

# *History Department*

## Guidelines for Annual Review, Cumulative Review, Tenure, and Promotion: Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Approved by the Office of the Provost March 25, 2024

### Contents

1. Introduction .....	4
1.a. The Purpose of Faculty Review.....	4
1.b. Establishment of Committees .....	5
1.c. Overall Performance Ratings. ....	6
1.d. Guidelines for Peer Observation of Teaching.....	6
1.e. Guidelines for Formative Review.....	9
1.f. Local History/Community Engagement.....	9
1.g. Definitions.....	10
1.g.1. Peer Review. ....	10
1.g.2. Peer Reviewed Journals. ....	10
1.g.3. Judging the impact of Historical Work.....	11
1.g.4. The Nature of Historical Scholarship. ....	11
1.g.5. Editorial Appointments.....	12
1.h. Guidelines for Student Course Evaluation data and Student Comments. ....	12
1.i. Guidelines for Selection of External Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion and Promotion to Full Reviews.....	13
1.i.1. Summary:.....	13
1.i.2. Selection of Reviewers.....	13
1.i.3. The Review Process .....	14
1.i.4. The Role of the External Reviews. ....	14

1.j. Research/Scholarship in Departmental Reviews.....	14
1.j.1. Research: .....	14
1.j.2. Prioritizing Research Activities: .....	15
1.j.2.a. Primary Publications: .....	15
1.j.2.b. Alternative publications.....	15
For evaluation purposes, alternative publications include .....	15
1.j.2.c. Grants:.....	16
1.j.2.d. Other Professional Activities .....	16
1.k. Workload Review .....	16
2. Policies for Tenure-Track Faculty.....	17
2.a.1. Annual Review: Tenure-Track Faculty. ....	17
2.a.1.a. Purpose .....	17
2.a.1.b. Procedure: .....	17
2.a.1.c. Process of Review: .....	18
2.a.1.c.1. Teaching: .....	18
2.a.1.c.2. Research/Scholarship:.....	19
2.a.1.c.3. Service: .....	20
2.a.1.d. Weighting and Workload:.....	20
2.a.1.e. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal .....	21
2.a.2. Third Year Review. ....	21
2.a.3. Promotion to Associate Professor. ....	21
2.a.3.a. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching.....	21
2.a.3.b. Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship .....	23
2.a.3.c. Criteria for Evaluating Service.....	24
3. Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion: Tenured Faculty.....	26
3.a.1. Annual Review Criteria: Tenured Faculty. ....	26
3.a.1.a. Purpose: .....	26
3.a.1.b. Procedure: .....	26
3.a.1.c. Process of Review: .....	27
3.a.1.c.1. Teaching: .....	27
3.a.1.c.2. Research/Scholarship:.....	28
3.a.1.c.3. Service: .....	29

3.a.1.d. Weighting and Workload:.....	30
3.a.1.e. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal .....	30
3.a.2. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation. ....	30
3.a.2.a. Purpose .....	30
3.a.2.b. Procedures .....	31
3.a.2.c. Criteria .....	31
3.a.2.d. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal .....	32
3.a.3. Promotion to Full Professor. ....	32
3.a.3.a. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching.....	32
3.a.3.b. Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship .....	34
3.a.3.c. Criteria for Evaluating Service .....	35
4. Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion: Non-Tenure Track Faculty. ....	36
4.a.1. Non-Tenure Track Faculty, All Ranks: Annual Review Criteria. ....	36
4.a.1.a. Procedure:.....	36
4.a.1.b. Performance Guidelines: .....	37
4.a.1.b.1. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching .....	37
4.a.1.b.2. Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship .....	37
4.a.1.b.3. Criteria for Evaluating Service .....	38
4.a.1.b.4. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal. ....	38
4.a.2. Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Promotion and Renewal Criteria.....	38
4.a.2.a. Procedures .....	38
4.a.2.b. Criteria .....	39
4.a.2.d. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal. ....	39
5. Outcomes, Remediations, and Action Plans.....	39
6. References and Resources.....	39
a.    UTRGV Policies.....	40
b.    UT System Policies and other Texas State Codes .....	40

## 1. Introduction

### 1.a. The Purpose of Faculty Review.

The Annual Review (hereafter, AR) focuses on the individual merit relative to assigned responsibilities for the academic year under review. Put simply, the Annual Review is not the comprehensive periodic evaluation, but instead an examination of a single academic year's accomplishments. Each review level must include a comprehensive written assessment of the faculty member's performance, as well as recommendations for improvement. For tenure track faculty, the AR is part of a cumulative process towards promotion (See ADM 06-503) which states that TT review is cumulative in the sense that it assesses progress towards the goal of T&P over the period of time on the tenure track:

Review Levels – The faculty member will be evaluated at the department committee, chair, college committee, dean, university committee and Provost/VP levels. Each level of review must include a written narrative providing an assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments in each review category, e.g., teaching research and service, unless otherwise specified. In each review category the assessment should highlight the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses over the period of time on tenure-track, as well as areas for improvement. Each level must also provide a recommendation regarding tenure and promotion. (ADM 06-503.D.9.d).

The Annual Review is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. The Annual Review is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas.

The Department of History acknowledges tenure as an important protection for academic freedom, especially since the foundation of our academic culture (and democratic society) rests on the principles of free inquiry, open debate, and “unfettered criticism” of knowledge and institutional practices. UTRGV also supports a periodic review of tenured faculty to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. To this end, the purpose of Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (formerly known as Post-Tenure Review) is to provide guidance for meaningful faculty development, to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals, to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate, and to assure that faculty are meeting their obligations to UTRGV and the State of Texas. At no time shall this Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation policy infringe on the tenure system,

academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights; nor shall it establish a term-tenure system or require faculty to re-establish their credentials for tenure.

The History Department's Faculty Evaluation Policy combines several evaluation processes into a single document: Workload, Peer Review of Teaching, Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion, and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (formerly known as Post-Tenure Review). While the policy is designed to emphasize the interlocking nature of these separate reviews, it is important to remember the differences that distinguish them, particularly in the case of Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion, and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (formerly known as Post-Tenure Review). All three of these reviews examine a faculty member's accomplishments in three performance areas: Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service. When looking at a faculty member's suitability for being granted tenure and/or promotion, the overall ratings (e.g., does not meet, meets, exceeds) generated by Annual Reviews provide a general indication of progress from academic year to academic year, but do not indicate that a faculty member has met or exceeded the established criteria for receiving tenure or being promoted to the next rank. The granting of tenure and promotion must be based on whether the faculty member has met or exceeded the relevant criteria for tenure and promotion specified in this policy.

## 1.b. Establishment of Committees

**Committees and Responsibilities:** During the last half of the Spring semester, the full-time History faculty will elect faculty evaluation committees (hereafter called FECs). These committees are responsible for conducting the faculty performance reviews (Annual, Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (formerly known as Post-Tenure)).

There will be three committees:

- **Tenured and Tenure-Track Evaluation Committee.** This committee will conduct Annual Review evaluations (annual evaluation for tenure-track faculty and all tenured faculty (both Associate Professor and Full Professor), CPE for Associate Professors, 3rd Year Review, and Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor. This committee will consist of five faculty members and an alternate, all tenured, including at least one full Professor. All tenured and tenure-track faculty may vote in this election. (Tenure-track faculty and NTT faculty will not serve on this committee.)
- **Promotion to Full Professor/CPE for Full Professor Committee.** This committee will conduct Promotion to Full Professor evaluations and CPE for Full Professor evaluations. This committee will consist of all eligible full professors, excluding the individual being evaluated. If fewer than five are eligible to serve, then the dean's office will appoint a member from outside the department. Faculty at full rank undergoing CPE may not serve on the CPE committee but may still serve on the promotion to full committee if eligible. (Some full professors may be excluded from membership due to administrative appointments. This would include a department chair at full rank.)
- **Non-tenure-track Evaluation Committee.** This committee will conduct Annual Reviews, Promotion evaluations, and Renewal evaluations for three-year lecturers. It will consist of five

members and one alternate, of whom one will be a three-year lecturer. All full-time faculty members will vote in the election for this committee. (Tenure-track faculty have the option to serve on the Non-tenure-track Committee but are free to decline a nomination.)

**1.b.1. Procedures.** Full-time faculty shall determine by secret ballot the membership of the elected committees. The following restrictions apply:

1.b.1.a. The Department Chair shall not be a member of any of these committees.

1.b.1.b. The committees must be composed exclusively of full-time faculty.

1.b.1.c. Regarding committee selection, the chair will call for nominations for each level of representation during the spring semester in time to conform with the university deadline for committee formation. At the end of the stipulated nomination period, the chair will conduct an anonymous faculty vote, either in person or online. All full-time faculty will vote on committee membership.

1.b.1.d. Although committees are separate and distinct, where eligible, membership may overlap. Eligible members of the NTT evaluation committee might also serve on the tenured and tenure-track evaluation committees and/or the Promotion to Full and CPE for Full evaluation committees.

1.b.1.e. The FECs shall elect their own Chairs.

1.b.1.f. Regarding the departmental representative to the College Committee, this person should be at full rank and will be selected at the time the departmental committees are formed. Only tenured and tenure-track faculty will vote for this person since the committee does not review NTT files.

