Faculty and administrators of each Department are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the department consistent with University criteria and procedures.

--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

Departments should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:

--Faculty Members and Administrators of the Department
   The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.

--Dean of Faculties
1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Hispanic Studies is, at a time when worldwide globalization includes the demographically and culturally significant Hispanization of Texas, as well as of large northern cities and virtually the entire Southwest of the Department States, through teaching, research, service and administration the HISP faculty to prepare students in all aspects of Hispanic Studies through fostering adequate preparation in the field and university and professional levels of bilingualism and biculturalism; and through its graduate program train specialists in all particular fields of Hispanic Studies, with a special attention to literary and visual studies, linguistics, and language studies, as well as in transdisciplinary Hispanic Studies. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Hispanic Studies for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Department; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general Department of Hispanic Studies guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</td>
<td><a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</td>
<td><a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their department. The following are titles within the Department of Hispanic Studies.

**Tenure-Track and Tenured Titles:**

Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or development leave appointments).

**Academic Professional Track Titles:**

Academic Professional Track faculty are appointments with the title of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor.

Academic Professional Track faculty with the title of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer will normally hold a master’s or terminal degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in such service and administrative activities as is required to carry out their instructional duties (e.g. coordinating multiple sections of a language course, or running placement exams).

The standard teaching load per semester for a full-time Lecturer or Senior Lecturer is four courses. Only regular course offerings will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for faculty on this track. Supervision of undergraduate reading and research courses (285, 291, 485 491) or internships (483, 484) will normally be considered as additions to the regular standard four-course load, except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head. Faculty in lecturer ranks should not be assigned to graduate courses. Course loads in excess of the standard four-course per semester load require the approval of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in research or service, but either or both may be taken into consideration in annual performance evaluations or for promotion in a category of enhancing instructional effectiveness.

Academic Professional Track faculty with the title of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor normally hold a terminal degree in the teaching fields and will be engaged in both instruction and significant service. The category of service is understood broadly to include student advising and pedagogically related activities outside the classroom.

The standard teaching load each semester for a full-time Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor normally is three courses. Only regular course offerings will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for faculty on this track. Supervision of undergraduate reading and research courses (285, 291, 485 491) or internships (483, 484) will normally be considered as additions to the regular standard four-course load, except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head. The standard three-course teaching load may be reduced in instances of a substantial service assignment (e.g., serving as director of undergraduate studies, serving as coordinator of multi-section courses). Both deviations from the standard course load and the assignment of instructional faculty to specific graduate courses will require the
Faculty with the title of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor are not expected to engage in research, but it may be taken into account in a category of enhancing instructional effectiveness in annual performance evaluations or for promotion.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member’s performance in the assigned categories of performance in teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; and service. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more performance areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the Department of Hispanic Studies, the College, and the University; and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to contribute to instruction and student development, to continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness, and to promote and diversify the development of instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Teaching Load. The Department of Hispanic Studies standard teaching load for tenure-track and tenured faculty is two courses a semester; the standard load of Academic Professional Track faculty with Lecturer or Senior Lecture titles is four courses a semester; and the standard load of Academic Professional Track faculty with Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor titles is three courses a semester. The relative weight for evaluating tenured faculty performance in the area of teaching normally shall be 30% of 100% effort. The relative weight for evaluating tenure-track faculty performance in the area of teaching normally shall be 35% of 100% effort. The relative weight for evaluating faculty performance of Academic Professional Track faculty with Lecturer or Senior Lecture titles in the area teaching normally shall be 100% of 100% effort. And, the relative weight for evaluating faculty performance of Academic Professional Track faculty with Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor titles in the area teaching normally shall be 75% of 100% effort. While the teaching weight for a faculty member may be modified temporarily for approved reasons, the teaching component shall not be less than the minimum percentage mandated by System Policy 12.01.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Criteria to be assessed include, but are not limited to: thorough and up-to-date knowledge of teaching area; effective preparation, organization, and presentation of course material; productive rapport with students; and professional/pedagogical development. Standard university-mandated student/course evaluations are required, but they are not sufficient to evaluate teaching, and other sources of information may include: self-evaluation, peer-evaluation, student feedback, and student learning. Other measures and indicators for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are: peer review of course materials (including syllabi and testing instruments), instructor supervision of undergraduate and graduate research such as theses and dissertations, development of high-impact teaching activities, personal narratives concerning innovation, development of new courses, and new teaching practices should be given appropriate weight.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work
Evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in research, scholarly activity or creative work must take into consideration the fact that a scholarly career is a long-term process, and it should consider all past accomplishments, including the accomplishments that led to appointment, tenure, and/or promotion at Texas A&M University. Accomplishments in research or creative work are most commonly demonstrated through the completion of significant research, writing, or performance projects. The quality and scope of outcomes and activities will serve to determine to what extent the standards of merit for different professorial ranks are being met.

