



**College of Liberal Arts
Department of History
Faculty Evaluation Policy**

**Workload, Peer-Review of Teaching, Annual Review/Merit,
Tenure, Promotion, Post Tenure**

Contents

<u>I. Introduction</u>	<u>p. 2</u>
<u>II. Research/Scholarship and Research in Departmental Reviews</u>	<u>p. 3-4</u>
<u>III. Establishment of Committees</u>	<u>p. 4</u>
<u>IV. Research Plans and Workload Review</u>	<u>p. 4-6</u>
<u>V. Peer Review of Teaching</u>	<u>p. 6-8</u>
<u>VI. Annual Review</u>	<u>p. 8-11</u>
<u>VII. Tenure and Promotion</u>	<u>p. 11-16</u>
<u>VIII. Post-Tenure Review</u>	<u>p. 16-17</u>

I. Introduction

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 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 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 numbers 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.

II. Research/Scholarship in Departmental Reviews

A. 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. To address this issue, all tenured and tenure-track History faculty are required to develop and maintain an approved Research Plan (see [section IV](#), below) that is part of their Six Year Growth Plan.

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

2. Alternative publications, including (but not limited to):

- a. A book chapter in a scholarly anthology;
- b. An annotated, contextualized translation or transcription project²;
- 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, in a timely fashion, in their Research Plan (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.

3. 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 weighted 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 the dossier.

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

² 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.

4. 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.

III. Establishment of Committees

A. Committees and Responsibilities: During the last half of the Spring semester, the History Department's tenured and tenure-track faculty will elect the *Faculty Evaluation Committee* (hereafter, FEC). The FEC is responsible for conducting the faculty performance reviews (Annual, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure), reviewing faculty Six Year Growth Plans that discuss Teaching, Research, and Service ([section IV](#), below) and making recommendations to the chair concerning applications for additional course releases for research.

B. Procedures: Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty shall determine by secret ballot the membership of the FEC. The following restrictions apply:

1. The Department Chair shall not be a member of the FEC.
2. The FEC must be composed exclusively of tenured faculty. The number of committee members will be determined by the department, but should consist of an odd number of members. Applicants for promotion to Professor must be reviewed by a committee consisting entirely of tenured Professors (it may be desirable to establish an alternative committee for consideration of applications for promotion to professor).
3. The FEC shall elect its own Chair.

IV. Research Plans and Workload Review

A. Purpose: This policy provides procedures for the Workload Review of tenured faculty. The Workload review will be used to determine whether a tenured faculty member in the Department of History will be assigned a "Teaching Load" (four classes each fall and spring term) or a "Research Load" (three courses each fall and spring term). Faculty on a Teaching Load are still expected to maintain an active research agenda, albeit at a reduced schedule in terms of publication in addition to excelling in teaching.

B. Objective: The standard assignment for all tenure-track faculty should be a Research Load. All faculty, when first granted tenure and promoted to associate professor, should normally be continued on a Research Load. The purpose of the Workload Review is to determine if tenured faculty have been productive in terms of scholarly publications sufficient to be continued on a Research Load or to be placed on a Research Load if previously assigned a Teaching Load.

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 plans to those faculty who have active and demonstrable research agendas and to the FEC and department chair charged with approving or modifying them.

D. Assignments: A tenured faculty member may always request to be placed on a 4/4 teaching load, which reduces expectations in terms of publications. Faculty who choose to be placed on a 4/4 teaching load must stay on that load for at least one academic year and apply to the Chair to change their workload status. A tenured faculty member is eligible to be placed on a 3/3 research load by submitting and maintaining satisfactory progress on an approved Research Plan as described in sections E and F of this Policy.

E. The Research Plan and Schedule of Reviews:

1. All tenured and tenure-track faculty must have a Research Plan that is part of their Six Year Growth Plan. Tenure track faculty must have their research plans approved by the chair. All research plans are reviewed by the FEC, which makes recommendations to the chair. Tenure track Research Plans must be designed to ensure that the faculty member meets or exceeds the requirements for tenure and promotion, and should focus heavily on primary publications (see Section II, above); Research Plans for tenured associate professors should ideally be designed to meet the requirements for promotion to professor in a timely fashion, and should also emphasize primary publications. Tenured faculty are encouraged to discuss their research plans with the chair and to indicate whether they intend to seek promotion to full professor.

