

College of Liberal Arts
Department of Literatures and Cultural Studies
Annual Review Assessment Policy

Purpose:

The purpose of this policy is to state the underlying guidelines for meeting annual expectations in the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and professional service/administration for the Department of Literatures and Cultural Studies. For the sake of consistency across reviews for all faculty in the department, this policy is designed to set out guidelines for faculty undergoing review, for the department chair, and for members of the Review Committee so that consistency of review is practiced in the department.

Objective:

This document defines the Department of Literatures and Cultural Studies criteria to meet annual expectations according to HOP ADM 06-502 and Regents' Rule 31102.2.sec. 5. 5.2.

Timeline:

The Annual Review in the Department of Literatures and Cultural Studies follows the same timeline and schedule as the other review processes for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. The Annual Review will be completed along with these reviews. Faculty who are due or applying for Tenure, Promotion, or Post-Tenure review will have the Annual Review and the Tenure, Promotion, or Post-Tenure review completed at the same time and on the same review form. Faculty are required to submit just one dossier each year, even when undergoing multiple reviews. When due for both the Annual Review and a multi-year review such as Tenure and Promotion, Post-Tenure review or Promotion to Full Professor, faculty members should report all relevant achievements since the last dossier submitted for a multi-year review. Work submitted for a previous six-year review cannot be counted twice.

Application of Criteria and Outcomes:

When any faculty member is undergoing multiple reviews, the final evaluative results for the yearly Annual Review do not govern the outcome of other longer-term reviews (for example, Tenure and Promotion final review, Post-Tenure review, promotion to Full Professor review, or promotion to Senior Lecturer review). Faculty applying for promotion and/or Post-Tenure review are subject to the criteria and requirements outlined in the policies approved for such reviews. Thus, regardless of a faculty member's evaluations for Annual Review over a multi-year period, the benchmark criteria established for other reviews must be met in order to Meet Expectations for that particular review.

As per UTRGV guidelines, faculty members who receive a final recommendation of Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory for their Annual Review will be required to meet with the Department Chair and the College Dean to develop an action/remediation plan. This may affect

the schedule for other reviews, particularly the Workload review. Faculty members who receive a final recommendation of Unsatisfactory may also be subject to further review. Faculty who receive a final recommendation of Unsatisfactory for two consecutive years may also be subject to further review and/or appropriate administrative action.

Faculty Dossier Submission Guidelines:

All review dossiers/folders will be submitted through the Faculty Portfolio Tool (FPT). When submitting their materials, faculty members will include all required documentation for the Annual Review in their dossier, including copies of student evaluations of teaching, faculty reports of peer evaluations of teaching, if applicable, copies of tabular summaries, an updated, current CV, and any other documentation required by HOP or Regents' Policy.

To supplement the information that the department chair and the review committee receives via the FPT links, all faculty members will also include in their dossier a brief narrative summary and self-evaluation of their activities in each area (Teaching, Professional Achievement, and Service) since submission of their last review folder so that the review committee and department chair can accurately highlight and report these accomplishments. This narrative will provide members of the departmental review committee and the department chair with a snapshot and clear overview of activities. The narrative should clearly list all relevant professional achievement activities, report all teaching accomplishments and results of student evaluations of teaching, and describe administrative appointments (for example, department chair, program director, graduate/undergraduate advisor, or area/assessment coordinator, etc.) and other service activities. The narrative should also clarify the teaching load as 3/3 or 4/4 (research or teaching workload) and include information about any teaching releases.

In addition, and since different faculty members at different ranks are subject to varying required reviews concerning their research/professional achievement for either Tenure and Promotion and Post-Tenure review, whichever is applicable, it is recommended that faculty provide a “long-view” narrative in their statements that will assist both the department chair and the review committee in making their reviews for the Research/Professional Achievement area on the Annual Review, even when the Annual Review covers only a single year. In years when faculty members are undergoing multiple reviews (Annual Review and Tenure and Promotion Review, Annual Review and promotion to Full Professor, or Annual Review and Post-Tenure Review), a single dossier will be submitted, including all documentation for all achievements since the last multi-year dossier was submitted. The faculty member, in addition to including all required documentation listed above for the multi-year period, will include two short narratives: 1) The first outlining achievements for the previous academic year (for the Annual Review); and 2) The second outlining the progress he/she is making toward tenure or post-tenure during the multi-year period under review (tenure track period or post-tenure period for the Tenure and Promotion or the Post-Tenure Review or the time since last promotion for the promotion to Full Professor or to Senior Lecturer review).

If the review binder appears incomplete, the review committee will contact the faculty member for more materials.

