Faculty and administrators of each Unit 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 unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.

--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to University Rule 12.01.99.M1.

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

--Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit
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 International Studies is to provide research, teaching, and service to the campus, community, state, university, and the various disciplines represented in the department. The department seeks to advance humanities-based ways of understanding the increasingly globalized regions of the modern world through research and teaching in languages and cultures. The department also seeks to advance, refine, and disseminate knowledge of the languages, literatures, and cultures of the ancient Mediterranean world and its heritage.

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 International 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.M1, 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 Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general Unit 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.M1 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles.
Faculty ranks and tracks within the Department of International Studies are as listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines:
- Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor (Research 55%; Teaching 35%; Service 10%)
- Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Assistant Professor (Teaching 80%; Service 20%)
- Senior Lecturer, Lecturer (Teaching 100%)

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M1, 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 (teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; 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 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 College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to:
1) contribute to instruction and student development;
2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and
3) promote and diversify the development of the College’s instructional programs.

Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include:
1) self-evaluation;
2) peer-evaluation;
3) student feedback; and
4) student learning.

The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

- Commitment to quality education;
- Clarity in the organization, preparation and presentation of course content that reflect a command of the area/s of instruction;
- High professional standards in teaching;
- Organization and effective presentation of course content;
- Professional development that enhances instructional effectiveness.

Effectiveness in teaching will be assessed through a combination of different evaluating tools, such as classroom visitations by tenured faculty members; scores on students’ evaluations consistently at or above the departmental mean; examination of tests and class assignments (e.g., their frequency, the material covered, the quality of the questions, use of the target language, grading policy, etc.); course syllabi and new course proposals; teaching awards and grants for development of new courses and innovative approaches to teaching.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work:
Research is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in research is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to:

1) maintain a significant and substantial record of scholarly publications that is consonant with the aims of a major research university.
2) Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.
Evaluation of research does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research performance are:

- Coherent, continuous scholarly agenda;
- Demonstrable scholarly productivity (underscored by the quality or volume of publications, and by grant and other scholarly activities);
- Influential research that is highly regarded in specialized fields or subfields and disciplines.

Books are the most important indicators of scholarship. Critical studies and editions are prime examples. Other types of editions, co-authored or co-edited studies will carry less weight. Translations cannot take the place of individual scholarly publications, but scholarly translations can be seen as a significant contribution to the discipline. Bibliographical studies will be judged according to their scholarly merits. While textbooks may be viewed as valuable to the profession, they cannot be equated with scholarly books. All books should 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.

Articles should appear in refereed journals, in volumes of critical essays or in selected proceedings from international and national conferences and symposia. Articles published in leading refereed journals will normally carry more weight than those appearing in volumes and proceedings. Venues will be evaluated according to the criteria put forward below regarding performance categories in annual reviews. Notes and reviews can enhance the overall record.

Grants and awards by foundations and scholarly organizations are key indicators of professional development and achievement. Translation and republication of one's work are evidence of excellence. Faculty are encouraged to play an active role in professional organizations, and to read papers at scholarly conferences. They should be reminded, however, that conference papers cannot be a substitute for published essays. Evaluation at the time of the tenure and promotion decision is based on what is in print and what has been accepted for publication. Work in progress is considered only in so far as it is evidence of an ongoing research program.

3.3 Service
Service is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: show signs of developing citizenship in the University and scholarly communities and establish a profile of effective service. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are:

- Consistent and effective participation in the operation of the department;
- Productive contributions to College and University initiatives and activities;
- Contributions to student development outside assigned teaching responsibilities;
- Demonstrable contributions to the mission and activities of professional organizations and scholarly communities, as is appropriate for track and rank;
- Demonstrable contributions to non-scholarly local and regional communities.

Service categories include committee work, academic advising, advising of student organizations, special academic or administrative assignments such as curriculum development and policy reports, offices held on professional societies, editorial work for refereed journals or scholarly publications, and organizing and chairing professional meetings and symposia.
4. **Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The Unit 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.

