

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Department of History

Approved by the Department of History

1.27.23

Approved by the College of Arts and Sciences

2.9.23

Approved by Faculty Affairs

3.10.23

REQUIRED

- Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.

--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)

Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:

--Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit

The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance 3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness 3-4
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure 4
6. Annual Review 4-9

- 7. Mid-Term Review 9-10
- 8. Post-Tenure Review 10-13

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of History is to study the past at a world-class level and and share our knowledge of historical thinking— rooting out cause and effect, identifying precedent and pattern, avoiding old mistakes—to as many Texas A&M students as possible. We believe that everything has a history and that thinking historically makes sense of the present and allows us to better envision the future. 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 History 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, thus, 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. ([UR 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2](#)) 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	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	Faculty Evaluation
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	Faculty Evaluation
Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	Faculty Evaluation
Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	FACULTY/ Promotion-and-Tenure

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 at [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty Titles](#). Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1) associated with each title within their unit.

Tenure stream faculty include the ranks of Assistant Professors (except in very rare situations almost exclusively tenure-track), Associate Professors (except in very rare situations almost exclusively tenured), and Professors. All tenure stream faculty have a standard load of 60% research, 20% teaching, and 20% service with few exceptions. The non-tenure Academic Professional Track in the department includes the ranks of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer and the ranks of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor. The APT lecturers are at 100% teaching. The Instructional ranks are at 75% teaching and 25% service with few exceptions.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance: teaching; research; and 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).

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, 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. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. There are many indicators of good teaching including but not limited to providing extra-curricular engagement, participating in pedagogical workshops, publishing in the scholarship of teaching, trying new pedagogical approaches, mentoring students, successfully directing completed MA and PhD students, winning a teaching award, etc.

3.2 Research

The scholarly, creative work that goes into research is very highly defined and includes winning external grants and awards; publishing journal articles, book chapters, and single authored monographs; creating and releasing a significant digital history or public history project. These are the achievements that are exclusively privileged in promotion and tenure decisions. Additional scholarly activity that is valued as important and complementary to these achievements would be presenting papers, participating in conferences and workshops, publishing un-refereed writing for mass media outlets, publishing fiction, publishing translations, publishing edited or co-edited collections, and winning internal grants and awards.

3.3 Service

The service work that is highly valued by the department is expansive. We remain open to many different kinds of service opportunities to the history profession, academia at large, to government at all levels, and to various community interests and activities. These include, but are not limited to, participating in conferences and symposia and organizing them, editing journals, reviewing book and article manuscripts for university presses and

academic journals, serving as a grant reviewer internally or externally, serving on departmental, college, and university committees, participating in a formal capacity in internal and external P&T committees for other scholars, and formally mentoring other scholars.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations.

- 4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching include, but are not limited to: winning major teaching awards, chairing graduate committees, serving on graduate committees, publishing pedagogical works, participating in study abroad, creating new courses, winning substantial curriculum grants, and teaching independent studies and/or honors sections/contracts.
- 4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to: maintaining minimum syllabus requirements, using effective teaching techniques, posting syllabi, turning grades in on time, maintaining regular office hours, responsiveness to students, positive peer evaluation, and attentiveness to other departmental input on teaching.
- 4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to: publishing single-authored monographs, journal articles, co-authored book and/or articles, edited or co-edited books and/or articles, translated works, winning grants, winning prizes or awards, producing a digital project of significant impact and scale, or producing a Public History project of significant impact and scale.
- 4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to: sustaining a long-term research agenda with current research activity involving presenting papers, conducting archival research, having publications in the past 5 years, documenting development of on-going digital project, or documenting development of a Public History project.
- 4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service include, but are not limited to: High-level university, college, or departmental service as chair of committees and as an officer, and/or major external service for professional societies, conferences, journal and university press advisory boards, granting agencies, and other forms of public-facing historical work.
- 4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service include, but are not limited to: serving on departmental committees when called upon and engaging in other forms of external activity involving professional societies.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research, service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the unit is as follows:

- 5.1.1 **Assistant Professor:** The basic standards at the Assistant Professor rank needed to be satisfied to justify promotion and tenure are:

Teaching: Candidates should show a genuine commitment to undergraduate and, if appropriate, graduate teaching. Courses taught should be characterized by diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, intellectual rigor, and fair evaluation of students' exams and assignments. Specific indicators of high-quality teaching may include, but are not limited to:

- Syllabi, assignments, exams, handouts, course websites

- Development of new modes of instruction
- Development of courses new to the curriculum
- Successful curriculum development grants
- Participation in workshops, institutes, or programs designed to improve teaching (e.g., for the department or the Center for Teaching Excellence)
- Course evaluation scores

Assessment of candidates will also be based on peer evaluation. At least two members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will observe the candidate in the classroom (two separate visits) and include their analyses in the teaching report.

Research and Publication: A single-authored research monograph, normally a significant revision of one's doctoral dissertation, at least one and preferably two articles drawn from that dissertation research, and tangible evidence of a clear and compelling agenda for future research are the requisites for consideration for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Tangible evidence of a post-dissertation research project—a significant and sustainable agenda intended to produce a second single-authored research monograph—normally consists of an article from that research published in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, a book chapter from that research published in a scholarly volume of essays, or an external grant or fellowship for conducting that research. The Department of History recognizes Digital History and Public History as a meaningful component of the research dossier for tenure (in addition to the single-authored research monograph).

In addition to their published work, candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure may also present work accepted for publication. Written evidence of acceptance (normally from journal or press editors) must be provided.

A section entitled "Works in Progress" may also be included on the *curriculum vitae* but should be listed under a heading separate from "Publications."