A one-size-fits-all set of criteria is difficult to define. While individual faculty members are in charge of presenting their personal case in the clearest way, reviews must show flexibility and discretion in evaluating the individual faculty member’s scholarly and/or creative work. Evaluation criteria to be considered are not only the number and length of faculty publications, but also the visibility and impact of the work published, insofar as they may be indicators of quality. Quality, not quantity, should be the primary consideration for evaluation in every case. The timing of research outcomes varies not just from faculty member to faculty member, but also within a faculty member’s career. Special attention needs to be paid in this specific case to narratives describing progress.

Given the complexity and variety of judgments to be made, and while full responsibility for adequate self-presentation is the charge of every faculty member, evaluators may seek additional guidance as needed from appropriate faculty in particular subfields within a discipline with regard to the importance of particular outcomes or professional activities. Within the obvious need for progress and the fulfillment of expectations, respect for a faculty member’s decisions as regards her or his own career development must trump the evaluator’s criteria for progress in her or his own case.

3.3 Service

Considering the different roles and challenges of untenured and tenured faculty in all institutions, the expectations for service are quantitatively and qualitatively different. But common to all professorial ranks is the expectation of being good departmental citizens. This includes, but is not limited to, regular attendance at departmental meetings, membership on appropriate departmental standing and ad hoc committees, and casting departmental ballots as eligible.

Opportunities for faculty service will naturally vary at different stages of individual careers, with some faculty members being active in functions not clearly visible at the departmental level. Narratives concerning service accomplishments from individual faculty members must be carefully studied by reviewers.

For the tenured ranks, service should be significant within the Department, College and University, and should also include evidence of impact and professional value beyond Texas A&M University. While service starts at the departmental level, it is equally valid at all levels of engagement. As reflected in departmental indicators of excellence and effectiveness, such engagement should target criteria to be assessed as they relate to: participation in the operation and function of the department; contributions to the mission and goals of the College and University; and activities in advancement of professional organizations and scholarly communities.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Hispanic Studies recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).
4.1 Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** include, but are not limited to the indicators listed below for “effectiveness in teaching,” and the “excellent” rating:

As per HISP Bylaws “…will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period…in Teaching, to the quality of the commitment to educational goals…For annual reviews, the subcategory will emphasize work within the previous calendar.”

To that end, Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- Teaching performance recognized by national-, regional-, university-, or college-level awards.
- Teaching performance as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes well beyond departmental averages.
- Effective direction of multiple graduate and/or undergraduate research or creative activities such as dissertation, honors theses, etc.
- Multiple competitive internal or external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Selection for departmental, college, university, or professional society teaching award.
- A textbook from a respected publisher not based on original research by the author
- Curricular development as seen in multiple new courses and/or major revision of existing courses.
- Multiple participation in and delivery of teaching workshops and other such activities.
- Chairmanship of multiple graduate advisory committees.
- Membership in multiple graduate advisory committees.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member’s students.
- Placement of multiple graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly and related positions.
- Significant contributions to the professional development of students.

