

Department of Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation Matrix

Approved by Vote of the Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty of the Department of Sociology and ISS: September 6, 2023

Submitted: September 6, 2023

Approved by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: September 6, 2023

In alignment with University policy and Board of Governors' Regulation 10.0003, as well as state law, all tenured faculty members in the Department of Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences are subjected to post-tenure review every five years. The review packet will be comprised of a narrative record of accomplishments over the previous five years prepared by the faculty member under review, the previous five years of annual performance reviews, the faculty member's CV, and the faculty member's disciplinary record (if there is any).

Post-tenure review examines the most recent five years of a tenured faculty member's record in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. The post-tenure review criteria for the Department of Sociology & Interdisciplinary Social Sciences are set out separately for the three areas of research, teaching, and service. The final score for the five-year record is then the score in each area weighted by the proportion of total assignment in that area over the five-year span.

The Department of Sociology and ISS recognizes each faculty member's contributions to the department in their teaching, research, and service. These Post-tenure Criteria seek to establish a baseline rubric to connect teaching accomplishments, research productivity, and service to the department, college, university, discipline, and community with specific ratings; however, all ratings are the responsibility of the Department Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee (EC).

Our governance document recognizes three categories of tenured faculty with annual assignments in teaching that vary by level of research productivity.

Teaching Focused tenured faculty have at least 75 percent of their annual assignment in teaching and are less research active.

Research Active tenured faculty have at least 62.5 percent of their annual assignment in teaching and engage in substantive research activity.

Research Productive tenured faculty have 50 percent or less of their annual assignment in teaching and engage in substantive research activity that has results in publication and other scholarly products.

Teaching

Historically teaching ratings have been primarily based on course documents and student evaluation of teaching. The Executive Committee and Chair recognize the problematic nature of teaching evaluations based on the specific course being taught, the size and modality of the classes being taught, and other factors that influence student ratings such as the physical embodiment of the instructor. For those reasons, we encourage instructors to provide evidence of successful teaching that captures engagement in and commitment to undergraduate and/or graduate programs in a variety of ways.

The yearly record may vary from year to year in terms of its contents but in each year the record should exhibit the specified level of achievement, or it should exhibit a total volume of achievement over the period that equates to this standard with less productive years offset by more productive years.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Exceeds Expectations (1.0) in Teaching includes evidence of consistent success in each year of the five-year period in at least two categories listed below. Criteria for each of the following ratings are listed below, but we recognize that the list provided is illustrative rather than exhaustive, so we encourage faculty to describe teaching activities that are not specifically noted or adequately captured in these categories in their annual reports and these will be taken into account in the PTR as well.</p> <p>Classroom Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> peer or student evaluation(s) that generally rate the candidate's teaching as effective syllabus and course materials 	<p>Meets Expectations (2.0) in Teaching includes evidence for each year of the five-year period of success in at least one category listed below.</p> <p>Classroom Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> peer or student evaluation(s) that generally rate the candidate's teaching as effective syllabus and course materials showing evidence of activities that encourage critical thinking, inquiry-based learning, written and oral communication, community engagement, or other high impact practices <p>Innovation and Teaching Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> engagement in instructional innovation through such activities 	<p>Does Not Meet Expectations (3.0) in Teaching means the Executive Committee does not find evidence in any of the five years for any of the items listed in the criteria for a “Meets Expectations” rating, but student evaluations during this period are not problematic.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory (4.0) in Teaching means the Executive Committee does not find evidence in any of the five years for any of the items listed in the criteria for a “Meets Expectations” rating.</p> <p>Additionally, the Executive Committee finds that peer or student evaluation(s) consistently rate the candidate's teaching as ineffective or problematic in the preponderance of years in the five-year window.</p>

<p>showing evidence of activities that encourage critical thinking, inquiry-based learning, written and oral communication, community engagement, or other high impact practices</p> <p>Innovation and Teaching Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> engagement in instructional innovation through such activities as the incorporation of new research findings into course content, the creation of new courses and new preparations for existing courses, and/or interest in and exploration of advanced instructional technologies engagement in teaching enhancement activities of colleagues or peers in and outside of the department <p>Curriculum and Program Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> participation in curriculum development, for example, establishing study abroad experiences, service-learning opportunities, writing intensive experiences, community 	<p>as the incorporation of new research findings into course content, the creation of new courses and new preparations for existing courses, and/or interest in and exploration of advanced instructional technologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> engagement in teaching enhancement activities of colleagues or peers in and outside of the department <p>Curriculum and Program Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> participation in curriculum development, for example, establishing study abroad experiences, service-learning opportunities, writing intensive experiences, community engagement opportunities, and so forth development of new courses in traditional, hybrid, or online formats participation in collaborative course development and team-teaching participation in program level revisions and assessment <p>Mentoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> advising and mentorship of undergraduate and graduate 		
---	--	--	--