A single-authored research monograph and accompanying publications do not guarantee tenure and promotion to associate professor. The attention paid to an individual's work by other scholars, including evidence of the work's quality and impact (or potential impact) on the candidate's field, will be an important area of assessment. Specific indicators of quality and impact may include, but are not limited to:

- Letters of evaluation from outside referees of national reputation in the discipline (solicited by the candidate's T&P evaluation subcommittee)
- Published reviews of books (time permitting)
- External research grant and fellowship proposals—submitted
- External research grant and fellowship proposals—awarded
- Awards for scholarship or scholarly achievements
- Conference papers and/or invited lectures presented at prestigious venues
- Contextual information regarding presses or series in which books are published if the press is not universally recognized as a leading one (i.e., other authors who have published in the same venue, impact on the discipline of other books in same venue), provided by the candidate's T&P evaluation subcommittee.
- Citations that especially appraise the value of the work and its distinctive contributions
- Citation counts

Service: Candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor should show a pattern of developing citizenship in university and scholarly communities. At this stage, service is most commonly rendered to the university by working on departmental committees (as assigned by the head) and assisting student organizations, and to the profession by participating in scholarly organizations and providing editorial services to scholarly presses and journals (manuscript and book reviews). Community service takes many forms, but relative

to promotion and the granting of tenure, it should have a scholarly or educational component. Specific indicators of meritorious service may include, but are not limited to:

- Departmental standing committee work (undergraduate, graduate, diversity)
- Department's executive committee
- Departmental search committees
- Departmental ad hoc committees
- Work with student organizations
- Other university service
- Significant community service
- Chair, commentator, coordinator of panels at professional conferences
- Participation in scholarly societies, including program committees, prize committees
- Editorial services to scholarly publishers (manuscript and book reviews)

5.1.2 **Associate Professor:** The basic standards at the Associate Professor rank needed to be satisfied to justify discretionary promotion to Professor are:

Teaching: The History Department expects excellent undergraduate teaching and important contributions (relative to the individual's field) to the graduate program from its full professors. Specific indicators of high-quality teaching may include, but are not limited to:

- Those listed above under Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
- Directed readings with undergraduates
- Supervising honors theses
- Publication of textbooks, pedagogical articles, or other instructional materials
- Awards for outstanding teaching
- Leading workshops or programs designed to improve teaching (e.g., for the department or the Center for Teaching Excellence)
- Leadership in programmatic and curricular development
- Student accomplishments (e.g., scholarly achievements, admission to prestigious graduate or professional programs)
- Teaching graduate seminars
- Recruiting, advising, training, and placing graduate students
- Research success by the candidate's graduate students (publications, conference papers)

Research and Publication: Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate continued and outstanding accomplishments in research. They will normally present an additional research monograph published by a prestigious university or trade press and related high-quality publications as evidence of an ongoing and productive scholarly research agenda. As in the case of promotion to associate professor, there should also be evidence of an ongoing research agenda. Candidates may present a body of publications—edited books, textbooks, co-authored works, book chapters, translations, bibliographies, and articles published in refereed journals—in lieu of a second single-authored research monograph, but they must make a persuasive case that this body of publications is equivalent to a single-authored book. Few faculty will possess the research accomplishments that will warrant such an exception. A significant and original work of Digital History or Public History is equal to a single-authored monograph only for promotion from associate professor to professor, and in submitting such a work, the candidate should be explicit about the status and scale of their work as well as the peer review processes it has undergone.

For promotion to professor, in contrast for promotion to associate professor, only works that are publicly released will be considered. Instances of scholarly works that have increased in stature and importance after initial publication and/or since one's first promotion may be documented through such evidence as reviews, republication in anthologies, and significant citations.

When presenting their work, candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate the actual (not just potential) impact of their research on their field. They should reflect on the entire body of their scholarship, not just their productivity since tenure. It is very important that candidates document their standing in the field, their national (or international) visibility, and the quality, impact, and significance of their research through multiple indicators—which may include, but are not limited to:

- Letters of evaluation from outside referees of national reputation in the discipline (solicited by the candidate's T&P evaluation subcommittee)
- Published reviews of books
- External research grant proposals and fellowships—awarded
- Awards for scholarship or scholarly achievements
- Conference papers, invited lectures, and/or keynote addresses presented at prestigious national and/or international venues
- Appearance of the candidate's work on graduate syllabi for courses in highly regarded programs
- Contextual information regarding presses or series in which books are published if the press is not universally recognized as a leading one (i.e., other authors who have published in the same venue, impact on the discipline of other books in same venue), provided by the candidate's T&P evaluation subcommittee.
- Citations that especially appraise the value of the work and its distinctive contributions
- Citation counts

Service: Aspirants to the rank of professor should demonstrate a pattern of established citizenship through leadership and engagement in significant university and professional activities. Specific indicators of high-quality service may include, but are not limited to:

- Those listed above under Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
- Participation on significant college and university level committees
- Chairing department standing, search, T&P, and/or ad hoc committees
- Leadership/participation in scholarly societies, including officer positions, editorial boards, executive boards, program committees, prize committees
- Service on external grant and fellowship review panels
- Writing external letters for promotion cases at other universities

5.1.2 **Professor:** The basic standards at the Professor rank are continuing the forward momentum on teaching, research, and service generated by the effort at both prior ranks. The rank of Professor is expected to take on a greater leadership role in one or more categories of teaching, research, or service and to continue to demonstrate excellence.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

Individuals in the titles of Instructional Assistant, Instructional Associate Professor, or Lecturer may be considered for promotion to the rank above. Instructional Assistant Professors, Instructional Associate Professors, and Lecturers who are candidates for promotion must submit a dossier for consideration by the departmental tenure and promotion committee, following the procedures and criteria in the College of Arts and Sciences, Academic Professional Track Faculty Guidelines.

5.3 Process

Tenure and Promotion Committee: This committee will conduct annual reviews and formal mid-term reviews of tenure-track faculty as well as formal reviews for tenure and/or promotion. It will consist of all faculty above the rank of the individual seeking promotion and/or tenure. In cases of instructional assistant and associate faculty seeking promotion, the committee will also include instructional faculty above the candidate's rank. In cases of those seeking tenure without change in rank, the committee will consist of all tenured members of the candidate's rank and above.

