Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
Department of Global Languages and Cultures

College of Arts and Sciences approved: 10/24/2025
Approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs: 10/24/2025

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Global Languages and Cultures is to provide research, teaching, and service to the campus, community, state, university, and the various disciplines represented in the department. The department seeks to advance humanities-based ways of understanding the flows of peoples, communities, goods and knowledge around the world through research and teaching in languages and cultures. The department also seeks to advance, refine, and disseminate knowledge of the languages, literatures, and cultures of the ancient Mediterranean world and its heritage.

Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Global Languages and Cultures for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom; hence the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (University Rule 12.01.99.M1). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01 Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	https://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M1.pdf
12.06.99.M1 - Post-Tenure Review	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf
Faculty Affairs Annual Evaluation and Mid-Term Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/annual-evaluation-and-mid-term-review.html
Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/promotion-tenure.html
Texas A&M University P&T Guidelines	https://tamucs.sharepoint.com/teams/Team-FacultyAffairsIntranet/SitePages/Promotion-&-Tenure.aspx

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

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found in University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (Sections 4.4.3 and 4.4.4), CAS Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, Sections 2.2.1,2.2.2, and 2.2.3), and the TAMU Faculty Affairs Faculty Title Guidelines (https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/current-faculty/faculty-title-guidelines.html). The following are titles within the Department of Global Languages and Cultures.

2.1 Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Titles

Professor, Associate Professor, and **Assistant Professor** are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members are typically expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which the faculty member will be primarily teaching. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or development leave appointments). Granting tenure is a recognition of excellence in all three areas and entitles the faculty member to continue in their academic position unless dismissed for good cause, and promotion is based on continuing accomplishment and national/international recognition for scholarship.

The standard teaching load per semester for a full-time Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor in the Department of Global Languages and Cultures is two courses per semester. Only regular course offerings will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for faculty on this track. Supervision of reading and research courses (285, 291, 485, 491, 685, 691) or internships (483, 484) will normally be considered as additions to the regular standard two-course load, except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head. The standard two-course teaching load may be reduced in instances of a substantial service assignment (e.g., serving as director of graduate or undergraduate studies).

2.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty Titles: Instructional

Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and **Instructional Assistant Professor** are appointment titles of Academic Professional Track Faculty. Instructional Faculty make significant contributions to teaching activity. Instructional faculty also make significant contributions in service activity. Instructional faculty members will be evaluated on teaching and service activity.

In the Department of Global Languages and Cultures, Academic Professional Track faculty with the title of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor normally hold a terminal degree in their teaching fields and will be engaged in both instruction and significant service. Typically, service activities will be central to carrying the curriculum forward in the discipline in which the faculty member teaches; they also may include, but are not limited to, student advising and pedagogically related activities outside the classroom, professional development, outreach, and institutional service.

Faculty with the title of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor are not expected to engage in research. However, scholarly activity with a bearing on teaching (eg. the scholarship of teaching and learning) may be taken into consideration in annual performance evaluations or for promotion with demonstrated evidence of and connection to enhanced instructional effectiveness.

The standard teaching load per semester for a full-time Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor normally is three courses or a minimum of 9 contact hours. Only regular course offerings will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for faculty on this track. Supervision of undergraduate reading and research courses (285, 291, 485, 491) or internships (483, 484) will normally be considered as additions to the regular standard three-course load, except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head. The standard three-course teaching load may be reduced in instances of a substantial service assignment (e.g., serving as director of undergraduate studies, or serving as coordinator of multi-section courses). Course loads in excess of the standard load and the assignment of instructional faculty to specific graduate courses require the approval of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

2.3 Academic Professional Track Faculty Titles: Lecturers

Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and **Lecturer** are appointment titles of Academic Professional Track Faculty. Lecturer Faculty make significant contributions to teaching activity. Lecturer faculty can also be assigned to service activity but would not be expected to consistently make significant contributions in the area of service. Lecturer faculty members will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity.

In the Department of Global Languages and Cultures, Academic Professional Track faculty with the title of Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Lecturer typically hold a master's or terminal degree in the teaching field and will primarily be engaged in instruction.

In the Department of Global Languages and Cultures, Academic Professional Track faculty with the title of Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Lecturer are not expected make significant contributions to research or service, but either or both may be taken into consideration in annual performance evaluations or for promotion as indicative of enhanced instructional effectiveness. Lecturers may, for example, engage in such service and administrative activities as part of their instructional duties (e.g., coordinating multiple sections of a language course, or running placement exams).

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

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance (teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments). (See University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1)

The relative weights for evaluating tenured and tenure-track faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research and service are:

Research: 50% tenured; 55% Assistant Professors
Teaching: 30% tenured; 35% Assistant Professors
Service: 20% tenured; 10% Assistant Professors

The relative weights for evaluating faculty performance of Academic Professional Track faculty performance in the areas of teaching and/or service are:

Teaching: 80% Instructional, 90% Lecturer
Service: 20% Instructional, 10% Lecturer

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the Department of Global Languages and Cultures and the College of Arts and Sciences, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Required student evaluations are not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Effective teaching will be assessed through a combination of evaluating tools. These include: positive classroom observations; student evaluation scores consistently at or above the departmental mean; positive evaluation of tests and class assignments (e.g., frequency, material covered, quality of the questions, use of the target language, grading policy, etc.); course syllabi and new course proposals; teaching awards and grants for development of new courses and innovative approaches to teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation by classroom observation; 3) student feedback on evaluations; and 4) documented evidence of student learning.

Primary criteria for assessing effectiveness in teaching performance are:

Commitment to quality education;
Clarity in the organization, preparation and presentation of course content reflecting instructor's command of the area(s) of instruction;
High professional standards in teaching;
Organization and effective presentation of course content;
Professional development that enhances instructional effectiveness.

3.2 Research and/or Creative Work

Research is central to the mission of the Department of Global Languages and Cultures and the College of Arts and Sciences, and effectiveness in research is required of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Research is characterized by the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain a significant and substantial record of research in the form of scholarly publications or creative work that is consonant with the aims of a major research university. Evaluation of research does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Faculty may produce original scholarship in a variety of formats depending on their field. Faculty members in research tracks should define disciplinary norms for their field (e.g., monographs, series of articles), including reference to disciplinary guidelines if available. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Primary criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research performance are:
Coherent, focused, and continuous scholarly agenda;
Demonstrable scholarly productivity (underscored by the quality or volume of publications, and by grant and other scholarly activities);
Influential research that is highly regarded in specialized fields or subfields and disciplines.

Evaluation of the faculty member's performance in research, scholarly activity, or creative work must take into consideration the fact that a scholarly career is a long-term process, and it should consider all past accomplishments, including the accomplishments that led to appointment, tenure, and/or promotion at Texas A&M University. In the College of Arts and Sciences, department- and college-level reviews for promotion (with tenure or to full professor) factor in the candidate's entire record of accomplishment, inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to their appointment on the tenure track at Texas A&M, or prior to obtaining tenure at Texas A&M or elsewhere. (See ArtSci Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, under "College-level Processes for Promotion and Tenure Review"). Accomplishments in research or creative work are most commonly demonstrated through the completion of significant research, writing, or performance projects. The quality and scope of outcomes and activities will serve to determine to what extent the standards of merit for different professorial ranks are being met.

A one-size-fits-all set of criteria is difficult to define. While individual faculty members are in charge of presenting their personal case in the clearest way, reviews must show flexibility and discretion in evaluating the individual faculty member's scholarly and/or creative work. Evaluation criteria to be considered are not only the number and length of faculty publications, but also the visibility and impact of the work published, insofar as they may be indicators of quality. Quality should be the primary consideration for evaluation in every case. The timing of

research outcomes varies not just from faculty member to faculty member, but also within a faculty member's career. Special attention needs to be paid in this specific case to narratives describing progress.

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

Research output expectations are discipline specific. Books are generally considered the most important indicators of scholarship in humanities fields. Monographs are the prime example; critical studies and critical editions of texts are further examples; editions of a collection of individual studies will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Translations cannot take the place of individual scholarly publications, but scholarly translations can be seen as a significant contribution to the discipline and a scholar's research profile. Bibliographical studies will be evaluated according to their scholarly merits. Literary and artistic works appropriate to the faculty member's field and appointment will be considered with regard to venue, selection process, peer review, and indicators of impact in the faculty member's field, such as reviews. In fields where articles have more impact than books and are the norm for a scholar's research output, consideration will be given to documented impact, venue, length, scope of research agenda, and frequency of publication. While textbooks may be viewed as valuable to the profession, they cannot be equated with scholarly books unless the author demonstrates significant new research. However, publication of scholarship of teaching and learning in quality, peer-reviewed venues is considered a contribution to research/scholarship performance rather than teaching performance. All books should be published by a university press or as part of a recognized scholarly series issued by a commercial publishing house (or by an equivalent foreign publisher). Highly regarded non-peer-reviewed venues may be considered with demonstrated impact. Vanity press publications are not acceptable.

Some fields in the department are by nature collaborative, and co-authored publications are common, with single and lead authorship highly valued as indicative of independence and initiative. Co-authored work requires documentation of the faculty member's contribution and will be weighted accordingly. Similarly, some fields may weight publication of articles more heavily than a monograph. Interdisciplinary fields may emphasize specialized journals. Faculty in such fields must make a clear case for the norms of their field, the impact of their published articles, the quality of venues in which the articles appear, or offer other indicators that a series of articles is making a significant contribution to research in their field.

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

introductions, and conclusions to edited volumes demonstrating original research, as well as omnibus reviews demonstrating research expertise, can enhance the overall record and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Grants and awards by foundations and scholarly organizations are indicators of professional development and achievement. Translation and re-publication of one's work are evidence of impact. Faculty are encouraged to play an active role in professional organizations, and to read papers at scholarly conferences. However, conference papers cannot be a substitute for published essays. Evaluation for tenure and promotion is based on work in print and work accepted for publication. Work in progress is considered only in so far as it is evidence of an ongoing research program.

3.3 Service

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

Evaluation of service does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Common to all professorial ranks is the expectation of being good departmental citizens. This includes, but is not limited to, regular attendance at departmental meetings, membership on appropriate departmental standing and ad hoc committees, and casting departmental ballots as eligible.

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

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

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

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

4.1 Teaching Indicators

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

Developing and/or leading study abroad programs, including field trips abroad

Excellent student performance as evidenced by indicators such as student research success (e.g., conference presentation, publications, research awards, UG thesis awards) or job and internship placement

Placement of multiple graduate students or post-doctoral fellows in significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions

Excellent instruction in classes with 50 or more students enrolled, as demonstrated through indicators such as the incorporation of high-impact pedagogical practices and student evaluations

Outstanding curricular innovation as evidenced through the development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses (e.g., pedagogical shift, technological innovation)

Chair of graduate dissertation/thesis committee

Significant contributions as graduate dissertation/thesis committee member on multiple committees

Direction of undergraduate research/creative activities such as Honors theses (497)

Direction of multiple graduate or undergraduate research/creative activities such as independent studies (485, 685), independent research (491, 691), etc.

