ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

Preamble

The goal of the annual evaluation is to determine whether a tenured faculty member is continuing to fulfill professional expectations in all three areas that form a dynamic and engaged scholarly or creative profile and to provide a method for the better recognition and encouragement of meritorious performance. The overall profile, as described in the narrative statement and documented in the form, should demonstrate that the individual is actively engaged in the advancement of knowledge and thereby the enhancement of the reputation and visibility of the department within the college, the university, and the scholarly community at large. This is shown in terms of scholarship and creative work, in implementing best practices and effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and in serving in roles that sustain and enhance the intellectual life of the department, the university, and the profession. In order to assess teaching performance, types of service, and progress towards research and creative goals, the evaluation form spans a window of 5 years†; this larger overview serves to enable and encourage the individual’s development of significant and sustained scholarly and creative projects as described in the narrative statement, to permit the faculty member to present consistent and verifiable patterns in terms of teaching practices, and to confirm the nature and extent of committee work and professional service both inside and external to the university. It is not to be assumed that all cases that surpass expectations are equal; finer distinctions among clearly meritorious records lie within the discretion of the department head and the salary advisory committee based on discipline-appropriate judgments of relative quantity, quality, visibility, and impact.

†The five year period of time for the window of assessment is in keeping with the post tenure review processes at peer and aspirational peer universities.

Service

Faculty service falls into three general categories: citizenship, impact, and visibility. The first is expected of all tenure-stream faculty members, with the second and third being more typical for senior faculty. Citizenship embraces the standard running of the department and is characterized by activities such as regular attendance at departmental meetings, membership on departmental committees, casting departmental ballots as eligible, volunteering for appropriate ad hoc activities, and the like. Impact includes higher-profile department, college, or university service including but not limited to active mentoring of junior and new faculty, chairing a departmental committee, serving on or chairing a TAMU committee beyond department level, or filling a
TAMU administrative role within or beyond the department level. Visibility refers to extra-
University professional service including but not limited to organizing a conference or academic
event; serving on an editorial board or program advisory board beyond TAMU; holding office in
a professional organization; serving as a tenure or promotion reviewer for another institution;
serving as an invited peer reviewer for a journal, book publisher, or grant giving organization.

To meet expectations over a five-year period: a tenured faculty member should present a record
of consistent good citizenship within and beyond the department, including service to the
profession at large, appropriate to rank and length of service and as evidenced by factors such as:

- Membership (need not be concurrent) on at least two standing or ad hoc departmental
  committees (e.g., EC, USC, GSC, Tenure and Promotion, Strategic Planning, Diversity,
  search committees), or on one departmental committee and one committee beyond the
department level, such as a college or university committee (e.g., Faculty Senate, Liberal
  Arts Council, Writing Center Course Advisory Committee).
- A record of consistent participation in ad hoc departmental service opportunities such as
  presentations at brown-bags, the shepherding of visitors, coordination of guest speakers
  for departmental or interdisciplinary working groups, mentoring, assisting with graduate
  student placement efforts, and the like. Some of these endeavors (such as mentoring
  first-time teachers) clearly take more time and energy than others, and the evaluation
  committee is urged to consider the amount of effort on display as a factor when
determining whether service expectations have been met or exceeded.
- Service to the profession as measured by at least five instances over the five-year period
  of some combination of any of the following: a book review in a quality peer-reviewed
  venue, a report for a professional journal/publisher/grants agency, an invited tenure or
  midterm faculty review, invited service as the external member on a thesis/dissertation
  committee for another university, assembling (and perhaps also chairing) a panel at a
  national or international conference, membership on the organizing committee for a local
  or regional conference.

To exceed expectations: a tenured faculty member should show one or more of the below:

- Unusually deep/extensive fulfillment of expectations from the above list or similar
  achievements.
- Evidence of good departmental citizenship as measured by factors such as those on the
  above list, in combination with successful administrative leadership within or beyond the
department.
- Evidence of good departmental citizenship as measured by factors such as those on the
  above list, in combination with evidence of national reputation such as elected or
  appointed office in a relevant professional organization, membership on (or chairship of)
  the organizing committee for a national or international conference, membership on an
Teaching

Faculty should demonstrate teaching competence in three broad areas: classroom instruction, graduate and undergraduate mentoring, and course development. Instructional competence includes all activities associated with the fair and effective management of regularly scheduled, multi-student courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Mentoring involves participation on graduate committees as appropriate to rank and field and may also include directed readings at the graduate and undergraduate levels and the direction of significant undergraduate research projects. Course development entails the ongoing maintenance of syllabi in regularly scheduled courses, contributions to course offerings in the form of proposals for senior seminars, single-author studies, or graduate seminars, and availability to teach a reasonable variety of courses at all levels over the course of a five-year period.

