

**BYLAWS AND STANDING POLICIES
DEPARTMENT OF HISPANIC STUDIES
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY - COLLEGE STATION**

CONTENTS

BYLAWS

I. Statement of Mission and Purpose	4
II. Administrative Structure	4
A. Department Head	4
i. Appointment	4
ii. Duties	4
a) Administrative	4
b) Budgetary	5
c) Curricular	5
B. Director of Graduate Studies (DGS)	5
i. Appointment	5
ii. Duties	5
C. Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS)	5
i. Appointment	5
ii. Duties	5
D. Director of Study Abroad (DSA)	5
i. Appointment	5
ii. Duties	5
E. Director of Lower Division Language Instruction	5
i. Appointment	5
ii. Duties	6
III. MEETINGS	
A. Departmental Meetings	6
B. Special Meetings	6
C. Voting	6
IV. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE	7
A. The Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee.....	7
i. Structure	7
ii. Subcommittee	7
B. The Promotion Committee	7
i. Structure	7
ii. Subcommittee	7
* NOTE: For Tenure and Promotion Guidance	7

C. Standing Committees	8
i. Graduate Admissions Committee (GAC)	8
ii. Graduate Committee (GC)	8
iii. Undergraduate Committee (UGC)	8
iv. Awards and Leaves Committee (ALC)	8
v. Peer Review Committee (PRC)	8
vi. Speakers and Events Committee (LC)	9
vii. Diversity Committee (DC)	9
V. PROCEDURES FOR ADOPTION AND AMENDMENTS	9
A. Adoption	9
B. Amendments	9
VI. APPROVAL AND REVISION HISTORY	9
STANDING POLICIES	10
I. Department Policy on Tenure and Promotion	10
A. Probationary Period	10
B. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion	10
i. Research	10
a) ... Dissertation-related research	10
b) ... Research program	10
c) ... Books	10
d) ... Articles	11
ii. Teaching	11
a) Effective Teaching	11
b) Evaluation	11
iii. Service	11
a) Definition	11
b) Projection	11
C. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor	11
i. Timing and expectations	11
ii. Research record	11
iii. Recognition	12
iv. Leadership	12
II. Performance Indicators for Review of Faculty	13
A. Research and Creative Work	13
B. Teaching	14
C. Service	15

III. Procedures for Review of Faculty	17
A. Annual Reports and Annual Merit Reviews	17
B. Periodic Peer Review	18
C. Definition of evaluation categories for Annual Review and Periodic Peer Review	18
D. Third-Year Reviews, Tenure Reviews, Reviews for Promotion	18
IV. Duties of HISP Officers	20
A. DGS	20
i. Student-related	20
ii. Administrative	20
iii. Curricular	20
B. DUS	20
i. Student-related	20
ii. Administrative	20
iii. Curricular	20
C. DSA	20
i. Student-related	20
ii. Administrative	20
iii. Curricular	20
D. DLI	21
i. Student-related	21
ii. Administrative	21
iii. Curricular	21
V. Procedures for Faculty Searches	22
A. The Search Committee	22
B. Procedures	22
C. The Candidates	22
D. The Finalists	22
E. The Final selection	22
VI. Guidelines for Office Behavior	23
VII. Evaluation of Teaching and Peer Classroom Visitation	24
ADDENDA	27
I: College, University and TAMU System Reference Documents	27
II: Procedures for Adjunct Appointments	28
III: Departmental Statement on Intellectual Freedom for Graduate Students	29
IV: E-mail Code of Conduct	30

SECTION I: STATEMENT OF MISSION AND PURPOSE

The faculty of the Department of Hispanic Studies (HISP) establish these Bylaws at a time when worldwide globalization includes the demographically and culturally significant Hispanization of Texas, as well as of large northern cities and virtually the entire Southwest of the United States. Through teaching, research, service and administration the HISP faculty contribute in their undergraduate work to preparing students in all aspects of Hispanic Studies through fostering adequate preparation in the field and university and professional levels of bilingualism and biculturalism especially in English, Spanish, and/or Portuguese, but not to the exclusion of other languages and cultures of the regions and lands where Spanish- and Portuguese-language presence is significant. The HISP graduate program trains specialists in all particular fields of Hispanic Studies, with a special attention to literary and visual studies, linguistics, and language studies, as well as in transdisciplinary Hispanic Studies.

Guided by the principles of fairness, civility, flexibility, diversity, and transparency, the HISP faculty define herein the administrative and departmental structures, functions and duties, as well as policies and procedures requisite to achieving their purposes in accord with the vision, policies and procedures of Texas A&M University and the College of Liberal Arts. By means of these Bylaws, the HISP faculty also describe how the traditional professorial activities in teaching, research, service and administration contribute to building an increasingly successful department wherein students and faculty realize their fullest potential.

SECTION II: ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The Department Head, the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), the Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS), the Director of Lower Division Language Instruction (DLDLI), and the Director of Study Abroad (DSA) shall be the officers of HISP.

A. Department Head

i. The Department Head is appointed by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, in consultation with the faculty, and serves at the Dean's pleasure. The Department Head is the chief executive officer of HISP.

ii. Duties. In addition to his or her duties as defined by the Dean, the Department Head has the following duties:

a) Administrative: Directs and monitors, in consultation with HISP faculty, departmental initiatives related to program building at the undergraduate and graduate levels; represents HISP at official functions; presides at general and special meetings of HISP, calls elections of faculty to designated departmental, college and university committees; makes ad hoc individual and committee appointments for specific departmental tasks; appoints HISP officers in consultation with the faculty; coordinates efforts for internationalization and cooperation with other institutions; presents candidates for adjunct faculty affiliations; recruits faculty and staff in consultation with the voting faculty; determines the duties of individual faculty members; fosters faculty development in accord with the mission and purpose of HISP;

b) Budgetary: Prepares the preliminary annual budget, and presents a report thereon to the faculty; supervises the allocation of the budget; allocates salary increases to individual faculty members in accord with University and College Policy; acts as advocate to the Dean and the Administration for appropriate

budgetary resources, including faculty salary increases and competitive pay scales.

c) Curricular: Proposes developmental and long-range plans for HISP to its membership; determines individual course assignments after consultation with the DGS, the DUS and individual faculty; assures that the content of course offerings as specified in course syllabi agrees with corresponding catalog descriptions of the course.

B. Director of Graduate Studies (DGS)

i. The Director of Graduate Studies is appointed by the Head normally for a term of four years in consultation with faculty. Reports to Department Head. Re-appointments must be approved by a majority of voting faculty.

ii. Duties: Recruitment and advising of graduate students; planning and implementing the graduate curriculum in consultation with the faculty; monitoring the overall progress of the graduate program; serving as Acting Head when requested to do so by the Head; chairing the Graduate Studies Committee.

C. Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) :

i. The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the Head normally for a term of four years in consultation with faculty. Reports to Department Head. Re-appointments must be approved by a majority of voting faculty.

ii. Duties: Supervision of the upper-division programs; oversight of lower-division language instruction; planning and implementing the undergraduate curriculum in consultation with the faculty; recruitment and supervision of advising for majors and minors; monitoring the overall progress of the undergraduate program; serving as Acting Head when requested to do so by the Head; chairing the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

D. Director of Study Abroad (DSA)

i. The Director of Study Abroad is appointed by the Head normally for a term of four years in consultation with faculty. Reports to Director of Undergraduate Studies and Department Head. Re-appointments must be approved by a majority of voting faculty.

ii. Duties: Planning and implementing new Study Abroad Programs for HISP; planning and implementing the study abroad curriculum in consultation with faculty; supervising the recruitment, selection, and advising of students going abroad in consultation with the Academic Advisor and, as needed, with DGS and DUS; monitoring current and future programs of study abroad; liaise between HISP and the Study Abroad Programs Office.

E. Director of Lower Division Language Instruction

i. The Director of Lower Division Language Instruction is appointed by the Head normally for a term of four years in consultation with faculty. Reports to Director of Undergraduate Studies and Department Head. Re-appointments must be approved by a majority of voting faculty.

ii. **Duties:** prepare syllabi for elementary and intermediate language core courses; establish policies for lower level Spanish courses (e.g., policy on absences); select and order textbooks; ensure that instructors are aware of all information pertinent to the instruction of these classes and that the instructors are on task; prepare language lab session or online materials for use in coordinated courses; communicate to the lab assistants, tutors, supplemental instruction leaders, etc. expectations of general and weekly performance, and monitor their compliance with expectations; act to correct lack of compliance; prepare unit exams and final exams for relevant courses; ensure that instructors are provided with copies of exams to be administered; work to ensure standard grading practices for all sections; provide instructor supervision/training by: setting up regular meetings with GATs for the discussion of expectations, teaching strategies, grading procedures, lab programs, online activities, etc.; organizing, with expected obligatory attendance, workshops for instructors of lower level Spanish courses; visiting GATs' classrooms for evaluation and feedback or arranging for such visitations, providing instruction and training for lab assistants, tutors, supplemental instruction leaders; provide the department head with a list of class assignments for the language sequence consistent with budget projections at mid-semester every semester.

SECTION III: MEETINGS

A. **Departmental Meetings:** Are conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order. Faculty shall usually meet as a whole once a month during the academic year. Every effort will be made to schedule meetings so as to avoid conflicts with the department teaching schedule and enable any voting faculty member to attend. The Head will set agenda items in consultation with faculty and moderate the meeting. All meetings will be announced at least one week in advance; agendas shall be distributed at least two days in advance. Additional meetings may be called by the Head to transact business as needed.

B. **Special Meetings:** The Head of HISP, or the chair of any duly-constituted HISP committee, following an affirmative vote by that committee, may call special meetings as necessary to transact business. Special meetings may also be called by written petition to the Head if supported by at least 33% of voting faculty.

C. **Voting:** The following members of HISP have voting rights on matters of general policy covered by these Bylaws and Standing Policies except where otherwise specified in this document: Faculty with the rank of Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor; Instructional Assistant, Associate, or Professor; Senior Lecturer; Lecturer with appointments of at least 75%; and Assistant Lecturers with 100% appointments. Faculty with a rank as specified above holding a budgeted joint appointment in HISP and another administrative unit are eligible to vote. Except for faculty members on a visiting appointment, faculty with an appointment of at least 50% are eligible to vote on general departmental matters not pertaining to hiring, tenure, promotion, or graduate program policy. Unless otherwise specified, absentee or proxy balloting shall be permitted in HISP. A quorum is needed for voting decisions that are binding. Quorum in the department is defined by the presence at the meeting of a simple majority of voting personnel available for attendance, that is, without an excused absence for the target meeting.

SECTION IV: COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

The committee structure of HISP shall consist of the Tenure and Promotion Committee; the Promotion Committee; and Standing Committees. The Head may appoint *ad hoc* committees in consultation with faculty as needed.

A. The Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee¹

i. The Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee consists of the tenured faculty of HISP with rank of Professor, or Associate Professor. Voting for T&P cases shall be by written secret ballot.

ii. Evaluation Subcommittee. The Head will establish an evaluation subcommittee and chair from among T&P Committee members to prepare four separate draft reports -- on teaching, on research, on service, and a draft summary of subcommittee deliberations and recommendations -- for the probationary third-year review and the review for promotion and tenure. The four reports and the candidate's dossier shall form the basis for discussion at the T&P Committee meeting, which the Head will not attend. The chair of the evaluation subcommittee shall moderate subcommittee meetings and T&P Committee deliberations. In the case of multiple tenure cases, the Head will appoint one chair to moderate all Tenure Committee deliberations. The chair will ensure that the final version of the four reports represents T&P Committee discussion and faculty voice, and reflects the vote of the committee. A summary report on the discussion and vote must be presented for full T&P Committee sign-off.

B. The Promotion Committee

i. The Promotion Committee for tenured associate professors consists of the tenured faculty at the rank of Professor. The Promotion Committee for faculty in the instructional ranks consists of all faculty at a rank higher than the candidate for promotion (tenured Professors, Instructional Associate and Full Professors). The Promotion Committee for Lecturers includes all faculty at a higher rank (tenured Professors, Instructional Associate and Full Professors, and Senior Lecturers). Voting for Promotion cases shall be by written secret ballot.

ii. Evaluation Subcommittee. The Head will establish an evaluation subcommittee and chair from among Promotion Committee members to prepare four separate draft reports -- on teaching, on research, on service, and a draft summary of subcommittee deliberations and recommendations -- for the review for promotion to Full Professor. The four reports and the candidate's dossier shall form the basis for discussion at the Promotion Committee meeting, which the Head will not attend. The chair of the evaluation subcommittee shall moderate subcommittee and Promotion Committee meetings. In the case of multiple promotion cases, the Head will appoint one chair to moderate all Promotion Committee deliberations. The chair will ensure that the final version of the four reports represents Promotion Committee discussion and faculty voice, and reflects the vote of the committee. A summary report on the discussion and vote must be presented for full Promotion Committee sign-off.

¹ For **Tenure and Promotion Guidance** please refer to College guidelines at:

<https://liberalarts.tamu.edu/app/uploads/2017/05/CLLA-Tenure-and-Promotion-Guidelines-2019-20.pdf>

C. Standing Committees:

i. Graduate Admissions Committee (GAC): Consists of four members from HISP, including the DGS and three HISP members elected from among graduate faculty by HISP graduate faculty, as well as the DGS from each participating campus. The term of membership on the Committee will be for a rotating three years. Duties will include identifying and recruiting eligible applicants, screening applications, interviewing candidates, making admissions decisions, and identifying possible nominees for awards and fellowships.

ii. Graduate Committee (GC): Consists of four members, serving for a rotating three years, at least one of whom will hold the rank of Full Professor and one of whom will be a graduate student; membership on the GC will be by means of election from among graduate students by graduate students in HISP and from among graduate faculty by the graduate faculty in HISP; the DGS will chair the committee; the graduate student will be a non-voting member of the GC; duties of the GC will include evaluation of graduate students, evaluation of the graduate curriculum, formulation of program reports, and recommendations for graduate program policies.

iii. Undergraduate Committee (UGC): Consists of seven members; the DUS will chair the committee; the UG advisor will be a non-voting *ex officio* member; membership for three positions will be by means of election from among faculty and will include representation from the lecturer, instructional, and T-TT ranks; one position will be filled by an undergraduate student who will be a non-voting member; one position will be filled by a graduate student who will be a non-voting member; duties of the UGC will include evaluation of the undergraduate curriculum, formulation of program reports, recommendations for undergraduate program policies, pre-approval of new course proposals and curriculum changes.