Teaching of Graduate courses, Honors courses (including individual Honors contracts), Writing-intensive courses, or capstone courses

Teaching performance recognized by national, regional, university, and/or college awards

significant grant support for teaching/learning projects

Publication of textbook or instructional materials, or of articles with a teaching focus or promoting pedagogical innovation

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

Note: multiple instances of the same indicator of Effectiveness may be considered to rise to the level of *Excellence* in Teaching

Meeting minimum syllabus requirements and adhering to college and university teaching policies and state laws such as:

> posting syllabi and CV on HOWDY
> meeting class at the scheduled time,
> hosting regularly scheduled office hours
> responding promptly and professionally to student concerns and problems
> submitting midterm and final grades on time.

Satisfactory teaching performance as evidenced by peer evaluation, student evaluations, and student outcomes

Effective construction of courses using sound pedagogical strategies

Contribution to revision of degree curriculum

Proposal of new courses accepted into the course catalog

Revision of existing courses, including incorporation of technology or innovative methods

Certification or re-certification of Writing Intensive, CD, ICD, or Core Curriculum courses

Teaching of senior seminars or other variable topic courses with a new topic for the first time

Member of graduate dissertation/thesis committee

Individual work with undergraduate students that does not involve thesis writing (485, 491)

mentoring of undergraduate students, such as advising about graduate programs or study abroad programs; contribution to the professional development of students

Development of and participation in transformative learning situations, such as field trips, service learning, and related activities

Continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation of course materials, student evaluations and outcomes, participation in teaching workshops, and other self-development activities

Presentation with a pedagogical focus at a conference or institution of higher learning

4.2 Research Indicators

4.2.1 Indicators of *Excellence* in Research include, but are not limited to:

4.2.1.1 Publications in refereed or widely recognized non-refereed venues

Note: Co-authored publications will be given credit equal to singly-authored ones, provided information is presented regarding what percentage of the combined work is attributable to the faculty member

Publication of a scholarly monograph, including work of a creative or literary nature

Publication of a critical text edition

Publication of a critical bibliography

Editing a scholarly collection of articles

Editing a special issue of a scholarly journal

Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book, collection of essays, or proceedings from national or international symposia

Publication of a scholarly article

Publication of an article-length book review (review article)

Publication of a scholarly encyclopedia or dictionary entry

4.2.1.2 Other Indicators of Excellence

Keynote address at a leading national or international scholarly association meeting

Series of widely recognized scholarly lectures at a leading institution (e.g., Sather Lectures at Berkeley)

Invited lecture at a prestigious venue (e.g., conferences, institutes, centers, libraries, public addresses)

Award of or completed application for a major external or internal research fellowship or other form of peer-reviewed external funding (e.g., grants)

External award for research from professional organizations, learned societies, national/international scholarly entities, etc.

Major internal college or university award recognizing research

4.2.2 Indicators of *Effectiveness* in Research include, but are not limited to:

Note: multiple instances of the same indicator of Effectiveness may be considered to rise to the level of *Excellence* in Research.

Publications (as listed under 4.2.1.1) in not widely recognized non-refereed venues

Book reviews

Publication of a translation (as distinct from a critical edition)

Publication of a scholarly interview

Re-publication or translation of one's research, creative, or scholarly work

Completion and release of digital databases, archives, and research tools of scholarly value

Invited lecture at a non-leading institution

Presentation of papers at regional, national, and international scholarly meetings or conferences

Award of or completed application for a lesser external or internal fellowship, grant, or other form of research funding

4.3 Service Indicators

4.3.1 Indicators of *Excellence* in Service include, but are not limited to:

Editor of a leading journal or book series in the discipline

Reviewing a book manuscript for a major scholarly press

Serving as a peer reviewer for other institutions, entities, or agencies (e.g., reviewing external tenure and promotion cases, serving as a reviewer for the NEH or other major grant/fellowship agency; serving on a review panel for national or international awards or fellowships, such as ACLS; serving as a member of an external review committee of a department at another university)

Serving as a member of an external review committee of a department at another university

Referee for a leading journal in the discipline

Member of the editorial board of a leading journal

Member of a major governmental task force, commission, or advisory board

Serving as an officer or committee chair in a regional, national, or international professional and/or governmental organization

Significant contributions to leadership in the University or College (e.g., officer of the Faculty Senate; appointment to a University or College task force; chairing a standing or ad hoc University or College committee)

~~Leadership roles at the Department level (e.g., administrative positions such as associate head, director of graduate or undergraduate studies, director of language instruction)~~

Leading major ad hoc initiatives at the Department level (e.g., writing NEH institutional grant or chairing ad hoc committee that advances the Department)

Member of a work-intensive committee at the University, College, or Department level (e.g., University Core Curriculum Council, Glasscock Advisory Board, Department Annual Review Committee, Dean's Advisory Committee, Faculty Senate committee, Search Committee, Tenure and Promotion Review Subcommittee, review committee for University or College awards and grants)

Substantial outreach and service to local community and public at large involving research or pedagogical expertise, including online public scholarship

Note: Leadership roles at the Department level (e.g., administrative positions such as associate head, director of graduate or undergraduate studies, director of language instruction) are accounted for through the redistribution of assigned weighted percentages in the category of service in annual review.

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

Note: multiple instances of the same indicator of Effectiveness may be considered to rise to the level of *Excellence* in Service.

Committee chair of a national or international professional organization, professional meeting, or symposium

Program chair at national or international meetings

Officer in a regional or state professional organization

Regular participation in departmental governance activities such as department meetings, tenure and promotion meetings, departmental committees, or college or university committees (e.g., member of the Faculty Senate).

Administrative roles (e.g., language program coordination) within the Department

Conducting peer observation of classroom teaching

Conducting placement testing

Service on University, College, or Departmental committees and task forces

Faculty mentoring and professional leadership development for professional colleagues

Advisor to student organizations

Writing letters of recommendation (ArtSci Guidelines 4.2.3)

Outreach for Department and service to local community and public at large

5. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department head is responsible. In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, the department head must collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews.

5.1 Purpose

The purpose of the annual review of faculty performance is to
(1) Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
(2) Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced or improved.
(3) Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
(4) Allow for an ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
(5) Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.
(6) Ensure that faculty members are in compliance with all university compliance requirements.

The annual review process is also an opportunity for the department to provide feedback to faculty regarding their progress toward future promotion. For faculty with mandatory probationary periods, the promotion progress review is a required element of the annual review process. For all other faculty, the promotion progress review is optional (see below, 5.6.2).

5.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable (see University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In assessing performance annually, the weights given to teaching, research and/or creative work, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual faculty member's

appointment and the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department, college, and university.

5.3 Time Period of Review

The Annual Review window for Teaching, Research, and Service is a three-year window.

5.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

The Department of Global Languages and Cultures uses the 5-point rubric described in Section 5.4 of the ArtSci Guidelines. This rubric recognizes that faculty members do not need to achieve every sample indicator listed to achieve a specific rating in any given year. Some indicators may be more relevant for faculty in some career tracks and/or career stages. For example, an APT faculty member may work with Ph.D. students but would not be expected to mentor the Ph.D. students. Similarly, an untenured assistant professor may not yet have the record to receive an external award, or to be the leading PI on a major collaborative grant project. Certain guiding criteria may take precedence over other guiding criteria. For example, "productivity" may carry more weight than "scholarly impact" and "positive trajectory" in the area of research, scholarship and/or creative work. Thus, the rubric is intended to assess a faculty member's overall work, taking into consideration percentages of effort, quality and quantity of work, impact, and other factors.

5.4.1 Teaching

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Teaching** are based on the indicators of Excellence and Effectiveness in Teaching listed in **4.1** above:

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

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. A "Needs Improvement" rating will be given to a faculty member who is found lacking in this category due to failure to maintain adequate patterns of performance in Teaching, through a failure to maintain appropriate standards as evinced by student evaluations, peer visitations, lack of course development, minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching.

Meets Expectations – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and other indicators noted above. A "Meets Expectations" rating will be given to a faculty member who is performing at appropriate levels in this category. A consistent pattern of positive work enhancing the departmental mission must be

apparent. Teaching this will be visible through positive indicators of strong investment in the education of undergraduate students, graduate students, or both.

Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom educators as evidenced by peer classroom observations, student evaluations, awards for education, and other accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

Outstanding – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of a faculty member **exceeding expectations**. A rating of "Outstanding" will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period. Evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching of outstanding classroom instructors as evidenced by peer observations, student evaluations, awards for education, student accomplishments, contributions to novel methodologies and curricular development.

5.4.2 Research

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are based on the indicators of Excellence and Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work listed in **4.2** above:

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. An "Unsatisfactory" rating will be given to a faculty member who exhibits a consistent pattern of inaction or negative action in this category (i.e. lack of any interest in research endeavors). This rating should be assigned to faculty members who have failed to contribute to the mission of the department in Research through the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth. A "Needs Improvement" rating will be given to a faculty member who is found lacking in this category due to failure to maintain adequate patterns of performance in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work through an insufficient commitment to publishable outcomes, limited evidence of research/scholarly/creative impact as supported by, for example, refereed articles, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.

Meets Expectations – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, and other factors. A "Meets Expectations" rating will be given to a faculty member who is performing at appropriate levels in this category. A consistent pattern of positive work enhancing the departmental mission must be apparent. In Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work considered are the submission of obvious, measurable results, or convincing narratives reflecting progress and promising solid outcomes, evidence of effectiveness supported by high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.

Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, performances, and invited presentations.

Outstanding – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of a faculty member **exceeding expectations**. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies. The "Outstanding" rating will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period. It Research, it must be linked to the quality of outcomes, quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations.

5.4.3 Service

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are based on the indicators of Excellence and Effectiveness in Service listed in **4.3** above:

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service. An "Unsatisfactory" rating will be given to a faculty member who exhibits a consistent pattern of inaction or negative action in this category (i.e., absenteeism, repeated failure to accomplish necessary tasks, lack of any interest). This rating should be assigned to faculty members who have failed to contribute to the mission of the department either in service over the period of evaluation, or through the absence of evidence of effectiveness in service.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the department and an absence of service beyond the department. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member. A "Needs Improvement" rating will be given to a faculty member who is found lacking in this category due to failure to maintain adequate patterns of performance in Service through a failure to serve in committees or a failure to adequately contribute to mandated departmental activities in the absence of compensatory engagements elsewhere (i.e., administrative appointment in the College or University, officership in a national organization), minimal evidence of effectiveness in service due to departmental involvement with the respective or an absence of extra-departmental service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.

