g., total number of citations, h-index, immediacy index, and other metrics to demonstrate the "impact" of their articles).

a. **Types of Scholarly Contributions and Varied Types of Publications**

The HHPR faculty fully supports varied types of scholarship (e.g., books of scholarly significance, book chapters, and refereed monographs). Specifically, we identify here common, viable forms of publication in our fields. Generally, with the acknowledgement that there are often exceptions, the priority/importance of the different forms of publication follows the order below. *In any instance, a candidate may provide information regarding the scholarly work (e.g., circulation, awards, invited work, prominence of organization, etc.) to justify its consideration of higher quality placement. While we value scholarly*

work across these categories, a lesser emphasis will be placed on publications in the "Important" and "Other" contributions categories below.

Most Important Contributions
- Research published in peer-reviewed journals in print or electronic form
- Theory/review articles published in peer-reviewed journals in print or electronic form
- Academic textbooks published by nationally recognized publishers (i.e., as opposed to self-published works)
- Edited academic textbooks published by nationally recognized publishers

Important Contributions
- Book chapters in edited texts
- Refereed conference proceedings (which include short manuscripts that describe the research beyond that of an abstract) or monographs for which candidates can demonstrate impact (e.g., citations)

Other Contributions
- Non-refereed articles published in proceedings or organized by a nationally/internationally recognized society

4. Research Collaboration, Relative Contribution, and Order of Authorship

The fields in HHPR embrace broad-based collaborative strategies as means of improving quality of research. Such approaches allow for effective blending of expertise from many different fields, often improving the quality of the overall research product. This is necessary as research in HHPR-related fields may involve a complex web of relationships among psychosocial, demographic, sociological, environmental, biomechanical, and physiological variables. Naturally, research questions involving such a broad array of potential influences are complicated to the degree that no single individual, entity, or professional discipline can hope to address them effectively without assistance. For this reason, HHPR faculty frequently engage in research, program development, and community service projects that involve a wide array of research collaborators, professionals, and community volunteers, all of whom may be critical partners in the effort. In fact, because these collective efforts are so critical for success, many government-sponsored and foundational grant-funding sources only approve proposals that represent broad-based collaborative efforts. In short, lists of multiple authors are commonly found on HHPR publications, grants, and other projects. This is a

natural outcome of the broad-based efforts in which HHPR researchers are commonly engaged.

In this context, taking the lead role on a collaborative project may be of equal value as working as a solitary investigator (i.e., leading to sole authorship). Multiple authorships in HHPR are valued and highly encouraged. In many cases, the first-author designation does signify the lead role and highest level of contribution; however, in many cases, beyond the first author, it is not possible to designate the weight of contribution. In some situations, alphabetical listings are used, particularly when the contribution is equally divided among the authors. For journals in some of our fields, the author who made the most significant contribution may be listed last. Consequently, individual faculty members must be able to document the nature and extent of contribution made to coauthored articles. ***For this reason, each HHPR faculty member should provide a brief description of her/his amount and type of contribution to any project within all annual performance, tenure, and promotion documents. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should regularly be taking a lead role on collaborative projects, though solitary efforts (i.e., sole authorship) may also demonstrate this type of scholarly initiative.*** Faculty members are encouraged to discuss issues related to contributions and order of authorship upon initiating collaborative scholarly efforts.

In many instances, faculty may have mentored students through the research process. This mentoring process is highly valued within HHPR. In addition, because there are many difficult ethical issues surrounding order of authorship, particularly as it pertains to student-faculty interaction and the potential for abuse, HHPR encourages faculty members to list students first when appropriate. *Consequently, when considering relative contribution to publications, presentations and other scholarly works, faculty members who list students' names before their own name on a publication should be acknowledged to have made an approximately equal contribution as in the instance when they are listed first on a publication. However, this is only the case if the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the scholarly work.*

5. Value of Longitudinal, Community-Based, and Other Research and Related Publication and Productivity Issues

When HHPR researchers engage in necessary long-range collaborative efforts, difficulties can arise in University-based performance evaluations for tenure and promotion. The individuals who are called on to make these evaluative decisions may be from other disciplines in which research and publication rates can move at a faster pace. Some research efforts are only successful after long months of community interaction to establish trust and commitment,

assess community-specific needs, develop population-specific survey instruments for data acquisition and strategies, train and monitor volunteer participants, foster community empowerment through inclusion in decision-making processes, and document long-range outcomes. To bypass these critical steps would, in essence, equate to abandoning the broad, multifaceted approach that, when patiently applied, has proven to effect long-range health-enhancing changes in our society. Community-based research takes time, as does long-term exercise training and/or intervention research. Yet such efforts are often the most impactful in our respective fields.