Review Completion Guidelines:

For the sake of consistency across all reviews completed at all levels in the department, both the review committee and the department chair will evaluate each area of review—Teaching, Research/Professional Achievement, and Service—separately using the Criteria outlined below as guidelines and will consider all activities and achievements outlined in the dossier in making their evaluation for each section of the review. If the review binder appears incomplete, the review committee will contact the faculty member for more materials.

When completing the narrative evaluation for **each** area on the report, including the final evaluative statement, both the review committee and the department chair will include in their evaluation for **each** area (Teaching, Research/Professional Achievement, Service, and the Final Evaluative Statement) a sentence articulating whether the faculty member's achievements Meet Expectations, Exceed Expectations, Do Not Meet Expectations, or are Unsatisfactory. This will give faculty members undergoing review a clear idea of the process and will further clarify the final outcome, reflected in the box that is checked indicating whether the activities pertaining to the entire review Meet Expectations, Exceed Expectations, Do Not Meet Expectations, or are Unsatisfactory.

In years when a faculty member is undergoing multiple reviews, both the review committee and the department chair will make separate comments for the Annual Review and for the Tenure, Promotion, or Post-Tenure review on the review form. For example, a first paragraph under each of the narrative comments sections (including the final evaluative statement) will be dedicated to the Annual Review and accomplishments achieved during the previous academic year (and will also include a sentence articulating whether the faculty member's accomplishments Meet Expectations, Exceed Expectations, Do Not Meet Expectations, or are Unsatisfactory), and a second paragraph will be dedicated to an overview narrative of accomplishments and a sentence articulating whether the candidate's achievements Meet Expectations, Exceed Expectations, Do Not Meet Expectations, or are Unsatisfactory concerning the tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, whichever is applicable, for the faculty member. Thus, in addition to providing an evaluation comment for the Annual Review for each area of the review (Teaching, Research, Service, and the Final Evaluative Statement), reviewers will include an additional, separate statement outlining activities and achievements for either the Tenure and Promotion Review, the promotion to Full Professor Review or Senior Lecturer, or the Post-Tenure Review on the Review Form directly following the statements added for that year's Annual Review.

To ensure consistency across all reviews in the department, this format will be required by both the review committee's and the department chair's reviews for all faculty Annual Review forms in which multiple reviews are taking place. This practice will ensure that faculty members who are undergoing multiple reviews will have both a complete Annual Review for every year of employment, and will also have a comprehensive and complete administrative review for other review considerations that may be covered in any academic year review cycle (Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure review) as well.

For other academic years (when only the Annual Review is being completed), the review committee and department chair will write a single paragraph in **each** of the review sections on the form, including the final evaluative statement and will also articulate whether the faculty

member's achievements Meet Expectations, Exceed Expectations, Do Not Meet Expectations, or are Unsatisfactory on the review form.

Criteria for Completing the Teaching Achievement Section/Area of the Review:

Both the department review committee and the department chair will apply the following criteria in determining its evaluation of the teaching achievement activities and accomplishments of each faculty member:

Meets Expectations:

4.0 average on all student evaluations of teaching (not each individual evaluation) by online student evaluations for the period under consideration.

For a faculty member whose course evaluations are under this benchmark, the review committee and department chair will consider additional Teaching Development Activities (see below) in determining if the faculty member Meets Expectations.

Exceeds Expectations:

4.5 average on all student evaluations of teaching (not each individual evaluation) by online student evaluations for the period under consideration.

OR

Faculty member has met the expectations articulated above under Meets Expectations plus has at least two additional Teaching Development Activities, including:

- Teaching a graduate course
- Mentoring graduate students as Teaching Assistants
- Teaching an Independent Study course
- Teaching an Online or Hybrid or ITV course
- Designing a new course for catalog inclusion
- Designing a new topics course
- Developing a Quality Matters online course with COLTT Review
- Participation in activities supported by the COLTT office
- Participation in activities supported by the Center for Teaching Excellence
- Teaching a new course for the first time
- Teaching an Honors course
- Participation at university or other recruitment events/activities
- Activities related to teaching or course/program development
- Attending and presenting material at university curriculum committees
- Teaching-related grant application or grant awards
- Supervising/mentoring graduate or undergraduate research projects
- Serving on a graduate exam or graduate portfolio committee
- Teaching-related presentations
- Teaching writing-intensive courses with focused writing activities

Serving on a Graduate Thesis Committee
Directing a Graduate Thesis Committee
Guest lecturing in another course
Participation in pedagogy-focused workshop
Teaching courses at more than one site
National, Regional, and University-Level Teaching Awards
Teaching Certifications

This list of Teaching Development activities is not exhaustive, and faculty members engaged with other activities or initiatives that augment Teaching should list them and explain their relevance in the self-evaluation narrative.

