



## **Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure**

The standards for tenure and promotion in the College of Health Sciences (COHS) at Sam Houston State University (SHSU) reflect a commitment to academic excellence. Each faculty member in the COHS is expected to demonstrate excellence in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Patient care may also be considered, when applicable. The standards set forth in this document are consistent with, and subservient, to SHSU [\*Academic Policy Statement 900417 – Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty\*](#), and the Texas State University System Rules and Regulations.

There are six academic units in the COHS: (a) the Department of Human Sciences, (b) the Department of Kinesiology, (c) the Department of Physical Therapy, (d) the Department of Physician Assistant Studies and Athletic Training, (e) the Department of Public Health, and (f) the School of Nursing. Each unit is responsible for application of the criteria and standards for promotion and/or tenure. Application of the criteria and standards must be consistent with prevailing standards of excellence in each of the unit’s respective disciplines. The Department Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (DPTAC) conducts the evaluation of a candidate’s portfolio. The DPTAC is established according to SHSU [\*Academic Policy Statement 900417\*](#), Section 7.

As described in [\*APS 900417, Section 6.03\*](#), external letters of evaluation may be required at the discretion of a college. The COHS requires external letters to be included as a part of a tenure-track/tenured promotion portfolio submission. Please consult with your chair/director for specific instructions on the external letter request process.

In order for tenure and/or promotion to be awarded, the candidate must have demonstrated a commitment to academic excellence and there must be reasonable expectation that the candidate will continue to meet the standards set forth by SHSU and COHS Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

### **Tenure**

The decision to grant tenure determines the academic quality of the university. It is the most important decision a university makes with regard to its faculty. Tenure requires significant contributions to the professional academic field evidenced by effective teaching, meaningful scholarly and creative productivity, and consistent service. Tenure-track appointments may be offered to select candidates with earned practice doctorates who have also demonstrated scholarly capabilities at a level equal to an academically degreed candidate. Tenure requirements apply equally to each.

### **Promotion**

Faculty promotion is marked by sustained, high level performance, and continuous improvement over time at the current rank. Per [\*APS 900417\*](#), Section 5.02, “faculty applicants for tenure and promotion are evaluated based on accomplishments in each of the three (3) or four (4) categories of performance (i.e., Teaching, Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments, and Service, and if applicable, Patient Care). Successful performance in any or all of such categories does not guarantee or entitle the applicant to tenure and/or promotion.”

## GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

### **For Award of Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Candidates must possess the appropriate terminal degree and, consistent with [APS 900417](#) normally, are reviewed for tenure during the sixth year in a tenure-track position. Moreover, a candidate is generally considered for promotion and tenure after serving at least five and one-half years as an Assistant Professor. Candidates should demonstrate consistency and growth in their teaching, scholarly activity and publication, professional development, and service to all stakeholders; professionalism; demonstrated effectiveness in clinical practice, as evidenced by productivity and patient satisfaction scores (as applicable); and a likelihood of continued excellence. Faculty are expected to work positively and collaboratively within the department, college, and university, promote the welfare of the programs, effectively and responsibly represent faculty on committees, and effectively interact with other departmental, college and university faculty. Guidelines for consideration for award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor include:<sup>1</sup>

#### **Teaching**

Quality teaching, with a variety of styles, methods, and settings is central to the COHS mission. As a craft, teaching is multifaceted. Neither a formula nor any single piece of evidence can define something as complex and dynamic as successful teaching. COHS faculty and academic administrators believe that the best way to evaluate teaching is to create a narrative synthesizing evidence from a variety of sources. The evaluation of teaching should be holistic, drawing from both quantitative and qualitative evidence that demonstrates a sustained pattern of performance. Faculty candidates will develop a teaching narrative addressing their approach, preparation, and performance of the practice of teaching, including outcomes. A candidate will address their strengths as a teacher, areas needing improvement, results of student and chair evaluations, how these results have enhanced teaching, and any relevant information deemed important for documenting and supporting teaching effectiveness. Artifacts contributing to a teaching narrative include but may not be limited to: student evaluations, including numerical scores and student comments; chair evaluations; peer evaluations; and other indicators addressed in this section. In the case of teaching scores below the departmental, college, or university average, the candidate should address these occurrences in the narrative, taking care to note problems, actions to rectify them and extenuating circumstances that may have led to lower than expected scores. In the case of higher scores, the candidate should likewise identify strengths to retain, successful teaching strategies, training that contributed to success, and fortuitous circumstances.

The probationary period allows candidates time to develop as teachers. Accordingly, student evaluation scores/ratings are generally expected to show growth or maintenance as appropriate over time. While global ratings from the student evaluation instrument provide a good overview of teaching effectiveness, the DPTAC members, department chair, and dean should consider other data included in the evaluation system. In addition, information about course characteristics (e.g., class size, required/elective, lower/upper division) should be considered when reviewing evaluation results.