## **1.c. Overall Performance Ratings.**

Faculty are evaluated for annual review in three separate areas: teaching, research/scholarship, and service. A faculty member who exceeds expectations in two of these three areas and meets or exceeds in the third will exceed expectations overall for the period under review. More particulars are found in the respective policy section of this document for each group of faculty and for each level of review.

## **1.d. Guidelines for Peer Observation of Teaching.**

1.d.1. Purpose: In accordance with institutional policies regarding improved teaching evaluation, the History Department will use these guidelines to inform the peer review evaluation process of teaching.

1.d.2. Objective: The Department of History recognizes the value of both formative and summative evaluation. The formative review is defined here as a content-based evaluation which uses classroom observation and course material review and is primarily designed to improve instruction and encourage best practices.

1.d.3. Procedure: Summaries of the formative evaluation process are generated and linked to the Promotion and Tenure, Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (formerly known as Post Tenure

Review), and Annual Review processes. The summative review process which will be completed annually consists of the submission of statements and materials documenting teaching excellence, summaries of student and peer evaluations and is part of the Annual Review process.

#### 1. Formative Evaluation:

A. Frequency of review for formative feedback and evaluation: Tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers are to be reviewed at least once every three academic years. Tenure-track faculty and Three-Year appointments below the rank of Senior Lecturer are to be reviewed every academic year. One-Year appointments are to be reviewed annually.

#### B. Method:

1. Tenured, tenure track, and Senior Lecturer appointments may choose one of the following options for selection of reviewer(s). The method of review will be noted on the documentation of the formative review.

##### Option 1

Each review cycle will involve reviewers chosen by the faculty member. Reviewers must be minimally at the same rank as the faculty member under review. The formative review consists of three activities: a meeting between instructor and reviewer prior to the review, a review that includes at least one classroom visit and review of course material (syllabi, methods of assessment, assignment sheets, notes, etc.), and a final informal oral discussion between the faculty member being reviewed and the reviewer where the bulk and details of the formative assessment are presented. After the review, a summary of the formative review is generated by the reviewer in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed. The summary should include all three aspects of the formative review described above. The summary of the review is given only to the faculty member being reviewed. According to the peer observation guidelines, the observed faculty should respond to the review with Faculty Member Report which includes responses to the following:

#### A. Elements of the Faculty Member Report:

1. Name and signature of faculty member
2. Name and signature of peer observer
3. Name and course number of observed class
4. Date of any pre-observation meeting
5. Date of observation(s)
6. Date of any post-observation meeting

7. A narrative written by the faculty member describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any plans for improvement or development.

See [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#) and 1.e. (Guidelines for Formative Review) for suggested formative review content

## **Option 2**

Each review cycle will involve one reviewer selected by the reviewed faculty member. Reviewers must be minimally at the same rank as the faculty member under review. The formative review consists of three activities: a meeting between instructor and reviewer prior to the review, a review that includes at least one classroom visit and review of course material (syllabi, methods of assessment, assignment sheets, notes, etc.), and a final informal oral discussion between the faculty member being reviewed and the reviewer where the bulk and details of the formative assessment are presented. After each review, a summary of the formative review is generated by the reviewer in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed. The summary should include all the aspects of the formative review described above. The summary is given only to the faculty member being reviewed. It is entirely up to the faculty member being reviewed as to whether and how the written summaries of the formative reviews are to be used, but at least one such summary from the last three academic years must be included in the faculty member's Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (formerly known as Post Tenure Review) and Annual Review files, and at least one summary from the last two academic years must be included in a faculty member's Promotion and Tenure file. The reviewer(s) will notify the chair when this discussion has occurred. Participation of tenure-track faculty as reviewers is entirely optional. See 8. References and Resources (Guidelines for Faculty Peer Evaluation of Teaching) and 1.e. (Guidelines for Formative Review) for suggested formative review content.

2. Faculty with three-year appointments below the level of Senior Lecturer will be reviewed by tenured or tenure-track faculty members appointed by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed. The summary of the formative review shall be submitted to the Chair and any committee conducting a comprehensive review of the three-year appointment. The summary of the review process shall also be submitted as part of the faculty member's Annual Review file. For one-year appointments, each review will be conducted by the chair, program coordinator, or a faculty member appointed by the chair for the purposes of reviewing one-year appointments.

C. Online Review: Faculty may replace one formative review cycle by participating in an online review of their course using the method employed by the Center for Online Learning and Technology for course reviews which entails applying the QM rubric.

## **2. Summative Evaluation:**



A. Documentation: Each academic year all faculty members will submit as part of their Annual Review file the following items to be reviewed by the elected department Faculty Evaluation Committee: documentation and statements describing teaching and instruction activities from the academic year under review, copies of syllabi, and statistical student evaluation summaries, and a summary of a formative review within the last three academic years.

Results: The results of the summative review will be communicated in writing to both the faculty member being evaluated and the chair of the department. The results will also become part of the faculty member's Annual Review file.

#### 1.e. Guidelines for Formative Review

The reviewing faculty members are expected to consult with the faculty member under review before the classroom observation and evaluation of course materials to discuss the following (suggested) items:

1. Learning objectives for the course
2. Concept behind the design of the course (syllabus to be provided)
3. Teaching philosophy and methods utilized
4. Assessment methods (sample assessment can be provided)
5. Classroom management style

Suggested content for the formative review include:

1. How well the course material and classroom activities align with the learning objectives for the course.
2. Discussion about classroom observation including strengths and/or weaknesses of presentation style, student-instructor and student-student interaction, classroom management, etc.
3. Feedback on assessment methods, syllabus, and other teaching materials
4. Description of overall strengths and weaknesses as an instructor, and general suggestions for improvement

#### 1.f. Local History/Community Engagement

The department encourages faculty involvement with local historical/regional historical organizations because such engagement offers an important avenue for public engagement/dialogue/education, and possible related publications. Innovative public history projects can combine scholarly academic research with professional and public service, providing the faculty with an important opportunity to contribute to our community/communities. Such work will be considered under both the classification of "substantial public history projects" as well as the general categorization of types of professional activity. Similar to grants, there is much variety to public history projects in terms of size and scope.

Examples of public history projects that count towards scholarly activity can include, but are clearly not limited to, the following 1) Organizing and collecting oral history interviews on local topics 2) Creating an on-line archive of nineteenth-century court cases about slavery or other colonial legal records 3) Creating and developing museum exhibits or tours. Assessment of such activity will be through both the FEC (which evaluates scholarly activity for T&P, Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, and AR).

Ultimately, such projects may lead to a publication (index, finding aid, museum exhibits, etc.) through sponsoring agencies such as state/local/regional historical organizations. Faculty are encouraged to include evidence of impact value in their Faculty Portfolio Tool (hereafter FPT) dossiers. The question of whether such activities meet the alternative publication list (and, more specifically, requirements for T&P and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation) will be determined by department review committees.

## 1.g. Definitions.

### 1.g.1. Peer Review.

1. Peer reviewed publishers follow a “double-blind” review process in which submitted manuscripts – once found worthy by the editors – are sent out to two or more recognized experts in the fields engaged by the manuscript.
2. Peer reviewed publishers are those who work with authors throughout the process from submission to ultimate publication by engaging in debate, discussion, and revision with the author(s) in order to ensure a high-quality product that will advance the historiography.

### 1.g.2. Peer Reviewed Journals.

In addition to the above two general characteristics, peer reviewed *journals* tend to share the following three characteristics as well.

1. Because they strive for academic excellence, peer reviewed journals tend to publish between 12 and 16 high-quality and well-vetted articles per year. This being the case, depending on a specific journal’s submission rate, an article may have to wait for a considerable time before being published even after having successfully passed through peer review.
2. Peer reviewed journals tend to have editors and editorial boards that represent a wide variety of respected and well-published scholars drawn from a wide variety of universities and institutions across the United States and/or the World.

Peer reviewed journals do not publish the work of the editors or editorial board members.

### 1.g.3. Judging the impact of Historical Work

According to American Historical Association, “At the same time, even historians inclined toward collaborative work rarely have access to the large multiyear grants that are the hallmark of research conducted in some disciplines. Hence, we do not consider collaborative work or grant-funding per se as evidence of superior scholarship or productivity; we assess our scholarship according to the value of what we produce, not according to its cost.”

“Like other scholars, historians consider articles to be a major form of scholarly production; however, the single-authored book, based on archival research, has been our core intellectual contribution to knowledge. Some of us engage in large, multiyear collaborative research and writing projects, and with the continued development of the digital humanities, such projects will no doubt become more common within the profession. In addition, we continue to diversify the modes of production of our scholarship, and to disseminate that scholarship in various forms. The AHA welcomes these developments, and encourages history departments to establish rigorous peer-review procedures to evaluate new forms of scholarship.”

In regard to journal articles, history as a discipline has a great many topically various journals which meet the definition for “peer review” cited above. With so many journals out there, no one title can amass impact factor scores that would compare with those of articles published in disciplines with fewer and less topically various journals. As a result, the discipline of history generally does not track individual article impact factor scores in determining the value of any given article.