4.1 *Indicators of Excellence in Teaching* include, but are not limited to:

- study abroad
- leading role in revision of degree curriculum
- chair of graduate dissertation/thesis committee (outside the department, in the absence of a graduate program)
- Association of Former Students teaching award, or other major teaching awards
- receipt of a major teaching grant or funding for pedagogical projects
- publication of a textbook
- publication of instructional materials, articles with a teaching focus or promoting pedagogical innovation

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

4.2.1 **High-Impact Indicators of Effectiveness**
- courses focusing on research and thesis writing
- honors courses
- writing-intensive courses and/or capstone courses
- (freshmen) critical thinking seminars
- other awards for teaching

4.2.2 **Other Indicators of Effectiveness**
- contribution to revision of degree curriculum
- development of new courses entered into the course catalog
- certification or re-certification of a Writing Intensive or Core Curriculum course
- teaching, with a new topic for the first time, of senior seminars or other variable topic courses
- courses that focus on diversity
- revision and improvement of existing courses, including incorporation of technology or innovative methods
- participation in and development of transformative learning situations, such as field trips, service learning, and related activities
- satisfactory peer evaluations
- satisfactory student evaluations
- attending pedagogical workshops
- maintenance of an active teaching portfolio as guided by the Center for Teaching Excellence
- presentations to local student organizations
- member of graduate dissertation/thesis committee
- individual work with undergraduate students that does not involve thesis writing
- mentoring of undergraduate students, such as advising about graduate programs or study abroad programs, and writing letters of recommendation
- presentation with a pedagogical focus at a conference or institution of higher learning

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

- publication of a scholarly monograph, including work of a creative or literary nature
- publication of a critical text edition
- publication of a critical bibliography
keynote address at a leading national or international scholarly association meeting
series of widely recognized scholarly lectures at a leading institution
major fellowship, research award, or other form of peer-reviewed external funding
award from professional organizations and learned societies

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

4.4.1 **High-Impact Indicators of Effectiveness**
editing or co-editing a scholarly collection of articles in a refereed or widely recognized non-refereed venue
publication of an article in a leading refereed journal or a widely recognized non-refereed journal
publication of a chapter in a scholarly book, collection of essays, or proceedings from national or international symposia, if refereed or published in a widely recognized non-refereed venue
presentation of an invited lecture at a leading institution

4.4.2 **Other Indicators of Effectiveness**
presentation of an invited lecture at a non-leading institution
publication of an article in a non-refereed journal
publication of a non-refereed chapter in a scholarly book, collection of essays, or proceedings from national or international symposia
publication of work of a creative or literary nature
publication of a scholarly encyclopedia or dictionary entry
publication of a translation or scholarly interview
editing or co-editing a scholarly collection of articles in a non-refereed venue
book reviews
presentation of an invited lecture at a non-leading institution
presentation of papers at scholarly meetings or conferences
other fellowships, research awards, or other form of external or internal funding

4.5 Indicators of **Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to:
editor of a leading journal or book series
service as peer reviewer for other institutions, e.g., being asked to write letters for external tenure and promotion cases, serving as a reviewer for the NEH, or reviewing a book manuscript for a major scholarly press
member of an external review committee of a department at another university
administrative leadership roles at the University, College, or Department level (e.g., associate head, director of undergraduate studies, director of language instruction)
member of a major governmental task force, commission, or board

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

4.6.1 **High-Impact Indicators of Effectiveness**
referee for a journal or an academic press
member of editorial board of a leading journal
officer in a national or international professional organization
chair of a major standing or ad-hoc committee at the University or College level
member of a work-intensive committee (such as Core Curriculum Committee, Glasscock Advisory Board, Dean’s Advisory Committee, Annual Review Committee, Search Committee, Tenure and Promotion Review Subcommittee) at the University, College, or Department level