- The committee will act in accordance with the College of Arts and Sciences procedures for review, tenure and promotion. The full committee, after discussion, by a secret ballot and simple majority vote, will make recommendations regarding annual reviews of untenured faculty, midterm reviews, and promotion/tenure. Faculty who will be away from the university on the day of committee meetings for pressing professional reasons (e.g., development leave, fellowship leave, or presenting research at a professional conference) may vote *in absentia*. Their requests for ballots must be submitted to the department head one week before the scheduled meeting. In emergencies, the department head may provide a ballot within that week at her or his discretion. Absentee ballots must be received by the staff person normally responsible for receiving electronic ballots by the beginning of the meeting for which they are being cast. The department head shall not vote on matters before the committee. The department head's participation in the deliberations will be limited to providing information requested by other members of the committee.
- The Tenure and Promotion Committee's deliberations and decisions will remain strictly confidential.
- Evaluation subcommittees for each faculty member under consideration at the mid-term review and for promotion and/or tenure will be appointed by the head with the advice of the executive committee. In appointing the heads of subcommittees, the department head will also consider suggestions from individual candidates for promotion.
- The chair of each meeting will be selected by the head of the department in consultation with the faculty under consideration and with the approval of the executive committee (committee members under review at the meeting in question will recuse themselves). The chair of the meeting will moderate the discussion and, for the midterm review and promotion and tenure, assure that the final version of each evaluation committee report represents the faculty voice.
- There will be a secretary for each candidate for the mid-term review and for promotion and tenure who will record the discussion during the meeting and modify the evaluation committee report as needed. The same procedure for selecting the chair will apply to selecting the secretary.
- Modifications of the evaluation committee report will be submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee for approval.
- The department head will forward the full dossier to the dean. The head will also forward an independent evaluation based on the candidates' dossier.
- Individuals in the titles of Instructional Assistant, Instructional Associate Professor, Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer may be considered for promotion to the rank above. Instructional Assistant Professors, Instructional Associate Professors, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers who are candidates for promotion must submit a dossier for consideration by the departmental tenure and promotion committee, following the procedures and criteria in College of Arts and Sciences, Academic Professional Track Faculty Guidelines.

6. 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 heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In the case of budgeted joint appointments, It is recommended that heads, directors and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member's performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
 - See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the 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.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Process

On or about December 1, the department head will initiate the annual review process in Interfolio. Each member of the faculty will be required to submit the completed report by January 20 of the succeeding year. The Interfolio dossier will detail the academic activities of a calendar year (January 1 through December 31) and will serve as the primary basis for evaluating a faculty member's professional progress and overall performance rating. It is incumbent upon each faculty member to make the best case for his/her accomplishments on the form and to state, with clarity and purpose, his/her short and long term goals for professional development (teaching, research, and service) in the section at the end of the form.

Approximately six weeks after the beginning of the succeeding calendar year, the department's executive committee will meet to determine each faculty member's overall performance rating (or weighted composite score) by evaluating their research, teaching, and service using a five-point scale: 4 = Superior; 3 = Excellent; 2 = Commendable; 1 = Satisfactory; 0 = Needs Improvement. (The scale does not include Unsatisfactory because, as stated in SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, an Unsatisfactory rating in any single category of performance results in an overall Unsatisfactory rating with no weighted composite score.) Typically, areas of responsibility will be weighted as follows: Research 60%, Teaching 20%, Service 20%. Thus, for example, a faculty member evaluated by the executive committee as Excellent in research, Satisfactory in teaching, and Commendable in service would receive an overall performance rating (or weighted composite score) of 3×0.6 (Research) plus 1×0.2 (Teaching) plus 2×0.2 (Service) or 2.4. The executive committee will evaluate teaching and service accomplishments in a manner appropriate to rank.

Upon the completion of the evaluations, the department head will notify each member of the faculty in writing of the executive committee's assessment of his/her performance, including individual scores and ratings in research, teaching, and service and overall weighted composite scores. This memorandum constitutes the faculty member's annual review. The department head will also include an assessment of each faculty member's progress in research, teaching, and service, which will vary from rank to rank. For assistant professors, the assessment will focus on progress toward tenure and promotion; for associate professors, on promotion to professor; and for full professors, on further advancement of the department's four core commitments. (For assistant professors, progress toward tenure and promotion is also assessed by the department's tenure and promotion committee.)

Faculty members, upon indicating receipt by signing a copy of the document, will be given the opportunity to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year with the department head. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member. If the annual review fails to follow the process and procedures of these published guidelines, complaints should be directed in writing to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and copied to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review.

The annual review serves as the primary documentation not only for evaluation of job performance but also for merit increases. On the basis of the completed evaluations and after consulting with the executive committee, the department head will recommend specific salaries to the dean when the university budget becomes known. When the recommendations have been approved by the Board of Regents, the department head will notify each faculty member of their respective salaries.

6.3 Focus

The focus of the annual review process 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, and progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and 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, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.4 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. The expanded window of the Department of History is three years.

6.5 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated as “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, “Commendable”, “Excellent”, or “Superior” based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

6.5.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:

- Unsatisfactory – The absence of demonstrated competence in the classroom over a three year period as evidenced by a faculty member’s failure to meet basic expectations (as defined below under “satisfactory”).
- Needs Improvement – Demonstrated competence in the classroom over a three year period called into question by documented complaints from students to the department head and/or a faculty member’s failure to mitigate concerns raised in student evaluations.
- Satisfactory – Demonstrated competence in the classroom over a three year period as evidenced by a faculty member meeting basic expectations, including consistently employing pedagogically sound techniques to instruct students, meeting classes during regularly scheduled times, holding regularly scheduled office hours, meeting minimum syllabus requirements, posting syllabi and C.V. on the HOWDY website, submitting midterm and final grades on time, conducting student evaluations, and complying with W-course standards.
- Commendable–Extra engagement in the classroom in the given calendar year beyond meeting basic expectations, such as teaching independent studies (485s, 497s, and 685s) or first-year critical thinking seminars, supervising honors theses, honors contracts, and/or embedded sections, winning curriculum development grants, participating in workshops or programs designed to improve teaching, participating in study abroad, adding a new course to the inventory of classes, publishing pedagogical articles in scholarly journals, delivering pedagogical papers at professional conferences, hosting a speaker in one’s class who addresses concerns of diversity and/or internationalization/globalization with respect to the course topic(s), contributing significantly to internationalization/globalization and/or diversity by, for example, participating in a teaching workshop or institute sponsored by the Center for Teaching Excellence or the Office of the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity; or contributing markedly to graduate education, as evidenced by chairing one or two committees or serving on at least four others, or significant recruiting efforts.
- Excellent–In the given calendar year, contributing substantially to the graduate program, as evidenced by chairing two or more committees and serving on more than four others, chairing a completed Ph.D., placement of a Ph.D. in a tenure-track position at a B.A./M.A.-granting institution or a significant non-academic position, scholarly publications by one’s current graduate students, or significant recruiting efforts to enhance diversity and/or internationalization/globalization; contributing substantially to the undergraduate program, as evidenced by three or more “commendable” teaching accomplishments, receipt of a College-level teaching award (or equivalent), or publication of a pedagogical book.
- Superior–Extraordinary teaching in the given calendar year as evidenced by, for example, receipt of a University-level teaching award (or equivalent); recent placement of a Ph.D. in a tenure-track position at a Ph.D.-granting institution.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**. The unit should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.