Source: <https://www.historians.org/jobs-and-professional-development/statements-standards-and-guidelines-of-the-discipline/statement-on-productivity>

### 1.g.4. The Nature of Historical Scholarship.

By its very nature, historical research requires extensive primary source investigation that usually necessitates travel to distant archives. Because of the structure of the academic calendar, such travel can often be undertaken only during the summers. In a large and diverse department, this may require research abroad for many scholars. While this is particularly true of those who specialize in regions outside North America, it may also be true for those studying the United States and Mexico. A historian of the Spanish borderlands, for instance, may need to conduct research in Seville, Madrid, or Mexico City while someone studying colonial British North America may need to conduct research in London, Edinburgh, or, closer to home, Boston or Philadelphia. This factor must be considered both by historians when planning research projects as well as by those evaluating scholarly research output and the trajectory of publication.

In addition, factors beyond the control of any one individual may affect the publication process. Rigorous peer evaluation takes time. While some journals, particularly online ones, may have a more rapid publication trajectory, most require far longer. A recent study found that

of 37 articles published in the *American Historical Review*, a flagship journal in the field, between 2015 and 2017, the period from initial submission to final acceptance ranged from 408 days at the lower end to 1259 days at upper end. The average time from submission to final acceptance for these 37 articles was 740 days – more than two years. In addition, the publication process required a further six months after final acceptance. The journal’s editor noted that “While this typical duration of about two years is longer than I would like—a median closer to 500 days would be optimal, in my view—I do not think it is so bad in light of the elaborate [peer review] procedures....” (See: Alex Lichtenstein, “From the Editor’s Desk: The Perils of Peer Review,” *The American Historical Review*, Volume 123, Issue 2, April 2018, Pages xiv–xvii, <https://academic.oup.com/ahr/article/123/2/xiv/4958381?login=true>, and Lincoln Mullen, “How Long Does It Take to Publish in the AHR,” Online Post, 31 July 2018, <https://lincolnmullen.com/blog/how-long-does-it-take-to-publish-in-the-ahr/>).

When evaluating scholarly output within the historical profession, the nature of the research undertaken, the need for travel to archival resources necessary for historical investigation, the predominant practice of single-authored publications, and the nature of the peer review and publication process in historical journals and academic presses publishing historical monographs must all be considered.

#### 1.g.5. Editorial Appointments.

Because history faculty members, at times, serve as editors or members of editorial boards of academic journals, the following guidelines are being provided:

1. No faculty member, in his or her capacity as an editor (or serving in any other editorial capacity), shall publish more than *one* of his or her own works of scholarship within a six-year period (including works in which the faculty member is a co-author or co-editor).
2. Under no circumstances will the majority of a faculty member’s current scholarly production (calculated over a six-year cycle) be published in a journal for which he or she sits as editor or in any other editorial or personnel capacity.
3. No faculty member may serve as the ‘external reviewer’ for any peer reviewed monograph or other manuscript written or edited by a fellow member of the UTRGV history department.

#### 1.h. Guidelines for Student Course Evaluation data and Student Comments.

If not accessible automatically through the tabular summary of teaching in FTP, all full-time faculty members should submit the summary of teaching evaluation scores for each course they taught during the academic year. Faculty members may also submit copies of the written student comments for their classes since these comments are not automatically uploaded into the FTP tabular summaries. The FEC will review student evaluation scores as part of its review. The respective standards regarding review scores and their role in annual evaluations and

performance evaluations appear later in those sections of the departmental guidelines document.

## 1.i. Guidelines for Selection of External Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion and Promotion to Full Reviews.

### 1.i.1. Summary:

In the fall semester of the year before a candidate's final year on the Tenure Track or application for promotion from Associate to Full Professor, the candidate, department chair, and department's Faculty Evaluation Committee (hereafter FEC) will compile a list of at least six names to contact for external reviews of the candidate's Research/Scholarship. These potential reviewers will be contacted during the spring term prior to the candidate's final review year. The external reviews obtained are to be included in the candidates' final year review during the Tenure Track or application for promotion.

### 1.i.2. Selection of Reviewers

During the fall term of the year before a candidate's final review year (normally, Review 5 out of 6) or the year before applying for promotion, the candidate, in consultation with the department chair and present chair of the FEC, will develop a list of at least six potential external reviewers to submit to the committee chair of that year's departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee. When compiling this list, the candidate is strongly encouraged to consult the candidate's mentor, the department's tenured faculty, and the department chair. With the list of potential reviewers the candidate must include their CVs, a brief explanation of why they are appropriate reviewers, and a description of the candidate's previous interactions (if any) with the recommended reviewers, to avoid conflicts of interest. In the context of this policy, conflict of interest is defined as having a close personal relationship or a collaborative professional relationship, such as having been one's advisor, having jointly authored a publication, or having been colleagues in a graduate program or academic department at another institution.

External reviewers should represent senior and distinguished or leading scholars in comparable academic or research fields to that of the candidate.

The department chair should send request letters to external reviewers no later than March 1. By April 1 materials should be sent to reviewers and external evaluations should be returned to the chair by July 15.

The candidate will rank these names, in consultation with the FEC, and send the list to the department chair, who will contact the recommended potential reviewers until either four have agreed to conduct the external review or all names on the list have been contacted. The department chair should send the initial letters to potential reviewers no later than March 1<sup>st</sup>.

### 1.i.3. The Review Process

The external reviewers will provide an evaluation of the candidate's achievements in the category of Research/Scholarship only. The department chair will provide the external reviewers with all evidence of scholarly achievement as provided by the candidate including copies of relevant publications, and a copy of the candidate's CV. The costs associated with all review materials including hardback monographs will be borne by the university and not the candidate. In the official letter which solicits the external review the chair will provide a summary of both the candidate's workload in terms of teaching (class sizes, number of course preparations, etc.) and service, and information about the level of support (travel funds, course releases, etc.) the University had provided to support the candidate's research. External reviewers should address the candidate's record of scholarly contribution. External reviewers should be asked to provide at least a one to two paragraph evaluation of the candidate's research record. Reviewers will send their reviews to the department chair. The candidate will be allowed to see all reviews received in their entirety, but reviewers' anonymity must be preserved. All received reviews *must be included in the FPT dossier*.

It is possible fewer than four reviews will be received in a timely fashion. If the candidate met his or her responsibility in terms of submitting appropriate names for reviewers, the fact that fewer than four reviews are obtained can in no way be held against the candidate.

Once reviews have been chosen for inclusion, the department chair will upload the unredacted reviews using the required method to make them accessible to review committees.

### 1.i.4. The Role of the External Reviews.

The external reviews of a candidate's scholarly accomplishments are intended to be just one facet of the candidate's FPT dossier. They are intended to provide internal reviewers with additional insight into the candidate's research record, but are not to be viewed as more significant than the internal reviews, especially those at the department level where faculty have a richer perspective of the candidate's overall performance in terms of the three areas of review: teaching, Research/Scholarship, and service. As noted above (1.i.3.), the external reviewers will provide an evaluation of the candidate's achievements in the category of Research/Scholarship only.

## 1.j. Research/Scholarship in Departmental Reviews

**1.j.1. Research:** The various departmental reviews examine three important areas of faculty achievement: Teaching, Research/Scholarship (research and publication) and Service. As faculty, our most important responsibility is teaching at the undergraduate and graduate level. However, historically it has been the area of Research/Scholarship that has been most problematical, both in terms of faculty not achieving tenure and in terms of tenured associate professors failing to qualify for promotion to professor.

**1.j.2. Prioritizing Research Activities:** In terms of research, the historical profession prizes most highly the dissemination of new interpretations and information, based on archival research, in the form of scholarly monographs and journal articles.<sup>1</sup> Additional forms of research and publication are recognized, and should be granted credit as appropriate as dictated in section II.B, 2, 3 and 4 below. This policy divides research publications/activities into two categories:

**1.j.2.a. Primary Publications:** scholarly monographs and journal articles that go through a blind, peer-review process;

**1.j.2.b. Alternative publications.**

**For evaluation purposes, alternative publications include**, but are not limited to, the following types of publications

- a. A book chapter in a scholarly anthology;
- b. An annotated, contextualized translation or transcription project<sup>2</sup>;
- c. A conference paper published in a volume of the selected proceedings of a reputable academic conference;
- d. A textbook published by a reputable press or significant contribution to such a textbook;
- e. A substantial public history project.
- f. An edited book published by a reputable university or academic press.

When evaluating Research/Scholarship for the granting of Tenure or for a promotion, co-authored works are acceptable and credit will be given commensurate with the candidate's contributions to the work. With the alternative items under section "2" above, an individual publication or project might count by itself as the equivalent of a refereed article, but depending on the length and review process involved with the publication, it might take two or more alternative publications to be counted as the equivalent of a refereed journal article. Candidates who wish to use one or more publications/projects from the alternative list, or a valuable scholarly project or publication not listed, are strongly advised to make their intentions clear to the department chair (and in the case of tenure-track faculty, to consult their mentor) so that if reviewers have concerns about these publications/projects, those concerns can be raised *before* the candidate has committed a considerable amount of time and effort to these alternative publications/projects. When discussing items from the alternative list in their narratives, faculty members should discuss both the review process through which the piece was evaluated and its scholarly impact.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the American Historical Association Council's "[The 'Productivity' Question: Assessing Historians and Their Work](#)", adopted March 2012.

<sup>2</sup> To be considered for Research/Scholarship, translation projects must include more than the translation of text from one language to another. They must also include extensive annotation, contextualization, and critical analysis.