Meets Expectations – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment. A "Meets Expectations" rating will be given to a faculty member who is performing at appropriate levels in this category. A consistent pattern of positive work enhancing the departmental mission must be apparent. In Service this entails a commitment to institutional advancement at either the departmental or other levels of the professional field.

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

Outstanding – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of a faculty member **exceeding expectations**. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations. The "Outstanding" rating will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period. In Service, this refers to the quality of contributions to institutional life. Evidence of effectiveness and excellence in service through impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, leading mentorship and outreach efforts, prominent national level service in professional organizations.

5.5 Annual Review Process

5.5.1 Annual Report of Faculty Member's Activities

Each year during the month of January, with the deadline to be set by the department head, all faculty members must submit an annual report in Faculty 180 that outlines activities within each of their assigned areas of responsibility. In the report, faculty members should point out the status of long-term projects, set the context in which annual activities have occurred, and state short-term and long-term goals. The information provided serves as the basis of the Annual Review Committees' evaluations.

5.5.2 Annual Review Committees

The composition of the Annual Review Committees should take into consideration representation and work loads of faculty across the areas of Hispanic Studies, Africana Studies, Religious Studies, Classics, Modern Languages, and Global Studies. Composition of the Annual Review Committees should balance representation over the three-year window of review. The department head may appoint members of a Committee to ensure representation across disciplines. The annual review committees are advisory to the head.

The Department of Global Languages and Cultures Annual Review Committees are constituted as follows:

5.5.2.1 The Tenured Annual Review Committee (TARC)

The Tenured Annual Review Committee (TARC) reviews Tenured/Tenure-track faculty. The TARC is partly appointed by the Head, in consultation with the Executive Committee, and partly elected by the tenured faculty from a slate of volunteers. The TARC consists of four tenured voting members, at least two of whom are full professors. TARC members serve staggered two-

year terms. The TARC is chaired by the Associate Head, who votes only on Committee members and cases where a voting member is excluded from proceedings by university nepotism rules.

For untenured faculty on the tenure-track, the Tenure & Promotion Committee each year will conduct a review separate from the regular Annual Review, to determine (1) whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure and (2) whether the candidate should be re-appointed for the next academic year.

5.5.2.2 The APT Annual Review Committee (AARC)

The APT Annual Review Committee (AARC) reviews APT faculty. The AARC is partly appointed by the Head, in consultation with the Executive Committee, and partly elected by the tenured and APT faculty from a slate of volunteers. The AARC consists of four voting members, at least two of whom must be APT faculty members, and at least one of whom must be a tenured faculty member. AARC members serve staggered two-year terms. The AARC is chaired by the Director of Undergraduate Studies, who votes only on Committee members and cases where a voting member is excluded from proceedings by university nepotism rules.

5.5.2.3 Faculty Performance

Performance in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service is judged on a five-category scale (see above, 5.4: Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance). The Annual Review Committees vote on each component of the file (Teaching, Research, and/or Service, as required by faculty appointment), cast on a scale from 1 to 5, in half-point increments, as follows:

1.0	= Unsatisfactory
1.5 and 2.0	= Needs Improvement
2.5, 3.0, and 3.5	= Meets Expectations
4.0 and 4.5	= Exceeds Expectations
5.0	= Outstanding

The overall score of each file, after averaging individual votes and calculating by percentage weight, shall result in the following evaluation:

1.00-1.49	= Unsatisfactory
1.50-2.49	= Needs Improvement
2.50-3.99	= Meets Expectations
4.00-4.75	= Exceeds Expectations
4.76-5.00	= Outstanding

The rating of Outstanding is reserved for a performance that is exceptional and greatly surpasses the norms and expectations of Exceeds Expectations.
In accordance with University policy, an Unsatisfactory rating in any single area of faculty performance or a rating of Needs Improvement in any two areas of faculty performance will result in an overall rating of Unsatisfactory.

For each faculty member, the appropriate annual review committee prepares a report, which provides a basis for the Department Head's independent review of the faculty member. The report is made available to the respective faculty member together with the Head's annual review letter.

5.5.3 Evaluation from Department Head

The department head will write an evaluation for the calendar year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document. Faculty members are allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's department personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service. The Head should also provide promotion-eligible faculty with an assessment of their progress towards promotion.

5.5.4 Compliance Review

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training). In cases where faculty members have been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. All faculty must certify that they are up to date on TrainTraq trainings and submit their TrainTraq transcripts with their Annual Review materials.

Annual review of faculty performance for Teaching must also consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member complies with all policies, rules, and deadlines associated with teaching. The annual evaluation rating accurately should reflect situations where a faculty member is out of compliance with the policies listed below for teaching:

Course Syllabi and CV must be posted no later than seven days after the first class day as stated in Texas Education Code 51.974.

All required midterm grades and final grades, including the grades for graduating seniors, must be submitted on time.

All attendance certifications (e.g., First Day of Attendance Certification) must be submitted

5.5.5 Meeting between the Department Head and the Faculty Member

The Department Head must provide an annual opportunity for a personal meeting with the faculty member, or the faculty member may request a meeting with the department head, to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member. The

Department Head (or an appropriate delegate, such as the Associate Head) should meet with all untenured tenure-track faculty on an annual basis to discuss their progress towards tenure.

5.6 Promotion Progress Review

5.6.1 Feedback on Progress towards Tenure for Untenured Tenure-track Professors

The members of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, consisting of all tenured faculty, must participate in an annual review of untenured assistant professors (and untenured associate professors, as applicable). Using annual review materials, this review must provide candid assessment of whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards tenure and promotion (relative to their year on the tenure clock), and to provide constructive feedback on ways to strengthen their overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The feedback is reported to the department head. The feedback shall include a secret vote of all tenured faculty on whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress, as well as a secret vote of all tenured faculty on whether the faculty member's appointment as a tenure track faculty member should be continued. The department head shall independently review all annual review materials and provide a written memo to the faculty member that incorporates feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process.

5.6.2 Optional Feedback on Progress towards Promotion for Promotion-Eligible Faculty

Promotion eligible faculty should understand that having a series of positive annual reviews is not the best indicator of whether somebody is ready to come up for promotion. In other words, a faculty member can be doing very good work and meet or exceed expectations during annual reviews, but not yet have a record that merits promotion. For that reason, tenured associate professors and academic professional track faculty who are not at the highest rank have the *option* of requesting *informal* feedback on their progress towards promotion as part of the Annual Review process. The purpose of this optional review is (a) to provide a candid assessment of how the faculty member's record of performance aligns with departmental and College criteria for promotion, and/or (b) to provide constructive feedback on how the faculty member might strengthen the overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The promotion process involves a much more extensive review of performance. For that reason, a "positive" promotion progress review should not be viewed as a guarantee for a successful promotion case.

Faculty members interested in having a promotion progress review should inform their department head at the time that they submit their annual review materials. If a faculty member requests a promotion progress review, the faculty member's annual review materials shall be shared with all faculty eligible to review and vote on that faculty member's promotion case. Members of the Promotion Committee shall review annual review materials and provide feedback to the department head. The department head shall independently review all annual review materials and provide oral feedback, incorporating feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process, to the faculty member.

In accordance with University guidelines (12.01.99.M1 section 4.3.1), a faculty member may opt to come up for a non-mandatory promotion at any time. In other words, there is no

requirement that a faculty member have an optional promotion progress review. Similarly, there is no requirement that a faculty member receives a successful outcome from a promotion progress review prior to coming up for promotion (though it would be inadvisable for a candidate to fully ignore advice from the departmental committee).

5.7 Assessment outcomes that require action

As per University SAP 12.06.99.M1 (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

5.7.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities, or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the Department's established criteria.

For tenure-track faculty, each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean. The report to the Dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and the department head for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see ArtSci Guidelines Section 9.2) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an "Unsatisfactory" periodic peer review (see ArtSci Section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M1 (Post-Tenure Review).

For academic professional track faculty, an unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean's office. In consultation with the Dean (and/or the Dean's delegates), the Head will work with the faculty member to address areas of concern. An academic professional track faculty member who receives "Unsatisfactory" for more than one year may be subject to further action. For additional guidance, see System Policy 12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, and University SAP 12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty.

5.7.2 Needs Improvement Performance

Tenured faculty members receiving a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see ArtSci Section 9) must work with their department head immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully.

Academic Professional Track faculty members receiving a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation must work with their department head to develop a plan for improvement.

5.8 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.

5.9 Complaint Procedure

Faculty members who believe that their annual review process did not comply with the Department's published annual review guidelines, or in their absence with those published by the College, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the Dean of the College, with a copy to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The Dean of the College will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the Dean of the College may be appealed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M1.

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an Annual Review. See Section 2.4.3.6 of University SAP 12.01.99.M1. A faculty member, however, may choose to write a written response to the Head's evaluation. The Head may revise the evaluation in the event that an error was made. Alternatively, the response may be added to the faculty member's personnel file.

6. Midterm Review for Untenured Assistant Professors

In accordance with Section 4.3.5.2 of University SAP 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive midterm review for untenured assistant professors subject to a probationary period (of five or more years) be conducted to determine the progress towards tenure.

6.1 Purpose

A midterm review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period. This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision. The review will ensure that the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress. It must result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service to date, as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period. If an untenured faculty member is not progressing adequately towards the requirements for tenure, the review might result in action to not renew the appointment.

6.2 Process

6.2.1 Timeline

The comprehensive midterm review is performed at the midway point of the probationary period, usually during the third year of the initial appointment. In the College of Arts and Sciences, midterm reviews occur in the Spring semester, normally between March and May. In the Department of Global Languages and Cultures, the Midterm Review replaces the Annual Review conducted in the Spring semester of the Midterm review. The table below describes the timeline for a standard probationary period of seven years.

Year Hired (first year in probationary period)	Probationary Period	Midterm Review will occur between
AY 2024-25	7 years	March-May 2027

Faculty with a shorter probationary period may come up for midterm review in their first or second year on the tenure clock, as indicated in their appointment letter. Faculty who are considering the option of coming up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year must come up for midterm review prior to coming up for tenure (unless otherwise stated in their appointment letter).

The Department Head shall set a deadline for candidates to submit their midterm review materials that allows sufficient time for the department's P&T committee to meet and review the candidate's materials and submit departmental reports to the department head. The Head must also submit a recommendation prior to the college deadline for midterm reviews.

6.2.2 Procedure

The midterm review will mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member, with the exception of external letters of evaluation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the midterm review will include review by the department's P&T committee, the department head, the College Dean's Advisory Committee–Tenure Track (DAC-TT), and the Dean. Midterm reviews, however, do not go beyond the College.

The Department Head shall appoint an evaluation subcommittee for each faculty to be reviewed. All members of the evaluation subcommittee are expected to review the candidate's dossier in each area and to contribute to the written report.