4.2 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- Effective teaching performance as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by syllabi, peer evaluations, and student outcomes.
- Effective direction of graduate and/or undergraduate research or creative activity such as dissertation, honors theses, etc.
- Competitive internal or external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Selection for departmental, college, university, or professional society teaching award.
- A textbook from a respected publisher not based on original research by the author
- Curricular development as seen in new courses and/or major revision of existing courses.
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation of course materials, student evaluations and outcomes, participation in teaching workshops and other such activities.
- Chairmanship in graduate advisory committees.
- Membership in graduate advisory committees.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member’s students.
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly and related positions.
- Significant contributions to the professional development of students.
“Effectiveness in Teaching” will be visible through positive indicators of strong investment in the education of undergraduate students, graduate students, or both. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize satisfactory performance within the previous calendar year.

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but are not limited to:

- multiple indicators listed below for “effectiveness in research/scholarly activity/creative work,” and the “excellent” rating:

As per HISP Bylaws “...will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period...in Research, it must be linked to the quality of outcomes.... For annual reviews, the subcategory will emphasize work within the previous calendar.

To that end, Indicators of Excellence in Research include, but are not limited to:

- High quality “effectiveness” indicators
- Presence of multiple “effectiveness” indicators
- Receipt of external awards for Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work
- Quality of the commitment to Research, Scholarly Activity, or Creative Work
- Lengthy single-author monograph published
- Scholarly edition with an author introduction and notes.
- Peer-reviewed scholarly articles in good-quality venues in excess of departmental average/expectations.
- Multiple book chapters in scholarly volumes and selective proceedings of major conferences.
- Multiple internal grants with a focus on research and development.
- Prestigious external national and international fellowships and grants.
- National award for research or creative activities.
- Multiple invited lectures at prestigious venues.

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but are not limited to:

- Monographs published or under contract with a respected press.
- Scholarly edition with an introduction and notes.
- Digital databases, archives, and research tools of scholarly value.
- Peer-reviewed scholarly articles in good-quality venues.
- Book chapters in scholarly volumes and selective proceedings of major conferences.
- Internal grants with a focus on research and development.
- External national and international fellowships and grants.
- An edited issue of a scholarly journal.
- A textbook from a respected publisher and based on original research by the author
- Frequent citation of publications, re-publication or translation of work.
- Awards for, or publication of, creative activities.
- Presentations at regional, national, or international conferences.
- Invited lectures.
- Omnibus reviews or article-length reviews.
- Translations published in recognized venues.
- For Creative Work: To meet or exceed expectations over a six-year period, a faculty member should present a detailed record indicating visibility, impact, and quality of venue of creative tasks resulting
in publications of poems, novels, literary translations, plays, or short-stories, or in performance actions.

“Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work” will be evidenced through the submission of obvious, measurable results, or convincing narratives reflecting progress and promising solid outcomes. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize satisfactory performance within the previous calendar year.

4.3 Indicators of **Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to the indicators listed below for “effectiveness in service,” and the rating of “excellent”:

As per HISP Bylaws “…will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period…in Research, it must be linked to the quality of outcomes.... For annual reviews, the subcategory will emphasize work within the previous calendar.

To that end, Indicators of **Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Special contributions in the service as departmental undergraduate, graduate director or other departmental administrative roles.
- Exceptional service as an officer or committee chair in a regional, national or international professional and/or governmental organization(s).
- Service as an officer of the Faculty Senate or Faculty Senate committee.
- Service on University, College and Department committees and task forces as chair or member.
- Service as an advisor to multiple student organizations.
- Substantial service to the local community and public at large.
- Service as editor of a journal or book series, or as editorial board member
- Service on multiple external peer committees for tenure and promotion cases
- Service as a proposal reviewer for multiple scholarly awards or on a governmental task force, commission or board.
- Participation on review panels for major institutional grants or national funding agencies.
- Presence of multiple “effectiveness” indicators
- Work visibly and decisively advancing the departmental mission in Service
- Receipt of external service awards