iv. Awards and Leaves Committee (ALC): Consists of three members from the tenured faculty, chosen by election by the faculty as a whole; chaired by the highest-ranked member; in cases of rank parity, the chair will be decided by the committee members, so as to distribute responsibilities fairly among; term of membership is a rotating three years; duties include: making nominations to the department Head for all fellowship, grant, and award competitions affecting departmental members (faculty, staff, and students) within the College and the University for which a formal nomination by the Head or by the Department is expected; helping the department Head develop precise criteria for the nomination process; setting non-flexible guidelines for the presentation of advising or supporting materials by prospective nominees; keeping records of all nominations and criteria; duties specifically exclude commissioning recommendation letters for the different competitions, as nominees will generally take responsibility for that aspect of the process as a condition of acceptance of their nomination; coordinating applications for Faculty and Professional Development leaves; producing a ranking of nominations; requesting and evaluating post-Leave reports.

v. Peer Review Committee (PRC): Consists of five members elected from the tenured faculty representing different ranks, two of whom must be full professors and two associate professors, and should be chaired by one of the full professors; term of membership is six years, that is, a full review cycle; all members of the committee will be reviewed by the remainder of the committee; collects and organizes peer review materials for tenured faculty; evaluates teaching, research, and service for each dossier under three categories, namely, "satisfactory," "needs improvement," and "unsatisfactory," correlative on a 1 to 5 numeric scale, to 2.5 through 5 for satisfactory; 2 through 2.4 for "needs improvement," and 1 through 1.9 for "unsatisfactory." "Excellent" is a subcategory of "satisfactory" and it is to be used ad hoc whenever it is advisable for reasons that must be made explicit (see Standing Policy III and Addendum III for details).

vi. Speakers and Events Committee. (LC). Consists of three members elected from the faculty; chaired by the highest-ranked member; in cases of rank parity, the chair will be decided by the committee members, so as to distribute responsibilities fairly among colleagues; term of membership is a rotating two years; promotes, collects and organizes departmental requests for invited lectures or other professional-development events; commits to supplementing departmental funds with funds from other available areas in the University, such as the Glasscock Center or the Dean's Office.

vii. Diversity and Climate Committee (DC). Consists of four elected faculty members from all ranks, one graduate student, and one staff member; chaired by highest-ranked member; in cases of rank parity, the chair will be decided by the committee members, so as to distribute responsibilities fairly among colleagues; term of membership is a rotating three years; takes a proactive position on all issues pertaining to diversity and climate in the department; coordinates with the College Diversity Committee; channels all considerations and requests meant to foster an appropriate departmental climate within its purview; advises the faculty and the Head on best diversity practices within the department.

SECTION V: PROCEDURES FOR ADOPTION AND AMENDMENTS

A. Adoption: These Bylaws and Standing Policies take effect immediately upon authorization by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the Dean of Faculties.

B. Amendments: Amendments to these Bylaws and Standing Policies may be proposed by the Head, by a duly constituted HISP committee or by written petition to the Head if supported by at least 33% of voting faculty. Proposals for amendments to bylaws will be included on the next departmental meeting agenda for debate only and voted upon at the following departmental meeting. Amendments to Standing Policies will be included on the next departmental meeting agenda and may be approved at that meeting. Amendments to bylaws require 66% approval of voting faculty in order to take effect; standing policies require majority approval of voting faculty to take effect.

SECTION VI: APPROVAL AND REVISION HISTORY

- A. Approved by HISP faculty 12/17/03
- B. Amended by Dean of Faculties K. Watson 1/6/04
- C. Amended by CLAA Dean's Office 1/6-9/04
- D. Revised 12/5/2005
- E. Revised 1/25/2007
- F. Revised 12/9/2009
- G. Revised and restructured – 12/5/2011
- H. Approved by HISP faculty 12/16/2011
- I. Approved by the College of Liberal Arts 6-4-12
- J. Approved by the Dean of Faculties (7-17-12)
- K. Revised 10/18/2013, Approved by HISP faculty 11/15/2013
- L. Revised 1/30/2015, Approved by HISP faculty 11/10/2016
- M. Revised 10/28/2016, Approved by HISP graduate faculty 12/9/2016
- N. Approved by the College of Liberal Arts: January 9, 2017
- O. Approved by the Dean of Faculties: DATE

STANDING POLICY I:

DEPARTMENT POLICY ON TENURE AND PROMOTION

The HISP faculty clarify here the standards by which tenure-track faculty members are judged during their probationary period. This statement indicates the objectives to be met for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor by the time of final review and the criteria for promotion to Professor. This policy is intended to be consistent, equitable, fair, and in accordance with CLAA and TAMU policies. Please refer to College guidelines at

<https://liberalarts.tamu.edu/app/uploads/2017/05/CLLA-Tenure-and-Promotion-Guidelines-2019-20.pdf>

A. Probationary Period. Annual reviews are mandatory. A comprehensive review is performed at the midway point of the probationary period, usually during the third year of the initial appointment. It is important that tenure-track faculty demonstrate high, continuing achievement by contributing to the programmatic needs of HISP through effective teaching, research and service. It is the responsibility of the candidate, in consultation with the Head and faculty, to plan a program of academic career development and a time-table for implementation of the plan. By the midterm review candidates must show clear and substantial progress toward the requirements of tenure and promotion.

B. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

i. Research. A candidate must show through significant and substantial scholarly publication a record of achievement and disciplinary recognition that is consonant with the aims of a major research university. The quality of these publications is more important than their quantity, and the candidate must demonstrate significant intellectual growth beyond the dissertation;

a. 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 third-year review. If a candidate should present as the major work for the tenure and promotion file a book that was taken from the dissertation, the T&PC 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;

b. It must be understood that, for any successful case for tenure and promotion, the candidate has to demonstrate evidence of a research program that is independent of, but not necessarily unrelated to, the dissertation. In all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor, there must be evidence of a significant and sustainable research program that is beyond any book or series of articles derived from the dissertation and that is demonstrated in thematically or theoretically related externally peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity.

c. Books are important indicators of scholarship. Single-authored monographs, critical studies and critical editions are prime examples. They should normally be published by a university press or as part of a recognized scholarly series issued by a commercial publishing house or by an equivalent foreign publisher. Vanity press publications are not acceptable. Other types of editions, co-authored or co-edited studies will carry less weight. Bibliographical studies will be judged according to their scholarly merits. Translations cannot take the place of individual scholarly publications, but high quality translations can be seen as significant contributions to the discipline. While textbooks may be viewed as valuable to the profession, they cannot be equated with scholarly books.

d. Articles will normally appear in refereed journals, volumes of critical essays edited by a respected member of the discipline, or selected, appropriately refereed proceedings from international or national conferences and symposia. Particularly valuable in some of our fields are series of related articles. Articles published in leading refereed journals will usually carry more weight than those appearing in volumes and proceedings, but the professional standing of the editor, other co-contributors and press will be evaluated and taken into account. Publications identified as notes will usually carry less weight than articles, but notes and reviews can enhance the overall record of the candidate.

ii. Teaching. For tenure and promotion a candidate's teaching must contribute efficaciously in the classroom to the effective education of students.

a. Effective teaching is assessed through a combination of methods and indicators, including direct observation of classroom teaching, the candidate's syllabi and teaching materials, student evaluations, as well as teaching awards and grants for development of new courses and innovative approaches to teaching.

b. At least once a year during the probationary period T-TT faculty members in two-person teams will observe the candidate teaching a class, and then produce written evaluations of the candidate.

iii. Service.

a. The most important service any faculty member can give is that which helps to build a stronger Department of Hispanic Studies, College of Liberal Arts, 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 a candidate's first service is given to the department and that the radius of his or her service increases with time. There are differential expectations for service loads on the basis of rank.

b. Consistent, effective service begins with attendance at HISP 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.

C. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

i. Normally the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor can be considered after at least four years of service and experience at the rank of Associate Professor. The promotion, however, is not a function of the numbers of years of service, but of clearly demonstrated achievement and distinction in teaching, research and service. Professors should be nationally and internationally visible, and recognized as leading scholars in one or more fields in which they have made an impact on the profession.

ii. The research record for promotion to Professor must include a body of ongoing scholarly research beyond the review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. This record will normally include a book-length critical study or critical edition published by a university press or as a part of a recognized series issued by a commercial publishing house or an equivalent foreign publisher. This study or edition must have been published by the time of consideration of the scholarly record. Vanity press publications are not acceptable. Guidelines concerning other types of editions, co-authored or co-edited studies, bibliographical studies, translations and textbooks are the same as stated above.

iii. The overall record of research must be recognized as a significant scholarly contribution by the profession. Such recognition may be established through published reviews, citation lists, editorship(s) of and/or membership(s) on the editorial board(s) of a major journal(s), and related or similar professional criteria.

iv. A professor is expected to be a leader in teaching, service and professional involvement. The rank bestows a special responsibility for the overall progress of the Department, and for the relations with other University entities, faculty and students. While scholarly achievement is normally the deciding factor for this promotion, true eminence in other areas may carry considerable weight.

STANDING POLICY II:

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY

The different review exercises mandated by University SAP 12.06.99.MO.01 are meant to accomplish three primary tasks: to help the professorial body in the Department as a whole in the understanding of expectations and the development of best practices for tenured faculty at Texas A&M University; to promote a constant process of self-assessment and improvement in the context of peer review; and to help the departmental head and the College administration in the determination of appropriate merit-based salary raises.

Both the Head and the Peer Review Committee are expected to perform their tasks with deep respect for the dignity of the departmental faculty, in a collegial and constructive manner, and with a primary concern for the welfare of the department. The annual review evaluations by the Head are also instrumental documentation for the preparation of the periodic peer reviews for tenured faculty, also mandated by University regulations, and conducted by the department's Peer Review Committee every six years. As noted elsewhere, additional reviews outside the six-year cycle can be requested by the individual faculty member or the Head in the context of the possible initiation of a Professional Development Review.

The overarching criteria must include, 1) an approach to the faculty member's scholarly career that includes a balanced assessment of her or his overall trajectory; 2) an emphasis on quality rather than merely quantity of performance; 3) a presumption of credit in all cases where the benefit of the doubt can be meaningfully used.

The annual review evaluates and rates practices over a three-year period, with a special concentration on the last year, in the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service.

Research and Creative Work

Both the annual review and the peer review must take into consideration the fact that a scholarly career is a long-term process, and that evaluation of a faculty member should take into account all past accomplishments, including the accomplishments that led to appointment, tenure, and/or promotion at Texas A&M University. 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, since it is in their best interest to do so, reviews must show flexibility and discretion in evaluating the individual faculty member's scholarly and/or creative work. Evaluators need to consider 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, not quantity, 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, both the Head and PRC members may (but do not

have to) 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 a faculty member's decisions as regards her or his own career development must trump the evaluator's criteria for progress in her or his own case. Not everyone must follow the same path, and faculty reviewers must be particularly sensitive to diversity.

For Research:

To meet or exceed expectations over a three-year (for annual reviews) or six-year (for periodic peer reviews) period, a faculty member should present a record of significant scholarly or creative work, as evidenced by achievements and activities such as, but not limited to, the following unranked list:

- Monographs published or under contract with a respected press.
- Scholarly edition with an introduction and notes.
- Digital databases, archives, and research tools of scholarly value.
- Peer-reviewed scholarly articles in good-quality venues.
- Book chapters in scholarly volumes and selective proceedings of major conferences.
- An edited book from a respected press.
- Internal grants with a focus on research and development.
- External national and international fellowships and grants.
- An edited issue of a scholarly journal.
- A textbook from a respected publisher and based on original research by the author
- Frequent citation of publications, re-publication or translation of work.
- Awards for, or publication of, creative activities.
- Presentations at regional, national, or international conferences.
- Invited lectures.
- Omnibus reviews or article-length reviews.
- Translations published in recognized venues.

For Creative Work:

To meet or exceed expectations over a six-year period, a faculty member should present a detailed record indicating visibility, impact, and quality of venue of creative tasks resulting in publications of poems, novels, literary translations, plays, or short-stories, or in performance actions.

Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of Hispanic Studies in language, linguistics, culture, literature, critical theory, and film and media. The challenge to faculty is to teach at a level that both covers the fundamentals of these several areas of study, and places cutting edge disciplinary research into the courses that constitute the undergraduate SPAN and HISP curricula and the graduate HISP degree plans. This process is by definition extremely dynamic and will be evaluated most directly in five ways: 1) peer review of course materials (including syllabi and testing instruments); 2) student reactions, outcomes, and evaluations; 3) peer-visitation/evaluation of classes; 4) instructor supervision of undergraduate and graduate research such as theses and dissertations; and 5) development of high-impact teaching activities at the departmental level or beyond. While student evaluations constitute an important indicator, they should not be the sole standard for evaluation. They are only one factor among several. Personal

narratives concerning innovation, development, new courses, and new practices should be given appropriate weight.

In evaluating teaching, the three- or six-year windows are designed to encourage flexibility and discretion in assessing the individual faculty member's performance in the context of the broader goals of promoting consistent and high-quality teaching. Factors such as class size and level, honors designation, and the luck of the draw can all affect course evaluation numbers in a given semester. A faculty member may develop several new courses over a period of a few years, followed by a period of appropriately repeating and refining those courses, and in a given year (i.e. a faculty development leave or external fellowship) may do no teaching at all.

To meet or exceed expectations over a three-year (for annual reviews) or six-year (for peer reviews) period, a faculty member should present a record of significant teaching, as evidenced by achievements and activities such as, but not limited to, the following unranked list:

- Effective teaching performance as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by syllabi, peer evaluations, and student outcomes.
- Effective direction of graduate and/or undergraduate research or creative activity such as dissertation, honors theses, etc.
- Competitive internal or external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Selection for departmental, college, university, or professional society teaching award.
- A textbook from a respected publisher not based on original research by the author
- Curricular development as seen in new courses and/or major revision of existing courses.
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation of course materials, student evaluations and outcomes, participation in teaching workshops and other such activities.
- Chairmanship in graduate advisory committees.
- Membership in graduate advisory committees.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students.
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly and related positions.
- Significant contributions to the professional development of students.