To meet expectations over a five-year period: a tenured faculty member should present a record of consistent, high-quality teaching as evidenced by the following:

- coherent and comprehensive syllabi that reflect departmental course descriptions and university policies and require assessments and assignments appropriate to the level of the course
- adherence to university policies regarding the timely submission of syllabi, curriculum vitae and grades
- availability to teach courses at all levels and within a range of subject areas as appropriate for rank and field
- an annual average ranking of “satisfactory” on university and departmental teaching evaluations
- active service on graduate committees and honors thesis committees as required by field and appropriate to rank

A faculty member may exceed expectations in the area of teaching: by winning a teaching award recognized by the Faculty Senate or from a professionally recognized body external to the university, doing significant service on eight or more graduate or honors thesis committees*, chairing three or more Ph.D. committees*, or by demonstrating a consistent record of achievement with at least two of the following:

- an annual average score on university and/or departmental evaluations that is markedly higher than the departmental average.
- evidence of frequent engagement in pedagogical training such as CTE or technology workshops
- evidence of significant technological innovation or of significant course development related to the implementation of technology
- evidence of substantial contributions to course development or creation
significant course development that furthers university initiatives in service learning, study abroad, or diversity
- a grant for teaching or course development
- evidence of significant and sustained mentoring of individual students at the graduate or undergraduate levels

*numbers are subject to change upon the advice of the Director of Graduate Studies in response to changing conditions such as enrollments.

---

**Research**

The goal of the evaluation is to determine whether the individual demonstrates an active research or creative agenda. The desired profile for research demonstrates the creation and the completion of significant research projects which might culminate in a monograph, scholarly edition, digital project, or a thematically coherent set of essays, published in well-regarded print or electronic peer-reviewed venues. The standards defined in this document for “meets” and “exceeds” expectations in research are intended to encourage faculty to be consistently productive, to produce high quality work and to be ambitious in placing that work (whether authored or editorial in nature) with top peer-reviewed presses, in nationally and internationally prominent peer-reviewed journals, and in other high impact print and electronic venues including edited collections from prestigious presses.

**Scholarship**

To meet or exceed expectations over a five-year period: a faculty member should present a record of consistent, substantive, and significant peer-reviewed scholarly or creative work, as evidenced by achievements such as, but not limited to the following unranked list:

- a substantial monograph published with a respected university or trade academic press
- a substantial critical edition with an introduction and scholarly apparatus
- digital databases, archives, and research tools whose creation involves serious intellectual work and is consistent with best practices in digital scholarship
- a book manuscript under contract with a respected university or trade academic press
- peer-reviewed scholarly articles in good-quality venues
- book chapters in edited volumes
- a substantial edited book from a respected university or trade academic press
- editing a scholarly journal
- external fellowships and grants
- invited work in prominent venues
- editing an issue of a scholarly journal
- a textbook from a respected publisher of textbooks
- omnibus reviews or article-length reviews
Following norms at peer and aspirational peer institutions, the benchmark for **meets expectations** is 3 substantial, well-placed peer-reviewed articles, or the equivalent as part of a profile of ongoing scholarly and creative activity to be evaluated in relation to normative criteria in the discipline, including number, length, venue, visibility, and impact. It should not be assumed that a higher number of publications is automatically superior to 3 high-visibility, high-impact placements or than any three articles necessarily meet this standard.

The category of **exceeds expectations** demonstrates accomplishment significantly surpassing the basic benchmark taking into account number, length, venue, visibility, and impact.

**Creative Writing**

The benchmark for **meets expectations** is one of the following, to be evaluated in relation to length, venue, visibility, and impact: fifteen or more poems; 4-6 stories; a novella; a play performed in a respected venue; a screenplay optioned by a studio; 4-6 creative non-fiction essays in respected venues.