Faculty members in HHPR are expected to document continuous progress in the areas of successful publication and grant procurement. We recognize, however, that the rate at which these two important areas progress will be, in part, dependent upon the nature of the research project (e.g., longitudinal vs. acute, clinical vs. field-based). Each faculty member is strongly encouraged to describe tasks accomplished and progress made within each research and grant-related project, and to include information that demonstrates how current research/grant procurement efforts are contributing to long-range research goals. As community-based and longitudinal research is greatly valued by our department, faculty members should identify work (i.e., publications, grants, etc.) in these areas.

C. __Service Expectations__ (university, profession, community, and church)

A crucial element of faculty members' responsibility is a service program responsive to the larger society that sustains the University. Thus, service is principally understood as the identification, development, and rendering of educational and technical service to individuals, communities, organizations, and public agencies. To a great extent, service involves the application of the faculty member's professional training and competence to issues and problems of significance to constituencies. Service is also related to the achievement of academic program objectives of the units to which the faculty member is appointed.

Faculty members are expected to be contributing members, in a variety of ways, both of the University community and of the larger academic, civic, and religious communities as well. HHPR faculty members are also asked to provide evidence of active religious service.

Major service contributions can occur at any level of the University, as well as beyond the institution. Highly productive professional service may be documented by a strong record as a contributing member, coordinator, leader, and initiator on campus committees, in campus or community initiatives, and within administrative positions, professional associations, etc. Faculty members are expected to engage in service activities in each of the following areas:

1. Service to the Profession

HHPR encourages such activities because they serve the interests of learning, because they are important forms of faculty development and scholarly participation in their own right, and because they are a source of pride and recognition for the University. Examples of service to the discipline or profession may include, but are not limited to:

- Membership and participation in professional organizations;
- Collaboration with field practitioners;
- Collaboration with private and public, for-profit and non-profit organizations in which faculty members apply their academic expertise to enhance the efficiency or effectiveness of the organizations served;
- Membership on civic, corporate, philanthropic, professional, or other academic boards or commissions;
- Participation in and maintenance of accreditation activities; and
- Elected officer positions or key committee assignments within professional organizations at the local, state, regional, or national level.

2. Service to the Institution

Academic programs, departments, the College, and the University require the shared participation of faculty in their administration and governance. HHPR expects responsible participation of all faculty members in the academic community. Examples of institutional service may include, but are not limited to:

- faculty governance activities, including providing meaningful contributions toward meeting the goals and objectives of program, department, School, or University committees, task forces, or governance bodies as an appointed or elected member, serving as a committee or task force chair, serving as a program coordinator, graduate director, or assistant department chair, etc.; and
- program, department, and college support activities, including participating in student recruiting activities, commencement ceremonies, and faculty meetings, providing workshops/seminars.

3. Service to the Student

Student service involves assistance to individual students and groups of students that goes beyond the normal teaching/mentoring obligations of every faculty member. It may involve support for both academic and social activities and organizations. Examples of student service may include, but are not limited to:

- assisting students in the transition from school to professional life through formal and informal career counseling, job seeking assistance, and providing letters of recommendation and referral;

- serving as a faculty advisor for a student chapter of a professional organization;
- serving as a faculty mentor for a student, student club, or other non-professional activity which may have both academic and social components.
- providing extracurricular seminars or workshops to students such as: ways to improve study habits, writing and speaking skills, and preparing for job interviews, preparing for entrance or exit exams, etc.; and
- being available to consult with students on campus and/or via other appropriate means.