2. Establishing a Research Plan: During their first term at UTRGV, tenure-track faculty should work with their mentor and the Department chair to develop a Research Plan, which should be submitted to the FEC as part of their Six Year Growth Plan for their first tenure review. The Research Plan should address the schedule of research, necessary financial support, and the target publication(s); additionally, it should provide clear benchmarks in order to be able to demonstrate annual progress on the agenda. The Research Plan should indicate a publishing agenda for those tenured faculty on a research track of 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 pg. 4, B.2. 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 pg. 4, B.2.](#)

3. The FEC reviews submitted Research Plans and should work with faculty when the Committee feels plans need revision. Once the FEC has reviewed a Research Plan, it forwards the Committee's recommendations to the Department Chair. The Chair reviews the Research Plan and determines faculty teaching load. Once a faculty member's Research Plan has been approved, the faculty member should be given an appropriate teaching/work load. The chair may implement teaching/workload revisions based on the faculty member's Research/Scholarship achievements.

4. Annual Updates and Reviews: Each Fall, during the period covered by the Research Plan, the faculty member will submit a progress report to the Departmental FEC as part of the faculty member's Annual Review dossier. This report should include the approved plan and a summary of the faculty member's progress, including whether targeted benchmarks have been met or exceeded. While the emphasis should be on the period covered by the approved Research Plan, if appropriate the faculty member should indicate how the research project will progress during the period after the current six-year period ends.

5. A faculty member may make changes to the Research Plan at his/her discretion. Changes to a Research Plan do not restart the clock on accountability. Faculty will need to demonstrate that they have met their objectives by the end of their tenure or post-tenure review period, and should be careful of making changes to Research Plans that hinder progress to such goals.

F. Research Plan Review:

a. During the Fall semester, as part of the Annual Review process, the FEC will review faculty Research Plans and progress reports from faculty members to determine whether or not a faculty member has reached established benchmarks, and will make a recommendation as to whether or not the faculty member should be continued on a research load or shifted to a teaching load. A Committee should not recommend moving a faculty member to a teaching load based on a single academic year where the faculty member has not reached an established benchmark in the Research Plan, but instead should note its concerns to the faculty member in question and make recommendations that will help the faculty member stay on track to complete the project. A Research Plan which projects publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal (or the equivalent) every three academic years meets the criteria for approval. Therefore, the Research Plan should reflect a successful publishing agenda for those on

a research track of two published 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 pg. 4, B.2. 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 [pg. 4, B.2](#). The criteria for approval of a research plan for a Full Professor shall be the same. The Committee's recommendation will be forwarded to the Department Chair for review.

b.The FEC may recommend shifting a faculty member to a teaching load if the faculty member has not met established benchmarks for two or more academic years covered by the Research Plan. The Chair determines each faculty member's workload.

c.When reviewing a faculty member's progress toward completion of the Research Plan, the FEC should take into account factors that affect the faculty member's progress, including personal circumstances that might impede progress (disability or illness of the faculty member; status of the faculty member as a principal caregiver of a preschool child, etc.).

The Chair's Review: After receiving the recommendations of the FEC, the Department chair will conduct an independent review of faculty members' Research Plans and progress reports. The Department Chair should use this policy when conducting his/her faculty reviews. Should the Chair disagree with a recommendation from the FEC, the Chair will work with the Committee and the Faculty member in question and attempt to reach an agreement. The Chair's final recommendation determines each faculty member's workload.

G. Appeal:

1. Before faculty evaluation materials are forwarded to the dean, if the faculty member is not satisfied with the department level outcome, she/he may request a review by a College Annual Review Committee, who will make a recommendation to the dean. The dean's decision is final. For a detailed appeal process, see HOP [ADM 6-502](#)

v. Peer Review of Teaching

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. 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 is primarily designed to improve instruction and encourage best practices. Summaries of the formative evaluation process are generated and linked to the Promotion and Tenure, Post Tenure Review, and Annual Review processes. The summative review process which will be completed annually consists in the submission of statements and materials documenting teaching excellence, summaries of student and peer evaluations and is part of the Annual Review process.