6.5.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are:

- Unsatisfactory – The absence of a significant and productive research agenda—one demonstrating progress, trajectory, and sustainability (as defined, below, under “satisfactory”).
- Needs Improvement – Indicators of activity not considered for Satisfactory but pertinent to one’s ongoing research—such as papers presented at professional meetings, invited lectures, major external grant proposals, additional publications submitted, Glasscock Center working-group papers, department colloquium presentations, and other comparable research products—at least two activities total over the course of the three year window under consideration.
- Satisfactory –The presence of a significant and productive research agenda—one demonstrating progress, trajectory, and sustainability. Evidence of such an agenda involves meeting the following criteria: at a minimum over a three year period, editing a volume of scholarly essays; or publishing an article in a second tier disciplinary journal or a second-tier area-specific journal, a scholarly essay in an edited volume, or a significant article-length translation; or winning small (as opposed to “major”) external grants or fellowships totaling approximately \$3,000; or receiving other research honors, such as a significant article or book award; or having a major (A- or B-category) research monograph in its third year of publication; or documented development of an ongoing digital project—such as adding data, enhancing data modeling, development of formal data schemas, prose documentation of a project; or documented development of a Public History project—such as internal grant support, external grant proposals, conference presentations, workshop presentations.
- Commendable–Demonstrable evidence of research productivity in the given calendar year, such as editing a volume of scholarly essays; or publishing an article in a second tier disciplinary journal or a second-tier area-specific journal, a scholarly essay in an edited volume, or a significant article-length translation; or winning small (as opposed to “major”) external grants or fellowships totaling approximately \$3,000; or receiving other research honors, such as a significant article or book award; having a major (A- or B-category) research monograph in its third year of publication; having a public history or digital history project previously earning a “superior” ranking in its third year of release; initial release of a digital project or the release of a major revision of a digital project; or documented progress on a Public History project—such as external grant support, initial project deliverables, contract or written agreement with a museum or other public entity.
- Excellent–Demonstrable evidence of a highly productive research agenda in the given calendar year, such as the publication of a major article in a first tier disciplinary journal or a first tier area-specific journal, two scholarly articles in second-tier disciplinary or area-specific journals (or any two “commendable” research accomplishments, e.g., a scholarly essay in an edited volume and a book award), a significant book-length translation, or a classroom book; or winning a major (national or international) external grant or fellowship, awarded for the year in which the grant or fellowship begins (see Appendix A); submission of results of peer review by a professional association for a digital history project that affirms that the project makes a significant intervention in its field, equivalent to that of a first tier journal article, awarded the year the peer-review was conducted and the project released; winning a major prize in digital history; or winning a major (national or international) external grant or fellowship for a digital history project as a PI or a co-PI (see Appendix C); the debut of an exhibit or documentary or completion of work on a historical site, an oral history project, or a cultural preservation project; winning a major (national or international) external grant or fellowship for a public history project as a PI or a co-PI; or submission of results of peer review by a professional association for a successfully completed public history project that affirms that the project makes a

significant intervention in its field, equivalent of a first tier journal article, awarded the year the peer-review was conducted and the project released (see Appendix D).

- Superior– Publication of a major (A- or B-category) research monograph in the first year and the second year of publication; the final and successful release of a major digital or public history project that has been funded by a major (national and international) external grant or fellowship; submission of results of peer review, obtained in cooperation with faculty member and department head, from a professional association or reports submitted to the department by a nationally recognized expert in digital or public history and a nationally recognized content field expert that attests to the significance and impact of the project (equivalent to a major research monograph), awarded the year the peer-review was conducted and the project released.

6.5.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are:

- Unsatisfactory – Failure to provide service in a manner appropriate to rank over a three year period (as defined below under “satisfactory”).
- Needs Improvement – Limited participation over a three year period, as judged in a manner appropriate to rank, in departmental processes (e.g., attending faculty and tenure and promotion meetings, providing the head with a valid explanation for an absence from a tenure and promotion meeting, serving, when asked, on standing committees, T&P subcommittees and search committees); **or** in professional activities (e.g., reviewing books and manuscripts, chairing and/or commenting on conference panels).
- Satisfactory – Participation over a three year period, as judged in a manner appropriate to rank, in departmental processes (e.g., attending faculty and tenure and promotion meetings, providing the head with a valid explanation for an absence from a tenure and promotion meeting, serving, when asked, on standing committees, T&P subcommittees and search committees); **and** in professional activities (e.g., reviewing books and manuscripts, chairing and/or commenting on conference panels).
- Commendable– In the given calendar year, exercising a leadership role in departmental processes (e.g., chairing a department standing committee, T&P subcommittee, or search committee; writing a research report for a T&P subcommittee; serving on the executive committee; or providing significant faculty mentoring); in university activities (e.g., sponsoring a student organization; giving a scholarly presentation on campus; serving as a member of the Faculty Senate; taking the training as an Aggie Ally; or conducting Center for Teaching Excellence workshop on diversity and/or internationalization/globalization); or in professional activities (e.g., reviewing at least four books and/or manuscripts; serving on editorial boards, program or prize committees, or as officers for associations; or significant public service to the local community).
- Excellent– In the given calendar year, exceptional participation in university affairs (e.g., serving as a department officer, or on important college and university committees such as the Dean’s Advisory Committee, or a college or university-level search committee, or as an officer in the Faculty Senate) or in professional affairs (e.g., serving as an evaluator for a major/national grant or fellowship organization, an academic program external review committee, on an external tenure and promotion committee, as an organizer of a major conference, or as an editor of a second-tier disciplinary or area-specific journal).
- Superior– Extraordinary participation in the given calendar year in university or professional affairs such as chairing a highly significant university committee, serving as president of a major historical association, or editing a first-tier disciplinary or area-specific journal.