4.   Service to the Community

Faculty serve the community in a variety of ways, including developing relationships with schools, organizations, businesses, and public agencies; developing and participating in outreach programs that apply and disseminate knowledge and creative work beyond the confines of the University; and developing and participating in partnerships (such as professional development schools and internship programs) between academic programs and external agencies. Activities such as these are legitimate extensions of scholarship and teaching, because they enrich academic programs and help to prepare students for lives of service and leadership. Service which involves remuneration is not precluded. Examples of community service may include, but are not limited to:
- Providing services to the public through involvement in professional development schools, clinics, hospitals, laboratories, or centers, etc.;
- Making research understandable and useable in specific professional and applied settings and the broader community;
- Government and agency-related activities, including, for example, participating in meetings or on panels, testifying before legislative committees, acting as an expert witness, etc.;
- Engaging in activities that address public-interest problems, issues, and concerns, aimed at either general or specialized audiences; and
- Involvement in communications directed toward popular and non-academic publications including newsletter, radio, television and magazines.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty after their third probationary year are expected to serve on at least one and no more than three University committees. Faculty members are expected to serve consistently at the departmental, college and University levels. Promotion and tenure require evidence of significant departmental committee involvement. Finally, as part of the tenure evaluation, faculty members are asked to provide evidence of active religious service as part of a local congregation and evidence of one's commitment to Baylor's distinctive Christian mission.

D. **Collegiality**

HHPR faculty members are expected to treat their colleagues and students with respect. In their personal activities and relationships, faculty members should maintain a level of ethical and moral behavior that is supportive of and consistent with the Christian mission of Baylor University. Civil resolution of disagreements is expected.

II. Promotion to Full Professor

Standards related to attainment of tenure/promotion to the rank of Associate Professor generally apply also to promotion to the rank of Professor. Additionally, the candidate's work should show evidence of outstanding achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and/or service (and administration, if applicable to a particular candidate) to exhibit national leadership, and, in most cases, international professional recognition as evidenced by peer reviews of scholarship in the faculty member's specific discipline.

The following criteria are very broad and allow many different potential paths for achieving promotion, whether a faculty's activities are predominantly in the areas of scholarship and research, teaching, or administration. In some disciplines, leadership in application of research to societal needs may be an important part of the evidence presented.

The timing for applying for promotion to the rank of Professor is individual and may vary by discipline. It is not likely that an Associate Professor will achieve the level of prominence and leadership expected of the rank of Professor earlier than six years past the receipt of tenure. University policy does not allow an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor sooner than four years after the granting of tenure.In any event, the standards for promotion to the rank of Professor would be consistent regardless of the number of years spent as Associate Professor.

A. **Teaching Expectations** **(Teaching & Related Scholarly Work)**

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of continued growth in teaching and attention to provision of high quality instruction. Evidence of teaching effectiveness and growth may be demonstrated through responses to student course evaluations, peer evaluations, and teaching artifacts (e.g., syllabi, class assignments, video teaching logs, graded student work, other evidence of teaching/professional development, etc.). Evidence should address the teaching and/or mentoring of both undergraduate (e.g., teaching undergraduate classes, mentoring, involving undergraduates in research) and graduate students (e.g., teaching graduate classes and/or serving on graduate student committees).

B. <u>**Scholarship Expectations**</u> **(Research & Scholarly/Creative Contributions)**

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of advanced and focused scholarly activity that is recognized nationally/internationally through peer review and impact. By this point in their careers, candidates for promotion should be able to document a cogent research agenda. Specifically, a candidate for promotion would have an established national and international reputation for quality research and/or writing in his or her respective discipline. An important indication of such reputation is the opinion of external reviewers from the candidate's specialty/expertise area.

Recognizing the University's support of interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarship, Associate Professors are encouraged to take advantage of the freedom afforded by tenure to pursue their scholarly interests whether they fall within or across traditional disciplinary boundaries. An Associate Professor may also have more opportunities for productive collaboration than would a candidate for tenure; though it continues to be expected that the individual's contribution should be significant.

Successful candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor would be expected to have obtained external/internal funding to support their research/scholarly activity. Successful candidates should show a consistent record of seeking and securing funding.