6.2.3 Expectations

In the Department of Global Languages and Cultures it is important that tenure-track faculty demonstrate high, continuing achievement by contributing to the programmatic needs of the Department through effective teaching, research, and service at this juncture. It is the responsibility of the candidate, in consultation with the Head and faculty mentors, to plan a program of academic career development and a timetable for implementation of the plan, including clear articulation of disciplinary norms for research/scholarship/creative work.

Assistant Professors should demonstrate clear and substantial progress toward the requirements of tenure and promotion at this stage, based on the evaluation criteria set out in these Guidelines. In the area of Research, if a candidate draws upon the dissertation for publication, such as a series of articles or a book, this work normally will be completed and submitted for publication by the time of the midterm review. More generally, a first book or a series of articles will be at a stage of completion that renders publication by the time of the tenure review highly probable.

The comprehensive midterm review will evaluate a candidate's progress in completing this first project and development of a research program beyond the dissertation (see below, 8.1.1.2.1).

6.3 Dossier Requirements

Each candidate's dossier should be prepared in accordance with the guidance for tenure and promotion provided by University Faculty Affairs in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Works under review or in progress should be included. External review letters are not required.

Each candidate's midterm dossier, to be submitted to the College, must include the following:

6.3.1 Item uploaded by candidate: The candidate's personal impact statement that adheres to university guidelines. The statement should explain the quality, productivity over time, and impact of teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service accomplishments. Each of these three assigned areas of responsibility must be addressed separately.

6.3.2 Item uploaded by candidate: The candidate's annotated *curriculum vitae* (c.v.) that follows university guidelines for promotion and tenure. This can be done using the university template (Word .doc) or through the Interfolio Faculty180 created vita. (The Word .doc template is preferred.)

6.3.3 Items uploaded by department: Copies of all annual review letters written by the department head and signed by the candidate. These letters are on file in the department are required and will be uploaded by the department for inclusion in the midterm dossier. Course evaluations teaching table is required, and will be uploaded by the department. Copies of peer observations of teaching. One peer observation is defined as the observation of one class session on the same day at the same time by a team of two people. Candidates for midterm review should have three peer observations, and they will be uploaded by the department.

6.3.4 If the candidate is affiliated with an interdisciplinary program outside the Department, the candidate may choose to include a support letter from the interdisciplinary program director or coordinator.

6.3.5 Items uploaded by the candidate: The candidate's publications including any materials published before hire at TAMU, course syllabi (a syllabus for each course prep), a candidate may elect to include a curated sample of student comments from course evaluations for a particularly noteworthy course, and representative sample of course assignments and exams (small sample to demonstrate rigor, scope, and quality).

6.3.6 The P&T Committee's summary report with separate sections focused on each area of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). The report should also include a section that summarizes the discussion of the P&T Committee about the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure. The teaching section should include a summary of student evaluations of teaching and peer observation(s) of teaching. The report should include the P&T Committee's yes/no vote on the following questions: "Is the candidate making satisfactory progress towards promotion with tenure?" and "Should the candidate's appointment be continued for another year?"

6.3.7 A recommendation from the department head indicating the head's overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The head's letter should also indicate the head's vote on the two questions stated in (6.3.6) above. Finally, the head's letter must indicate any progress the head deems necessary during the remainder of the probationary period.

6.4 Feedback for Midterm Review

All faculty members going through the midterm review process must be provided with accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period. In a memo to the department head, the Dean will convey the assessment and recommendation of the Dean's Advisory Committee–Tenure Track (DAC-TT), as well as the Dean's assessment based on the Dean's independent review of the dossier. The review of the DAC-TT will also include two votes as stated under (6.3.6) above. The memo will provide formative feedback on the formulating, implementing, and monitoring of plans for necessary actions in the remainder of the probationary period. The department head should schedule a meeting with the faculty member to review the Dean's memo and work with the candidate on a plan to address recommendations from both the department and the college.

7. Promotion and Tenure Review: Processes

7.1 Purpose

A Promotion and Tenure Review is intended to provide an objective evaluation of a faculty member's record of accomplishments at several levels of review (i.e., department, college, university). For tenure track faculty, the evaluation will include external letters of evaluation focusing on research and/or creative work. The review further serves to assess the quality, significance, and impact of a faculty member's work, as well as the potential for continued excellence. Finally, the review will determine whether a faculty member's performance in all assigned areas of responsibility merits promotion to the next rank within the career track corresponding to the faculty member's job title (e.g., promotion from tenure track assistant professor to associate professor with tenure, promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, promotion from instructional associate professor to instructional professor).

7.2 Focus

The focus of the promotion review process will vary by track and the desired rank for promotion. It is important to understand that "promotion" (from a lower rank to a higher rank within a job title track) is distinct from "reclassification" (from one job title track to another job title track). Promotion is based on an assessment that a faculty member's achievements and accomplishments meet the expectations of the higher rank, and requires multiple levels of review (as indicated in this document). Reclassification is reserved for exceptional circumstances and is outside the scope of this document.

When evaluating performance for promotion, the weights given to teaching, research and/or creative work, clinical work, service, and/or administrative work shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual faculty member's appointment, the annual review, and the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department, college, and university.

7.3 Time Period of Review

The promotion process is on a similar timeline for all promotions, regardless of job title (with the exception of Tenure Review Upon Hire reviews). The overall timeline is set by the Office for the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, with college-level deadlines set by the College of Arts and Sciences.

In the spring of each year, the College of Arts and Sciences will release the timeline for review and submission of promotion materials to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for the following academic year. This includes the deadline for departments to submit a candidate's dossier materials for external review and the deadline for departments to submit the candidate's dossier (including departmental reports) to the college. Typically, departments solicit external review letters (for tenure track promotion cases) in the spring, and conduct department level reviews in the early fall. The college level review process takes place in October and November,

and the college submits promotion cases to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs in December. The university-level review of promotion cases takes place in January. Promotion and tenure decisions are reviewed by the University President (for all cases) and the Board of Regents (in the case of tenure cases only) in the spring. Promotion and tenure decisions become effective on September 1st of each year.

7.3.1 Mandatory Promotion Reviews

The department head should identify mandatory candidates for promotion and tenure in the early part of the calendar year. Faculty with mandatory promotion reviews will be informed of the timeline for their review, and asked to confirm that they intend to submit the documentation for promotion and tenure.

7.3.2 Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH)

Faculty who are hired at Texas A&M University at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH). Note that tenure is obtained only by a positive recommendation by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the University President. The review and submission process for TRUH is out-of-cycle for all TRUH candidates. The process may be expedited for TRUH candidates who are professors at aspirant peer institutions and/or professors who are members of the National Academy of Sciences (for more information see the link on TRUH processes at Hiring)
. The University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure include information on external review letter requirements for TRUH cases.

7.4 Time Considerations

7.4.1 Assistant Professors (Tenure Track)

Assistant Professors have a mandatory review date for tenure set at the time of hire. The "standard" tenure clock at Texas A&M University involves a 7-year probationary period, with a "mandatory" tenure review that starts at the end of the 5th year and takes place during the 6th year. Some faculty may be hired with a shorter tenure clock, particularly if they have years of experience in a tenure track position at a peer university.

7.4.1.1 Early Tenure Reviews

Candidates may opt to undergo review prior to their mandatory year (i.e., early tenure review), as long as they have completed the midterm review. Candidates considering this option are strongly encouraged to speak to their mentors and department head prior to indicating a desire to come up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year.

7.4.1.2 Tenure Clock Extensions

Candidates may request an extension to the probationary period in accordance with the University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (Candidate Process Section). Requests for

tenure clock extension are submitted by the faculty member, and approved by the department Head, the Dean, and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Candidates who receive tenure clock extensions are held to the same standard as all other candidates. In other words, they should not be expected to have a stronger record due to a clock extension. Candidates who receive tenure clock extensions may later decide against using the clock extensions (as long as they inform their department head in the spring semester before coming up for tenure).

7.4.1.3 *Credit for Accomplishments Prior to Employment on the Tenure Track at Texas A&M*

In the College of Arts and Sciences, department- and college-level reviews for promotion (with tenure) factor in the candidate's entire record of accomplishment (inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to their appointment on the tenure track at Texas A&M). For a successful promotion case, there needs to be evidence that there is both a continuous and a positive research and/or creative trajectory.

7.4.2 Tenured Faculty

Candidates who are tenured do not have a mandatory time to undergo review to professor. Faculty may choose to become a candidate for promotion at any time. They need to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service, with national and/or international recognition. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in Section 5.6, and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors in order to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.4.2.1 *Credit for Accomplishments Prior to Tenure*

In the College of Arts and Sciences, department and college-level reviews factor in the candidate's entire record of accomplishment (inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to hire at Texas A&M). **Productivity** and **trajectory** continue to be important **guiding criteria** (see below, **8.0**), while **scholarly impact** and **independence and intellectual leadership** increase in relative importance. In other words, candidates must be able to demonstrate that they have continued to be productive (with a positive trajectory) since the last promotion or hire. In addition, there must be increasing evidence that their work is innovative and impactful, and that they have become an intellectual leader in their chosen area of specialty.

7.4.3 Academic Professional Track Faculty

Candidates on academic professional tracks do not have a mandatory time to undergo review for promotion. Candidates need to demonstrate sustained excellence in their assigned areas of responsibilities, as defined in their letter of appointment. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in Section 5.6, and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.5 Other Special Considerations

7.5.1 Reviewing Faculty with Budgeted Joint Appointments

Reviews of faculty with funded joint appointments will follow guidance in the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Such faculty will be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by both units in accordance with guidelines from both units. Both units should collaborate on the selection of external reviewers.

7.5.2 Reviewing Faculty Transitioning to the College from University Libraries

Faculty members who transitioned from University Libraries into the College of Arts and Sciences will be evaluated based on expectations outlined in departmental and college guidelines. However, candidates who originally had appointments in the University Libraries may have unique records of accomplishments that draw on their areas of expertise. Faculty who have moved from University Libraries have the option to include an annual statement summarizing library and information discipline-related work with their other annual evaluation materials. As appropriate, annual appointment letters should indicate any ways in which their assigned areas of responsibility differ from the departmental norm. For example, if part of their teaching responsibilities includes providing instruction to students on how to conduct library-based research, this should be described in the appointment letter. Similarly, if part of their service responsibilities may include providing guidance to faculty on data management, the use of altmetrics, then this should be indicated in the appointment letter. Promotion reviews would then factor in the information that is provided in the annual appointment letters. When selecting external review letter writers for faculty transitioning from university libraries, it is acceptable to include letters from tenured faculty librarians at other universities (assuming all university criteria for the selection of external review letters are met).