6.6 Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.6.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities.

The exact form of the faculty member's report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College, but must include the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of possible content for the report are the following as listed and described in the Department of History Faculty Member's Annual Report Form:

Department of History
Faculty-Member's Annual Report Form
Calendar Year 2015

Name:

Rank:

It is incumbent upon each faculty member to make the best case for his/her accomplishments on this form. Elaborations/annotations are welcomed and encouraged.

Please list accomplishments for the calendar year only. For publications, the copyright date determines the year eligible for merit. Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary contributions in research, teaching, and service are valued no more and no less than disciplinary contributions.

*Indicates activities unlikely to be considered for merit but pertinent to one's professional development.

RESEARCH

1. Research monographs (complete citations)
2. Edited volumes (complete citations)
3. Classroom books (complete citations)
4. Articles in refereed journals (complete citations)
5. Scholarly essays in edited volumes (complete citations)
6. Books or articles translated by you (complete citations)
7. Research fellowships/grants (list project title, funding source, amount of fellowship/grant, date fellowship/grant begins)
8. Research-related honors (significant book awards, article awards, etc.)
9. Digital history project (citation and documentation of its significance and scale)
10. Public history project (citation and documentation of its significance and scale)
11. *Revised editions of previously published books (complete citations)
12. *Other refereed publications such as reference works, biographical dictionaries, etc. (complete citations)

13. *Publications accepted but not yet in print (indicate where it was submitted and its status – accepted but still under revision, final form of manuscript submitted or accepted, etc.)
14. *Publications submitted (where, date submitted, status of review)
15. *Papers presented at professional meetings (title of paper, name of organization, date of meeting)
16. *Invited lectures (title of lecture, place, date)
17. *Submitted research fellowship/grant proposals (list project title, funding source, amount of fellowship/grant)
18. *Status of long-term research project(s)

TEACHING

1. Courses Taught

Semester Course No. Hours #of Students #of Sections

2. Independent Studies (485s, 497s, and/or 685s)

Semester Course No. Hours # of Students

3. Contributions to Undergraduate Education

- A. Pedagogical books, articles, lectures, and/or papers at professional conferences (provide full citations/details)
- B. Curriculum and pedagogical development (adding new courses to the Catalog, grants used to support curriculum improvement, participating in workshops or programs designed to improve teaching, etc.)
- C. Extra-Engagement undergraduate experiences (honors theses, teaching first-year critical thinking seminars, study abroad)
- D. Significant contributions to diversity and/or internationalization/globalization (e.g., participation in a Center for Teaching Excellence workshop addressing these issues, study abroad)
- E. Teaching awards (describe)

4. Contributions to Graduate Education

- A. Chair of Graduate Student Committees
PhD candidates (list names) MA candidates (list names)
- B. Chair of Completed Ph.D.s (list names, dates)
- C. Scholarly publications by current graduate students under your supervision
(complete citation)
- D. Committee Member of Graduate Committees
PHD candidates (names & department) MA candidates (names & department)
- E. Graduate Student recruiting efforts (describe)

SERVICE

1. University Service

- A. Department Committees (list) Chair Member
- B. College Committees (list) Chair Member
- C. University Committees (list) Chair Member
- D. Administrative Duties (describe)
- E. Sponsorship of student organizations (describe)
- F. Scholarly presentations on campus (title, date, occasion; not a classroom presentation)
- G. Civic and Public Relations Activities (lectures to community organizations, media – interviews and/or television appearances, etc.)
- H. Significant contributions to diversity and/or internationalization/globalization (e.g., conducting a Center for Teaching Excellence workshop addressing these issues)
- I. Significant faculty mentoring by you (describe efforts, identify mentees)

- J. Faculty who have mentored you significantly (describe efforts, identify mentors)
2. Extra-mural Service
- A. Book Reviews (complete citations)
 - B. Manuscript reviews (title of press or journal)
 - C. Reviewing grant applications (granting agency)
 - D. Sessions chaired at professional meetings (full session title, name of professional meeting, date)
 - E. Commentator, discussion panelist, or panel organizer at professional meetings (full title of session, name of professional meeting, date)
 - F. Outside research evaluator: tenure and promotion, academic program external review committee, etc. (list institution, nature of evaluation, and date)
 - G. Conference organizer (title of conference, location, date)
 - H. Offices held or committee membership in professional organizations (name of organization or board and position held)
 - I. *Membership in professional organizations

MISCELLANEOUS

Special Accomplishments Please describe any accomplishments in research, teaching, or service not specified in the above criteria.

Goals (required)

- A. Short term goals for professional development (teaching, research, service)
- B. Long term goals for professional development (teaching, research, service)

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

6.6.2 A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations.

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the 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 and should be 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 unit 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. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

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 a faculty member has 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. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the department head's, director's, or supervisor's written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

6.6.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member 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/director/supervisor or faculty member.

6.6.4 Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual's appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University.

6.7 Assessment outcomes that require action

As per [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

6.7.1 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 (e.g., administration, patient care...), 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 unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). 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 department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see Section 8.) 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 section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.7.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 8), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor 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. The rating of "Needs Improvement" can stay as "Needs Improvement" as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to "Unsatisfactory". The rating of "Needs Improvement" should be changed to "Satisfactory" when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.8 Time-Line

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. The Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, "These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year."