Service

Service is the glue by which departments focus their energies on their common missions and goals, and the interface between departments and their colleges and universities, and with the broad scholarly enterprise at the level of region, nation and world. Taking into account the different roles and challenges of untenured and tenured faculty in all institutions, the expectations for service are quantitatively and qualitatively different. But 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.

Opportunities for faculty service will naturally vary at different stages of individual careers, with some faculty members being active in functions not clearly visible at the departmental level. Narratives

concerning service accomplishments from individual faculty members must be carefully studied by faculty reviewers.

For the tenured ranks service should be significant within the department, college and university, and should also include evidence of impact and professional value beyond TAMU. Note that, while service starts at the departmental level, it is equally valid at all levels of engagement. Departmental service should not be privileged over college- or university- or professional-field service, or viceversa.

To meet or exceed expectations over a three-year (for annual reviews) or six-year (for peer reviews) period, a faculty member should present a record of significant service, as evidenced by achievements and activities such as, but not limited to, the following unranked list:

- Service as departmental undergraduate, graduate director or other departmental administrative roles.
- Service as an officer or committee chair in a regional, national or international professional and/or governmental organization(s).
- Service as a member or officer of the Faculty Senate.
- Service on University, College and Department committees and task forces as chair or member.
- Service as an advisor to student organizations.
- Substantial service to the local community and public at large.
- Service as editor of a journal or book series, or as editorial board member
- Service on external peer committees for tenure and promotion cases or as a proposal reviewer for scholarly awards or on a governmental task force, commission or board.
- Participation on review panels for major institutional grants or national funding agencies.
- Organization and/or chairmanship of program sessions at national and international meetings.

STANDING POLICY III:

PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY

Procedures for annual review of faculty are governed by these guidelines, which in turn are governed by policies of Texas A&M and the College of Liberal Arts. University policy regarding faculty evaluation is outlined in University SAP 12.01.99.M2 and SAP 12.06.99.M0.01. There are binding internal departmental Guidelines for Faculty Review. The annual review by the Head evaluates faculty performance on a yearly basis, even though, in accordance with College bylaws, annual reviews of the previous three years must be taken into account for merit raises. In cases of conflict between the procedures that follow and University or College policies, this document is superseded.

A. Annual Reports and Annual Merit Reviews. The Department Head shall conduct annually a review of each T-TT faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service. Non T-TT faculty will be evaluated on teaching effectiveness and, as relevant, on service. Faculty undergoing a probationary review or review for tenure and/or promotion will be peer-reviewed by the appropriate committee (See B below), the materials for which shall form the basis for the Head's annual review.

In preparation for each year's review, faculty will submit an annual report consisting of a current vita and a report of individual accomplishments for the year of review, along with copies of publications and supporting materials deemed appropriate, and communicated to the faculty through yearly instructions from the Head. The Head, in view and full consideration of the departmental Guidelines for Faculty Review, will write and convey an evaluation of the annual report consistent with performance indicators provided in Standing Policy II. The Head's evaluation shall serve as the basis for recommendation for merit salary increases.

The relative weights for evaluating T-TT faculty performance across the three areas of concern normally shall be: 1) 50% Research or Creative Work); 2) 30% Teaching and 3) 20% Service, excepting probationary TT faculty, who will follow the formula: 1) 55% Research or Creative Work, 2) 35% Teaching, 3) 10% Service.

HISP officers carrying especially heavy service loads, for example, or faculty on teaching leave or who elect to teach heavier loads throughout the year, may have this general formula adjusted by the Head. The Head will determine any individual variation from the general formula in consultation with individual faculty members and document that variation in advance of the review. In any reallocation of workload, each course taught in addition to the basic four courses a year will be equivalent to 10 percent of the workload.

In order to place each member of the faculty in the appropriate category ("satisfactory," "needs improvement," and "unsatisfactory"), the head will use a five point-scale, from 5 to 1, with 5 representing the highest possible rating and 1 the lowest. A "satisfactory" rating will correspond to 2.5 through 5 in the numerical scale; a "needs improvement" rating stands for values between 2 and 2.4; "unsatisfactory" corresponds to values between 1 and 1.9. This scale will be applied to each category of research, teaching, and service.

In compliance with SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, to receive an overall satisfactory rating a member of the faculty will need to achieve a rating of "satisfactory" in at least two categories, and may not receive a rating of

“unsatisfactory” in any category (i.e., three “satisfactory” ratings or two “satisfactory” ratings and one “needs improvement” rating). Other combinations (e.g., one “satisfactory” and two “needs improvement”, two “satisfactory” and one “unsatisfactory”, etc.) will lead to an overall unsatisfactory rating, regardless of the relative weight of any category ranked “unsatisfactory.”

For faculty with overall “satisfactory” ratings, the determination of raises will be based on the rating obtained for research, teaching, and service, weighted by percentage corresponding to each category (normally, 0.5 for research, 0.3 for teaching, and 0.2 for service). Thus, for example, a faculty member receiving an evaluation of 4.2 in research, 3.5 in teaching, and 5 in service would receive a composite score of $4.2 \times 0.5 + 3.5 \times 0.3 + 5 \times 0.2$, or 4.15 overall. The head may decide to employ the category “Excellent” for any faculty who is deemed deserving of extraordinary merit on a given year.

B. Periodic Peer Review. The Peer Review Committee will conduct a comprehensive performance evaluation of every tenured faculty member every six years following the Guidelines for Faculty Review in the Department of Hispanic Studies (Standing Policy III). It may also evaluate the performance of a faculty member who requests an additional review. Special reviews outside the regular cycle may also be set in motion by a request from the Head to initiate a Periodic Peer Review of any tenured faculty member, as authorized by University regulations.

In all cases, the Peer Review Committee will proceed to its task by collecting annual review documentation for faculty members for the previous six years. At any point in its deliberations or in preparation for them, the Committee will have the option to request additional documentation within the six-year range from faculty members under review in cases that may warrant it, i.e., when the committee may run into unclear cases in one or more of the evaluation categories.

The Peer Review Committee will proceed to its task with full knowledge and consideration of the departmental regulations and guidelines concerning peer evaluation and review standards.

C. Definition of evaluation categories for Annual Review and Periodic Peer Review. For purposes of Annual Review and Peer Review processes in HISP, we will use the three standard categories, which are “satisfactory,” “needs improvement,” and “unsatisfactory.” It is understood that a category of “excellent,” under the general rubric of “satisfactory” can be employed by the Head or the Peer Review Committee whenever it is felt appropriate and the numerical values justify it.

“Satisfactory” corresponds to numerical values between 2.5 and 5. “Needs improvement” corresponds to numerical values between 2 and 2.5. “Unsatisfactory” corresponds to numerical values between 1 (the minimum in the scale) and 1.9. The subcategory of “excellent” should be justified ad hoc in every case, and will normally require numerical values in excess of 4.

A “satisfactory” rating will be given to a faculty member who is performing at appropriate levels in the relevant 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. In Teaching this will be visible through positive indicators of strong investment in the education of undergraduate students, graduate students, or both. In Research it will be done through the submission of obvious, measurable results, or convincing narratives reflecting progress and promising solid outcomes. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize satisfactory performance within the previous calendar year.