**1.j.2.c. Grants:** The department recognizes the importance of grants (both internal and external) for funding research. Faculty members are encouraged to apply for grants and such work demonstrates a commitment to professional activity. Since the size and scope of grants varies considerably, distinctions on grants need to be considered and weighed by the FEC (factors such as competitiveness and size of the award). Application efforts at grants that are unsuccessful will be considered as evidence of professional activity, but will not offset the need for the requisite number of publications required of the faculty member. Faculty should include a detailed reviewer report with points and comments from the grant institution in their FPT dossier.

**1.j.2.d. Other Professional Activities:** The department recognizes that faculty engage in many scholarly pursuits indicative of professional activity. Professional activities include attending academic conferences and workshops, applied and engaged scholarship, writing grant proposals, producing scholarly audio-visual or computer based media, editing books or journals, or publishing book reviews, encyclopedia entries, conference proceedings, book chapters, journal articles, textbooks, or monographs.

#### **1.k. Workload Review**

A. Purpose: This policy provides procedures for the Workload Review of all full-time faculty.

B. Objective: Handbook of Operating Procedures Policy Number ADM 06-501 specifies that workloads for individual faculty members will be determined in consultation between the faculty member and the department chair based on program demands. For the purposes of establishing workload weights or equivalencies, each unit, following its established shared governance processes, and in consultation with and subject to the approval of the College dean, shall determine the characteristics and minimum and maximum number of seats for a reference course (three semester credit hours (SCH)) at the lower- and upper-division levels. Factors that may be taken into account include things such as the degree of writing intensity, amount and intensity of individual instruction, amount of preparation required, or other factors that may be identified by the unit. One reference course (3 SCH) shall be considered to account for 10% of a full-time faculty member's annual workload. The actual workload weight of any particular course may vary depending on various workload weights and equivalencies.

C. Flexibility: This policy delineates a process intended to insure that faculty members with active research agendas are given appropriate support in terms of their workload assignments, and that those faculty who do receive a workload adjustments to aid them in their research remain productive in terms of research and publications. Since research agendas may vary widely in structure, scope and timing, this policy is intended to grant flexibility regarding research to those faculty who have active and demonstrable research agendas and to the department chair who is charged with approving or modifying workload assignments. Evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service will take such



variable workload assignments into consideration as part of any and all reviews according to a fixed policy which shall be binding on the Faculty Evaluation Committee each academic year.

## 2. Policies for Tenure-Track Faculty.

### 2.a.1. Annual Review: Tenure-Track Faculty.

**2.a.1.a. Purpose:** The Annual Review focuses on the individual merit relative to assigned responsibilities for the academic year under review. Put simply, the Annual Review is not the comprehensive periodic evaluation, but instead an examination of a single academic year's accomplishments. Each review level must include a comprehensive written assessment of the faculty member's performance, as well as recommendations for improvement. The Annual Review is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. The Annual Review is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas. While this is a discrete annual evaluation in keeping with general guidelines, in the case of Tenure Track faculty the FEC report should note how the current evaluation fits into the overall pattern of past Annual Review reports in order to advise the faculty member concerning progress toward tenure.

### 2.a.1.b. Procedure:

**Committee formation:** In accordance with the new HOP Policy ADM 06-503, ADM 06-504, composition of the FEC *should* be proportionate to the composition of department faculty by rank. At present, the committee should include two full professors, two associates, one assistant, one three-year lecturer, with an alternate at full professor rank (since that individual may have to evaluate members at all ranks).

2. In the fall of each academic year, faculty will submit their FPT dossier of annual review materials in accordance with HOP and the Provost's guidelines.

2. The FPT dossier for Annual Evaluation is released through Workflow several weeks before the submission deadline. The faculty member must compile and submit their FPT dossier, meeting the requirements outlined in Appendix D – Dossier Requirements, by the deadline stated in Pathways.

3. Both the Department Chair and FEC will independently evaluate the FPT dossiers. Both the FEC and the Department Chair must follow the policy when conducting his/her faculty reviews. Each review level must include a comprehensive written assessment of the faculty member's performance, as well as recommendations for improvement.

4. The FEC will send a copy of its evaluation to each faculty member. Faculty who are not in agreement with the evaluation may request a reconsideration (this option is provided as a link in the FPT dossier) in a timeframe and manner stipulated by HOP and the appropriate institutional guidelines. The FEC will then review the original evaluation. The FEC will then make a final evaluation and send it to the candidate.
5. The Department Chair will send a copy of his/her evaluation to each faculty member by means of the built-in features within the FPT review portal. Faculty who are not in agreement with the evaluation may request a reconsideration (by marking “yes” in the request for consideration question in the FPT dossier) in a timeframe and manner stipulated by HOP and the appropriate institutional guidelines. The Chair will then review the original evaluation and make a final evaluation and send it to the candidate.
6. Once the Chair evaluation is complete (including any requests for reconsideration), the FPT dossier is forwarded to the Dean of the College.

### 2.a.1.c. Process of Review:

Below is a rubric that describes, in general terms, what constitutes the four levels of performance in the three areas of review. This policy does not include numeric reviews. This policy emphasizes that faculty who are doing their jobs competently should be rated as “*Meets Expectations*,” and only faculty with exceptional levels of performance should be listed in the “*Exceeds Expectations*” category. Scholarly activities such as publications, conference participation, manuscript review, grant writing, book reviews, etc. will count towards one’s Annual Review evaluation. To emphasize: faculty have a demanding job balancing the three areas of review, and the University has high expectations for faculty performance. Accordingly, a rating of “*Meets Expectations*” is indicative of considerable successful effort on a faculty member’s behalf. A faculty member can exceed expectations overall if they exceed expectations in two of three categories while at least meeting expectations in the third category.

#### 2.a.1.c.1. Teaching:

Baseline: *Meets Expectations*: faculty members who meet expectations teach assigned classes, conform to University policies that relate to teaching, typically receive student evaluation numbers that average between 80 and 90, make routine adjustments to course content (changing exams, adjusting PowerPoint presentations, etc.), and have assignments for courses consistent with Departmental recommendations.

*Exceeds Expectations*: faculty members exceed expectations if they typically receive student evaluations that average above 90% and go beyond normal expectations, including some combination of the following activities: develop or teach a new course/courses, make

substantial revisions to courses they have previously taught, if they teach beyond their normal workload assignment (participate in a team-taught class, taking over a course from an ill colleague, have a substantial number of “overload” students in their classes, etc.), if they serve on a significant number of Master’s thesis committees (especially when serving as committee chair), if they conduct extensive mentoring of undergraduate students, if they utilize innovative teaching pedagogies (service learning, team-taught classes, learning communities, study abroad, on-line teaching). The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider time, effort, and quality of teaching activities rather than merely quantity.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* faculty members do not meet expectations if they do not conform to University policies that relate to teaching, typically receive student evaluation numbers that average below 80%, make minimal or no efforts to update course materials, have not had a peer evaluation of teaching during the time period mandated by department policies and/or have assignments for classes inconsistent with Departmental recommendations.

*Unsatisfactory:* faculty members are unsatisfactory if they seriously violated university policies that pertain to teaching and student/faculty relationships, are seriously negligent in their teaching responsibilities (not grading and returning assignments, have frequent unexcused absences from class, etc.), or are significantly unsuccessful at covering course content.

### 2.a.1.c.2. Research/Scholarship:

The Department recognizes that faculty engages in a number of scholarly pursuits indicative of professional activity. Professional activities include attending academic conferences and workshops, writing grant proposals, producing scholarly audio-visual or computer-based media, editing books or journals, or publishing book reviews, encyclopedia entries, conference proceedings, book chapters, journal articles, textbooks, or monographs.

Baseline: *Meets Expectations:* faculty members meet expectations if they demonstrate progress with planned research for the academic year in review OR if they have demonstrated productivity by engaging in three or more of the “Other Professional Activities” cited in 1.j.2.d.

*Exceeds Expectations:* if they publish research in an academic venue as described in section 1.j. above.. Note that faculty members who have published a refereed journal article, book, or book chapter, or had a book manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable university or academic press will automatically exceed expectations for that year. Note that thus, for a monograph, faculty can exceed expectations for two consecutive academic years (when revisions are completed and the book is accepted by the publisher, and the book is published, if those are separate academic years). By excelling in a number of professional activities in a given year, a faculty member may exceed expectations. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider time, effort, and quality of research activities rather than merely quantity.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* faculty members do not meet expectations if they do not demonstrate progress with planned research for the academic year in review OR if they have not demonstrated productivity in three or more of the “Other Professional Activities” cited in 1.j.2.d..

*Unsatisfactory:* Faculty members are unsatisfactory if they meet the criteria for “Does Not Meet Expectations” for two or more academic years in a row.

### 2.a.1.c.3. Service:

Baseline: Meets Expectations: faculty members meet expectations if they regularly attend departmental meetings, actively participate in assigned departmental committees, contribute to the effective faculty governance of the department, and perform service for at least one other level—university, community, professional.