<p>engagement opportunities, and so forth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development of new courses in traditional, hybrid, or online formats • participation in collaborative course development and team-teaching • participation in program level revisions and assessment <p>Mentoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advising and mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students in independent research, acting as assigned advisor to first-year students, serving as honors' theses chair, master's theses chair or committee member, serving on portfolio committees, serving on dissertation committees • mentoring of, through the training of, Teaching Assistants • supervising student internships, advisement, or counseling • publishing and presenting collaborative work with students (particularly as part of a class, with undergraduate students, or otherwise not recognized or counted as a research activity) 	<p>students in independent research, acting as assigned advisor to first-year students, serving as honors' theses chair, master's theses chair or committee member, serving on portfolio committees, serving on dissertation committees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mentoring of, through the training of, Teaching Assistants • supervising student internships, advisement, or counseling • publishing and presenting collaborative work with students (particularly as part of a class, with undergraduate students, or otherwise not recognized or counted as a research activity) <p>Contributing to Departmental Teaching Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teaching required courses • teaching General Education courses • teaching large courses (capped at 90+ students) • other contributions not otherwise listed in these categories (please elaborate in teaching narrative) 		
---	--	--	--

<p>Contributing to Departmental Teaching Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teaching required courses • teaching General Education courses • teaching large courses (capped at 90+ students) • other contributions not otherwise listed in these categories (please elaborate in teaching narrative) <p>Alternatively, the committee may assign a rating of Exceeds Expectations on the basis of consistently exceptional performance in a single category - such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the receipt of multiple teaching, mentoring, or advising awards during the evaluation period; • leadership roles in department, college, university-wide curriculum development during the evaluation period; • service on undergraduate honors, MA thesis, or PhD dissertation committees in the evaluation period that is unusually large in comparison with other department members and is not otherwise recognized; • other accomplishments deemed 			
--	--	--	--

extraordinary by a majority of committee members. Evidence of such exemplary accomplishments must be included in the faculty member's post-tenure report for consideration.

Research

The Executive Committee and Chair encourage faculty to provide evidence of all research activity and productivity during the evaluation period including scholarly publications that appear in and/or are copyrighted during the period, conference papers submitted and presented during the period, and grant proposals submitted, and grants awarded during the period.

The EC and Chair give consideration to manuscripts in progress as well as other research activities described below. While the Executive Committee reviews all publications and manuscripts in the file, only the most notable may be mentioned in the written evaluation. Faculty must submit a current curriculum vitae and each scholarly product they wish to be counted in the review.

The following kinds of productivity are considered:

Published Work with Significant Contributions

- Peer-reviewed book published by a respected press for which the faculty member is the sole author, corresponding author, or co-author with substantive contribution
- An edited collection published by a respected press for which the faculty member is the sole editor, corresponding editor, or co-editor with substantive contributions
- Published peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter for which the faculty member is the sole author, corresponding author, or co-author with substantive contributions

External Funding

- Active funded external grant as a Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator (include any reporting to the funding agency)

Other Published Work

- Published article/chapter as a co-author without a substantial contribution
- Editorship of a journal special issue
- Published other type of work (e.g., encyclopedia entry, book review, conference proceedings)

Works Under Review

- Submitted journal article or revise & resubmit (if reviewed, include reviews)
- Submitted grant proposal to an external funding agency as a Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator (if reviewed, include reviews)

Research Participation

- Funded external grant as senior personnel or social researcher
- Evidence of active participation in community-engaged research
- Evidence of meaningful progress toward a book (i.e. chapter drafts)
- Evidence of other significant scholarly work
- Two presentations at regional, national, or international refereed conferences or invited presentations

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Exceeds Expectations (1.0) in Research includes evidence of consistent success defined as a record over the five-year period of review that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one peer-reviewed book published by a respected press for which the faculty member is the sole author, corresponding author, or co-author with substantive contributions; or • An edited collection published by a respected press for which the faculty member is the sole editor, corresponding editor, or co-editor with substantive contributions; or • At least one external major active grant (“major” within the context of the field of study) on which the faculty member is the PI or co-PI (if co-PI, the contribution must be on par with PI) that generates research expenditures each year or 	<p>Meets Expectations (2.0) in Research includes a record over the five-year period that does not meet requirements for Exceeds Expectations, but shows evidence of consistent research activity that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one published peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter for which the faculty member is the sole author, corresponding author, or co-author with substantive contributions; evidence of meaningful progress toward a book (i.e. chapter drafts); or the equivalent, <p>AND</p> • At least two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o additional peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters as described above o editorship of a journal special issue 	<p>Does Not Meet Expectations (3.0) in Research means that the record does not meet criteria for Meets Expectations, but shows evidence of some research activity that includes at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress toward an article or chapter as evidenced by a draft • Presentation accepted for regional, national, or international referred conferences or invited presentations 	<p>Unsatisfactory (4.0) in Research means the Executive Committee finds no evidence in any of the five years for any of the items listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress toward an article or chapter as evidenced by a draft • Presentation accepted for regional, national, or international referred conferences or invited presentations