4.3 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Service as departmental undergraduate, graduate director or other departmental administrative roles.
- Service as an officer or committee chair in a regional, national or international professional and/or governmental organization(s).
- Service as a member of the Faculty Senate.
- Service on University, College and Department committees and task forces as chair or member.
- Service as an advisor to student organizations.
- Substantial service to the local community and public at large.
- Service as editor of a journal or book series, or as editorial board member
- Service on external peer committees for tenure and promotion cases or as a proposal reviewer for scholarly awards or on a governmental task force, commission or board.
- Organization and/or chairmanship of program sessions at national and international meetings.
“Effectiveness in Service” will be evidenced by performance at appropriate levels in a consistent pattern of positive work enhancing the departmental mission must be apparent. This entails a commitment to institutional advancement at either the departmental or other levels of the professional field.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of the areas of faculty performance of teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service, with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. Impact has become increasingly important, and it will be identified and evaluated through a process of external review. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the Department of Hispanic Studies are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor:
A comprehensive review is performed at the midway point of the probationary period, usually during the third year of the initial appointment. It is important that tenure-track faculty demonstrate high, continuing achievement by contributing to the programmatic needs of HISP through effective teaching, research and service. It is the responsibility of the candidate, in consultation with the Head and faculty, to plan a program of academic career development and a time-table for implementation of the plan. Candidates must show clear and substantial progress toward the requirements of tenure and promotion.

5.1.2 Associate Professor:
Research. A candidate must show through significant and substantial scholarly publication a record of achievement and disciplinary recognition that is consonant with the aims of a major research university. The quality of these publications is more important than their quantity, and the candidate must demonstrate significant intellectual growth beyond the dissertation. If a candidate draws upon the dissertation for publication, such as a series of articles or a book, this work normally will be completed and submitted for publication by the time of the third-year review. If a candidate should present as the major work for the tenure and promotion file a book that was taken from the dissertation, the T&PC must firmly establish that the book is a substantially revised and expanded version of the dissertation and that it has gone significantly beyond the dissertation. The candidate has to demonstrate evidence of a research program that is independent of, but not necessarily unrelated to, the dissertation. In all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor, there must be evidence of a significant and sustainable research program that is beyond any book or series of articles derived from the dissertation and that is demonstrated in thematically or theoretically related externally peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity. Books are important indicators of scholarship. Single-authored monographs, critical studies and critical editions are prime examples. They should normally be published by a university press or as part of a recognized scholarly series issued by a commercial publishing house or by an equivalent foreign publisher. Vanity press publications are not acceptable. Other types of editions, co-authored or co-edited studies will carry less weight. Bibliographical studies will be judged according to their scholarly merits. Translations cannot take the place of individual scholarly publications, but high-quality translations can be seen as significant contributions to the discipline. While textbooks may be viewed as valuable to the profession, they cannot be equated with scholarly books. Articles will normally appear in refereed journals, volumes of critical essays edited by a respected member of the discipline, or selected, appropriately refereed proceedings from international or national conferences and symposia. Particularly valuable in some of our fields are series of related articles. Articles published in leading refereed journals will usually
carry more weight than those appearing in volumes and proceedings, but the professional standing of the editor, other co-contributors and press will be evaluated and taken into account. Publications identified as notes will usually carry less weight than articles, but notes and reviews can enhance the overall record of the candidate.

**Teaching.** For tenure and promotion, a candidate’s teaching must contribute efficaciously in the classroom to the effective education of students. Effective teaching is assessed through a combination of methods and indicators, including direct observation of classroom teaching, the candidate’s syllabi and teaching materials, student evaluations, as well as teaching awards and grants for development of new courses and innovative approaches to teaching. At least once a year during the probationary period faculty members in two-person teams will observe the candidate teaching a class, and then produce written evaluations of the candidate.