The category of **exceeds expectations** demonstrates accomplishment significantly surpassing the basic benchmark taking into account number, length, venue, visibility, and impact. Examples would include: a book of poetry; a novel; a substantial short story collection; a collection of novellas; a collection of non-fiction essays.

---
Guidelines for Department Head and Evaluation Advisory Committee in Conducting the Annual Review

As stated in the preamble to this document, the annual evaluation process is designed to enable and encourage the individual faculty member’s development of significant and sustained scholarly and creative projects as defined in the narrative statement, to permit the faculty member to present consistent and verifiable patterns in terms of teaching practices, and to confirm the nature and extent of committee work and professional service both inside and external to the university.

In evaluating teaching and service, the five-year window is designed to encourage flexibility and discretion in assessing the individual faculty member’s performance in the context of the broader goals of promoting consistent, high-quality teaching, active citizenship in the department, high impact service within the university, and highly visible contributions to the profession at large. The Head and the Advisory Committee will need to make judgments about the different responsibilities and impacts of varying teaching and service activities, and should also take into account the rhythms, stages and one-time factors marking individual careers that affect faculty performance in these areas. It is evident, for example, that factors such as class size and level, honors designation and the luck of the draw can all affect course evaluation numbers in a given semester. A faculty member may develop several new courses over a period of a few years, followed by a period of appropriately repeating and refining those courses, and in a given year (i.e. a faculty development leave or external fellowship) may do no teaching at all. Similarly, opportunities for faculty service will naturally vary at different stages of individual careers. A full professor may be more likely to be asked to serve on a major university committee than a newly-tenured associate professor. Someone who serves as President of a national scholarly organization will, in all probability, never be asked to serve in that capacity again, just as someone who is awarded a college or university teaching award is unlikely to receive the same award in the years immediately following.

In the area of research, a one-size-fits-all set of criteria is especially difficult to define. Given the widely varied research profiles of department faculty, the Department Head and Evaluation Committee must show flexibility and discretion in evaluating the individual faculty member’s scholarly and/or creative work over the five-year window. Evaluators need to consider not only the number and length of faculty publications, but also the visibility and impact of the work in the discipline. Visibility and impact are indicators of quality: visibility is an assumption about the prominence of the venue; impact requires more time to manifest itself in such things as book prizes and awards, invitations to give talks, reprints, frequency and prominence of citations, etc.

In practice, such flexibility in evaluating faculty research will necessitate a variety of judgment calls. For example, in determining whether a given faculty member has met expectations as defined (“3 substantial peer-reviewed articles, or the equivalent as part of a profile of ongoing scholarly and creative activity”), certain non-refereed publications/activities might be judged equivalent to a peer-reviewed article, for instance, a substantial invited contribution to a high-impact edited collection, or responsibility for publishing a “The Year’s Contributions to ______ Studies” round-up in a respected journal. Again, while we want to encourage publication in top journals (PMLA or ELH, for example), evaluators should also recognize significant placements...
published in high-quality but more specialized venues that are likely to have major impact in specific sub-fields.

Similarly, in determining what level/kind of productivity “exceeds expectations” (defined as “accomplishment significantly surpassing the basic benchmark”), evaluators will need to consider such factors as: the visibility and impact of journal-editing and special-issue-editing activity; the nature and origin of an edited book collection (how prominent is the press? how prominent are the contributors? does the book include a substantial introduction? is the volume a lightly-edited “conference proceedings” or a more originally-conceived and more substantial scholarly product?); the difference between a lightly-edited paperback edition and a full-scale scholarly edition; the distinctions between conference papers and invited keynote addresses, or between major national grants (ACLS, Guggenheim) and internal grants (i.e. Glasscock Center fellowships); etc. Moreover, it should be recognized that certain kinds of professional accomplishment—keynote addresses at particular conferences; publication in some venues; receipt of specific major national grants—are not likely to be frequently repeated.

Evaluators should bear in mind the fact that some faculty members may present achievements in both creative and scholarly endeavors. Finally, given the complexity and variety of judgments to be made, the Head and the Committee are urged to seek guidance as needed from appropriate faculty with regard to the prominence of particular venues (presses, journals, book collections) and activities (conferences organized; editorial work) in particular subfields within the discipline; reputable external peer-reviewing groups and committees (for example, in the field of digital humanities) may also be consulted as needed.