A “needs improvement” rating will be given to a faculty member who is found lacking in the relevant category due to failure to maintain adequate patterns of performance in Research, Teaching, or Service over the period under evaluation. For Service, this could mean a failure to serve in committees or a failure to adequately contribute to mandated departmental activities in the absence of compensatory engagements elsewhere. For Teaching, a failure to maintain appropriate standards as evinced by student evaluations, peer visitations, or lack of course development. For Research, an insufficient commitment to publishable outcomes over a significant enough period of time. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize insufficient performance within the previous calendar year.

An “unsatisfactory” rating will be given to a faculty member who exhibits consistent pattern of inaction or negative action in the relevant category (i.e., absenteeism, repeated failure to accomplish necessary tasks, 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 either in Research, Teaching, or Service over the period of evaluation. For annual reviews, the category will emphasize performance, or lack thereof, within the previous calendar year.

The “excellent” rating (a subcategory within “satisfactory”), will be given to a faculty member whose work visibly and decisively advances the departmental mission in any given evaluation period. In Research, it must be linked to the quality of outcomes; in Teaching, to the quality of the commitment to educational goals; and in Service, to the quality of contributions to institutional life. For annual reviews, the subcategory will emphasize work within the previous calendar.

D. Third-Year Reviews, Tenure Reviews, Reviews for Promotion. The Department Head shall appoint an evaluation subcommittee for each faculty to be reviewed for the probationary third-year review and for the tenure and promotion review (see Section IV.A), and for promotion (see Section IV.B). All members of the evaluation subcommittee are expected to review the candidate's dossier in each area and to contribute to the written report. Additional documentation may be solicited to supplement the report in each area for the third-year review. External letters must be solicited for the report on Research and Creative Work for the review for tenure and promotion. At least half of the solicited external letters should be from a list provided by the candidate, and none shall be from the candidate's "Do Not Ask List." The results of each stage of a candidate's review process shall be made known to the candidate as the review proceeds.

Evaluation subcommittee reports (research, teaching, service, and summary) and the candidate's dossier will form the basis for consideration of a case by the Tenure and Promotion Committee or the Promotion Committee. The chair of the evaluation subcommittee shall moderate subcommittee meetings and T&P Committee deliberations. Following open discussion by the committee, a decision to continue, tenure, and/or promote the faculty member shall be taken by written secret ballot. The chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee or Promotion Committee shall forward its vote, final report, and materials from the evaluation subcommittees to the Head. The chair, not the department Head, will ensure that the final version of the four reports represents T&P Committee discussion and faculty voice, and reflects the vote of the committee. A second summary report summarizing T&P Committee discussions and vote must be presented for full committee sign-off.

STANDING POLICY IV:

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF HISP OFFICERS

A. **DGS.** Duties of the Director of Graduate Studies include:

1. Student-related: Recruiting; coordinating offers of financial assistance; coordinating orientation programs for new graduate students; advising for registration, degree plans, and committees opportunities; advising for awards and other funding opportunities; conferring with DSA concerning graduate student study abroad opportunities; conducting exit interviews and maintaining longitudinal records of career placement and professional advancement;

2. Administrative: Serving as the HISP representative to the College-Level Graduate Instruction Committee and as liaison between HISP and the Office of Graduate Studies; processing petitions; amending degree plans or making other requests of the Dean and Office of Graduate Studies; monitoring and reporting policy and requirement changes that affect the HISP graduate program, and general status of graduate programs and students; supervising the HISP test for university-wide, graduate-student, foreign-language requirement; chairing Graduate Studies Committee.

3. Curricular: Planning curriculum offerings in consultation with the Head, DUS and graduate faculty; processing changes to curriculum.

B. **DUS.** Duties of the Director of Undergraduate Studies include:

1. Student-related: Supervising major and minor advising; coordinating student relations and recruitment and retention efforts; acting as the HISP liaison with the CLLA Office of Student Affairs; resolving grade disputes; maintaining longitudinal records of career placement and professional advancement; acting as liaison with high-school Spanish programs;

2. Administrative: Serving on College-level Undergraduate Instruction Committee and as liaison with the College's Office of Undergraduate Studies; supervising and implementing changes in the HISP undergraduate curriculum; chairing the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

3. Curricular: Advising Head regarding scheduling and teaching assignments in consultation with faculty and the DGS; monitoring continuity of upper-division course offerings; processing changes to curriculum.

C. **DSA.** Duties of the Director of Study Abroad include:

1. Student-related: Promoting HISP study abroad programs, supervising the recruitment, selection and advising students who study abroad on programs sponsored by HISP;

2. Administrative: Representing HISP study abroad programs within SAPO, CLLA, and other University entities; serving on relevant study abroad committees; monitoring current study abroad programs, developing and implementing future study abroad programs; processing program approvals; supervising HISP-sponsored study abroad programs;

3. Curricular: Working with the DUS and the HISP Advisor to integrate study abroad programs

sponsored by HISP into departmental philosophy and ensure compliance with HISP requirements.

D. **DLI.** Duties of the Director of Lower-Division Language Instruction include:

1. Student-related: Providing instructor supervision/training by: conducting regular meetings with GATs for the discussion of expectations, teaching strategies, grading procedures, lab programs, online activities, etc.; organizing, with expected obligatory attendance, workshops for instructors of lower-level language courses; visiting GATs' classrooms for evaluation and feedback or arranging for such visitations, providing instruction and training for lab assistants, tutors, and supplemental instruction leaders.
2. Administrative: Providing the department head with a list of class assignments for the language sequence consistent with budget projections at mid-semester every semester; consulting in the selection of graduate students chosen for service as teaching assistants and communicating with them prior to the beginning of their service.
3. Curricular: Preparing syllabi for lower level language courses; establishing policies for said courses (e.g., policy on absences); selecting and ordering textbooks; ensuring that instructors are aware of all information pertinent to the instruction of these classes and that the instructors are on task; preparing language lab session or online materials for use in coordinated courses; communicating to the lab assistants, tutors, supplemental instruction leaders, etc. expectations of general and weekly performance, and monitoring their compliance with expectations; acting to correct lack of compliance; preparing unit exams and final exams for lower-level language courses; ensuring that instructors are provided with copies of exams to be administered; working to ensure standard grading practices for all sections.

STANDING POLICY V:

FORMATION AND PROCEDURES OF SEARCH COMMITTEES FOR T-TT FACULTY

A. When hiring for a T-TT faculty position is approved by the Dean of CLLA, the Head will name a search committee consisting of at least three T-TT members in consultation with the T-TT faculty. The committee should demonstrate strength in the academic specialty being recruited. Membership on the committee may be from outside of HISP should circumstances of a particular search make such membership advisable.

B. At the first meeting of the Search Committee, chaired by the department Head, committee members will prepare the job description, determine advertisement venues, set a schedule for the receipt of applications and selection of semi-finalists, who are normally to be interviewed at the MLA Annual Convention, and elect the chair, who will be responsible for the orderly functioning of the search and for keeping the T-TT faculty apprised of progress with the search.

C. The dossiers of candidates shall be available to HISP T-TT faculty during the search, which contains within it a vetting process whereby faculty may comment on specific candidacies. The list of semi-finalist candidates produced by the Search Committee will take into account T-TT faculty comments.