**Service.**
The most important service is that which helps to build a stronger Department of Hispanic Studies, College of Liberal Arts, or University. Service to the professional field is external service, and will be considered equally useful. Service should help the faculty member establish her or his personal profile at those relevant levels. It is normally the case that a candidate’s first service is given to the department and that the radius of his or her service increases with time. There are differential expectations for service loads on the basis of rank. Consistent, effective service begins with attendance at HISP departmental meetings and includes active engagement and cooperation in departmental initiatives and participation in ad hoc and standing committees. It may extend to College and University committees to complement departmental service. External service includes service to the professional field at large.

### 5.1.3 Professor:

i. Normally the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor can be considered after at least four years of service and experience at the rank of Associate Professor. The promotion, however, is not a function of the numbers of years of service, but of clearly demonstrated achievement and distinction in teaching, research and service. Professors should be nationally and internationally visible, and recognized as leading scholars in one or more fields in which they have made an impact on the profession.

ii. The research record for promotion to Professor must include a body of ongoing scholarly research beyond the review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. This record will normally include a book-length critical study or critical edition published by a university press or as a part of a recognized series issued by a commercial publishing house or an equivalent foreign publisher. This study or edition must have been published by the time of consideration of the scholarly record. Emphasizing always the overall scholarly stature of the candidate, College policy additionally addresses demonstrable, well-advanced pipeline work (in press, for example) that is indicative of scholarly eminence. Vanity press publications are not acceptable. Guidelines concerning other types of editions, co-authored or co-edited studies, bibliographical studies, translations and textbooks are the same as stated above.

iii. The overall record of research must be recognized as a significant scholarly contribution by the profession. Such recognition may be established through published reviews, citation lists, editorship(s) of and/or membership(s) on the editorial board(s) of a major journal(s), and related or similar professional criteria.

iv. A professor is expected to be a leader in teaching, service and professional involvement. The rank
bestows a special responsibility for the overall progress of the Department, and for the relations with other University entities, faculty and students. While scholarly achievement is normally the deciding factor for this promotion, true eminence in other areas may carry considerable weight.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)

For appointment and promotion in the Academic Professional Track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

Promotion reviews for APT faculty will be conducted according to the criteria listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

5.3 Process

The Department Head shall appoint an evaluation subcommittee for each faculty to be reviewed for the probationary third-year review and for the tenure and promotion review, and for promotion. All members of the evaluation subcommittee are expected to review the candidate's dossier in each area and to contribute to the written report. Additional documentation may be solicited to supplement the report in each area for the third-year review. External letters must be solicited for the report on Research and Creative Work for the review for tenure and promotion. At least half of the solicited external letters should be from a list provided by the candidate, and none shall be from the candidate's "Do Not Ask List." The results of each stage of a candidate's review process shall be made known to the candidate as the review proceeds.

Evaluation subcommittee reports (research, teaching, service, and summary) and the candidate's dossier will form the basis for consideration of a case by the Tenure and Promotion Committee or the Promotion Committee. The chair of the evaluation subcommittee shall moderate subcommittee meetings and T&P Committee deliberations. Following open discussion by the committee, a decision to continue, tenure, and/or promote the faculty member shall be taken by written secret ballot. The chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall forward its vote, final report, and materials from the evaluation subcommittees to the Head. The chair, not the department Head, will ensure that the final version of the four reports represents T&P Committee discussion and faculty voice, and reflects the vote of the committee. A second summary report summarizing T&P Committee discussions and vote must be presented for full committee sign-off.

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate departments to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors, and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.
In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, regarding the faculty member’s performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1 Purpose
- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  - See University Rule 12.01.99.M2. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Process
The Department Head shall conduct annually a review of each T-TT faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service. Non-T-TT faculty will be evaluated on teaching effectiveness and, as relevant, on service. Faculty undergoing a probationary review or review for tenure and/or promotion will be peer-reviewed by the appropriate committee (See Bylaws “Peer Review Committee”), the materials for which shall form the basis for the Head’s annual review.