7.5.3 Reviewing Faculty Appointed at the Higher Education Center at McAllen

Faculty at the Higher Education Center at McAllen (HECM) will be reviewed by the P&T committee of their academic department at the College Station campus. Candidates from HECM should not be disadvantaged in the review process by unique contextual factors that are beyond their control (e.g., lower enrollments, fewer service opportunities, less support resources for teaching, etc.) As appropriate, departments guidelines must specify how faculty members at McAllen will be evaluated.

7.5.4 Reviewing Faculty Whose Records Qualify as Exceptions to Normal Requirements

In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1.5., exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure, or more commonly promotion to professor, may sometimes be warranted. Examples include (a) gifted and productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b) exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the University is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding, but whose teaching and research are only acceptable. In all cases, performance in the other two

dimensions must be at least acceptable. Few faculty members will possess qualities such as these, but those who do, deserve recognition and advancement. In those rare circumstances, it is expected that there will be ample evidence demonstrating the required excellence in one area to warrant such exceptions.

7.6 Requirements for the Candidate's Promotion Dossier

The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the promotion dossier, as listed in the University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines. The following elements are *required* and must be submitted by any candidate seeking promotion.

7.6.1 Promotion Impact Statement

Candidates must submit an impact statement that explains the quality, productivity over time, and the impact of their accomplishments in each of their assigned areas of responsibility (teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). Following university guidelines provided by Faculty Affairs, the candidate's three-page narrative statement should:

7.6.1.1 be organized with a summary paragraph and a separate section with percentages for any area of professional responsibility that applies to the candidate's job title (see the university template at this link Candidate-Impact-Statement-Example.docx)
,

7.6.1.2 explain the quality, productivity, impact, and future trajectory of the candidate in each area of responsibility,

7.6.1.3 be written to engage and be understood by both a general academic readership (e.g., dean, president) and by a professional readership (e.g., external reviewers),

7.6.1.4 address the candidate's perspective on past, present, and future performance and accomplishments,

7.6.1.5 provide a clear context for any metrics provided as indirect proxies for impact, and

7.6.1.6 offer a narrative that provides a context for understanding other items in the dossier.

The weighting of areas of responsibility will vary across title, rank, and departments, and the statement should reflect the weights assigned to the individual faculty member. For example, a faculty member who is assigned 75% responsibility in teaching should dedicate the majority of the statement to describing the impacts of their contributions to teaching. For more detailed guidance on how to craft a promotion impact statement, see the additional information on the VPFA's website.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback on their impact statement from their mentors, P&T subcommittee chair, department head, and/or associate head prior to submission.

7.6.2 Annotated Curriculum Vitae (c.v.)

Candidates should prepare an annotated curriculum vitae (c.v.) following university guidelines for promotion and tenure. This can be done using the university template (Word .doc) or through the Interfolio Faculty 180 created vita. (The Word .doc template is preferred.) Candidates are strongly encouraged to annotate their c.v., as needed, to highlight the impact of their work and their specific contributions. Labels can also be added to indicate publications that include undergraduate, graduate or postdoc co-authors. In the areas of teaching and service, annotations can be added to describe new course preparations, modifications based on professional development activities, and contributions within a service role. Candidates should be careful to avoid padding their c.v. For example, refereed publications should be listed separately from non-refereed publications, and publications that have been accepted but not yet published should be clearly labeled.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback on their c.v. from their mentors, P&T subcommittee chair, department head, and/or associate head prior to submission.

7.6.3 Teaching Materials/Portfolio

Candidates are required to submit the documents as evidence and examples of materials they use in courses they teach. Within the University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines, there is a section on Evaluating Teaching Activity that outlines documents P&T Committees should use when evaluating teaching activity, but this section is also helpful for candidates to determine specific documents to include in their teaching portfolio. Candidates should make sure the teaching materials are well-organized, concise, and kept to a reasonable page length. Suggested documents for candidates to include in the teaching portfolio are:

7.6.3.1 Course syllabi

Candidates for promotion (with tenure) should include copies of syllabi for all courses taught as an untenured faculty member at Texas A&M (e.g., one syllabus for each course prep). All other candidates for promotion should include copies of syllabi for the three courses taught most often within the last 5 years.

7.6.3.2 Representative sample of course assignments and exams

Candidates should provide a small representative sample of materials (e.g., an exam or assignment from one or two courses) for review committees to assess the scope, rigor, and quality of course offerings.

7.6.3.3 Peer observations of teaching

The College of Arts and Sciences requires ***two reports from peer observations of teaching*** prior to each promotion evaluation. It is the Department's responsibility to ensure that peer observations of teaching are conducted; however, faculty members may make their own arrangements, as long as they inform their department head. Departments may choose to arrange for more than the required number of peer observations (i.e., annual peer observations).

In accordance with College policy (ArtSci 7.6.3(4)), the Department of Global Languages & Cultures allows for peer observations of teaching to be conducted by departmental faculty who are not eligible to vote on a candidate's case, regardless of rank (e.g., an instructional associate professor may conduct a peer observation for promotion to professor, or a lecturer may conduct a peer observation for promotion to senior lecturer or associate professor). Assistant professors will undergo a peer observation, by two faculty members visiting the same class, during each year of their probationary period, and will be provided with a copy of each observation report.

In the event that a candidate has had more than two peer observations of teaching, the candidate may choose which peer observations of teaching to include with the midterm and promotion reviews. Candidates may choose to include reports from peer observations of teaching from different academic years to give a longitudinal evaluation of their teaching. Alternatively, they may choose to include reports from peer observations from different types of classes to show their versatility. Untenured assistant professors may include the report submitted with their midterm review materials as one of the two required reports.

7.6.3.4 Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdocs

This information should be listed on the c.v. and may also be in the narrative statement.

7.6.3.5 Uploaded by the Dept.: ***Complete compiled summary of student evaluations of teaching***

The department will provide   a table summarizing the candidate'steaching evaluations (as outlined in the University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines). Candidates for promotion (with tenure) will have a complete compiled summary of all student evaluations of teaching for courses taught as an untenured faculty member at Texas A&M. All other candidates for promotion will have a complete compiled summary of student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught within the past 5 years.

7.6.4 Research and/or Creative Work Materials

Candidates who have research and/or creative work as one of their assigned areas of responsibilities **are required to submit s**elected **publications** that best exemplify a scholar's greatest research and/or creative contributions (Faculty may choose to include all publications, or a subset of publications).

Other sources that may be helpful, but are **not required**, to evaluate research and/or creative work include:

7.6.4.1 Information regarding digital scholarship, performances, or creative work (other than published work).

7.6.4.2 Copies of funded grant proposals.

7.6.4.3 Copies of patents.

7.6.4.4 Information on scholarly metrics that are valued within the discipline or department, such as journal impact factors, H-index, etc. (If included, metrics should be contextualized within the discipline, and journal impact factors should be provided for all journals.)

7.6.5 Service Materials

There is not a prescribed list of items or sources to use in the evaluation of service. The key sources of information for evaluating service include the c.v. and the promotion impact statement. Faculty may opt to include additional evidence for their service performance in their dossier, including support letters, emails that acknowledge service contributions, etc.

7.6.6 External Review Letters

7.6.6.1 Tenure Track Faculty

External letters are required for candidates in tenure track and tenured positions seeking promotion to either associate professor or professor. Following university guidelines, the college expects a minimum of five letters, with a minimum of three letters selected by the departmental P&T committee. (Per university guidelines, potential reviewers that are on both the department list and the candidate list can count in either category.) Departments should follow university guidelines on procedures for selecting potential letter writers, sending solicitation letter, and for documenting such requests. Departments should request approval from the Dean for any letters that are not "arm's length" from the candidate as defined in the university guidelines. Departments should request no more than eight letters in the initial solicitation, ideally four from the department list and four from the candidate list. Those who review a candidate's dossier should not interpret a lack of response from a reviewer as a negative statement against the candidate. At no time should a candidate inquire about the status of reviewers they nominated or contact them about their review.

7.6.6.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty (Research Professors)

Following university guidelines, academic professional track faculty with research titles are required to have external review letters. All the requirements stated above for tenure track faculty apply to faculty in research titles. The solicitation letter should be modified, to reflect the candidate's job responsibilities.

7.6.6.3 Academic Professional Track Faculty (All Other Tracks)

For all other academic professional track job titles, external review letters are optional. The Department of Global Languages & Cultures does not require external or internal review letters.

7.6.7 COVID-19 Impact Statement (Optional)

Faculty may include an optional COVID-19 impact statement in their promotion dossier that provides a context for evaluating performance in each of their assigned areas of responsibility. For most faculty, this would include a combination of research or creative work activities, teaching activities, and service activities. The option to include COVID-19 impact statements will continue until the point at which the timeframe for a given promotion review no longer includes the years that are covered by the COVID-19 impact statement (i.e., 2020 and 2021). The primary objective of the COVID-19 impact statement is to provide a context for understanding the impact of the pandemic on a faculty member's professional workload and responsibilities.

7.6.8 Verification of Contents

This section in Interfolio accurately describes the materials candidates have submitted for departmental review for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration.

7.7 Department Evaluation Process for Promotion and Tenure

7.7.1 Evaluation Process for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure and Promotion to Professor

The Department Review is conducted in all respects in accordance with the procedures listed and described in the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, Section 7.7. The Promotion and Tenure/Promotion Committee composition must be the same for all candidates in the same track seeking the same rank within the department.

7.7.1.1 Evaluation Review Subcommittee

The Department Head shall appoint an Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each faculty member to be reviewed for the probationary midterm review, for the tenure and promotion review, or for promotion review. The Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each case of probationary midterm review and of Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure is composed of four tenured faculty members at or above the rank of Associate Professor, one of whom serves as Chair of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee. The Evaluation Review Subcommittee for Promotion to Professor is composed of four tenured faculty members at the rank of Professor, one of whom serves as Chair.

All members of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee are expected to review the candidate's dossier in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. The Subcommittee will submit a single comprehensive report evaluating, in separate sections, the candidate's performance in all three areas to the departmental Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee; individual Subcommittee members may be assigned the task of preparing a draft of the report section for each of those areas.

7.7.1.2 Tenure & Promotion and Promotion Committees

The Department Tenure & Promotion Committee (for promotion to associate professor with tenure) consists of all tenured faculty; the Promotion Committee (for promotion to professor) consists of all tenured faculty at the rank of Professor. The Department Head, the Chair of the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee, and the members of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee should prepare for the P&T cycle by reviewing the University and College guidelines and requirements as well as their department guidelines. Normally, the departmental Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee is chaired by the Associate Head or an eligible-to-vote tenured faculty member (who may be identical with one of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee Chairs) appointed *ad hoc* by the Department Head. It must consist of a minimum of 5 eligible-to-vote committee members for all cases for promotion and/or tenure.