A. Formative Evaluation

1. Frequency of review for formative feedback and evaluation

- a.**Tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers are to be reviewed at least once every three academic years
- b.**Tenure track faculty and Three Year Appointments below the rank of Senior Lecturer are to be reviewed every academic year
- c.**One year appointments are to be reviewed annually

2. Method

- a.**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. It is entirely up to the faculty member being reviewed as to whether and how the written summary of the formative review is to be used, but at least one such summary from the last three academic years must be included in the faculty member's Post Tenure Review and Annual Review files. See [Appendix I](#) for suggested formative review content and see the Provost's [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#).

Option 2

Each review cycle will involve two reviewers, one selected by the reviewed faculty member and one who is appointed in some way other than simple self-selection. Reviewers must be minimally at the same rank as the faculty member under review. The typical procedure shall be that the chair suggests three faculty members to serve as reviewers and the faculty member being reviewed shall pick one of the three suggested faculty. The formative reviews 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 summaries of the two reviews are 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 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 appendix I for suggested formative review content. 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.

b. 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.

c. 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.

d. 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. .

B. Summative Evaluation

a. 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.

b. 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.

VI. Annual Review

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.

B. Procedure:

1. In the Fall of each academic year, faculty will submit their dossier of annual review materials in accordance with HOP and the provost's guidelines.

2. The dossier should include:

- a.** A brief statement of professional accomplishments in each of the three categories for the past academic year (no more than a single page for each category);
- b.** An abbreviated current *curriculum vitae*;
- c.** Updated tabular summaries (e.g., Summary of Teaching Evaluations, Summary of Teaching Achievement, Summary of Research/Scholarships, Summary of Service) for the previous academic year;
- d.** The statistical summaries of student evaluations of teaching from the previous academic year;
- e.** Peer evaluations of teaching as per the department or college and University Guidelines
- f.** A Six Year Growth Plan that covers Teaching, Service, and Research/Publication and corresponds to the department's guidelines/criteria.
- g.** A copy of course syllabi for each course taught during the academic year under review.

3. Both the Department Chair and FEC will independently evaluate the dossiers. Both the FEC and the Department Chair should consult 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.

C. 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 request must be submitted to the FEC chair in writing within ten calendar days after receipt of the evaluation. The FEC will then review the original evaluation. The FEC will then make a final evaluation and send it to the candidate.

D. 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. This request must be submitted to the Department

Chair in writing within ten calendar days after receipt of the evaluation, or 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.

E. The annual evaluation forms will be forwarded by the Department Chair to the Dean of the College.

F. The History Department uses the following four point scale to rate faculty in each of the three areas of review (Teaching , Research/Scholarship, Service). Note that ratings assigned faculty are not limited to whole numbers (a faculty member may receive a rating of 3.2, for example). It should be noted that per [HOP ADM 06-505 D3.e](#), “Meeting these basic evaluation requirements/criteria does not ensure tenure or promotion.”

<u>Category</u>	<u>Value</u>
Exceeds Expectations	4.0
Meets Expectations	3.0
Does Not Meet Expectations	2.0
Unsatisfactory	1

G. Below is a rubric that describes, in general terms, what constitutes the four levels of performance in the three areas of review. The actual awarding of numbers is, of necessity, based on the reviewers’ subjective judgment of candidates’ performance levels (the exception being the publication requirement for receiving a 4.0 in Research/Scholarship). This policy emphasizes that faculty who are doing their jobs competently should be rated as “Meets Expectations” (with a numerical score from 3.0 to 3.9), and only faculty with exceptional levels of performance should be listed in the “Exceeds Expectations” category. Scholarly activities such as conference participation, manuscript review, grant writing, book reviews, etc. will count towards one’s Annual Review score. *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.*