*Exceeds Expectations:* faculty members exceed expectations when they meet the criteria for “Meets Expectations” and demonstrate significant levels of college, university, community, and /or professional service. Additionally, faculty members who hold administrative positions exceed expectations if they perform the duties of that position effectively and meritoriously.<sup>3</sup> The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider time, effort, and quality of service activities rather than merely quantity.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* faculty members do not meet expectations if their attendance at departmental meetings is poor (for reasons other than legitimate scheduling conflicts) and/or if their contributions to assigned departmental committees are deemed weak by FEC.<sup>4</sup>

*Unsatisfactory:* faculty members are unsatisfactory if they make no discernible positive contributions to departmental governance, and/or if they have no significant service commitments to the college, university and community.

### 2.a.1.d. Weighting and Workload:

The FPT dossier will include the faculty member’s Workload percentages for the year, and these will be factored into their evaluation. The standard Workload breakdown is 60% teaching, 20% research/scholarship, and 20% service for T/TT faculty and 80% teaching and 20% service for lecturers. The “Best Practices for Creating and Revising Department Evaluation Guidelines”

---

<sup>3</sup> In this respect, “meritoriously” suggests that the faculty member significantly contributed to a department/college/university committee, above and beyond expectations. For example, the individual not only served on a committee or in an administrative role but provided exceptional service exceeding that of other members of the committee or the expectations of the role.

<sup>4</sup>“Weak” contributions to committee work includes if the faculty member fails to respond/contribute to committee interchange or is habitually absent from any committee meetings.

document states: *A Department Evaluation Guidelines document must specify how expectations relate to differentiated workloads, and what methodology will be used to account for different workload allocations in teaching, research, and service.*

The FEC will weight evaluations based on the percentage workloads specified in the Workload document for the year under evaluation. If a faculty member receives a reduction in teaching workload and a corresponding increase in research/scholarship or service workload, the FEC must weigh their evaluations in accordance (higher research/scholarship or service and lower teaching). Evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service will take such variable workload assignments into consideration as part of any and all reviews according to a fixed policy which shall be binding on the Faculty Evaluation Committee each academic year.

#### 2.a.1.e. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal

Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal are detailed in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-503 and 06-504 Appendix E, 2.d. (Request for Reconsideration) and Appendix E, 2.e. (Appeal).

#### 2.a.2. Third Year Review.

HOP ADM 06-503 states: “The third (3rd) year review will follow the procedures of an annual tenure-track evaluation, with the addition of a review by the college tenure and promotion committee after the department chair’s review.”

This is a cumulative review covering the entire tenure-track period to this time. Within the History Department, in the 3rd year review, tenure-track candidates will be expected to have demonstrated that they are making progress toward tenure (a) through satisfactory annual reviews in previous years and (b) through meeting the stipulated benchmarks in their research agenda that will lead towards successfully earning tenure.

When reviewing the files of third year tenure-track candidates, the committee should undertake a cumulative evaluation that considers progress in teaching, research, and service as demonstrated through previous annual evaluations and that evaluates research progress in terms of the stipulated benchmarks in that candidate’s research agenda. This should include some discussion of the candidate’s overall progress towards tenure, including specific recommendations for improvement during the remainder of the probationary period.

#### 2.a.3. Promotion to Associate Professor.

##### 2.a.3.a. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

Evidence and evaluation of teaching shall be based on multiple criteria. Faculty submitting tenure and promotion portfolios are encouraged to provide a broad range of evidence to document their teaching, and reviewers should consider this breadth of evidence when making their evaluation. Evidence of teaching may include but is not limited to a number of activities and accomplishments. The following list is not exhaustive nor are the items listed in any order or preference. To be considered eligible for tenure, a tenure-track faculty member must submit a portfolio of items selected from the list that documents successful teaching during the probationary period, with an understanding that not all tenure-track faculty members will have the opportunity to fulfill all the options listed.

- a.** Student evaluations of teaching, noting that both for annual review and promotion purposes an average score exceeding 90% is typically required for exceeds expectations and an average score exceeding 80% is typically required for meets expectations.
- b.** Peer evaluations of teaching (at least one for each year by the time a faculty member stands for the final tenure and promotion review).
- c.** Contributions to curriculum and course development through teaching a diversity of classes.
- d.** Design and implementation of writing assessments and learning outcomes assessments.
- e.** Use of innovative teaching methods, such as reduced-seat classes, online classes, technology-enhanced instruction, team-taught classes, learning communities, service learning, and study abroad classes.
- f.** Efforts to increase student retention and success, balanced with appropriate rigor and grading practices (such as participation in the Early Warning System, attendance at workshops focusing on student success, changes to pedagogies designed to improve retention rate).
- g.** Awards and Honors of teaching excellence.
- h.** Participation in the Rafael and Carmen Guerra Honors Program.
- i.** Mentoring of students, including, but not limited to teaching assistants, undergraduate and graduate students who make presentations at state/regional/national conferences, graduate students writing a thesis, and undergraduate students working on an Honors thesis.

- j. Professional development in the area of teaching, for example attending a workshop on pedagogy, participating in training for on-line classes, etc.
- k. Demonstration of current and comprehensive knowledge of pedagogy and developments in relevant historical fields, such as attendance at professional teaching development seminars, integration of new material into courses, pedagogical research activities, publication of course materials, attending conferences, faculty development opportunities, interdisciplinary collaborations, and other workshop opportunities.
- l. Involvement in student mentoring; faculty should include in their supporting documentation a list of the students mentored.

### 2.a.3.b. Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship

By the date of the tenure-review for a candidate, the majority of work must either be in print or in press. Work that is accepted and forthcoming is subject to review and verification.

To qualify for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, faculty must produce a body of scholarly, peer-reviewed publications. If a faculty member is applying for tenure and promotion based on a series of shorter publications – as opposed to a scholarly monograph – then the majority of those publications should be published in venues that follow a blind peer-review process. Candidates should indicate the method of review used for each publication. Co-authored publications are acceptable, but the candidate must also show evidence of sole-authored research. Candidates may publish in a related discipline, but most of their publications must be in the discipline of history.

Assessment of a tenure-track faculty member's record in Research/Scholarship will be based on substantial original contributions to scholarship. By the date of the tenure-review for a candidate, the majority of work must either be in print or in press. Work that is accepted and forthcoming is subject to review and verification.

The standard for the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor is either:

1. A scholarly monograph published by a reputable university or academic press;
2. Four articles in refereed academic journals; or
3. Three articles in refereed academic journals together with one or more alternative publications from the following list:

- i.** A book chapter in a scholarly anthology;
- ii.** An annotated, contextualized translation or transcription project;
- iii.** A conference paper published in a volume of the selected proceedings of a reputable academic conference;
- iv.** A textbook published by a reputable press or significant contribution to such a textbook;
- v.** A substantial public history project.
- vi.** An edited book published by a reputable university or academic press;
- vii.** Submission of a positive scored external grant application. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with external grant opportunities in their areas of scholarship and apply for appropriate grants to support their research projects.
- viii.** A combination of conference presentations, publication of book reviews in scholarly journals, and activities that help educate the general public about history (public lectures, appearing in a documentary, op-ed pieces, being interviewed by the press, etc.).

When evaluating Research/Scholarship for the granting of tenure and promotion, co-authored works are acceptable, and credit will be given commensurate with the candidate's contributions to the work. With the alternative items listed above, an individual publication or project might count by itself as the equivalent of a refereed article but depending on the length and review process involved with the publication it might take two or more alternative publications to be counted at the equivalent of a refereed journal article. Candidates who wish to use one or more publications/projects from the alternative list, or a valuable scholarly project or publication not listed, are strongly advised to make their intentions clear, in a timely fashion. When discussing items from the alternative list in their narratives, faculty members should discuss both the review process through which the piece was evaluated and its scholarly impact.

When assessing scholarly achievement, the reviewing committee will consider the quality of the publications, not just the quantity of publications. E-publications will be considered the equivalent of traditional publications if their length and the review process they undergo are commensurate.

### 2.a.3.c. Criteria for Evaluating Service.

The Department recognizes the important role of faculty service in advancing the mission of the university. However, tenure-track faculty should be careful not to over-commit in service, to the detriment of their performance in the areas of Teaching and Research/Scholarship. Tenure-track faculty are encouraged to consult with their mentor and the Department chair concerning appropriate levels of service activities.



Evaluation of faculty's record in the area of service will be based on the activities listed below. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to list and describe professional service activities in a manner that enables reviewers to determine the scope and intensity of the activities. To meet the minimum standard for tenure, the candidate must show evidence of participation in three of the four categories. The faculty member should submit details of the work contributed to each committee.

- a. Service to the Department: including but not limited to serving as a member or officer of a standing or ad hoc Departmental committee, advising a student organization, mentoring new faculty, and/or holding one of the Department's administrative posts.
- b. Service to the College or University: including but not limited to serving as a member or officer of a standing or ad hoc College/University committee or taskforce, advising a non-Departmental student organization, serving on the College Council or Faculty Senate, and holding one of the College/University's administrative posts.
- c. Service to the Community: including but not limited to active participation in discipline-related community organizations, participation in local boards and committees in the area of disciplinary expertise, work activity related to public schools and educational organizations, professional consulting in the community, presentations/workshops within the community, providing free expertise to non-profit organizations, and participation in Community-oriented programs and festivals (e.g. HESTEC, International Week, FESTIBA).
- d. Service to the Profession: including but not limited to editing or reviewing articles or manuscripts for publication by a scholarly journal or press; writing book reviews<sup>5</sup>; organizing, chairing, or service as commentator or respondent on a panel at an academic conference; serving as an officer of a professional organization; active membership in professional and educational associations; participation at professional meetings; participation on boards and committees of professional organizations; assistance to professional groups, organizing seminars, workshops etc.; and reviewing grant applications for a recognized grant organization.