HHPR notes that the quantity of research and scholarly contributions may vary among candidates due to faculty members' dates of hire and resultant workload/expectations. Research and scholarly output may also vary due to the candidates' varying abilities to access graduate students in their discipline. Hence, potential candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should consult the Department's current full Professors, the Department Chair, and the College's Dean regarding publication and grant achievement of potentially successful candidates.

C. <u>**Service Expectations**</u> **(University, profession, community, and church)**

Service to department, college, University, community, and a local congregation are highly important considerations for promotion to the rank of Professor. Candidates for promotion (and tenured faculty members as a group) also have special responsibilities for mentoring junior faculty and for leadership in service and governance on the departmental, college, and University levels. Additionally, however, it is important for candidates for promotion to have exhibited service efforts that receive attention across the College or University, in national/international professional organizations, and/or in the broader community. Such noteworthy service could include, but is not limited to: serving in an elected or appointed office for national/inter-national professional organizations, departmental and/or college leadership

roles, leading and/or initiating committees or task forces for professional organizations, or taking a major role in community projects or organizations.

III. Department External Peer Review Guidelines

In accordance with BU Tenure and Promotion Procedures as outlined in the Baylor University Faculty Handbook, the HHPR department uses the following policy for selecting external reviewers for tenure and/or promotion:

Process for External Review for HHPR Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion:

A. The Candidate shall submit a letter to the Department Chair along with a current curriculum vita, representative publications, and a list of three names (including telephone numbers, addresses, nature of professional relationship, and brief professional profile) of potential external reviewers by published University deadlines prior to the academic year in which he or she will be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion. Outside evaluators must hold a rank at least equal to the rank that the candidate is seeking or have comparable professional standing in a non-academic setting. The ideal evaluators should come from highly reputable programs at respected peer and/or aspirant universities. In addition, except in rare cases, external evaluators should not include individuals for whom a close academic or personal connection with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisors, former professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, fellow faculty, friends, former students of the candidate, etc.) might compromise their ability to evaluate the candidate's work objectively. Finally, it should be noted that letters from co-authors regarding the contributions of a candidate to co-authored work could in some circumstances provide useful information regarding the record of a tenure candidate, so departments may choose to submit letters of this nature as an additional part of the tenure and/or promotion review process. In no circumstance, however, shall a letter from a co-author be considered an "external review letter" with respect to the other recommendations in this report (see Tenure Procedures at Baylor University, p. 13).

B. The Chair, upon consultation with the tenured faculty (or the Professors in the case of promotion to the rank of Professor), will add three names to the Candidate's list. The Candidate's list, along with the names added by the Chair and/or tenured faculty (or Professors), will be forwarded to the tenured faculty (or Professors) within the department. The tenured faculty (or Professors) will meet and rank order the potential reviewers and forward the list of names to the Chair. Reviewers will be recognized for their scholarly contributions to the Candidate's field of academic endeavor and should ordinarily be employed in a higher education setting at a peer and/or aspirant University. Every effort will be made to minimize biases for or against the candidate when selecting qualified reviewers.

C. The Chair will subsequently write to the top three reviewers (with the remaining three serving as ranked alternates), requesting a confidential, written assessment of the Candidate's scholarly activity. A copy of the Candidate's curriculum vitae, representative publications, and Baylor University's guidelines for tenure/promotion will be included. The external reviewers' letters of assessment will be included as part of the Candidate's professional portfolio at all levels of University consideration.

At a minimum, the letter of invitation to review should request that the reviewer:

1. Detail his or her acquaintance or familiarity with the candidate and the candidate's scholarly work.
2. Review and critique of the candidate's scholarly activity on the basis of standards in the specific discipline or sub-discipline.
3. Provide an assessment of the candidate's recognition and standing among his or her peers.
4. Indicate whether his or her scholarship has had an impact on the discipline or advanced the discipline in meaningful ways, and, if it has done so, describe how it has affected the discipline.
5. Indicate whether it has earned for the candidate a national reputation.
6. Indicate whether the candidate's collective work/program of research is likely to yield further significant advances in knowledge.