D. Finalist candidates will be selected by the Search Committee following interviews with the semi-finalists. The search chair, in conjunction with the Head, will create a schedule of on-campus interviews for finalists, which will include a scholarly presentation and may include a demonstration class by the candidate, as well as formal meetings with the appropriate level(s) of administration beyond the Department, as well as with HISP Officers and faculty.

E. When the round of on-campus interviews is complete, the T-TT faculty will meet to rank-order its selection of finalists via secret ballot. Taking into account this ranking, the Head will enter into negotiations with a candidate when authorized to do so by the Dean of CLLA.

STANDING POLICY VI

GUIDELINES FOR HISP WORKPLACE BEHAVIOR AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

These guidelines are based on the following assumptions:

- Faculty, staff, and students in HISP recognize that a productive working environment is based on mutual respect and courtesy at all levels of the departmental operation.
- All members of the department are committed to fostering a constructive atmosphere where individuals can feel supported and supportive of others.
- Faculty, staff and students of HISP will make every effort to maintain friendly and courteous attitudes toward others at all times, whether internal or external to our department.
- Generosity, tolerance, fairness, and an open demeanor are essential aspects of courteous behavior whether in real or virtual interaction (i.e., email, telephone, or other electronic means).

Should situations arise that are in conflict with any of these assumptions, individuals are encouraged to work toward resolution that generally benefits all involved parties and supports the best interests of HISP. The following guidelines for reporting problems having to do with uncivil or discourteous behavior in the workplace offer multiple courses of action to address workplace conflict, if it were to occur.

1. Consider whether resolution can be accomplished through a direct conversation between conflicting parties. Seek to understand, to clarify, and to explain the source of conflict and its impact.
2. Direct the problem to the attention of your immediate supervisor or of the departmental head as soon as possible if informal, personal measures fail to resolve the issue or are not prudent to pursue.
 - a. You are entitled to ask for a witness to be present during your reporting interview.
 - b. Your supervisor will attempt to mediate through a personal conversation. Should that fail, your supervisor will bring the issue to the attention of the departmental head.
 - c. The departmental head will prescribe immediate action as appropriate to the situation and within University policy.
 - d. If the head's action does not resolve the problem, a grievance procedure may be initiated in accordance with College and University regulations.
3. Should the departmental head be perceived as the cause of the problem or conflict, undergrad students may report directly to the Director of Undergraduate Studies; graduate students may report directly to the Director of Graduate Studies; staff members may report directly to the Office of Human Resources; and faculty members may address their concern to the Dean of Liberal Arts or the Dean of Faculties. The DUS, DGS, Human Resources personnel, or the Dean of Faculties will, under their separate authorities, seek resolution directly with the departmental head or through the office of the Dean of Liberal Arts, as appropriate.

For general reference re faculty members, please see

<https://rulesadmin.tamu.edu/rules/download/12.99.99.M0.01>

STANDING POLICY VII:

EVALUATION OF TEACHING AND PEER CLASSROOM EVALUATION

Teaching is the central to the mission of Texas A& M University. Consistent with that mission, the Department of Hispanic Studies is strongly committed to and has a long tradition of instructional excellence.

Faculty should be proud of their performance in the classroom, and they may welcome visits by colleagues as opportunities to share successful strategies with others and to receive helpful feedback from colleagues, and as part of what should be an ongoing peer review of teaching. Such visits, arranged in advance and agreed to by both parties, are appropriate for formative applications, when an instructor wishes to improve her or his teaching by observing the teaching of a colleague and when an instructor wishes a colleague to observe her or his teaching and give advice as to how it might be improved.

Formalized class or classroom visitation is also appropriate as part of the normal annual review process, as part of review for tenure and/or promotion, and whenever substantive concerns have been raised about the nature of the learning experience. Deans, department chairs, and others with responsibility for assuring a high level of instruction or for evaluating the performance of faculty members have a right to visit and/or expect the regular visitation faculty members' classes for summative purposes.² A peer review consisting of legitimate and shared criteria should be carried out in a climate of mutual support, respect, and trust, and the procedures to be observed follow below in "Policies and Procedures for Faculty Classroom Visitation."

The Annual Review Committee will examine the quality and quantity of a variety of teaching dimensions, including: semestral and cumulative career student evaluations; effectiveness in unusually demanding classroom settings (e.g., large enrollment sections, new or redesigned courses, required courses, and others for which the Department has special commitments); contributions to/use of service, inquiry-based, or community learning; contributions to a range of courses spanning both undergraduate and graduate curriculum; the effective use of new instructional technologies; leading and shaping the graduate program; mentoring graduate students; assisting graduate students in their own teaching; directing and serving on master's thesis and dissertation committees; participation in teaching workshops, research colloquia, and other efforts to improve teaching. Reflective of and conducive to teaching excellence are teaching awards.

Criteria for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A strong tradition of teaching excellence is founded on a culture of best practices. The primary criteria employed by the Department in the annual review evaluation of faculty teaching include qualitative and quantitative dimensions of the following categories:

1) *Course Repertoire*: The list of courses taught provides an indication of the scope and diversity of an instructor's teaching repertoire. There is an expectation that all faculty contribute to the undergraduate and graduate teaching mission and to the special teaching needs of the Department (e.g. large-enrollment sections, honors and other special student populations).

² When substantive and pressing concerns have been raised about an instructor's performance the Head, Dean, or designee thereof may visit a class without any advance notification.

2) *Student Evaluations*: Standardized, university-required student evaluations of teaching with both their numerical results and unsolicited student commentary.

3) *Course Syllabi*: A good syllabus should contain the basic information required by the University (e.g., grading policy, attendance, missed exams, honor code, disabilities), substantive content appropriate to the course, and be organized in a clear and effective manner.

4) *Directed Independent Study, Senior Theses, Honors Theses*: A record of activity in these categories.

5) *Graduate Committees*: A record of activity as director/ member of master's and doctoral committees.

6) *Classroom Visitations*: The Department recognizes peer visitations as an important factor in summative teaching evaluations as well as one means through which colleagues can learn from each other and share in the craft and deepen the culture and collective commitment to quality teaching. See below for policies and procedures.

7) *Learning Outcomes*: A record of tests, papers, projects etc. indicative of expectations and student achievement.

8) *Self-evaluation*: A structured report to display an instructor's teaching objectives, activities, accomplishments, and shortcomings. Suggested areas to be addressed are classroom approach, instructor-student rapport, knowledge of discipline, course organization and planning, and challenges.

Policies and Procedures for Faculty Classroom Visitation

For cases of annual review and cases of tenure and promotion, documentation from peer classroom visitations shall be included.

Faculty classroom visitations will be coordinated by the Head or his or her designee. In all cases except those in which substantive concerns have been raised or those dealing with specific exigencies of tenure and promotion, the visitation committee will consist of two faculty members: one chosen by the Head, the other member chosen by the faculty member to be visited. Without any advance notification to the faculty member who is being visited, the two faculty members will attend the same class as a team visitation, but they will write and sign independent reports.

The peer evaluator is expected to: (a) be as unobtrusive as possible in the visit; (b) complete a standard departmental form; (c) attach a narrative report; and (d) provide the peer instructor evaluated with a copy of the report. The peer evaluator's report shall be placed in the faculty member's file and be considered as one piece of information used by the Annual Review Committee and the Head in their annual summative assessment of the faculty member's teaching performance. Peer evaluator reports will be used in cases of tenure and promotion by the subcommittee on teaching in tenure and promotion, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Head.