While student evaluations are a valuable source of information, scores should be interpreted in the context of other materials documenting pedagogical achievement. The department chair, through annual evaluation of the candidate during the probationary period, will address additional evidence of teaching

---

<sup>1</sup> According to [Academic Policy Statement 900417](#), Section 2.04, “a faculty member cannot be promoted to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant award of tenure.”

effectiveness. A candidate may also wish to elicit written evaluations from peers. Faculty are in a unique position to evaluate and provide specific feedback on aspects of teaching that are beyond the expertise of students. A candidate will have the right to nominate to the chair the individual/s providing the evaluation. The evaluator/s will use the department's peer evaluation form.

Demonstration of effective pedagogy may also include: contributions to curriculum; participation in course development or revisions; innovative use of technologies or teaching strategies; recognition of teaching expertise in the form of awards and/or honors; implementation of service-learning or Academic Community Engagement (ACE) designated coursework; participation in workshops or other professional development intended to enhance teaching; and pedagogical publications and/or presentations that demonstrate and provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

### **Research and Scholarly Activity**

The evaluation of research and scholarly activity, like that of teaching, should be holistic, drawing from a variety of sources of evidence that reflects a sustained pattern of performance. COHS faculty and academic administrators believe that the best way to evaluate research and scholarly activity is through the creation of a research narrative that addresses a candidate's accomplishments and progress related to scholarship/creative activity. Within the narrative, candidates should describe their scholarship in relation to the discipline; progress in initiating and completing research projects; methodological approaches to scholarship; future directions, including works in progress; and self-evaluation of scholarship. Sources contributing to a research narrative include but may not be limited to: peer-reviewed scholarly publications (e.g., empirical, theoretical/policy, application, philosophical/ pedagogical, historical), including articles, books and chapters, and monographs; external and internal grants; published conference proceedings; presentations at international, national, state, and regional conferences; and other indicators addressed in this section. Examples of creative scholarship include visual essays, demonstrations/displays, design portfolios, commissioned works, exhibitions, and other forms that may contribute to the candidate's promotion portfolio. Please consult with your department chair/school director if you have specific questions on how specific research and scholarly activity examples will be evaluated as a part of your promotion portfolio.

Primary evidence of scholarly activity is peer-reviewed publications. A clearly illustrated research line that is evidenced by consistent publications and presentations in a specific topic is desired; scholarship that covers a wider array of topics can be appropriate. Candidates are responsible for making the case within their narrative that their scholarly contributions are substantial, and their overall body of work warrants tenure with promotion. The following indicators can also demonstrate the quality of published scholarship: lead or senior authorship on publications; descriptions of the peer-review process; published reviews of the candidate's work; journal impact factors; acceptance rates; and number of citations.

In summary, the body of work is expected to show that the overall composite of the candidate's scholarly activity is substantial, balanced, and shows future promise for continued scholarship.

### **Service**

Professional service is essential to the success of each department/school and the COHS as a whole. As in the case of teaching, research, and scholarly activity, the probationary faculty member should include a narrative that explains the kinds of service in which the probationary faculty member has been involved and the significance of their involvement. While service takes many forms and will vary by department/school, the candidate must have demonstrated sustained involvement in service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community. Evidence of involvement may include, but not be limited, to: attendance and participation in professional conferences, seminars, workshops, or short courses (continuing professional

education); membership and involvement in appropriate professional organizations; a record of service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community; and significant contribution to self-studies/accreditation reports. Higher weighting should be assigned to service as the leader or significant contributor of program accreditation self-study and related reports.

### **Patient Care**

As stated in [APS 900417, Section 5.01](#), this category includes the clinical care of patients, either directly or indirectly through the supervision of medical students, residents, or other healthcare professionals. This category is only applicable to licensed healthcare professionals who have an expectation to perform patient care as a component of their faculty assignment. Please consult with your Department Chair or School Director for more information.

### **For Promotion to Professor**

Candidates must possess the appropriate terminal degree and normally must have served at least five and one-half years as a tenured Associate Professor. Candidates should demonstrate leadership and high-level performance in their teaching, scholarly activity, professional development, and service to all stakeholders; professionalism; demonstrated effectiveness in clinical practice, as evidenced by productivity and patient satisfaction scores (as applicable); and a likelihood of continued excellence. Faculty are expected to work positively and collaboratively within the department, college, and university, promote the welfare of the programs, effectively and responsibly represent faculty on committees, and effectively interact with other departmental, college, and university faculty. Guidelines for consideration for promotion to Professor include:

### **Teaching**

Quality teaching, with a variety of styles, methods, and settings is central to the COHS mission. As a craft, teaching is multifaceted. Neither a formula nor any single piece of evidence can define something as complex and dynamic as successful teaching. COHS faculty and academic administrators believe that the best way to evaluate teaching is to create a narrative synthesizing evidence from a variety of sources. The evaluation of teaching should be holistic, drawing from quantitative and qualitative evidence that demonstrates a sustained pattern of performance. Faculty candidates will develop a teaching narrative addressing their approach, preparation, and performance of the practice of teaching, including its results. A candidate will address their growth as a teacher since tenure and/or promotion especially in the area of leadership, areas in need of improvement, results of student and chair evaluations, how these results have enhanced teaching, and any relevant information deemed important for documenting and supporting teaching effectiveness. Artifacts contributing to a teaching narrative include but may not be limited to: student evaluations, including numerical scores and student comments; chair evaluations; peer observations; and other indicators addressed in this section. In the case of scores below the departmental, college, or university average the candidate should address these occurrences in the narrative, taking care to note problems, actions to rectify them and extenuating circumstances that may have led to lower than expected scores. In the case of higher scores, the candidate should likewise identify strengths to retain, successful teaching strategies, training that contributed to success, and fortuitous circumstances.