7.7.1.3 Evaluation Review Subcommittee Report

All members of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee are expected to review the candidate's dossier in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Each Evaluation Review Subcommittee prepares a single comprehensive draft report evaluating, in separate sections, the candidate's performance in all three areas. (Individual Subcommittee members may be assigned the task of preparing a draft of the report section for each of those areas.) The Chair of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee sends the report to the full Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee through the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee Chair in advance of the scheduled Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee meeting.

7.7.1.4 Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee Meeting and Report

The comprehensive Evaluation Review Subcommittee report (on Teaching, Research, and Service) and the candidate's dossier form the basis for consideration of a case by the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee, which is convened by its Chair as defined in 7.7.1.2. The Department Head shall not be present at any such meeting, but shall be available to be contacted in case of procedural questions.

The Chair of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each candidate under review is responsible for leading discussion and summarizing it as part of the Final Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Report. Following open discussion by the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee, a decision to tenure and/or promote the faculty member shall be taken by secret ballot (on voting eligibility and procedure, **see below, 7.7.5**). The Final Report includes the comprehensive report on Teaching, Research and Service prepared by the Evaluation Review Subcommittee with any revisions requested by the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee, a summary of the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee discussion, and the vote. All members of the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee must sign the Final Report.

The Chair of each Evaluation Review Subcommittee shall ensure that the Final Report is conveyed to the Head. The Chair of each Evaluation Review Subcommittee and the Chair of the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee, not the Department Head, shall ensure that the

Final Report accurately represents the discussion and faculty voice in the Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee, and accurately reflects the vote of the Committee.

7.7.2 Evaluation Process for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor

Department Review is conducted in accordance with the procedures listed and described in the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, Section 7.7. The Promotion Committee composition must be the same for all candidates in the same track seeking the same rank within the department.

7.7.2.1 Evaluation Review Subcommittee

The Department Head will appoint an Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each candidate. The Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each case of Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor is composed of three members at or above the rank sought (Guidelines to Faculty Titles)
. ; the Evaluation Review Subcommittee for promotion to Instructional Professor is composed of three members at the rank sought (Guidelines to Faculty Titles).
. At least one member of each subcommittee must come from the tenured faculty, and at least one from the academic professional track faculty. In all cases, one member of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee serves as Chair of the Subcommittee.

7.7.2.2 Promotion Committees

For promotions to Instructional Associate Professor, the departmental Promotion Committee consists of all tenured and academic professional track faculty at or above the rank soughtr; for promotions to Instructional Professor, the Promotion Committee consists of all tenured and academic professional track faculty at the rank sought (Guidelines to Faculty Titles)
. The Department Head, the Chair of the Promotion Committee, and the members of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee should prepare for the promotion cycle by reviewing the University and College guidelines and requirements as well as their department guidelines. Normally, the departmental Promotion Committee is chaired by the Associate Head or an eligible-to-vote tenured faculty member (who may be identical with one of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee Chairs) appointed *ad hoc* by the Department Head. The Promotion Committee must consist of a minimum of 5 eligible-to-vote committee members for all cases for promotion.

7.7.2.3 Evaluation Review Subcommittee Report

All members of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee are expected to review the candidate's dossier in the areas of Teaching and Service. The Subcommittee will submit a single comprehensive report evaluating, in separate sections, the candidate's performance in both areas to the departmental Promotion Committee; individual Subcommittee members may be assigned the task of preparing a draft of the report section for each of those areas. The Chair of the

Evaluation Review Subcommittee sends the report to the full Promotion Committee through the Promotion Committee Chair in advance of the scheduled Promotion Committee meeting.

7.7.2.4 Promotion Committee Meeting and Report

The comprehensive Evaluation Review Subcommittee report (on Teaching and Service) and the candidate's dossier form the basis for consideration of a case by the Promotion Committee, which is convened by its Chair as defined in 7.7.2.2. The Department Head shall not be present at any such meeting, but shall be available to be contacted in case of procedural questions.

The Chair of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each candidate under review is responsible for leading the Promotion Committee discussion and summarizing the discussion as part of the Final Report. The Final Report includes the comprehensive report on Teaching and Service prepared by the Evaluation Review Subcommittee with any revisions requested by the Promotion Committee, a summary of the Promotion Committee discussion, and the vote (on voting eligibility and procedure, **see below, 7.7.5**). All members of the Promotion Committee must sign the Final Report.

The Chair of each Evaluation Review Subcommittee shall ensure that the Final Report is conveyed to the Head. The Chair of each Evaluation Review Subcommittee and the Chair of the Promotion Committee, not the Department Head, shall ensure that the Final Report accurately represents the discussion and faculty voice in the Promotion Committee, and accurately reflects the vote of the Committee.

7.7.3 Evaluation Process for Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer

Department Review is conducted in accordance with the procedures listed and described in the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, Section 7.7. The Promotion Committee composition must be the same for all candidates in the same track seeking the same rank within the department.

7.7.3.1 Evaluation Review Subcommittee

The Department Head will appoint an Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each candidate. The Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each case of Promotion to Senior Lecturer is composed of two members at or above the rank sought; the Evaluation Review Subcommittee for promotion to Principal Lecturer is composed of two members at the rank sought (Guidelines to Faculty Titles)
. At least one member must come from the tenured faculty, and at least one from the academic professional track faculty. In all cases, one member of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee serves as Chair of the Subcommittee.

7.7.3.2 Promotion Committees

For promotions to Senior Lecturer, the departmental Promotion Committee consists of all tenured and academic professional track faculty at or above the rank sought; for promotions to

Instructional Professor, the Promotion Committee consists of all tenured and academic professional track faculty at the rank sought (Guidelines to Faculty Titles). The Department Head, the Chair of the Promotion Committee, and the members of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee should prepare for the promotion cycle by reviewing the University and College guidelines and requirements as well as their department guidelines. Normally, the departmental Promotion Committee is chaired by the Associate Head or an eligible-to-vote tenured faculty member (who may be identical with one of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee Chairs) appointed *ad hoc* by the Department Head. The Promotion Committee must consist of a minimum of 5 eligible-to-vote committee members for all cases for promotion.

7.7.3.3 Evaluation Review Subcommittee Report

All members of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee are expected to review the candidate's dossier in the area of Teaching. The Subcommittee will submit a comprehensive report evaluating the candidate's performance to the departmental Promotion Committee; an individual Subcommittee member may be assigned the task of preparing a draft of the report. The Chair of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee sends the report to the full Promotion Committee through the Promotion Committee Chair in advance of the scheduled Promotion Committee meeting.

7.7.3.4 Promotion Committee Meeting and Report

The comprehensive Evaluation Review Subcommittee report (on Teaching and Service) and the candidate's dossier form the basis for consideration of a case by the Promotion Committee, which is convened by its Chair as defined in 7.7.3.2. The Department Head shall not be present at any such meeting, but shall be available to be contacted in case of procedural questions.

The Chair of the Evaluation Review Subcommittee for each candidate under review is responsible for leading the Promotion Committee discussion and summarizing the discussion as part of the Final Report. The Final Report includes the comprehensive report on Teaching prepared by the Evaluation Review Subcommittee with any revisions requested by the Promotion Committee, a summary of the Promotion Committee discussion, and the vote (on voting eligibility and procedure, **see below, 7.7.5**). All members of the Promotion Committee must sign the Final Report.

7.7.4 Department Final Report

The Department must prepare a summary report with separate sections focused on each of the assigned areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service, as applicable). Sections should be proportional to weights assigned to each area of responsibility. The report should evaluate the level of accomplishment and trajectory relative to disciplinary norms and standards. The research section should include a review of the quality and impact of selected publications or works, and address the candidate's contributions to any multi-authored works. The teaching section should include a summary of student evaluations of teaching and peer observation(s) of teaching. The service section should explain the candidate's involvement and contributions, as well as the impact of their service activities. The report should also include

a section that summarizes the discussion of the committee about the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure. The report must address any negative comments from external review letters (as applicable), identify any questions that emerged during the discussion of the case, and explain the votes, including the context and justification for negative votes (if discussed during the meeting). The department report and recommendation to the head is advisory in nature. The report should include the Promotion or Promotion & Tenure Committee's yes/no vote on the promotion case, following university guidelines. Departmental committee discussions must be kept confidential.

7.7.5 Promotion and Tenure & Promotion Committee Vote

All P&T meetings will be in person. All faculty present at a Promotion or Tenure & Promotion Committee meeting are required to submit their vote, by secret ballot, to the chair of the Promotion or Tenure/Promotion Committee within two business days after the meeting. Faculty may be absent from the meeting only if excused by the Chair of the Promotion or Tenure/Promotion Committee, and must have a legitimate reason for not being present. Faculty so excused and absent may submit their vote, by secret ballot, to the Chair of the Promotion or Tenure/Promotion Committee no later than two business days after the meeting. All faculty members who vote must indicate that they have reviewed the candidate's materials. Recusals are allowed *only* when there is a significant conflict of interest (e.g., relative of the candidate, graduate, or postdoc advisor). Professional collaborators with a candidate may vote on the case. Abstain votes are not allowed. Only the final vote of the department is recorded (i.e., the Evaluation Review Subcommittee does not submit a separate vote). The Promotion or Tenure/Promotion Committee vote is recorded, and the report submitted in a Memorandum to the Department Head using the template provided by Faculty Affairs at (https://tamucs.sharepoint.com/teams/Team-FacultyAffairsIntranet/SitePages/Promotion-&-Tenure.aspx).

7.7.6. Department Head Recommendation

The department head letter must provide an independent review of the candidate's teaching, research and/or creative work, and service, as applicable. The head's letter should provide a basis for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The head's letter should also provide relevant contextual information for understanding the case. This might include disciplinary and departmental norms regarding authorship, publication venues, citations, grants, teaching assignments, student evaluations of teaching, undergraduate and graduate student mentoring, service assignments (relative to job title and rank). The head's letter should address Promotion or Promotion & Tenure Committee reports that need clarification (e.g., low rate of participation, discrepancies between votes and assessment, unclear evaluative statements). The head's letter should also address any special considerations, including but not limited to unresolved issues with the candidate's professional conduct that resulted in documented sanctions, and restrictions or other personnel actions. If the department head's recommendation is contrary to the departmental committee's recommendation, the head should clearly explain the basis for the head's recommendation.

8. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Guiding criteria play a key role in the evaluation of faculty performance in general and serve as the *college-level expectations* for each area of responsibility and promotion to the next rank. Not all guiding criteria, however, are relevant for every promotion. See criteria by rank and job title outlined in the sections below. For descriptions of college-level guiding criteria, see Section **8.0**. For sample indicators for promotion corresponding to each of the guiding criteria, see ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A.