The above lists are not exhaustive nor are the items listed in any order of preference.

---

<sup>5</sup> \*If considered under research, book reviews may not be credited as professional service.

### 3. Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion: Tenured Faculty.

#### 3.a.1. Annual Review Criteria: Tenured Faculty.

##### 3.a.1.a. Purpose:

The Annual Review focuses on the individual merit relative to assigned responsibilities for the academic year under review. Put simply, the Annual Review is not the comprehensive periodic evaluation, but instead an examination of a single academic year's accomplishments. Each review level must include a comprehensive written assessment of the faculty member's performance, as well as recommendations for improvement. The Annual Review is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. The Annual Review is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas.

##### 3.a.1.b. Procedure:

Committee formation: In accordance with the new HOP Policy ADM 06-503, ADM 06-504, composition of the FEC *should* be proportionate to the composition of department faculty by rank. At present, the committee should include two full professors, two associates, one assistant, one three-year lecturer, with an alternate at full professor rank (since that individual may have to evaluate members at all ranks).

1. In the fall of each academic year, faculty will submit their FPT dossier of annual review materials in accordance with HOP and the Provost's guidelines.
2. The FPT dossier for Annual Evaluation is released through Workflow several weeks before the submission deadline. Faculty need to complete the summaries of activities for each category of evaluation: teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Faculty at the associate and lecturer levels also need to complete the summary of professional goals section. Supporting documents need to be attached. FPT dossiers should include syllabi, personal CVs (optional), and peer evaluation of teaching (if conducted during the AY).
3. Both the Department Chair and FEC will independently evaluate the FPT dossiers. Both the FEC and the Department Chair must follow the policy when conducting his/her faculty reviews. Each review level must include a comprehensive written assessment of the faculty member's performance, as well as recommendations for improvement.

4. The FEC will send a copy of its evaluation to each faculty member. Faculty who are not in agreement with the evaluation may request a reconsideration (this option is provided as a link in the FPT dossier) in a timeframe and manner stipulated by HOP and the appropriate institutional guidelines. The FEC will then review the original evaluation. The FEC will then make a final evaluation and send it to the candidate.

5. The Department Chair will send a copy of his/her evaluation to each faculty member. Faculty who are not in agreement with the evaluation may request a reconsideration (by marking “yes” in the request for consideration question in the FPT dossier) in a timeframe and manner stipulated by HOP and the appropriate institutional guidelines. The Chair will then review the original evaluation and make a final evaluation and send it to the candidate.

6. Once the Chair evaluation is complete (including any requests for reconsideration), the FPT dossier is forwarded to the Dean of the College.

### 3.a.1.c. Process of Review:

Below is a rubric that describes, in general terms, what constitutes the four levels of performance in the three areas of review. This policy does not include numeric reviews. This policy emphasizes that faculty who are doing their jobs competently should be rated as “*Meets Expectations*,” and only faculty with exceptional levels of performance should be listed in the “*Exceeds Expectations*” category. Scholarly activities such as publications, conference participation, manuscript review, grant writing, book reviews, etc. will count towards one’s Annual Review evaluation. To emphasize: faculty have a demanding job balancing the three areas of review, and the University has high expectations for faculty performance. Accordingly, a rating of “*Meets Expectations*” is indicative of considerable successful effort on a faculty member’s behalf. A faculty member can exceed expectations overall if they exceed expectations in two of three categories while at least meeting expectations in the third category.

#### 3.a.1.c.1. Teaching:

Baseline: *Meets Expectations*: faculty members who meet expectations teach assigned classes, conform to University policies that relate to teaching, typically receive student evaluation numbers that average between 80 and 90, make routine adjustments to course content (changing exams, adjusting PowerPoint presentations, etc.), and have assignments for courses consistent with Departmental recommendations.

*Exceeds Expectations*: faculty members exceed expectations if they typically receive student evaluations that average above 90% and go beyond normal expectations, including some combination of the following activities: develop or teach a new course/courses, make substantial revisions to courses they have previously taught, if they teach beyond their normal

workload assignment (participate in a team-taught class, taking over a course from an ill colleague, have a substantial number of “overload” students in their classes, etc.), if they serve on a significant number of Master’s thesis committees (especially when serving as committee chair), if they conduct extensive mentoring of undergraduate students, if they utilize innovative teaching pedagogies (service learning, team-taught classes, learning communities, study abroad, on-line teaching). The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider time, effort, and quality of teaching activities rather than merely quantity.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* faculty members do not meet expectations if they do not conform to University policies that relate to teaching, typically receive student evaluation numbers that average below 80%, make minimal or no efforts to update course materials, have not had a peer evaluation of teaching during the time period mandated by department policies and/or have assignments for classes inconsistent with Departmental recommendations.

*Unsatisfactory:* faculty members are unsatisfactory if they seriously violated university policies that pertain to teaching and student/faculty relationships, are seriously negligent in their teaching responsibilities (not grading and returning assignments, have frequent unexcused absences from class, etc.), or are significantly unsuccessful at covering course content.

### 3.a.1.c.2. Research/Scholarship:

The Department recognizes that faculty engages in a number of scholarly pursuits indicative of professional activity. Professional activities include attending academic conferences and workshops, writing grant proposals, producing scholarly audio-visual or computer-based media, editing books or journals, or publishing book reviews, encyclopedia entries, conference proceedings, book chapters, journal articles, textbooks, or monographs.

Baseline: *Meets Expectations:* faculty members meet expectations if they demonstrate progress with their planned research for the academic year in review OR if they have demonstrated productivity by engaging in three or more of the “Other Professional Activities” cited in this document.

*Exceeds Expectations:* faculty members exceed expectations if they publish research in an academic venue as described above. Note that faculty members who have published a refereed journal article, book, or book chapter, or had a book manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable university or academic press will automatically exceed expectations for that year. Note that thus, for a monograph, faculty can exceed expectations for two consecutive academic years (when revisions are completed and the book is accepted by the publisher, and the book is published, if those are separate academic years). By excelling in a number of professional activities in a given year, a faculty member may also exceed expectations. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider time, effort, and quality of research activities rather than

merely quantity. While this is a discrete annual evaluation in keeping with general guidelines, in the case of all faculty the FEC report should note how the current evaluation fits into the overall pattern of past Annual Review reports in order to advise the faculty member concerning progress toward future promotion.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* faculty members do not meet expectations if they cannot demonstrate progress with their planned research for the academic year in review and if they have not demonstrated productivity in three or more of the “Other Professional Activities” cited above.

*Unsatisfactory:* Faculty members are unsatisfactory if they meet the criteria for “Does Not Meet Expectations” for two or more academic years in a row.

### 3.a.1.c.3. Service:

Baseline: Meets Expectations: faculty members meet expectations if they regularly attend departmental meetings, actively participate in assigned departmental committees, contribute to the effective faculty governance of the department, and perform service for at least one other level—university, community, professional.

*Exceeds Expectations:* faculty members exceed expectations when they meet the criteria for “Meets Expectations” and demonstrate significant levels of college, university, community, and /or professional service. Additionally, faculty members who hold administrative positions exceed expectations if they perform the duties of that position effectively and meritoriously.<sup>6</sup> The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider time, effort, and quality of service activities rather than merely quantity.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* faculty members do not meet expectations if their attendance at departmental meetings is poor (for reasons other than legitimate scheduling conflicts) and/or if their contributions to assigned departmental committees are deemed weak by FEC.<sup>7</sup>

*Unsatisfactory:* faculty members are unsatisfactory if they make no discernible positive contributions to departmental governance, and/or if they have no significant service commitments to the college, university and community.

---

<sup>6</sup> In this respect, “meritoriously” suggests that the faculty member significantly contributed to a dept./college/university committee, above and beyond expectations. For example, the individual not only served on a committee or in an administrative role but provided exceptional service exceeding that of other members of the committee or the expectations of the role.

<sup>7</sup>“Weak” contributions to committee work includes if the faculty member fails to respond/contribute to committee interchange or is habitually absent from any committee meetings.

### 3.a.1.d. Weighting and Workload:

The FPT dossier will include the faculty member's Workload percentages for the year, and these will be factored into their evaluation. The standard Workload breakdown is 60% teaching, 20% research/scholarship, and 20% service for T/TT faculty and 80% teaching and 20% service for 3-year lecturers. The "Best Practices for Creating and Revising Department Evaluation Guidelines" document states: *A Department Evaluation Guidelines document must specify how expectations relate to differentiated workloads, and what methodology will be used to account for different workload allocations in teaching, research, and service.*

The FEC will weight evaluations based on the percentage workloads specified in the Workload document for the year under evaluation. If a faculty member receives a reduction in teaching workload and a corresponding increase in research/scholarship or service workload, the FEC must weigh their evaluations in accordance (higher research/scholarship or service and lower teaching). Evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service will take such variable workload assignments into consideration as part of any and all reviews according to a fixed policy which shall be binding on the Faculty Evaluation Committee each academic year.

### 3.a.1.e. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal

Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal are detailed in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-503 and 06-504 Appendix E, 2.d. (Request for Reconsideration) and Appendix E, 2.e. (Appeal).