In preparation for each year’s review, faculty will submit an annual report consisting of a current vita and a report of individual accomplishments for the year of review, along with copies of publications and supporting materials deemed appropriate, and communicated to the faculty through yearly instructions from the Head. The Head, in view and full consideration of the departmental Guidelines for Faculty Review, will write and convey an evaluation of the annual report consistent with performance indicators provided in Standing Policy II. The Head’s evaluation shall serve as the basis for recommendation for merit salary increases.

The relative weights for evaluating T-TT faculty performance across the three areas of concern normally shall be: 1) 50% Research or Creative Work; 2) 30% Teaching and 3) 20% Service, excepting probationary TT faculty, who will follow the formula: 1) 55% Research or Creative Work, 2) 35% Teaching, 3) 10% Service.

6.3 Focus
The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or
excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.4 Time Period of Review
Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but they will include an expanded three-year window for the review period.

6.5 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance
During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance will be rated on at least three categories: “satisfactory,” “needs improvement,” and “unsatisfactory.” In order to place each member of the faculty in the appropriate category (“satisfactory,” “needs improvement,” and “unsatisfactory”), the head will use a five point-scale, from 5 to 1, with 5 representing the highest possible rating and 1 the lowest. A “satisfactory” rating will correspond to 2.5 through 5 in the numerical scale; a “needs improvement” rating stands for values between 2 and 2.4; “unsatisfactory” corresponds to values between 1 and 1.9. This scale will be applied to each category of research, teaching, and service, based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence.

6.5.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – An “unsatisfactory” rating will be given to a faculty member who exhibits a consistent pattern of inaction or negative action in the category (i.e., absenteeism, repeated failure to accomplish necessary tasks). This rating should be assigned to faculty members who have failed to contribute to the mission of the department through the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in teaching. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize performance, or lack thereof, within the previous calendar year.

- **Needs Improvement** – A “needs improvement” rating will be given to a faculty member who is found lacking in the category due to failure to maintain adequate patterns of performance in Teaching, through a failure to maintain appropriate standards as evinced by student evaluations, peer visitations, lack of course development, minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize insufficient performance within the previous calendar year.

- **Satisfactory** – A “satisfactory” rating will be given to a faculty member who is performing at appropriate levels in the category. A consistent pattern of positive work enhancing the departmental mission must be apparent. Teaching this will be visible through positive indicators of strong investment in the education of undergraduate students, graduate students, or both. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize satisfactory performance within the previous calendar year. Appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching, which can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and student accomplishments.

- **Excellent** – The “excellent” rating (a subcategory within “satisfactory”), will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period. In Teaching, for annual reviews, the subcategory will emphasize work within the previous calendar. Evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching of outstanding classroom instructors as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, student accomplishments, contributions to novel methodologies and curricular development.
6.5.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are

- **Unsatisfactory** – An “unsatisfactory” rating will be given to a faculty member who exhibits a consistent pattern of inaction or negative action in the category (i.e. lack of any interest in research endeavors). This rating should be assigned to faculty members who have failed to contribute to the mission of the department in Research through the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize performance, or lack thereof, within the previous calendar year.

- **Needs Improvement** – A “needs improvement” rating will be given to a faculty member who is found lacking in the category due to failure to maintain adequate patterns of performance in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work through an insufficient commitment to publishable outcomes, limited evidence of research/scholarly/creative impact as supported by, for example, refereed articles, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize insufficient performance within the previous calendar year.

- **Satisfactory** – A “satisfactory” rating will be given to a faculty member who is performing at appropriate levels in the category. A consistent pattern of positive work enhancing the departmental mission must be apparent. In Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work considered are the submission of obvious, measurable results, or convincing narratives reflecting progress and promising solid outcomes, evidence of effectiveness supported by high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize satisfactory performance within the previous calendar year.