8.0 Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Areas of Responsibility

8.0.1 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

The College of Arts and Sciences will use the following **guiding criteria** in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of teaching:

Quality of Teaching. Any review of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence the faculty member has an established record of high-quality teaching. Quality teaching encompasses a variety of skills and best practices including, but not limited to, (a) use of teaching techniques proven to motivate students and engage them in the learning process; (b) careful selection and preparation of course content (i.e., sequencing of topics, level of rigor, pacing of topics, etc.); (c) use of accurate, organized, neat, and up-to-date teaching materials; (d) appropriate methods to assess student work and progress in the course; (e) proper course management; (f) use of effective communication (i.e., clear explanations in class, timeliness of email responses, clarity of course or assignment expectations, etc.); and (g) maintaining a positive, inclusive, and equitable learning environment for all students.

Professional Development. Any review of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member engages in professional development activities that enhance and improve their instructional effectiveness. This could include, but is not limited to, programs offered by the professional organizations, the Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Transformational Teaching and Learning Conference.

Curricular Development. Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member creates, improves, or enhances the curriculum for a course or a set of courses, or a new course.

Impact Beyond the Classroom. Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that a faculty member's teaching has an impact that extends beyond the classroom. This would include (a) supervising high-impact learning experiences (e.g., internships, honors contracts, study abroad, undergraduate research, etc.); (b) mentoring and advising undergraduate and/or graduate students; (c) activities that contribute to the professional success of students (e.g., reviewing student's grant proposals or manuscripts, writing reference letters, etc.); and (d) disseminating teaching methods and course materials to other instructors.

8.0.1.1 Sources for Evaluating Teaching Performance

The evaluation of teaching is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement or the use of a single source of information (i.e., student evaluations of teaching). To better protect against potential bias and ensure a more holistic review of a faculty member's teaching performance, multiple sources of information must be considered.

The following two sources are required for any review (annual, midterm, promotion, or post tenure) of faculty performance in teaching:

8.0.1.1.1 Faculty descriptions of their teaching contributions. These descriptions include information on new and revised courses, high impact learning experiences, mentoring of students, professional development related to teaching, etc.

8.0.1.1.2 Student feedback regarding their learning experience as judged by students' end of course evaluations.

For promotion reviews the college also requires:

8.0.1.1.3 Two peer-evaluations via observation of teaching by a colleague at the university (see above, 7.6.3.4).

Other possible sources that can be used, **but are not required**, for annual, midterm, promotion, and post-tenure reviews are:

8.0.1.1.4 Self-evaluation and reflective practices to improve teaching methodologies.

8.0.1.1.5 Peer-evaluation of course materials including syllabi, assignments, and assessments,

8.0.2 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Research and/or Creative Work

The College of Arts and Sciences will use the **guiding criteria** described below in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of research and/or creative work. The first criterion is relevant for all four types of faculty performance evaluation (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review, and post-tenure review). The other three guiding criteria may be used for all types of review but are of particular relevance for promotion reviews.

Productivity. Productivity encompasses a variety of activities including, but not limited to, time and effort spent conducting research; the delivery of research presentations; the submissions of research proposals for funding (in disciplines where funding is available and normally expected); the production of digital scholarship (in disciplines where digital scholarship is relevant); and the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly or creative work. Each department will define specific indicators of performance regarding research productivity. Any review of faculty performance (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review, or post-tenure review) will consider

demonstrated evidence that the faculty member is a productive scholar with an active research and/or creative work agenda.

Independence and Intellectual Leadership. Any review of faculty performance will consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member has established an independent record of research and/or creative work that goes beyond early career mentors (particularly for early career scholars) and/or that the faculty member is regarded as an intellectual leader within a chosen area of specialty (particularly for senior scholars). To meet this guiding criterion, a faculty member's scholarly or creative work must be regarded as original, authentic, or innovative within the discipline and/or subspecialty. To achieve independence and intellectual leadership, a faculty member needs to have the skills and resources necessary to design and conduct a feasible study. In some disciplines, this would include serving as the principal investigator on external grants. In some disciplines, this would include the development of networks and collaborations critical for success.

Scholarly Impact. Any review of faculty performance will consider evidence that the faculty member's work is making an impact. The impact may be limited to impacts on the discipline, but may also include broader impact to the local community, the State of Texas, the nation, or beyond. Broader impacts may include practical applications of research, including but not limited to the production of patents. Departmental guidelines must indicate how the department measures and assesses the impact of scholarly activities. For promotion reviews, external review letters should address the impact of a faculty member's research and/or creative work, and department reports and department head letters must provide information to help understand how individual metrics fit within the context of the discipline and subspecialty.

Positive Trajectory. Any review of faculty performance will consider evidence that the faculty member is on a positive trajectory within the next 3-5 years, with projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future.

8.0.2.1 Sources for Evaluating Research and/or Creative Work

The evaluation of research and/or creative work is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Multiple sources of information must be considered when reviewing records of research and/or creative work. Each type of review (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review, and post-tenure review) requires a different set of required sources (as indicated in more detail in the sections below).

8.0.3 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

The College of Arts and Sciences uses the following **guiding criteria** in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of service:

Institutional Engagement. Institutional engagement includes activities that benefit the department, college, and university. This includes serving on committees commensurate with one's academic rank and job title and making meaningful contributions to the governance of the institution.

Academic Leadership. Academic leadership exemplifies a commitment to the institution and the discipline. Leadership activities include, but are not limited to, chairing committees and task forces on campus, coordinating operations of multi-section courses, and serving as a leader to scholarly organizations and entities that serve academia.

Professional Mentoring. Professional mentoring encompasses a variety of activities, including the informal and formal mentoring of colleagues, participating in and/or leading programs designed to provide professional development to others, serving as a faculty advisor to a student group, and writing letters of recommendation.

Commitment to the Discipline. There is a wide variety of review work that falls outside the scope of committee work (e.g., reviews for internal and external grant programs, scholarly journals, awards programs, tenure and promotion reviews, program reviews, etc.) This work is a normal component of service activities. Invitations to review work signifies stature in the discipline, or interdisciplinary field, while providing review work demonstrates a commitment to the discipline.

Public Outreach and Engagement. Public outreach and engagement consists of service and leadership activities that benefit the local community, the state, the nation, and the broader society. This includes but is not limited to speaking engagements for broader audiences, publication of editorial opinions, outreach activities to local schools, serving on the board of a community organization (relevant to one's area of scholarly expertise), and providing testimony based on one's area of expertise.

8.0.3.1 Sources for Evaluating Service

The evaluation of service is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Evaluation of service should focus on the significance and impact of the service activities to the department, college, university, academic discipline, or the broader community relative to the faculty member's title and percentage of assigned responsibility. There is not a prescribed list of items or sources to use in the evaluation of service. The key sources of information for evaluating service include the c.v., annual review form (for annual reviews), and impact statement (for midterm and promotion reviews). Faculty may opt to include additional evidence for their service performance, including, but not limited to, support letters and emails that denote service contributions.

8.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of responsibility (teaching, research and/or creative work, and service), with primary emphasis on the **guiding criteria** for each area of responsibility. For promotion and/or tenure, candidates must demonstrate that they meet the **guiding criteria (set by the College)** and the **specific criteria (set by their Department)**. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

8.1.1 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor (with Tenure)

To meet expectations for promotion to associate professor (with tenure), a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. The college criteria, with sample indicators, are described in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A.

8.1.1.1 Teaching

Candidates for promotion to associate professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate, and where appropriate, graduate teaching. Candidates must have a record of ***high-quality teaching***, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates should provide evidence that they have engaged in ***professional development*** activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness. Candidates should demonstrate that they have contributed to the ***development of curriculum*** in their department, though such contributions might be limited to the development of new courses. Candidates should demonstrate that they have provided an ***impact beyond the classroom*** to undergraduate students, and as appropriate, graduate students and/or postdoctoral scholars under their supervision.

8.1.1.2 Research and/or Creative Work

Candidate for promotion to associate professor must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and their research record must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. Candidates for promotion to associate professor must provide evidence of ***productivity*** as appropriate for their discipline. Candidates for promotion to associate professor must also demonstrate that they have established ***scholarly independence and signs of intellectual leadership*** through a record of accomplishment that is separate from their dissertation and/or postdoctoral work. The candidate should also be making original research contributions within their area of specialty. The research record should also include some signs of ***scholarly impact*** within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline or the department). Candidates for promotion must also demonstrate that they are on a ***positive trajectory***, as evidenced by projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future. For promotion to associate professor, the majority of research and/or creative work activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A).

8.1.1.2.1 Specific Criteria for Evaluating Research. For promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure in the Department of Global Languages & Cultures, a first book or a series of articles should be published, or at a minimum accepted for publication in final manuscript form, before the candidate's Promotion and Tenure review. If a candidate draws upon the dissertation for publication, such as a series of articles or a book, this work normally will be completed and submitted for publication by the time of the midterm review (see above, 6.2.3). If a candidate should present as the major work for the tenure and promotion file a book that was taken from the dissertation, the Tenure and Promotion Committee must firmly establish that the book is a substantially revised and expanded version of the dissertation and that it has gone significantly beyond the dissertation.

In all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of a research program that is independent of, though not necessarily unrelated to, the dissertation and that shows significant intellectual growth beyond the dissertation. Such a research program should be demonstrated in peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity that goes beyond any book or series of articles derived from the dissertation.

8.1.1.3 Service

Candidates for promotion to associate professor must show evidence that they meet at least two guiding criteria for service: ***institutional engagement*** and ***commitment to the discipline.*** Candidates may also show evidence of achievements related to the other three guiding criteria. Faculty members who have significant achievements in these three service criteria may substitute these service activities for a weaker record in either of the two required service criteria for promotion to associate professor. For promotion to associate professor, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A).

8.1.1.3.1 Specific Criteria for Evaluating Service. Service must show signs of developing citizenship in the University and scholarly communities. The most important service is that which helps to build a stronger Department of Global Languages and Cultures, College of Arts and Sciences, or University. Service to the professional field is external service, and will be considered equally useful. Service should help the faculty member establish her or his personal profile at those relevant levels. It is normally the case that candidates' first service is given to the Department and that the radius of their service increases with time. There are differential expectations for service loads on the basis of rank. Consistent, effective service begins with attendance at departmental meetings and includes active engagement and cooperation in departmental initiatives and participation in *ad hoc* and standing committees. It may extend to College and University committees to complement departmental service. External service includes service to the professional field at large. Outreach to the community making use of teaching or research expertise may also be considered significant service.

8.1.2 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to professor, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. The college criteria, with sample indicators, are described in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A.

8.1.2.1 Teaching

Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate, and where appropriate, graduate teaching. The types of contributions in the areas of professional development, curricular development and impact beyond the classroom should be more substantial than that expected for promotion to associate professor. Candidates must have a record of ***high-quality teaching***, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer

evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates should provide evidence that they have engaged in ***professional development*** activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness. Candidates for promotion to professor may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching. Candidates should demonstrate that they have contributed to the ***development of curriculum*** in their department. Contributions to curricular development should be substantial for those seeking promotion to professor. Candidates should demonstrate that they have provided an ***impact beyond the classroom*** to undergraduate students, and as appropriate, graduate students and/or postdoctoral scholars under their supervision.