## 3.a.2. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation.

### 3.a.2.a. Purpose

The Department of History acknowledges tenure as an important protection for academic freedom, especially since the foundation of our academic culture (and democratic society) rests on the principles of free inquiry, open debate, and "unfettered criticism" of knowledge and institutional practices. UTRGV also supports a periodic review of tenured faculty to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. To this end, the purpose of Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (formerly known as Post-Tenure Review) is to provide guidance for meaningful faculty development, to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals, to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate, and to assure that faculty are meeting their obligations to UTRGV and the State of Texas. At no time shall this Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (formerly known Post-Tenure) policy infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights; nor shall it establish a term-tenure system or require faculty to re-establish their credentials for tenure.

### 3.a.2.b. Procedures

1. All tenured faculty members are to be evaluated annually (AR), with a comprehensive evaluation performed every six academic years after the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation. The six-year evaluation is to include evaluation of all three areas of professional responsibility (Research/Scholarship, teaching, and professional service) taken as a whole. The Department of History recognizes that different faculty may contribute to the university, profession, and community in different but equally valuable ways.
2. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit a curriculum vita, including a summary of professional accomplishments, periodic peer and student evaluations of their teaching, and the annual evaluations from the six-academic year review period. Faculty members may also submit any other materials they deem to be appropriate.
3. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to meet with the FEC, if desired. The results of the FEC's evaluation shall be communicated in writing via FPT to the faculty member being reviewed and the chair. The chair shall conduct an independent review. The results of both the FEC and chair evaluations shall be communicated in writing to both the faculty member being reviewed and the dean.

### 3.a.2.c. Criteria

The criteria the Department of History has set shall be the same used for Annual Review, namely the final evaluation of a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory must be based on all three areas of evaluation (Research/Scholarship, teaching, and professional service) taken as a whole. The Department of History recognizes and values the fact that different faculty may choose to dedicate more time and effort to any of the three areas of review and that the differential availability of resources may create differential patterns of performance.

Evaluations in all three areas of review should be congruent with the annual review rankings a faculty member received during the period under review. Note, however, that in the area of Research/Scholarship the Annual Review rankings can result in "Meets Expectations" if a faculty member is making appropriate progress with their planned research, yet it is possible that the target publication(s) have not yet been accepted for publication at the point the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation is conducted, which would result in a "Does not Meet Expectations" result. By the date of the comprehensive periodic review for a candidate, the majority of scholarly work must either be in print or in press. Work that is accepted and forthcoming is subject to review and verification.

The publishing expectation for those tenured faculty on a research track is a minimum two peer-reviewed articles in six academic years (or one article and the equivalent of an article

made up from publication(s) from the alternative publications list (see 1.j.2.b.). Faculty on a 4/4 teaching load should meet a minimum standard of one peer-reviewed article (or the equivalent of an article made up from publication(s) from the alternative publications list (see 1.j.2.b.)).

Workload Consideration: The expectation for publication for those on a 10% workload commitment is one peer reviewed publication within the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation period. Although rare, someone with a 30% research workload would then need to have three articles within the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation period whereas someone with a 10% workload (on a 4:4 teaching load) would need one peer-reviewed article. Someone who has a 5-year average of 22.5% research workload, for instance, would need two published articles and evidence of a third one under way. As indicated above, the standard expectation for someone with a 20% research workload is two peer reviewed articles within the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation period.

### 3.a.2.d. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal

Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal are detailed in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-503 and 06-504 Appendix E, 2.d. (Request for Reconsideration) and Appendix E, 2.e. (Appeal).

### 3.a.3. Promotion to Full Professor.

#### 3.a.3.a. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

To be eligible for promotion from associate to full professor in the category of teaching, the faculty member must submit a teaching portfolio that documents continued commitment to excellence in teaching since promotion to associate professor, covering at least the previous six academic years.

Evidence and evaluation of teaching shall be based on multiple criteria. Faculty submitting tenure and promotion portfolios are encouraged to provide a broad range of evidence to document their teaching, and reviewers should consider this breadth of evidence when making their evaluation. Evidence of teaching may include but is not limited to a number of activities and accomplishments. The following list is not exhaustive nor are the items listed in any order or preference. To be considered eligible for promotion to full professor, a tenured faculty member must submit a portfolio of items selected from the list that documents successful teaching since the previous promotion, with an understanding that not all faculty members will have the opportunity to fulfill all the options listed.

- a. Student evaluations of teaching, noting that for both annual review and promotion purposes an average score exceeding 90% is typically required for exceeds expectations and an average score exceeding 80% is typically required for meets expectations.



- b. Peer evaluations of teaching (at least one for every three year period since becoming tenured, up to the time that a faculty member stands for promotion to full professor).
- c. Contributions to curriculum and course development through teaching a diversity of classes.
- d. Design and implementation of writing assessments and learning outcomes assessments.
- e. Use of innovative teaching methods, such as reduced-seat classes, online classes, technology-enhanced instruction, team-taught classes, learning communities, service learning, and study abroad classes.
- f. Efforts to increase student retention and success, balanced with appropriate rigor and grading practices (such as participation in the Early Warning System, attendance at workshops focusing on student success, changes to pedagogies designed to improve retention rate).
- g. Awards and Honors of teaching excellence.
- h. Participation in the Rafael and Carmen Guerra Honors Program.
- i. Mentoring of students, including, but not limited to teaching assistants, undergraduate and graduate students who make presentations at state/regional/national conferences, graduate students writing a thesis, and undergraduate students working on an Honors thesis.
- j. Professional development in the area of teaching, for example attending a workshop on pedagogy, participating in training for on-line classes, etc.
- k. Demonstration of current and comprehensive knowledge of pedagogy and developments in relevant historical fields, such as attendance at professional teaching development seminars, integration of new material into courses, pedagogical research activities, publication of course materials, attending conferences, faculty development opportunities, interdisciplinary collaborations, and other workshop opportunities.
- l. Involvement in student mentoring; faculty should include in their supporting documentation a list of the students mentored.

### 3.a.3.b. Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship

Assessment of a faculty member's record in Research/Scholarship will be based on substantial original contributions to scholarship. By the date of the promotion review for a candidate, the majority of work must either be in print or in press. Work that is accepted and forthcoming is subject to review and verification.

To qualify for promotion to the rank of full professor, faculty must produce a body of scholarly, peer-reviewed publications that includes at least one published monograph. The majority of these publications should be published in venues that follow a blind peer-review process. Candidates should indicate the method of review used for each publication. Co-authored publications are acceptable, but the candidate must also show evidence of sole-authored research. Candidates may publish in a related discipline, but most of their publications must be in the discipline of history.

For promotion from associate professor to professor, only work not counted towards the previous promotion can be counted. By the date of the promotion-review for a candidate, the majority of work must either be in print or in press. Work that is accepted and forthcoming is subject to review and verification.

The standard for promotion to the rank of professor is an historical monograph published by a reputable university or academic press. However, if a faculty member has previously published such a monograph, either before coming to UTRGV or as part of their tenure probationary period, they may meet the criteria for promotion to Professor by publishing four articles in refereed academic journals or three such articles and a combination of the following alternative items deemed the equivalent of a refereed journal article:

- A. A book chapter in a scholarly anthology;
- B. An annotated, contextualized translation or transcription project;
- C. A conference paper published in a volume of the selected proceedings of a reputable academic conference;
- D. A textbook published by a reputable press or significant contribution to such a textbook;
- E. A substantial public history project.
- F. An edited book published by a reputable university or academic press.

When evaluating Research/Scholarship for promotion, co-authored works are acceptable, and credit will be given commensurate with the candidate's contributions to the work. With the alternative items listed above, an individual publication or project might count by itself as the equivalent of a refereed article but depending on the length and review process involved with the publication it might take two or more alternative publications to be counted at the equivalent of a refereed journal article. Candidates who wish to use one or more

publications/projects from the alternative list, or a valuable scholarly project or publication not listed, are strongly advised to make their intentions clear in a timely fashion. When discussing items from the alternative list in their narratives, faculty members should discuss both the review process through which the piece was evaluated and its scholarly impact.

When assessing scholarly achievement, the reviewing committee will consider the quality of the publications, not just the quantity of publications. E-publications will be considered the equivalent of traditional publications if their length and the review process they undergo are commensurate.

### 3.a.3.c. Criteria for Evaluating Service

The Department recognizes the important role of faculty service in advancing the mission of the university.

To be eligible for promotion from associate to full professor in the category of service, the faculty member must submit a service portfolio that documents continued commitment to excellence in service since promotion to associate professor, covering at least the previous six academic years.

Evaluation of faculty's record in the area of service will be based on the activities listed below. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to list and describe professional service activities in a manner that enables reviewers to determine the scope and intensity of the activities.

To meet the minimum standard for promotion to full professor, the candidate must show evidence of sustained participation in three of the four categories. The faculty member should submit details of the work contributed to each committee.