4.6.2 **Other Indicators of Effectiveness**
Committee chair of a national or international professional organization, professional meeting, or symposium
Program chair at national or international meetings
Officer in a regional or state professional organization
Evidence of other Service to the profession, including awards
classroom peer observations
placement testing
administrative roles (e.g., language program coordination) within the Department
member of the Faculty Senate
service on University, College, or Departmental committees and task forces
advisor to student organizations
evidence of other service to the department, college, or university, including awards
development of programs focused on diversity
awards and recognitions related to diversity, inclusion, or climate
faculty mentoring and professional leadership development
committee service that furthers diversity aspects within the general task of the committee
efforts to recruit students of color
diversity mentoring of individual students from underrepresented groups
other activities enhancing diversity, inclusion, or climate
public service to the local community or other communities in the State of Texas
evidence of other service to the local community, including awards

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 their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. 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 unit is as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor:
Assistant professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field. They should be well qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research in a special field. Over time an assistant professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of associate professor and the awarding of tenure.

5.1.2 Associate Professor:
Research and creative work must show evidence of both accomplishment and impact, and must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. A first book or series of articles, for instance, those based on the dissertation should be published as early as is consistent with practices in nationally visible departments. Third year reviews will evaluate a candidate’s progress in completing the first project and development of a research program beyond 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. The existence of such a research program is demonstrated in thematically or theoretically related externally peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity and impact.

Teaching must be shown to be consistently competent, and the evidence presented should be both substantial and sufficiently thorough to make a strong case. The College’s expectation is that the evidence in successful tenure cases will show a genuine commitment to undergraduate and, where
appropriate, graduate teaching. Moreover, the College also expects that the record will indicate that the courses taught by the successful applicant will be characterized by diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the students being taught, and fair and appropriate evaluation of students' tests and assignments.

Service must show signs of developing citizenship in the University and scholarly communities.

5.1.3 Professor:
Promotion to Professor is not a function of the number of years of service, but of clearly demonstrated achievement and distinction in all areas. Professors should be nationally and/or internationally visible and recognized as leading scholars in one or more fields, not too narrowly defined, in which they have made an impact on the profession.

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. (Candidates for Professor must indicate on their vita all work that was published or accepted for publication and considered during their review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.) At a minimum, 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 scholarly series issued by a commercial publishing house (or by an equivalent foreign publisher). Normally, this study or edition should be published by the time of consideration of the scholarly record. Vanity press publications are not acceptable.

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.

A Professor is expected to be a leader in teaching, service, and professional involvement. For successful promotion to Professor, a candidate’s teaching effectiveness should be documented through a teaching portfolio developed with the Center for Teaching Excellence. A candidate for Professor must also have taken an active part in the affairs of the Department, the University, and the scholarly community. Service should be consistent and effective. Service categories include such activities as important committee work, advising of student organizations, special academic or administrative assignments such as curriculum development and policy reports, offices held in professional societies, editorial work for refereed journals or scholarly publications, and organizing and chairing professional meetings and symposia.

While scholarly achievement is normally the deciding factor for this promotion, exceptions to those requirements may be warranted. In rare and exceptional cases, promotion may be based on teaching or service, provided that the candidate's performance in other areas is satisfactory. In such cases, the burden of proof rests with the candidate to demonstrate that the university criteria have been met.

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. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. 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 Evaluation Process for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Professor

5.3.1 Department Review
The Department Review is conducted in all respects in accordance with the procedures listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Specifically, the Review Subcommittee for each case of Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure is composed of four tenured members, one of whom serves as chair; the Review Subcommittee for Promotion to Professor is composed of four tenured members at the rank of Professor, one of whom serves as chair. The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (for promotion to associate professor with tenure) consists of all tenured faculty; the Promotion Committee (for promotion to professor) consists of all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor. Each promotion committee is chaired by a tenured faculty member appointed ad hoc by the Department Head; normally, this will be the chair of the corresponding Review Subcommittee. Each Subcommittee prepares the draft reports on Teaching, Research, and Service for the full Tenure and/or Promotion Committee, as well as the Summary report reflecting the discussion in the Tenure and/or Promotion Committee. As a rule, faculty present at the Tenure and/or Promotion Committee meeting are required to submit their vote, in writing, within two business days of the meeting; faculty excused absent may submit their sealed vote, in writing, ahead of the meeting, but in any case no later than within two business days of the meeting.