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Vice President 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 President 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](#)

7. Mid-Term Review

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 mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term 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.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should 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.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
-------	---------------------	------------------------------------

Calendar Year 2019	7 years	Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)
--------------------	---------	--

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

As specified in its *Review, Tenure and Promotion Procedures*,* the College of Arts and Sciences conducts formal personnel reviews of faculty on probationary status in February of their third year of service (“mid-term” reviews in the parlance of the College). Candidates credited with two years of prior academic service at the time of appointment will undergo the mid-term review during their second year in rank at Texas A&M. Recognizing that mid-term reviews are a “very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty,” the history department provides guidance for assistant professors for putting together their first and second year dossiers to prepare them for these formal procedures. The following guidelines are meant to supplement the College document and the department’s *Statement on Tenure and Promotion Criteria*.**

Research

The department *strongly recommends* that by the time of their mid-term review, tenure-track faculty should have completed revisions of their dissertations and have their first book manuscripts circulating with an appropriate publisher (i.e., in the hands of an editor). The required one or two articles from first-project research (see the department document) should also have been submitted for publication by this time. The department recognizes, however, that some books take longer than others, and thus does not *mandate* this date for completion/circulation. Nonetheless, a successful tenure case will require a peer-reviewed article accepted for publication or a competitive external grant as evidence of a second project— i.e., a “significant and sustainable” research program *beyond* the revised dissertation. Candidates are thus advised to leave themselves as much time as possible to meet this challenging requirement.

Teaching

The department expects candidates to teach their assigned courses, develop a good rapport with their students, and seek assistance from faculty mentors or the Center of Teaching Excellence if they feel it necessary. Procedures for the third-year review mandate the comparison of teaching evaluation scores with departmental means, but the department looks primarily for evidence of steady improvement. The personal statement provides an opportunity for candidates to reflect on their teaching philosophy and/or experience.

Service

Candidates should have begun participating in departmental service (as directed by the department head) and pursuing professional activities outside the university (book reviews, memberships in scholarly organizations, etc.).

8. Post-Tenure Review¹

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

¹ Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

8.1 Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

8.2 Peer Review Committee

The elected six-member Executive Committee (3 by each rank, 3 at large) functions as the Periodic Peer Review Committee. Members serve two-year elected terms and no one shall serve more than two consecutive terms. The Periodic Peer Review process will limit the participation from the mixed-rank Executive Committee by utilizing only ranked peers in the process. Assistant Professors on the Executive Committee will not provide Periodic Peer Review evaluative input for anyone; Associate Professors on the Executive Committee will not provide Periodic Peer Review evaluative input for the rank of Professor. After an election (usually in early May), should fewer than two Professors serve on the Executive Committee, Professors as a whole will elect an additional Professor to serve as an ad hoc member of the Periodic Peer Review Committee for a two-year term. The election will be conducted by the Professor currently serving in the by-rank position on the Executive Committee in May. The Professor elected shall not be the Department Head or Associate Department Head. This will set the size of the Periodic Peer Review Committee at no less than two. The Periodic Peer Review Committee will generate foundational faculty evaluations as the basis for the Periodic Peer Review that is conducted by the Department Head.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- Annual Performance Reviews for up to five years, or fewer if a voluntary Periodic Peer Review.
- Executive Committee annual evaluations for up to five years, or fewer, if a voluntary Periodic Peer Review.
- Department Head annual evaluations for up to five years, or fewer if a voluntary Periodic Peer Review.

8.3.2 The 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, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department and university guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

- 8.3.4 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.6. 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, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.² If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.8 **By no later than May 31st**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/ director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

8.4.1 The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

8.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be

² It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what “consultation” means.

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

8.4.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

8.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

8.4.5.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 8.5) acceptable to the dean.

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the unit guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, director, or supervisor and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review)

8.6 Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of [University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01](#) (Faculty Grievances Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the department head, director, or supervisor (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

9. **Granting Faculty Emeritus Status**

[University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see [Institutional Rule 31.08.01](#), which indicates the process for this situation.

See the Vice President for Faculty Affairs website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

Appendix A

Peer-Reviewed Book Presses

A Such a press enjoys the reputation of being a major national/international publisher producing books of the highest quality that are well publicized, widely distributed, and reviewed in major journals. A book published by an A-category press typically is in the best position to make a significant impact in the discipline.

B The B-category press has a distinguished publishing record and a national/international reputation in the subject areas of the books that are distributed under its name. A book published by a B-category press is well positioned to make an impact in its field of study.

C The C-category press peer-reviews the manuscripts it publishes, but does not have a national/international reputation in the area of study of the books it distributes. Such a book is not best positioned to make an impact in its field.

Classroom Books

Those intended primarily for use in undergraduate courses—i.e., in series published by presses such as Bedford/St. Martin's, Longman, Wiley, etc., as well as authored or co-authored textbooks published by appropriate presses.

Peer-Reviewed Journals

First tier disciplinary journals publish high-quality articles of significance across the discipline. Such journals enjoy high reputations, are likely to be widely read and cited by scholars, and their impact on the discipline is great. Examples may include but are not limited to: *American Historical Review*, *Past and Present*, *Journal of the Historical Society*, *Daedalus*

First tier area-specific journals publish high-quality articles of significance within a specific sub-field or area and generally are the leading journals in the particular subfield or area. Such journals enjoy high reputations throughout their sub-field and often beyond and are likely to be read and cited by scholars in their relevant sub-field and beyond. Examples may include but are not limited to: *Journal of American History*, *William and Mary Quarterly*, *Journal of Southern History*, *Business History Review*, *French Historical Studies*, *Journal of Modern History*, *Pacific Historical Review*, *Journal of Military History*, *Journal of Asian Studies*, *Technology and Culture*

Second tier disciplinary journals are respected in their fields and publish articles of interest across the discipline. Examples include but are not limited to: *The Historian*, *History Today*

Second tier area-specific journals publish peer-reviewed articles of interest within a specific sub-field or area. Publications in these journals frequently are selectively read and cited by scholars active in the relevant sub-field or area. Examples may include but are not limited to: *The Southern Quarterly*, *Journal of the West*, *Southern California Quarterly*, *The Annals of Iowa*, *Contemporary European History*, *European History Quarterly*, *German Studies Review*, *Modern & Contemporary France*, *Journal of Baltic Studies*

Major Grants and Fellowships

Highly competitive, national, semester or year-long research fellowships, such as those awarded by the American Council of Learned Societies, American Philosophical Society, Fulbright Scholar Program, Huntington Library, Guggenheim Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Humanities Center, Woodrow Wilson Center, and others approved by the College of Liberal Arts in its "Policy on Development Leaves, External Fellowships, and Course Buyouts," Appendix 1.