Does Not Meet Expectations:

Faculty member has not met the expectations articulated above under Meets Expectations.

Faculty members may add a statement explaining why evaluations are below the benchmark to meet expectations. Both the department chair and the review committee will take this statement into consideration and may also speak with faculty members directly to clarify information or to supplement the written statement. Both the department chair and the review committee may determine, based on either the content of the written statement and/or the information gathered, that good cause is present to mitigate the outcome of the annual student evaluations. Should good reasons be presented, the faculty member may receive an evaluation of Meets Expectations, and both the department chair and the review committee will clarify the reasons on the narrative statement added to the Annual Review form for this area.

Unsatisfactory:

The faculty member is well below the Does Not Meet criteria. If the review binder appears incomplete, the review committee will contact the faculty member for more materials.

Criteria for Completing the Research/Professional Achievement Section/Area of the Review:

Since different faculty ranks in the department are subject to different processes for review where research/professional achievement is concerned, the Annual Review of all faculty must be in alignment with these other policies to insure consistent and comprehensive review in this area. As appropriate, the department chair and the review committee will complete the Professional Achievement section of the Annual Review in alignment with the policies and benchmarks established for either Tenure and Promotion or Post-Tenure review.

Both the department review committee and the department chair will apply the following criteria in determining its evaluation of the research/professional achievement activities and accomplishments of each faculty member:

Meets Expectations:

Faculty member has completed 1-3 scholarly products/activities listed on the “Scholarly Products for Evaluation Professional Achievement” section below. Faculty member is also making effective and engaged progress toward any pending required reviews (for example, Tenure and Promotion review or Post-Tenure review) so that the final six-year review for either process will be successful.

Thus, a tenure-track faculty member’s progress toward eventual tenure must be taken into consideration by both the department chair and the review committee in their subsequent reviews for these faculty, and the kind of scholarly products that are appropriate for Meeting Expectations will vary depending on whether a faculty member is a lecturer, on the tenure-track, or tenured.

Note: Faculty applying for Tenure and Promotion, Promotion, and/or Post-Tenure review are subject to the criteria and requirements outlined in the policies approved for such reviews, as applicable. Regardless of a faculty member’s evaluations for Annual Review over a multi-year period, the benchmark criteria established for other reviews must be met in order to Meet Expectations for that particular review. Thus, Meeting Expectations for all years in the Annual Review does not guarantee that a faculty member will Meet Expectations for any Tenure and Promotion, Promotion, or Post-Tenure Review that he/she completes.

Exceeds Expectations:

In a single year, faculty member has completed more than 4 scholarly products/activities listed on the “Scholarly Products for Evaluating Professional Achievement” section below. Faculty member is also making effective and engaged progress toward any pending required reviews (for example, Tenure and Promotion review or Post-Tenure review) so that the final six-year review for either process will be successful. OR

Faculty member has met the expectations articulated above under Meets Expectations, and at least one scholarly product has been published or accepted for publication, or one grant application/proposal has been funded/awarded. OR

For faculty who Meet Expectations according to the benchmarks above, the review committee and department chair may consider substantial submission/s (including submitting a completed monograph or edited collection, annotated book, multiple articles for publication consideration) as Exceeding Expectations. Faculty members who complete a number of other scholarly products that clearly exceeds the benchmark for Meets Expectations may also be considered as Exceeding Expectations. Faculty members should clarify this achievement in their self-evaluation narratives.

NOTE: Faculty members who publish more than one article (or its reasonable equivalent, including a second article, a book monograph, a special issue of a

journal, an edited collection, etc.) in a single year will Exceed Expectations for the year under review and for the following year as well. Faculty members should clarify this achievement in their self-evaluation narratives for the following year.

Does Not Meet Expectations:

Faculty member has not met the expectations articulated above under Meets Expectations.

Unsatisfactory:

The faculty member is well below the Does Not Meet criteria. If the review binder appears incomplete, the review committee will contact the faculty member for more materials.

Scholarly Products for Evaluating Professional Achievement

Note: In the Department of Literatures and Cultural Studies, co-authored publications/grant proposals/presentations, etc count the same as single-authored publications. Forthcoming/in press publications may be counted as published works, but may not be counted again after they appear in print if counted as forthcoming.