Student evaluation scores/ratings are generally expected to show growth or maintenance as appropriate over time. While global ratings from the student evaluation instrument provide a good overview of teaching effectiveness, the DPTAC members, department chair, and dean should consider other data included in the evaluation system. In addition, information about course characteristics (e.g., class size, required/elective, lower/upper division) should be considered when reviewing evaluation results.

While student evaluations are a valuable source of information, scores should be interpreted in the context of other materials documenting pedagogical achievement. The department chair, through annual evaluation of the candidate during the review period, will address additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. A candidate may also wish to elicit written evaluations from peers. Faculty are in a unique position to evaluate and provide specific feedback on aspects of teaching that are beyond the expertise of students. A candidate will have the right to nominate to the chair the individual/s providing the evaluation. The evaluator/s will use the department's peer evaluation form.

Demonstration of effective pedagogy may also include: contributions to curriculum; participation in course development or revisions; innovative use of technologies or teaching strategies; recognition of teaching expertise in the form of awards and/or honors; implementation of service-learning or ACE designated coursework; participation in workshops or other professional development that were intended to enhance teaching; and pedagogical publications and/or presentations that demonstrate and provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

### **Research and Scholarly Activity**

The evaluation of research and scholarly activity, like that of teaching, should be holistic, drawing from a variety of sources of evidence that reflects a sustained pattern of performance. COHS faculty and academic administrators believe that the best way to evaluate research and scholarly activity is through the creation of a research narrative that addresses a candidate's accomplishments and progress related to scholarship/creative activity. Within the narrative, candidates should describe their progression in research since the award of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. Sources contributing to a research narrative include but may not be limited to: peer-reviewed scholarly publications (e.g., empirical, theoretical/policy, application, philosophical/pedagogical, historical), including articles, books and chapters, and monographs; external and internal grants; published conference proceedings; presentations at international, national, state, and regional conferences; and other indicators addressed in this section. Examples of creative scholarship include visual essays, demonstrations/displays, design portfolios, commissioned works, exhibitions, and other forms that may contribute to the candidate's promotion portfolio. Please consult with your department chair/school director if you have specific questions on how specific research and scholarly activity examples will be evaluated as a part of your promotion portfolio.

Primary evidence of scholarly activity is peer-reviewed publications. A clearly illustrated research line that is evidenced by consistent publications and presentations in a specific topic is desired; scholarship that covers a wider array of topics can be appropriate. Candidates are responsible for making the case within their narrative that their scholarly contributions are substantial, and their overall body of work warrants promotion. The following indicators can also demonstrate the quality of published scholarship: lead or senior authorship on publications; descriptions of the peer-review process; published reviews of the candidate's work; journal impact factors; acceptance rates; and number of citations.

In summary, the body of work is expected to show that the overall composite of the candidate's scholarly activity is substantial, balanced, and shows promise for continued scholarship. For promotion to full professor, candidates should fulfill all the requirements of the current rank with emphasis on sustained productivity and a wider dissemination of the research produced.

### **Service**

Professional service is essential to the success of each department/school and the COHS as a whole. As in the case of teaching and research and scholarly activity, the faculty member should include a narrative that

explains the kinds of service in which the faculty member has been involved and the significance of their involvement paying particular attention to their leadership roles. While service takes many forms and will vary by department/school, the candidate must have demonstrated sustained involvement in service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community. Evidence of involvement includes: attendance and participation in professional conferences, seminars, workshops, or short courses (continuing professional education); membership and involvement in appropriate professional organizations; a record of service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community; and significant contribution to self-studies/accreditation reports. In order to be promoted from Associate Professor to Professor, the candidate must have demonstrated engagement and leadership in service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community. Evidence of engagement in leadership includes: leadership in departmental or college service activities; sustained participation in educational/leadership activities of professional organizations; sustained record of service and leadership to the university, profession, and community; mentoring of junior faculty; and leadership in the development of self-study reports.

### **Patient Care**

As stated in [APS 900417, Section 5.01](#), this category includes the clinical care of patients, either directly or indirectly through the supervision of medical students, residents, or other healthcare professionals. This category is only applicable to licensed healthcare professionals who have an expectation to perform patient care as a component of their faculty assignment. Please consult with your Department Chair or School Director for more information.