5.3.2 Joint Appointments
As listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

5.3.3 The Dossier
As listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

5.4 Evaluation Process for Promotion in the Academic Professional Track
The Department Review is conducted in all respects in accordance with the procedures listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Specifically, the Review Subcommittee for each case of Promotion to Instructional Assistant Professor and Instructional Associate Professor is composed of four members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, one of whom serves as chair; at least one member must come from the tenured faculty, and at least one from the academic professional track faculty. The Review Subcommittee for each case of Promotion to Instructional Professor is composed of four members at the rank of Professor, one of whom serves as chair; at least one member must come from the tenured faculty, and at least one from the academic professional track faculty. For promotions to Instructional Assistant Professor and Instructional Associate Professor, the Department Promotion Committee consists of all tenured and academic professional track faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor; for promotions to Instructional Professor, the Department Promotion Committee consists of all tenured and academic professional track faculty at the rank of Professor. Each Subcommittee prepares the draft reports on Teaching and Service for the full Promotion Committee, as well as the Summary report reflecting the discussion in the Promotion Committee. Each promotion committee is chaired by a tenured faculty member appointed ad hoc by the Department Head; normally, this will be the chair of the corresponding Review Subcommittee. As a rule, faculty present at the Promotion Committee meeting are required to submit their vote, in writing, within two business days of the meeting; faculty excused absent may submit their sealed vote, in writing, ahead of the meeting, but in any case no later than within two business days of the meeting.

6. Annual Review
Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (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 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 (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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, director, or supervisor 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, director, or supervisor 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.M1. 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 Annual Review Process
The Department Annual Review Committee consists of four tenured members and one academic professional faculty track member elected by the faculty at large, for staggered terms of two years; one additional academic professional track faculty member is elected if volunteering to serve. At least two of the elected tenured members must hold the rank of Professor, and at least one elected tenured member each must from the International Studies faculty and from the Classics faculty. The Associate Head serves as an additional member and chair of the committee ex officio, but has no vote except in cases where an elected member is excluded from proceedings (as the subject of the evaluation or due to university nepotism rules).

All faculty must complete and submit, by a deadline no later than the end of February of each year, the Department’s Annual Review Form; the information provided in the form serves as the basis of the Annual Review Committee’s evaluation. Faculty performance in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service is judged on a five-category scale (see below, 6.5: Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance); in the overall assessment of tenured and tenure-track faculty, Teaching accounts for 35 per cent, Research for 55 percent, and Service for 10 per cent. (The corresponding ratios for instructional professors of all ranks are Teaching at 80 percent, and Service at 20 per cent; for lecturers, Teaching is evaluated at 100 per cent.) For each faculty member, the Annual Review Committee prepares a detailed report, which provides a basis for the Department Head’s own and independent review of the faculty member; the report is made available to the respective faculty member together with the Head’s annual review letter.
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.M1 (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 may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. The expanded review window of the Department of International Studies is three years.

6.5 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance
During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4) will be rated on at least three categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Meets expectations/Satisfactory,” “Exceeds Expectations.” A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, “Exemplary”, and “Most Meritorious” based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance.

6.5.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are based on the indicators of Excellence and Effectiveness in Teaching listed in 4.1 and 4.2 above:
- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching.
- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and other indicators noted above.
- Exceeding Expectations – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and other accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- Outstanding – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of a faculty member exceeding expectations. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

6.5.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are based on the indicators of Excellence and Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work listed in 4.3 and 4.4 above:
- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, for example, funding, manuscripts, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.
- Satisfactory – strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, and other factors.
● **Exceeding Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, performances, and invited presentations.