Published Books

Published Edited Collections

Published Refereed Articles

Published Book Chapters (including those appearing in published Edited Collections)

Published Introductions (including those appearing in published Edited Collections)

Published Textbooks

Special Issue Editor of an Academic Journal

Refereed multi-media publications or productions

Editor of a book collection

Grant award (internal and external)

Edit a reprinted version of an out-of-print literary work

Edit and bring to publication an archival literary work not previously published

Publish an annotated edition of a previously published literary work

Published Long (article-length) Book Review

Published Concordances or Bibliographies

Published Translations

Encyclopedia Entry

Reference Book Entry

Published Review

Conference Proceeding

Published Non-Refereed Article

Reprint of previously published work

Grant or Fellowship award (internal and external)

Work submitted for publication

Work accepted for publication

Work in progress for publication

- Signing a book contract
- Grant or Fellowship application submitted for consideration
- Conference presentations--national, international, or regional
- Presentation at local venues
- Creative Writing Performances
- Editor of academic or creative journals
- Review of faculty member's previously published work
- Citation of faculty member's previously published work
- Invitations to submit works for publication
- Fellowship application and/or award
- Membership on Editorial Boards
- Conference presentations--national, international, or regional
- Invitations to present research
- Participating on panels, workshops, etc.
- Chairing a panel at a conference/workshop
- National, Regional, and University-Level Research Awards

This list of Scholarly Products is not exhaustive, and faculty members engaged with other activities or initiatives that augment Professional Achievement should list them and explain their relevance in the self-evaluation narrative.

Criteria for Completing the Service Section/Area of the Review:

Both the department review committee and the department chair will apply the following criteria in determining its evaluation of the service activities and accomplishments of each faculty member:

Meets Expectations:

Faculty member has served the university on department, college, university-wide committees, standing and/or elected and/or ad hoc, served as peer observer for teaching effectiveness, advised student organizations, mentored new faculty, etc. or is engaged in service to the profession organizing round tables, panels, judging abstracts for professional meetings, serving as an editorial referee for a professional journal, etc. or faculty member has served the community without remuneration as consultant, presenter, and/or group leader for the discipline in venues such as FESTIBA, HESTEC, B&N discussion groups, in-service teacher trainings, etc.

This list of Service Activities is not exhaustive, and faculty members engaged with other activities or initiatives that augment Service should list them and explain their relevance in the self-evaluation narrative.

Exceeds Expectations:

Faculty member has met the expectations articulated above under Meets Expectations plus has additional accomplishments, including chairing a major committee, serving on multiple department, college, university-wide committees, serving on the departmental Review Committee, mentoring colleagues, serving as

an EDA advocate, serving on the Faculty Senate or College Council, or membership on a committee that meets regularly on the Harlingen campus, awardee of the UTRGV Excellence in Service or Excellence in Mentoring award.

OR

Faculty member has met the expectations articulated above under Meets Expectations plus has additional accomplishments, including serving as the Department Chair or Associate Chair, serving on a Steering Committee or as an Area as a Coordinator in the department, directing an interdisciplinary minor for the college, serving as an Advisor for the major or the one of the tracks represented in the department, or serving as an Assessment or Planning coordinator for the department.

OR

Faculty member has served the profession organizing round tables, panels, judging abstracts for professional meetings, completing external reviews for other institutions, serving as an editorial referee for a professional journal or academic press, etc.

Does Not Meet Expectations:

Faculty member has not met the expectations articulated above under Meets Expectations.

Unsatisfactory:

The faculty member is well below the Does Not Meet criteria. If the review binder appears incomplete, the review committee will contact the faculty member for more materials.

Criteria for Completing the Final Evaluation Section/Area and Final Evaluative Statement of the Review:

Both the department review committee and the department chair will apply the following criteria in determining the Final Evaluation (reflected in the box checked on the Annual Review Form) and the narrative comment for the Final Evaluative Statement section of the review:

A. Exceeds Expectations--such a recommendation is based on a dossier that shows the faculty member exceeds expectations in two or more areas or significantly exceeds expectations in one area during the period under review. Faculty members who Exceed Expectations in the area of Professional Achievement and Meet Expectations in the areas of Teaching and Service also Exceed Expectations for the entire review.

B. Meets Expectations--such a recommendation is based on a dossier that shows the faculty member has met the expectations outlined above in the criteria for two or more areas during the period under review.

C. Does Not Meet Expectations--such an evaluation is based on a dossier that indicates the faculty member has not met the expectations listed above under criteria for two or more of the areas under consideration during the period under review.

D. Unsatisfactory--such a recommendation is based on a dossier that indicates the faculty member's activities and achievements are Unsatisfactory for all of the areas under consideration during the period under review.

To be reviewed on or before September 2027.