1. Teaching :

Baseline: *Meets Expectations:* faculty members who meet expectations teach assigned classes, conform to University policies that relate to teaching, receive student evaluation numbers within one standard deviation of Departmental averages (based on the average from the five-point scale on the course evaluations), 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 receive student evaluations more than one standard deviation above Departmental averages (based on the average from the five-point scale on the course evaluations), 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 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), 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, receive student evaluation numbers more than one standard deviation below Departmental averages, 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. 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 have met all of the measurable objectives set in their Research Plan for the academic year in review OR if they have demonstrated productivity by engaging in at least three of the “Other Professional Activities” cited in II.B.4

Exceeds Expectations: faculty members exceed expectations if they have met all of the measurable objectives set in the Research plan for the academic year in review, and if they publish research in an academic venue as described in [section II.B](#) of this policy. Note that to achieve the maximum score of 4.0 in the area of Research/Scholarship faculty members must have published a refereed journal article or book, or had a book manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable university or academic press. Note that thus, for a monograph, faculty can receive a 4.0 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).

Does Not Meet Expectations: faculty members do not meet expectations if they cannot document that they have met the measurable objectives set in their Research Plan plan for the academic year in review and if they have not demonstrated productivity in at least three of the “Other Professional Activities” cited in II.B.4.

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. 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.³

³ 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

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.⁴

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.

H. Weighting

A faculty member's overall rating will be based on a weighted average of the three numerical scores awarded for Teaching Research/Scholarship, and Service. The weights assigned will be based on a faculty member's workload assignment based on the formulas below. T = Teaching, R= Research. S = Service, and F = Flexible. After conducting its review, the FEC should add T, R, and S scores collectively to total 90%. The FEC should add the remaining 10% (the flexible F score) to whichever category a faculty member scored highest in.

Standard Three course load: T 35%, R 35%, S 20%, F 10%.

Four course teaching load: T 45%, R 25%, S 20%, F 10%.

One course teaching load with two releases for service (example: the Department Chair): T 30%, R 20%, S 35%, F 15%.

Two course teaching load with release for service: T 35%, R 25%, S 30%, F 10%.

Two course teaching load with release for research: T 25%, R 45%, S 20%, F 10%.

The above formula should cover most faculty's workload assignments. If a faculty member has two different workload assignments during the two terms of a single academic year, then average the weighting of the two appropriate formulas. Should a faculty member have an assignment not covered above, the faculty member should work with the Department Chair to establish a mutually-acceptable formula for weighting the areas of review.

I. Appeal

If a faculty member disagrees with the recommendation of the FEC and/or the Department chair, the faculty member may request a review by a College Annual Review Committee, who will make a recommendation to the dean. The dean's decision is final. For a detailed appeal process, see [HOP ADM 6-502](#).

VII. Tenure and Promotion

In keeping with University policy (H.O.P), the History Department has developed the following tenure and promotion guidelines in order to clarify performance requirements in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. All HOP guidelines for tenure and promotion procedures take precedent. Those powers and procedures not specifically dictated in HOP are reserved for the History Department.

administrative role, but provided exceptional service exceeding that of other members of the committee or the expectations of the role.

⁴"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.

A. Procedures

1. Each academic year, in accordance with the Tenure Evaluation Calendar, the FEC and Department Chair will independently and successively evaluate a faculty member's performance and provide the faculty member with the following:

- a. written evaluation of noted strengths and/or areas for improvement in performance;
- b. recommendation to reappoint on tenure-track or remove from tenure-track;
- c. recommendation for consideration for tenure when appropriate.

2. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to demonstrate consistent progress toward the achievement of tenure. To facilitate this progress, the faculty member will have a conference with the Department Chair **each academic year** at the conclusion of the tenure evaluation process to discuss perceived strengths/weaknesses, possible means of improvement, and prospects for reappointment and continuation to final tenure review. This conference may include the faculty member's mentor or other advisor.

3. All faculty members' principal responsibilities are teaching, Research/Scholarship, and professional service. Faculty undergoing tenure and/or promotion reviews will be evaluated in all three areas.

4. Candidates applying for consideration for early tenure and promotion must do so in compliance with *H.O.P.*

B. Performance Guidelines

1. To be considered for tenure, a tenure-track faculty member must meet the department's requirements for tenure and promotion. The minimum requirements are established in this policy. The University of Texas System links the award of tenure with promotion to associate professor; consequently, the criteria for both are identical for faculty placed on tenure track with the rank of assistant professor.