- **Excellent** – The “excellent” rating (a subcategory within “satisfactory”), will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period. It Research, it must be linked to the quality of outcomes, quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. For annual reviews, the subcategory will emphasize work within the previous calendar year.

6.5.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – An “unsatisfactory” rating will be given to a faculty member who exhibits a consistent pattern of inaction or negative action in the category (i.e., absenteeism, repeated failure to accomplish necessary tasks, lack of any interest). This rating should be assigned to faculty members who have failed to contribute to the mission of the department either in Service over the period of evaluation through the absence of evidence of effectiveness in service. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize performance, or lack thereof, within the previous calendar year.

- **Needs Improvement** – A “needs improvement” rating will be given to a faculty member who is found lacking in the category due to failure to serve in committees or a failure to adequately contribute to mandated departmental activities in the absence of compensatory engagements elsewhere (i.e., administrative appointment in the College or University, officership in a national organization), minimal evidence of effectiveness in service due to departmental involvement with the respective or an absence of extra-departmental service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize insufficient performance within the previous calendar year.
● **Satisfactory** – A “satisfactory” rating will be given to a faculty member who is performing at appropriate levels in the category. A consistent pattern of positive work enhancing the departmental mission must be apparent. In Service this entails a commitment to institutional advancement at either the departmental or other levels of the professional field. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize satisfactory performance within the previous calendar year. Evidence of effectiveness in service will be involvement appropriate for career stage and time assignment.

● **Excellent** – The “excellent” rating (a subcategory within “satisfactory”), will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period. In Service, this refers to the quality of contributions to institutional life. Evidence of effectiveness and excellence in service through impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, leading mentorship and outreach efforts, prominent national level service in professional organizations. For annual reviews, the subcategory will emphasize work within the previous calendar.

6.6 Required Components

The Department Head shall conduct annually a review of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service. Academic Professional Track faculty will be evaluated on teaching effectiveness and, as relevant, on service. Faculty undergoing a probationary review or review for tenure and/or promotion will be peer-reviewed by the appropriate committee (See B below), the materials for which shall form the basis for the Head's annual review.

In preparation for each year's review, faculty will submit an annual report consisting of a current vita and a report of individual accomplishments for the year of review, along with copies of publications and supporting materials deemed appropriate, and communicated to the faculty through yearly instructions from the Head. The Head, in view and full consideration of the departmental Guidelines for Faculty Review, will write and convey an evaluation of the annual report consistent with performance indicators provided in Standing Policy II in the HISP Bylaws.

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

6.6.1 Faculty member's report of accomplishments and goals

The form of the faculty member’s calendar year review of accomplishments and goals is a rank-specific template that includes the following:

- A report focused on the immediately previous calendar year, and an expanded three-year window, and allowing a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report incorporating teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of the templates for the report are available in the Department, and they are (See “Resources” at [https://liberalarts.tamu.edu/hisp/](https://liberalarts.tamu.edu/hisp/)):

- Annual Review 2019 FAC
- Annual Review 2019 LEC
- Annual Review 2019 APT
Reports will request a guided written narrative (not to exceed 750 words) of professional activities in the previous three years, with particular emphasis/reference to the calendar year, where the faculty member features top accomplishments.

Mandatory materials for the three-year window:
   1. Current curriculum vitae (provide dates)
   2. Copies of published work
   3. Documentation for grants and awards (e.g., reports of completed FDL/PDL)
   4. Student evaluations
   5. Syllabi of courses taught
   6. Peer evaluations of your classes

Optional additional materials:
   7. Examples of student assignments (e.g., tests, evaluation rubrics)
   8. Self-evaluation
   9. Additional information that may help document your contributions in any category

6.6.2 A written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations

The department head, director will write an evaluation for the year in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the department head’s, director’s, or supervisor’s written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

6.6.3 Meeting between the department head and the faculty member

The department head may meet with the faculty member, or the faculty member may request to meet with the department head to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.