Appendix B

Individual Circumstances

In their efforts to maintain a significant and productive research agenda, faculty members should not be penalized in annual reviews for individual circumstances such as a serious health condition or acute family care situation that cause them to miss significant time (three months or so). A faculty member cannot earn a satisfactory rating in research solely on the basis of illness or acute family care situations, but may request, in writing and with proper documentation, an extension of the three to five year window owing to the issues raised by such circumstances. In order to ensure fairness, equal access to assistance, and consistency in how such situations are handled across the department, the department head, in consultation with the executive committee, will normally consider such

requests *after* the faculty member has been granted leave under the [Family Medical Leave Act](#) or a temporary workload adjustment under [College of Arts and Sciences policy](#).

Upon approving the request, the department head will extend the three to five year window *forward*, so as to allow the faculty member to recoup the research time lost in the given calendar year, and *backward* so as to, in essence, remove the given calendar year from the evaluation period. To illustrate, assume, for example, that the significant period of lost research time occurred in calendar year 2013. The faculty member's evaluation for calendar year 2014 will extend to what amounts to a four-year window (2011-2014) and the evaluation for 2015 will cover the period 2012-2015. The 2016 evaluation, at which time calendar year 2013 will fall out of the three year window, will return to normal. Both these four year windows extend to six years where appropriate (i.e., with the publication of a major research monograph, as stated on p. 4 of these guidelines). Similarly, the 2013 evaluation period will extend back four years to include 2010 for publications, grants, and awards and to 2008 for a major research monograph.

As with all annual reviews, the executive committee will determine the faculty member's rating in research on the basis of the criteria listed on these guidelines, as opposed to publications submitted or projects in progress.

Appendix C

Digital History

The Department of History at Texas A&M has aligned its evaluation of Digital History with the principles outlined in the [American Historical Association \(AHA\) Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship by Historians \(2015\)](#) and the [AHA Guidelines on Broadening the Definition of Historical Scholarship \(2023\)](#). Digital History has two main aims: advance historical understanding using digital technologies; advance the digital tools used for conducting historical inquiry. Digital History must do more than digitally increase access to primary and secondary materials that remain essentially analog. Moreover, while Digital History projects often serve the important aims of increasing public engagement and of preserving cultural heritage, these activities remain more central to Public History than to Digital History. Projects that seek primarily to meet these goals should be assessed under the rubric of Public History. Digital History projects facilitate analysis at scales that are difficult for humans to accomplish without the aid of a computer. They collect, organize, aggregate, and disseminate—for human use and/or for machine analysis—the results of the researcher's source analysis. Digital History projects produce data that model source texts and historical information derived from source texts. They apply data standards that maximize the use, reuse, and aggregation of data across multiple independent projects as well as metadata standards that maximize discoverability. They produce data visualizations resulting in new ways of thinking about the past. They emphasize transparency of methods and results through their application of accepted standards, data storage, and project documentation. As such, the project work itself, documenting the project, and the traditional publications critically engaging with the digital technologies used in the project are all research outputs in the field of Digital History. Digital History entails valuable academic work requiring a reimagining of concepts of collaboration, scholarly products, and peer review.

1) Collaboration

Digital History is usually collaborative, especially at the level of grant writing. Collaborative work should be seen as a strength in Digital History. It is, however, incumbent upon researchers to be explicit about their individual roles and contributions.

2) Scholarly Products

Digital History values process alongside product. So while the creation or release of a single scholarly product signals the end of a project in traditional scholarship, digital historians often make projects available online at the early developmental stage and refine their methodologies through user feedback and formal presentations. In most cases, the malleability and extensibility afforded by digital media is a significant motivation for those researchers who choose digital methodologies over static analog formats. Significant research output should be considered "pre-publication."

However, digital research that is publicly available via a persistent URL and is peer-reviewed by an appropriate body (see below) should be seen as “published” in every meaningful sense of the word.

3) Peer Review

Digital History entails a broadening of what is traditionally seen as peer review. The consensus in the field of Digital Humanities is that grant funding is a form of peer review. Researchers rarely complete major digital projects without significant grant funding. Review processes for these grants are rigorous and have success rates far lower than most academic journals. Effective applications require extensive up-front work and multiple letters of support from outside researchers. Receiving funding beyond an initial exploratory grant entails the assessment of early phases of the project closely aligns with traditional peer review procedures and indicates that previous grant objectives have been met. Assessing the quality of the peer-review function of successful grant writing should include the prestige of the granting institution, the rigor of the application process, the number of grants received by a project, and the dollar amount of the grants awarded.

Significant work in the humanities, digital or traditional, does not necessarily require large grant awards. In addition to the peer-review function of successful grant writing, various associations, data aggregators, and publications provide peer review for Digital History projects. The period-specific constituent nodes of the [Advanced Research Consortium](#) provide peer-review by bodies of scholars that equal the prestige of major university presses. George Mason University's [Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media](#) offers a peer-review process that includes a conference presentation and article publication. Additional bodies provide similar services.

Researchers are required to undergo peer review in at least one of the ways described above for any digital project that will constitute a significant component of a dossier for tenure and/or promotion. Likewise, they are encouraged, but not required, to demonstrate impact through citations of their digital project and article publications about the project as these also constitute a form of peer review.

=====

Faculty undertaking a Digital History project must consult with the Department Head and reach an agreement upon project goals and markers of assessment for the Annual Review process that best fit the project, the faculty member's aspirations, and the Department of History's interests.

The Department of History recognizes Digital History as a meaningful component of the research dossier for tenure (in addition to the single-authored research monograph); however, it supports a significant and original work of Digital History as equal to a single-authored monograph only for promotion from associate professor to professor. In all assessment documents researchers should be explicit about the status and scale of their work as well as the peer review processes it has undergone.