The letter of invitation should provide a statement addressing confidentiality such as: "Your letter will be provided to departmental, college and University review committees and appropriate administrators. Candidates will not be told the identity of the reviewers who are chosen, or be allowed to read the original reviews. The letters will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by Texas law, although a candidate who successfully obtains tenure may request and obtain a general written summary of the reviews from the departmental chair or dean."

D. Candidates will not be told the identity of the reviewers who are chosen, or be allowed to read the original reviews. If tenure is granted, the candidate may request a written summary of the reviews from the department chair or dean. Confidentiality is granted to the external reviewers by the department, college, or school through the tenure process. The external reviews, however, may be discoverable if legal action is taken by a candidate who is unsuccessful in the tenure process.

E. The Chair (or the chair's designate) is responsible for ensuring the following are completed:

1. Securing names of potential reviewers by the annually published University deadline.
2. Contacting external reviewers and securing their agreement to participate by University deadline.
3. Securing reviews by University deadline.
4. Placing reviews in the candidate's file.
5. Summarizing the qualifications of the external reviewers and placing this summary in the candidate's file.
6. If needed, placing in the file any justification for why the external review process was not conducted in accordance with the stated criteria.

Appendix A

<div align="center">

HHPR PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING
Instructional Assessment Form

</div>

Date:_____Presentation:_____
Instructor:_____Rater:_____

Directions: This instrument consists of seven sections and twenty-four statements intended to serve as a guide for assessing instruction in lecture and lab settings. After attending an instructional period, please respond to each statement by circling the number that best corresponds to your observations. The scale is as follows: **(1) Poor; (2) Fair; (3) Average; (4) Good; (5) Excellent: and NA (Not Applicable)**

A. **DEMONSTRATES EXPERTISE IN SUBJECT AREA AND SKILL IN KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERENCE**

1.	Specifies purpose of the instructional period	1 2 3 4 5 NA
2.	Sets general ground rules for audience participation and evaluation	1 2 3 4 5 NA
3.	Relates the main body of information to the introductory purpose	1 2 3 4 5 NA
4.	Makes transitions between different segments of the instructional content	1 2 3 4 5 NA
5.	Uses clear, relevant examples to demonstrate ideas	1 2 3 4 5 NA
6.	Clarifies technical terminology	1 2 3 4 5 NA
7.	Summarizes most important points of ideas of the instructional period	1 2 3 4 5 NA
8.	Develops a conclusion related to the purpose and body of the instructional period	1 2 3 4 5 NA
9.	Cites appropriate authorities to support statements	1 2 3 4 5 NA
10.	Presents divergent viewpoints for contrast and comparison	1 2 3 4 5 NA
11.	Separates fact from opinion	1 2 3 4 5 NA
12.	Can illustrate theory through practice models	1 2 3 4 5 NA
13.	Provides resources for further investigation of subject	1 2 3 4 5 NA

B. **DEMONSTRATES SKILL IN USE OF VOICE AND BODY MOVEMENTS DURING INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS**

1.	Speaks at a volume suitable for audience	1 2 3 4 5 NA
2.	Speaks at a suitable pace for presentation	1 2 3 4 5 NA
3.	Varies rate, pitch, and force of voice for emphasis	1 2 3 4 5 NA
4.	Speaks in a conversational manner	1 2 3 4 5 NA
5.	Uses eye contact with entire audience	1 2 3 4 5 NA
6.	Uses a variety of appropriate facial expressions	1 2 3 4 5 NA
7.	Uses hand and arms appropriately	1 2 3 4 5 NA
8.	Moves purposefully	1 2 3 4 5 NA

C. **DEMONSTRATES SKILL IN THE USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT MEDIA (ie. over-heads, PowerPoint, dry erase board, slides, videos, demonstration, etc.)**

1.	Coordinates support media with verbal presentation	1 2 3 4 5 NA
2.	Uses support media to enhance understanding of subject matter	1 2 3 4 5 NA
3.	Uses support media which are easily visible and audible to all students	1 2 3 4 5 NA

D.　　**GENERAL COMMENTS (Any score below a rating of "3", requires a comment)**

E.　　**STRENGTHS**

F.　　**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

G.　　**STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**