6.7 Assessment outcomes that require action

As per University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:
6.7.1 “Unsatisfactory” Performance

In compliance with SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, to receive an overall satisfactory rating a member of the faculty will need to achieve a rating of “satisfactory” in at least two categories, and may not receive a rating of “unsatisfactory” in any category (i.e., three “satisfactory” ratings or two “satisfactory” ratings and one “needs improvement” rating). Other combinations (e.g., one “satisfactory” and two “needs improvement”, two “satisfactory” and one “unsatisfactory”, etc.) will lead to an overall unsatisfactory rating, regardless of the relative weight of any category ranked “unsatisfactory.”

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the established criteria. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.7.2 “Needs Improvement” Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review, they must work with the department head immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.8 Time-Line

With faculty members delivering their annual report of accomplishments early in the spring semester, the annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling the department head to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.”

6.9 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2.
7. Mid-Term or Third-Year Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of University SAP 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.

- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.

- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.

- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

- This review can take the place of the annual faculty performance review. A faculty member may choose that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm review.

- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year prior to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year AY2023-2024, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2023 and December 2023. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hired Calendar Year 2020</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between Mar – Dec 2023 (due before December 2023 of AY 2023-2024)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department Head shall appoint an evaluation subcommittee for each faculty to be reviewed for the probationary third-year review. All members of the evaluation subcommittee are expected to review the candidate’s dossier in each area and to contribute to the written report. Additional documentation may be solicited to supplement the report in each area for the third-year review. The results of each stage of a candidate's review process shall be made known to the candidate as the review proceeds.

7.3 Feedback from midterm review
Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/department director), and departmental faculty.

The Department of Hispanic Studies will conduct the midterm review following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

8. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head or Peer Review Committee.

2) Periodic review by the peer Review Committee (see Section 8.2.).

8.1 Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

8.2 Peer Review Committee

The Department of Hispanic Studies Peer Review Committee (PRC) Consists of five members elected from the tenured faculty, and is chaired by a committee member elected by the committee; term of membership is six years, that is, a full review cycle; all members of the committee will be reviewed by the remainder of the committee; collects and organizes peer review materials for tenured faculty; evaluates teaching, research, and service for each dossier under three categories, namely, “satisfactory,” “needs improvement,” and “unsatisfactory,” correlative on a 1 to 5 numeric scale, to 2.5 through 5 for satisfactory; 2 through 2.4 for “needs improvement,” and 1 through 1.9 for “unsatisfactory.” (see HISP Bylaws and Standing Policy III for details).

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee: In preparation for each year’s review, faculty will submit a report consisting of a current vita and a report of individual accomplishments for the years of review, along with copies of publications and supporting materials deemed appropriate, and communicated to the faculty through instructions from the Head. The PRC, in view and full consideration of the departmental Guidelines for Faculty Review, will write and convey an evaluation of the report consistent with performance indicators provided in HISP Bylaws Standing Policy II.

8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the department guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, whichever is earlier.

8.3.4 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.5 A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.6 A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.

8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both departments. If reviewed only by the primary department, the department head, will share the report with the other department or program head of the secondary department or program.

8.3.8 **By no later than May 31st**, the Department will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review, or upon request of the faculty member. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.1) acceptable to the dean.

8.4.1 The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.
8.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and the faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

8.4.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

8.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

8.4.5.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform a near term improvement plan.

8.4.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the department guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, and the dean, and it should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review)

8.6 Appeal
If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure Review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01 (Faculty Grievances Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee’s finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

If the faculty member, department head and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

8.7 **Voluntary Post-Tenure Review**

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the department head (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

9. **Granting Faculty Emeritus Status**

*University Rule 31.08.01.M2* states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see *Institutional Rule 31.08.01*, which indicates the process for this situation.

The Dean of Faculties website for procedures and forms is the best source for current information regarding nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

**Appendix**

**Contact Office**

Department of Hispanic Studies, Office of the Department Head (Richard K Curry), r-curry@tamu.edu