<p>a combination of active major shorter-term grants that add up to five years of funding; or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum of three published peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters for which the faculty member is the sole author, corresponding author, or co-author with substantive contributions; <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of ongoing research including at least two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ additional peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters as described above ○ editorship of a journal special issue ○ submitted grant proposal to an external funding agency as a Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator ○ active small grant on which the faculty member is the PI or co-PI ○ active funded external grant as senior personnel or social researcher ○ non-refereed publications like book reviews, encyclopedia entries, white papers, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ submitted external grant proposals (with at least one funded) ○ small grant on which the faculty member is the PI or co-PI ○ active funded external grant as senior personnel or social researcher ○ non-refereed publications like book reviews, encyclopedia entries, white papers, and technical reports ○ substantive progress on a book manuscript, article, or book chapter evidenced by a draft ○ conference presentations (at least two) ○ activity not otherwise listed but approved by review of the Executive Committee and Chair of the Department 		
---	--	--	--

<p>technical reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ activity not otherwise listed but approved by review of the Executive Committee and Chair of the Department.			
---	--	--	--

NOTE: A book or edited volume is counted for three consecutive years in our annual review criteria and will be given equivalent weight in the five-year PTR. A book published prior to the beginning of the five-year period will count if it was counted during an annual review within the five-year period.

Service

Service ratings are based on membership on department, college, or university level committees, membership or leadership of regional, national, or international organizations, or service to the discipline as evidenced as participation on journal editorial boards, journal peer review, external grant review panels, or other activities that promote research and scholarship. Community service is included as well.

The yearly record may vary from year to year in terms of its contents but in each year the record should exhibit the specified level of achievement, or it should exhibit a total volume of achievement over the period that equates to this standard with less productive years offset by more productive years.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
<p>Exceeds Expectations (1.0) in Service means the Executive Committee finds evidence that on a yearly basis in each of the five years the service record includes active membership on at least two department, college, or university level committees and evidence of service to the discipline or community and in the preponderance of years, evidence of at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of at least one department, college, or university level committee • Leadership or active membership in regional, national, or international organizations 	<p>Meets Expectations (2.0) in Service means there is evidence each year of the five years of active membership on at least two department, college, or university level committees.</p>	<p>Does Not Meet Expectations (3.0) in Service means the record lacks evidence for each year of the five-year evaluation period of active membership in at least two department, college, or university level committees, but there is evidence of some kind of service to the department, college, university, profession, or community.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory (4.0) in Service means there is no evidence in the record of any service to the department, the college, the university, the profession, or the community.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence of other significant contributions to the department, college, university, discipline, or community• Evidence of service to the discipline			
--	--	--	--

NOTE: Faculty members who have service appointments that include directorship of centers and institutes will be evaluated only on the portion of service not related to their duties as directors.

OVERALL PTR RATING

To reiterate, the final score for the five-year record is the score in each area weighted by the proportion of total assignment in that area over the five-year span. This calculation will produce fractional quantities such as 1.45 or 1.55. Conversion to the four-point scale is done by rounding scores with fractions of less than .5 down and those with fractions of .5 or more up. In the two examples, 1.45 becomes 1.0 or EE while 1.55 becomes 2.0 or ME.

In other words, the Weighted Average PTR Score = (Teaching score X average percentage assignment in teaching) + (Research score X average assignment in research) + (Service score X average percentage in service)

NOTE: For faculty members who have service appointments that include directorship of centers and institutes, the percentage of assignment associated with the directorship will be removed from the total and the assignments in other categories will be adjusted to total 100 percent for the purpose of calculating their overall weighted average.

Exceeds Expectations (1)	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (4)
Weighted Average PRT Score is less than 1.5	Weighted Average PRT Score is 1.5 or higher, but less than 2.5	Weighted Average PRT Score is 2.5 or higher, but less than 3.5	Weighted Average PRT Score is 3.5 or higher