8.1.2.2 Research and/or Creative Work

Candidates for promotion to professor must show evidence accomplishment and stature sufficient to merit promotion at any major research university. Candidates for promotion to professor must provide evidence of continued ***productivity*** as appropriate for their discipline. Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate that they have established ***scholarly independence and intellectual leadership*** through their scholarly record, as well as the candidate's national and international visibility. The candidate's contributions to the discipline or area of specialty should be viewed as original and creative. The research record should include significant signs of ***scholarly impact*** within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline or the department). Candidates for promotion must also demonstrate that they continue to be on a ***positive trajectory***, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future. For promotion to professor, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (see ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A).

8.1.2.2.1 Specific Criteria for Evaluating Research. Professors should be nationally and/or internationally visible and recognized as leading scholars in one or more fields in which they have made an impact on the profession. The research record for promotion to Full Professor must include a body of ongoing scholarly research. At a minimum, this record will normally include, beyond the record presented for review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a book-length critical study or critical edition published by a university press or by an equivalent foreign publisher, or as a part of a recognized scholarly series issued by a commercial publishing house. Normally, this study or edition should be published by the time of consideration of the scholarly record. A research profile in a field in which norms are articles and/or co-authored and/or interdisciplinary work must clearly articulate the expectations for impact, quality, and quantity of research in their field(s).

The overall record of research must be recognized as a significant scholarly contribution by the profession. Such recognition may be established as appropriate to the discipline through, for example, published reviews of the candidate's work, citations, re-prints of articles or chapters, translation of books into multiple languages, and research awards. While not itself research, professional service recognizing disciplinary expertise can be considered evidence of sustained impact and professional status. Such service includes editorship of and/or membership on the editorial board of a major journal, and related or similar professional criteria. Guidelines

concerning other types of editions, co-authored or co-edited studies, bibliographical studies, translations and textbooks are stated above (4.2).

8.1.2.3 Service

Candidates for promotion to professor must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for multiple guiding criteria for service: ***institutional engagement, academic leadership, commitment to the discipline, professional mentoring,*** and ***academic leadership***. Candidates may also show evidence that align with the fifth guiding criteria: ***public engagement and outreach***. Faculty members who have significant achievements in this last area may substitute these service activities for a weaker record in any of the other areas. For promotion to professor, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (as described in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A).

8.1.2.3.1 Specific Criteria for Evaluating Service. A candidate for Professor must have taken an active part in the affairs of the Department, the University, and the scholarly community. Service should be consistent and effective. Service categories include such activities as important committee work, advising of student organizations, special academic or administrative assignments such as curriculum development and policy reports, offices held in professional societies, editorial work for refereed journals or scholarly publications, and organizing and chairing professional meetings and symposia.

8.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

Academic professional track faculty members will typically be reviewed by departments for promotion after five years in any rank. If an individual's record of accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of the rank of at the next level, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion prior to five years in rank.

Academic professional track faculty should be evaluated for promotion based on accomplishments in their assigned areas of responsibility (teaching, research and/or creative work, and/or service). For promotion, candidates must demonstrate they have meritorious accomplishments that align with the guiding criteria (set by the college; see above, **8.0**), the specific criteria (set by their department), and demonstrate a high potential for continued excellence.

Candidates seeking promotion to the rank of **Senior Lecturer** or **Instructional Associate Professor** must demonstrate impact within the university in their assigned areas of responsibility. Candidates seeking promotion to the rank of **Principal Lecturer** or **Instructional Professor** must demonstrate significant and sustained impact within the university, or some achievements beyond the university in at least one of their assigned areas of responsibility. Departments may set unit-specific criteria and indicators but cannot impose research expectations on academic professional track faculty in titles where research is not expected, nor can research be substituted for service in titles where service is required.

8.2.1 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To meet expectations for promotion to Senior Lecturer, candidates must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to senior lecturer requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and demonstrated impact of the accomplishments within the university. Candidates seeking promotion to senior lecturer must have an established record of ***high-quality teaching*** and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in ***professional development*** activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate they have contributed to the ***development of curriculum*** in their department, as appropriate for the department, and may demonstrate ***impact beyond the classroom*** to undergraduate students, though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title. Candidates may also have service and/or research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities, but these are not required for promotion within the lecturer track. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A.

8.2.2 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Principal Lecturer

To meet expectations for promotion to Principal Lecturer, candidates must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to principal lecturer requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership, particularly as it relates to teaching, within the university, or some teaching related achievements beyond the university. Candidates seeking promotion to principal lecturer must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching and have an established record of ***high-quality teaching***, and must provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Contributions in the areas of ***professional development*** are required and should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to senior lecturer. For promotion to principal lecturer, candidates must have some achievements that demonstrate ***impact beyond the classroom***. Achievements in ***curricular development*** are not generally required for this track, though may be appropriate in some departments. Candidates may also have service and/or research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities, but these are not required for promotion within the lecturer track. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in Appendix A.

8.2.3 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to instructional associate professor requires demonstrated impact within the university in the candidate's assigned areas of responsibility. The evaluation for promotion must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letters. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching and service are given in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A.

8.2.3.1 Teaching

Candidates seeking promotion to instructional associate professor must have an established record of *high-quality teaching* and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in *professional development* activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate that they have contributed to the *development of curriculum* in their department (as appropriate for the department) and may have achievements that demonstrate an *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department), though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title.

8.2.3.2 Service

Candidates seeking promotion to instructional associate professor must have a meritorious record of service. Candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for *institutional engagement*, and at least one of the other four guiding criteria: *academic leadership, commitment to the discipline, professional mentoring,* and/or *public engagement and outreach*. For promotion to instructional associate professor, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A).

8.2.4 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to Instructional Professor, candidates should demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to instructional professor requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership within the university, or some professional achievements related to the candidate's areas of responsibilities beyond the university. The evaluation for promotion to instructional professor must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letter. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching and service are given in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A.

8.2.4.1 Teaching

Candidates seeking promotion to instructional professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching and have an established record of *high-quality teaching*, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must also provide evidence that they have significant contributions in *professional development* activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. The professional development activities should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to instructional associate professor. Candidates for promotion to instructional professor may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching. For promotion to instructional professor, candidates

must have some meritorious achievements that demonstrate either ***impact beyond the classroom*** to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department) or ***curricular development***. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A.

8.2.4.2 Service

Candidates must have a meritorious record of service. Candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for ***institutional engagement***, and at least two of the other four guiding criteria for service***: academic leadership***, ***commitment to the discipline***, ***professional mentoring*** and/or ***public engagement and outreach***. For promotion to instructional professor, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (such as those identified in ArtSci Guidelines Appendix A).

9. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M1 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development. Post-tenure review also enables a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated **professional development plan** that should enable them to return to expected levels of productivity.

There are two different levels of post-tenure review:

(1) Annual performance reviews conducted by the department head or supervisor responsible for conducting a faculty member's annual performance evaluation. (See Section 5 of these Guidelines).

(2) Periodic peer review by a committee (as described in this section).

The Department of Global Languages and Cultures conducts post-tenure review of faculty in accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M1.

9.1 Purpose

(1) Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.

(2) Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.

(3) Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.

(4) Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

9.2 Periodic Peer Review

All tenured faculty in the department undergo peer committee review annually by the department's Tenured Annual Review Committee (TARC; see above, 5.5.2.1). This review is conducted in the Spring semester and is an evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service in a three-year window.

The Periodic Peer Review is conducted every six years (or at a lesser interval if a faculty member so requests). Faculty will be assigned to be reviewed six years from the date of promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty hired with tenure on arrival shall be reviewed six years from the start date of employment.

The peer committee reviews conducted by the Tenured Annual Review Committee (TARC) serve as the basis for the Periodic Peer Review process. The Tenured Annual Review Committee (TARC) will constitute the Periodic Peer Review Committee. If fewer than four members of the TARC hold the rank of Professor, the Department Head shall appoint additional TARC members

at the rank of Professor, for the purpose of the Periodic Peer Review, to the number of four. All members of the TARC will conduct the of faculty at the rank of Associate Professor; all members at the rank of Professor will conduct the Periodic Peer Review of faculty at that rank.

9.3 Process for Periodic Peer Review

9.3.1 Materials

Materials to be reviewed by Periodic Peer Review Committee:

(1) Updated c.v.

(2) Annual review reports for the three years prior to the most recent Annual Review. For example, the Periodic Peer Review conducted in 2025 will be based on the current Annual Review Report submitted for 2025 (covering the years 2022 through 2024), and the Annual Review Reports submitted for 2024 (covering 2021-2023), 2023 (covering 2020-2022), and 2022 (covering 2019-2021). Since each such a report covers a three-year window, the Periodic Peer Review will encompass the entire six-year period since each faculty member's last Periodic Peer Review.

9.3.2 Responsibility of Periodic Peer Review Committee

The Periodic Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities (teaching, research, and service), as well as an overall evaluation. The Committee shall base its evaluation on all the materials considered in the Annual Peer Reviews completed since the most recent Periodic Peer Review of the faculty member in question, but shall also take into account materials beyond those considered for the annual peer review process, such as compelling evidence of work in progress. Since Annual Reviews in the department are based on a three-year window, the average of four consecutive Annual Peer Reviews shall constitute the basis of evaluation for the Periodic Peer Review.

The Periodic Peer Review Committee shall be provided with copies of the three earlier annual reviews for each faculty member undergoing Periodic Peer Review. The faculty member being reviewed may submit additional materials that show evidence of work in progress, but is not required to do so. The evaluation of work in progress shall only be factored into the Periodic Peer Review, not into the current Annual Review.

9.3.3 Process for Each Rating of Review

9.3.3.1 Satisfactory

The standards for the individual and overall performance ratings for the Periodic Peer Review follow the criteria established for the Annual Review in these Guidelines (above, 5.4). A finding of "Outstanding," Exceeds Expectations," or "Meets Expectations" shall constitute a Satisfactory performance for the purpose of the Periodic Peer Review.

If all the relevant review categories are Satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years, or following three consecutive Unsatisfactory Annual evaluations by the department head, whichever is earlier.

9.3.3.2 Unsatisfactory

A rating of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the Department guidelines (see above, 5.4). An Unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

9.3.3.3 Needs Improvement – Two Categories

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

9.3.3.4 Needs Improvement – Single Category

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

9.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" Annual Reviews or one "Unsatisfactory" Periodic Peer Review, or upon request of the faculty member. The review will be conducted in accordance with ArtSci Guidelines, Section 9.4.

College of Arts and Sciences approved: 10/24/2025
Approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs: 10/24/2025