- a. Service to the Department: including but not limited to serving as a member or officer of a standing or ad hoc Departmental committee, advising a student organization, mentoring new faculty, and/or holding one of the Department's administrative posts.
- b. Service to the College or University: including but not limited to serving as a member or officer of a standing or ad hoc College/University committee or taskforce, advising a non-Departmental student organization, serving on the College Council or Faculty Senate, and holding one of the College/University's administrative posts.
- c. Service to the Community: including but not limited to active participation in discipline-related community organizations, participation in local boards and committees in the area of disciplinary expertise, work activity related to public

schools and educational organizations, professional consulting in the community, presentations/workshops within the community, providing free expertise to non-profit organizations, and participation in Community-oriented programs and festivals (e.g. HESTEC, International Week, FESTIBA).

- d. Service to the Profession: including but not limited to editing or reviewing articles or manuscripts for publication by a scholarly journal or press; writing book reviews<sup>8</sup>; organizing, chairing, or service as commentator or respondent on a panel at an academic conference; serving as an officer of a professional organization; active membership in professional and educational associations; participation at professional meetings; participation on boards and committees of professional organizations; assistance to professional groups, organizing seminars, workshops etc.; and reviewing grant applications for a recognized grant organization.

The above lists are not exhaustive nor are the items listed in any order of preference.

## 4. Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion: Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

### 4.a.1. Non-Tenure Track Faculty, All Ranks: Annual Review Criteria.

As teaching faculty with a 4-4 load, the standard lecturer workload is 80% teaching and 20% service unless otherwise approved by the chair and dean. While research naturally informs teaching, lecturers are teaching faculty and are therefore not required to provide evidence of research/scholarship activities. Lecturers should include their workload form with their FPT dossier submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee in the fall. When a lecturer is going up for promotion, all previous years will be reviewed by the FEC since the period of the last promotion or initial hire.

#### 4.a.1.a. Procedure:

Annual review of lecturers will be conducted following HOP guidelines for FPT dossier submission and workflow (relevant HOP policy pending). Regarding workload and evaluation criteria, lecturers who have a 0% workload distribution in research or service in any given year will be deemed to have met expectations in that area for the period under review. Those with other non-standard workload distributions will have category weights adjusted proportional to their workload distribution for that year.

---

<sup>8</sup> \*If considered under research, book reviews may not be credited as professional service.

## 4.a.1.b. Performance Guidelines:

### 4.a.1.b.1. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

*Meet Expectations:* Faculty members who meet expectations teach assigned classes, conform to University policies that relate to teaching, typically receive student evaluation numbers that average in the agree/strongly agree categories equal or greater than 80% but less than 90%,, and have the required number of Peer Teaching Observations which indicate reflection and improvement attempts for teaching as judged by those reviewing the FPT dossier. They should also make routine adjustments to course content (changing exams, adjusting PowerPoint presentations, etc.) or have assignments for courses consistent with Departmental recommendations.

*Exceed Expectations:* Faculty members who exceed expectations teach assigned classes, conform to University policies that relate to teaching, typically receive student evaluation numbers that average in the agree/strongly agree categories equal or greater than 90%, have required number of Peer Teaching Observations which indicate reflection and improvement attempts for teaching as judged by those reviewing the FPT dossier, develop new courses or make substantial revisions to courses they have previously taught, if they teach beyond their normal workload assignment (participate in a team-taught class, taking over a course from an ill colleague, have a substantial number of “overload” students in their classes, etc.), if they serve on a Master’s thesis or content exam committee, if they conduct mentoring of undergraduate students, if they utilize innovative teaching pedagogies (service learning, team-taught classes, learning communities, study abroad), or in other ways go beyond normal expectations.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* faculty members do not meet expectations if they do not conform to University policies that relate to teaching, typically receive student evaluation numbers in the agree/strongly agree categories that average below 80%, make minimal or no efforts to update course materials, have not had a peer evaluation of teaching during the time period mandated by department policies and/or have assignments for classes inconsistent with Departmental recommendations.

*Unsatisfactory:* faculty members are unsatisfactory if they seriously violated university policies that pertain to teaching and student/faculty relationships, are seriously negligent in their teaching responsibilities (not grading and returning assignments, have frequent unexcused absences from class, etc.), or are significantly unsuccessful at covering course content.

### 4.a.1.b.2. Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship

Given changes to Regents’ Rules on the matter that exclude scholarship from the "Lecturer" title and define them as teaching faculty, there are no research expectations for teaching

faculty. Any research will EXCEED expectations, including such activities as conference activity, book reviews, journal articles, book chapters, etc.

#### 4.a.1.b.3. Criteria for Evaluating Service

*Meet Expectations:* Regularly attend departmental meetings and actively participate in assigned departmental committees AND additional service to the University (College or University activities, Assessment, Student Organization, etc.) OR annual service to either the community involving the individual's professional training and/or competence (such as presentation locally at FESTIBA or HESTEC, etc.) OR the profession (such as serving on national organization's committees, reviewing articles for a journal, assisting in editing for a professional newsletter, blog, etc.).

*Exceed Expectations:* Service on TWO DEPARTMENT committees or more AND additional service to the University (College or University activities, Assessment, Student Organization, etc.) AND annual service to the community OR annual services to the profession OR multiple services to either the community involving the individual's professional training and/or competence or the profession.

*Does Not Meet Expectations:* faculty members do not meet expectations if their attendance at departmental meetings is poor (for reasons other than legitimate scheduling conflicts) and/or if their contributions to assigned departmental committees are deemed weak by FEC.

*Unsatisfactory:* faculty members are unsatisfactory if they make no discernible positive contributions to departmental governance, and/or if they have no significant service commitments to the college, university and community.

#### 4.a.1.b.4. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal.

Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal are detailed in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-503 and 06-504 Appendix E, 2.d. (Request for Reconsideration) and Appendix E, 2.e. (Appeal).

### 4.a.2. Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Promotion and Renewal Criteria.

#### 4.a.2.a. Procedures

4.a.2.a.1. All non-tenured faculty members are to be evaluated annually (AR), with a comprehensive evaluation performed every three academic years after the last successful comprehensive review for contract renewal and/or promotion. The three-year evaluation FPT dossier is currently structured to include evaluation of Research/Scholarship, teaching, and professional service, but standard lecturer workload at UTRGV is currently 80% teaching and 20% service. Research accomplishments may be considered when reviewing FPT dossiers for lecturer renewal or promotion, but, given that lecturer workload does not require research, the absence of such will not adversely affect the lecturer contract renewal and/or promotion process.

4.a.2.a.2. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit a curriculum vita, including a summary of professional accomplishments, annual peer and student evaluations of their teaching, and the annual evaluations from the three-academic year review period. Their FPT dossier should also include documentation for any other accomplishments in teaching, service, or research. Faculty members may also submit any other materials they deem to be appropriate.

4.a.2.a.3. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to meet with the FEC, if desired. The results of the FEC's evaluation shall be communicated in writing via FPT to the faculty member being reviewed and the chair. The chair shall conduct an independent review. The results of both the FEC and chair evaluations shall be communicated in writing via FPT to both the faculty member being reviewed and the dean.

#### 4.a.2.b. Criteria

4.a.2.b.1. The criteria the Department of History has set shall be the same for Annual Review, Renewal and Promotion, namely the final evaluation of a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory must be based on all three areas of evaluation (teaching, research/scholarship, and professional service) taken as a whole. As noted above, the standard lecturer workload at UTRGV is 80% teaching and 20% service; the absence of research accomplishments will not adversely affect either the renewal or the promotion process.

4.a.2.b.2. Evaluations in all three areas of review should be congruent with the annual review rankings a faculty member received during the period under review.

4.a.2.b.3. Overall assessment for both Renewal and Promotion:

*Exceeds expectations:* Must exceed expectations in Teaching and one other area (either service or scholarship) and meet expectations in the third.

*Meets expectations:* The candidate must at least meet expectations in teaching and service.

*Does not meet expectations:* A ranking of *does not meet expectations* will be awarded should a person not meet expectations in teaching but at least meets expectations in service.

*Unsatisfactory:* A ranking of *unsatisfactory* will be awarded should a person not meet expectations in both teaching and service.

#### 4.a.2.d. Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal.

Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal are detailed in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-503 and 06-504 Appendix E, 2.d. (Request for Reconsideration) and Appendix E, 2.e. (Appeal).

### 5. Outcomes, Remediations, and Action Plans.

Requests for Reconsideration and Appeal are detailed in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-503 and 06-504 Appendix E, 2.d. (Request for Reconsideration) and Appendix E, 2.e. (Appeal).

### 6. References and Resources.

a. UTRGV Policies

- [Tenured Faculty Evaluation \(ADM 06-504\)](#)
- [Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments \(ADM 06-503\)](#)
- HOP ADM 06-503 and ADM 06-504 Appendices
  - [Appendix A, Department Evaluation Guidelines](#)
  - [Appendix B, Evaluation Categories and Standards](#)
  - [Appendix C, Definitions of Performance Ratings](#)
  - [Appendix D, Dossier Requirements](#)
  - [Appendix E, Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review](#)
- ~~[Annual Faculty Evaluation \(ADM 06-502\)](#)~~
- [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#)
- [Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers](#)

b. UT System Policies and other Texas State Codes

- [The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 10901, Statement of U. T. System Values and Expectations](#)
- [The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 30501, Employee Evaluations](#)
- [The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31001, Faculty Appointments and Titles](#)
- [The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member](#)
- [The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31102, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)
- [Texas Education Code Section 51.942, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)
- [Texas Government Code Section 552.102, Public Information Exception: Confidentiality of Certain Personnel Information](#)