2. The FEC and the Department Chair, in their respective reviews, will evaluate a tenure-track faculty member's performance for the previous academic year in each of the three areas of review, and note the strengths and weakness in each area. In the final probationary year, tenure-track faculty will receive a review based on the faculty member's performance over the entirety of the probationary period.

3. To be eligible for tenure, a tenure-track faculty member must meet or exceed the minimum standards established in this policy. Meeting the minimum requirements does not guarantee the award of tenure or promotion to associate professor, but failure to meet them makes a candidate ineligible for promotion and tenure.

4. A tenure-track faculty member must meet or exceed teaching, publication, and service requirements as established in this policy during the probationary period. As noted in the [HOP ADM 06-505 D.c](#) "The purpose of promotion at UTRGV is to recognize and reward faculty records of sustained professional accomplishments and potential for future performance that contribute to UTRGV's mission and to establishing UTRGV as an emerging research institution." Accomplishments in teaching, Research/Scholarship, and professional service completed prior to appointment at UTRGV may be considered as evidence of a candidate's potential for future performance but will not be used as the sole criteria for awarding tenure.

C. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

1. 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 within or above the standard deviation of Departmental averages (based on the average from the five-point scale on the course evaluations).
- 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. Promotion from Associate to Professor

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, using the same criteria listed above.

A. Criteria for Evaluating Research/Scholarship

1. 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.
2. 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 on the basis of 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 the majority of their publications must be in the discipline of history.

3. 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.

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

- a.** A scholarly monograph published by a reputable university or academic press;
- b.** Four articles in refereed academic journals; or
- c.** 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.).

5. 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 the granting of tenure and 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.

6. 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 "5" 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, in their Professional Growth Plan (and in the case of tenure-track faculty, to consult their mentor)

7. 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.

B. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching: Please follow [section VII. C](#) above.

C. Criteria for Evaluating Service

1. 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 the area of 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.

2. 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; 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.

3. 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, using the same criteria listed above.

VIII. Post-Tenure Review

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 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 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.

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 PTR. 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, the annual evaluations from the six-academic year review period, and their approved Research Plan for the period under review. 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 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.

C. Criteria

1. The criteria the Department of History has set shall be the same used for Annual Review (see section VI). The final evaluation of a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; 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.

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. 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 according to the faculty member’s Research Plan, yet it is possible that the target publication(s) have not yet been accepted for publication at the point the PTR is conducted, which would result in a “Does not Meet Expectations” result.

D. Appeal

A faculty member may appeal a Post-Tenure Review decision, following the procedures outlined below:

1.If a faculty member disagrees with the recommendation of the FEC and/or the Department chair, the faculty member may request a review by the Department’s tenured faculty, meeting as a committee of the whole; this committee will include the members of the FEC and the Department Chair. Before the file is forwarded to the dean, if the faculty member is not satisfied with the department level outcome, he/she may request a review by a College Annual Review Committee, who will make a recommendation to the dean. The dean’s decision is final. For a detailed appeal process, see HOP [ADM 6-502](#).

2.The Departmental tenured faculty shall review the recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair, and the appeal of the faculty member. The tenured faculty may either endorse one or both of the previous reviews or make a separate recommendation of their own. Once the tenured faculty have made their recommendation, all three recommendations are then forwarded to the Dean.

Appendix I: 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

Appendix II – 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, PTR, 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 folders. The question of whether such activities meet the alternative publication list (and, more specifically, requirements for T&P and PTR) will be determined by department review committees

Appendix III – Peer Review

General Definition of “Peer Review” in Academic Publishing

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.

Definition of “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.
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.
3. Peer reviewed journals do not publish the works of the editors or the editorial board members.

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.

Appendix IV

Selection of External Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion

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.

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 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 said 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 1st.

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 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 add the reviews, together with a current CV of the reviewers, into the candidate's final review dossier after the candidate has submitted that dossier to the department chair, and before the dossier is submitted to the tenure and promotion committee during the candidate's final review year.

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 dossier. They are intended to provide internal reviewers with some additional insight into the candidate's 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.