Rank-specific policy on classroom visitations

Graduate Teaching Assistants:

Graduate Teaching Assistants with sole responsibility for their own classes should have their classrooms visited by the Director of Graduate Studies, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Head, or other faculty members, at least once during the semester of the class.

For those aspiring to academic careers, evidence of teaching experience and effectiveness is important. Graduate Teaching Assistants are, therefore, strongly encouraged to invite faculty, especially those who are members of their graduate committees, to observe their teaching, and complete peer visitation reports.

Untenured Faculty:

Untenured faculty (Assistant Professors, Senior Lecturers, Lecturers, etc.) are obligated to have their classroom teaching observed at least once a year, and they are urged to do so at least once a semester. Formal classroom peer visitations used for annual evaluation should be conducted in a manner consistent with peer Faculty Classroom Visitation policy.

Untenured faculty are encouraged to invite other faculty to visit their classrooms and to file peer evaluation reports. A larger collection of reports, from a variety of colleagues, is likely to be more meaningful in promotion or tenure materials than a smaller number of reports.

Associate Professors

Associate Professors' classrooms will be visited at least once a year. Formal classroom peer visitations used for annual evaluation should be conducted in a manner consistent with peer Faculty Classroom Visitation policy. Tenured faculty are encouraged to invite other faculty to visit their classrooms and to file peer evaluation reports. A larger collection of reports, from a variety of colleagues, may be preferable for promotion materials per University regulations on tenure and promotion.

Full Professors

Professors are not obligated to have peer classroom visitations. However, the Department strongly encourages that such visitations be arranged among colleagues for purposes of summative evaluation as well as for sharing teaching styles and tactics. Formal classroom peer visitations used for annual evaluation should be conducted in a manner consistent with peer Faculty Classroom Visitation policy.

Adjunct Faculty:

To the extent that an adjunct faculty member adds something to the Department's teaching mission, peer visitation shall be done of adjunct faculty classrooms during the first semester of their appointment, and once a year thereafter with the sole purpose to determine, in conjunction with student evaluations, if the Department's mission is in fact being enhanced.

A COPY OF THIS POLICY STATEMENT SHALL BE GIVEN TO EACH MEMBER OF THE FACULTY, AND TO EACH GRADUATE STUDENT TEACHING ASSISTANT AND ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBER UPON ISSUE OF APPOINTMENT AND RE-APPOINTMENT LETTER.

Approved by the Departmental of Hispanic Studies, October 24, 2012

ADDENDA

ADDENDUM I

College, University and System Reference Documents

College of Liberal Arts Review, Tenure and Promotion Procedures (2018)

<https://liberalarts.tamu.edu/app/uploads/2017/05/CLLA-Tenure-and-Promotion-Guidelines-2019-20.pdf>

Tenure and Promotion (Dean of Faculties)

<https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Forms/DOF-TOA/2019-2020-P-T-Guidelines.pdf>

University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (UR 12.01.99.M2)

<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf>

University Rule on Post-Tenure Review (UR 12.06.99.M1)

<https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf>

Task Force for Faculty Performance Evaluation Report

<https://cte.tamu.edu/getattachment/Faculty-Teaching-Resource/Teaching/Peer-Review/2010-Report-TAMU-Faculty-Performance-Evaluation-Task-Force.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>

Dean of Faculties Faculty Handbook

See <http://dof.tamu.edu/> for newest version

Arts & Humanities Fellowship Program

<https://vpr.tamu.edu/initiate-research/arts-and-humanities-fellows/ahfp-ap>

ADDENDUM II

Procedures for Adjunct Appointments

Adjunct affiliation in HISP may be offered for varying reasons, but the overarching factor must be of an academic nature. Adjunct faculty must help advance the academic mission of the department along lines having to do with undergraduate and graduate program development, and be consistent with goals regarding interdisciplinarity and internationalization.

For adjunct faculty affiliation to HISP, the curriculum vitae of the person must be circulated among the general faculty by the departmental head. Usually no formal vote will be necessary, since adjunct affiliations are honorary, and affiliates do not compete for departmental allocations or resources. However, adverse opinions from faculty members will be taken into account and might in fact constitute grounds to call for a formal vote or for rejection.

ADDENDUM III

DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT ON INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

Whereas

- Graduate students in the department, while not yet finished with their formation, are nonetheless professionals-in-training;
- The Department of Hispanic Studies is, by its very nature, and has been, since its inception, highly interdisciplinary; and
- The same principles of academic freedom we hold dear as scholars should apply also to our mentees;

Let it be resolved that:

- No professor, including departmental officers, in the department should take the liberty of deciding for a graduate student which courses to take or not take;
- Professors should not mandate that their students attend or not attend any specific conference; and
- Students should be free to choose their own dissertation topic and pursue their own intellectual interests.

Alleged or reported violations of these recommended best practices will be referred to the Department Head for appropriate action.

Approved by the Department of Hispanic Studies, October 21, 2019

ADDENDUM IV

E-mail Code of Conduct

The Department of Hispanic Studies at Texas A&M University takes pride in creating a work environment for all faculty, staff and students that fosters collegial, high integrity behavior and that encourages people to strive for their best. The Department of Hispanic Studies neither sanctions nor censors an individual's right to freedom of expression. However, it expects the same standard of behavior be used when sending electronic mail as would be used when communicating orally or in writing. Moreover, it is understood that department and university related e-mail serves the primary purposes of fostering teaching, research, service and administration.

In the case(s) where failure to adhere to the guidelines listed below can be demonstrated, the Head will issue a warning to the responsible faculty, staff or students. Repeated infractions may lead to the imposition of sanctions that could include suspension of all e-mail privileges to, in extreme cases, dismissal from the Department. Please see the rule listed below for Texas A&M University's standard administrative procedures and rules regarding "Responsible Computing."

- For the present purposes "business" refers to issues directly related to departmental functions whether they concern teaching, administrative or personnel matters through the calendar year.
- Make timely e-mail replies. "Timely" would usually mean within one business day for departmental officers and urgent departmental business, and one week for other members of the Department and other business.
- Use the standard automated response option when you may be out of e-mail contact for some legitimate reason.
- Make sure the subject line indicates all topics covered in the e-mail.
- Re-read and edit as necessary e-mail before it is sent.
- Be mindful of tone when sending an e-mail.
- Use the listservs for specific departmental and professional purposes.
- Use "copy up" only for the purpose of sharing information with those who are legitimately interested in the subject of the e-mail.
- Follow TAMU, State and Federal Government protocols when writing about students and student records.
- Do not forward e-mails that are slanderous, defamatory, offensive, racist or obscene.
- Do not use e-mail to criticize others or spread gossip. Remember that e-mail is not private and can be viewed under necessary circumstances.
- Do not respond to an email in anger.
- Do not overuse "reply to all."
- Do not send junk mail (spam) or unsolicited mail to the faculty listserv or any other groups.

29.01.03.M2 *Rules for Responsible Computing*, Revised October 15, 2013.

Approved by the Department of Hispanic Studies, February 17, 2020.