● **Outstanding** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of a faculty member **exceeding expectations**. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

6.5.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are based on the indicators of **Excellence and Effectiveness in Service** listed in 4.5 and 4.6 above:

● **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.

● **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.

● **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.

● **Exceeding Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.

● **Outstanding** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of a faculty member **exceeding expectations**. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

6.6 Required Components
The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of **University Rule 12.01.99.M1**, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.6.1 Faculty member’s report of previous activities.
The exact form of the faculty member’s report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College, but must include the following:

● The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit’s practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.

● The report should incorporate 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 possible content for the report are:
Teaching:
1. List of courses taught
2. High-Impact teaching activities (e.g., study abroad, research and thesis writing, honors courses, writing-intensive courses, critical thinking seminars)
3. Teaching grants and awards
4. Curricular and programmatic contributions
5. Professional development activities (e.g. pedagogical workshop)

Research:
1. Publications
2. Other research (e.g., lectures at other institutions, papers presented at scholarly meetings)
3. Fellowships and awards
4. Work accepted, under review or in progress

Service:
1. Editor of a leading journal
2. Manuscript review for journals and presses
3. Administrative leadership position at university, college, or department level
4. Membership in department, college, university committees
5. Climate-and-Inclusion-related activities

(See Appendix 1, “Department of International Studies Annual Review Form,” for details)

For further examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M1, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

6.6.2 A written document stating the department head’s, program director’s, or supervisor’s evaluation and expectations.
The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or 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 memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member’s unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor 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 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, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member 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/director/supervisor or faculty member.
6.6.4 Performance Assessment.
In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual’s appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University.

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
An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). 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, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 9.2.) 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 (see section 9) 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 (see section 9), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor 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 predetermined milestones are met.

6.8 Time-Line
The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors 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.M1.
There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of University SAP 12.01.99.M1

7. Mid-Term Review
In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of University SAP 12.01.99.M1 (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 mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.

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

This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) 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, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hired</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year 2019</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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/unit director), and departmental faculty.

The Department of International 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, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).

2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (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

Post-Tenure Review will be conducted by the tenured members of the Annual Review Committee, composed as described above (6.2: Annual Review Process), viz., four tenured members elected by the faculty at large, for staggered terms of two years. At least two of the elected tenured members must hold the rank of Professor, and at least one elected tenured member each shall be from the International Studies faculty and from the Classics faculty. The Associate Head serves as an additional member and chair of the committee ex officio, but has no vote except in cases where an elected member is excluded from proceedings (as the subject of the evaluation or due to university nepotism rules). The review of faculty at the rank of Professor will be conducted solely by those members of the committee holding the rank of Professor; if fewer than three Professors are elected to the committee, or if they do not include at least one member each from the International Studies faculty and from the Classics faculty, the Department Head will appoint a third member at the rank of Professor, from the International Studies faculty or the Classics faculty as appropriate, for the purpose of reviewing faculty at that rank.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- Annual Review Report forms for the period under review
- Additional teaching materials (e.g., peer observation reports, syllabi)
- Additional research materials (e.g., copies of publications, concrete evidence of ongoing research not yet published)

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.

---

1 Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.
responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit 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, director, or supervisor, 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 unit 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 unit 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, director, or supervisor 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 unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.2 If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

8.3.8 By no later than May 31st, each unit 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 (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). 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, director, or supervisor 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/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

---

2 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
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 faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what “consultation” means.

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 the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3 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 unit 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, director, or supervisor and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, 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/director/supervisor, 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/director/supervisor, 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, director, or supervisor (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.

See the Dean of Faculties website for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

Contact Office

Department of International Studies, Stefanie Harris, stefanieharris@tamu.edu