Digital History in the Annual Review

Satisfactory: Evidence of a significant and productive research agenda, such as documented development of an ongoing digital project—i.e. adding data, enhancing data modeling, development of formal data schemas, prose documentation of a project.

Commendable: Evidence of research productivity, such as the initial release of a digital project or the release of a major revision of a project (i.e. a version 2.x).

Excellent: Evidence of highly productive research, such as submission of results of peer review by a professional association (for example, the Advanced Research Consortium or the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media) that affirms that the project makes a significant intervention in the field, equivalent of a first tier journal article, awarded the year the peer-review was conducted and the project released; winning a major prize in digital history such as the

AHA's Roy Rosenzweig Prize for Creativity in Digital History; or winning a major (national or international) external grant or fellowship for a digital history project as a PI or a co-PI. Examples of major external grants and fellowships include but not limited to the NEH's Digital Humanities Advancement Grants program (DHAG), Humanities Collections and Reference Resources, NEH-Mellon Fellowships for Digital Publication; grants and fellowships from the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR).

Superior: The final and successful release of a major digital project that has been funded by a major (national and international) external grant or fellowship for a digital history project; or submission of results of peer review, obtained in cooperation with faculty member and department head, from a professional association or reports submitted to the department by a nationally recognized expert in digital history and a nationally recognized content field expert that attests to the significance and impact of the project (equivalent to a major research monograph), awarded the year the peer-review was conducted and the project released.

Appendix D

Public History

The Department of History at Texas A&M recognizes Public History as research. Public historians are first and foremost, historians— those who interpret primary and secondary sources, contend with historiography, and advance original historical arguments— but in forms that aim to reach beyond academia. Oftentimes, Public History is referred to as “applied history” because it is scholarly, historical research that engages a general audience or is produced to address real world issues (see [National Council on Public History's definition](#)). Therefore, Public History is a flexible category that may take many forms. Examples of Public History include but are not limited to museum exhibits, historical site documentation/curation, community projects, oral history projects, documentary film or websites, identifying cultural heritage sites, historical preservation projects, collaborative projects with faculty, students, or non-academic groups, consultation and research on legal cases, and interpretive projects. The History Department also values other kinds of Public History.

To assess Public History research, the Department of History follows the recommendations set by the National Council on Public History, the American Historical Association, and the Organization of American Historians. For more, see the [AHA's 2017 report “Tenure, Promotion, and the Publicly Engaged Historian”](#). Evaluation metrics include but are not limited to internal and external grant and fellowship support, conference presentations and workshops, peer reviews published in academic journals, reviews published online by scholars, specialists, and community members in a variety of forums, award outcomes, institutional support of scholarly work, digital tracking statistics, and peer reviewed publications on the project.

1) Collaboration

Public History is usually collaborative. Most public history grants require community partnerships. These partnerships may emerge between scholars, institutions, community members, and /or community groups. Collaborative work should be seen as a strength in Public History. It is, however, incumbent upon researchers to be explicit about their individual roles and contributions.

2) Scholarly Products

Public History yields deliverables at multiple stages. So while the creation or release of a single scholarly product (such as an article or book chapter) signals the end of a project in traditional scholarship, debut of a public history project deliverable may signal completion of the product for small scale initiatives but may signal completion of a pilot (or first stage of a project) for large scale initiatives. For large scale public history projects, a pilot deliverable is necessary to receive investment from a major grant agency or large scale community partner. Completion of a small scale project or initial and public debut of a pilot deliverable for a large scale project should be considered equal to an article. Completion of a large scale project, and the question of whether it is equal to an edited volume or single-authored

manuscript and eligible for superior, should generally be determined in consultation with the department head. Public history products that are available to the public should be seen as “published” in every meaningful sense of the word.

3) Peer Review

Public History entails a broadening of what is traditionally seen as peer review. In the field of Public History, grant funding is one form of peer review. Researchers rarely complete major public history projects without significant grant funding. Review processes for these grants are rigorous and have success rates far lower than most academic journals. Effective applications require extensive up-front work and multiple letters of support from outside researchers. Assessing the quality of the peer-review function of successful grant writing should include the prestige of the granting institution, the rigor of the application process, the number of grants received by a project, and the dollar amount of the grants awarded. In the absence of such endorsement (which, typically, is the case for smaller scale projects or pilot deliverables), peer review of a public history project may be assessed by reviews published in scholarly journals, public outlets, and community publications. If the aforementioned forms of evaluation are not available, peer review may come in the form of solicited review from an external scholar by the public historian’s department.

=====

Faculty undertaking a Public History project must consult with the Department Head and reach an agreement upon project goals and markers of assessment for the Annual Review process that best fit the project, the faculty member’s aspirations, and the Department of History’s interests.

The Department of History recognizes Public History as a meaningful component of the research dossier for tenure (in addition to the single-authored research monograph); however, it supports a significant and original work of Public History as equal to a single-authored monograph only for promotion from associate professor to professor.

Public History in the Annual Review

Satisfactory: Documented development of a Public History project. Documentation may include internal grant support, external grant proposals, conference presentations, workshop presentations, and other documented evidence of project development.

Commendable: Documented progress on a Public History project. Documentation may include external grant support, initial project deliverables, contract or written agreement with a museum or other public entity.

Excellent: Evidence of highly productive research such as the debut of an exhibit or documentary or completion of work on a historical site, an oral history project, or a cultural preservation project; winning a major (national or international) external grant or fellowship for a public history project as a PI or a co-PI; or submission of results of peer review by a professional association (for example, National Council on Public History) a successfully completed public history project that affirms that the project makes a significant intervention in the field, equivalent of a first tier journal article, awarded the year the peer-review was conducted and the project released.

Superior: The final and successful release of a major public history project that has been funded by a major (national and international) external grant or fellowship for a public history project; or submission of results of peer review, obtained in cooperation with faculty member and department head, from a professional association or reports submitted to the department by a nationally recognized expert in public history and a nationally recognized content field expert that attests to the significance and impact of the project (equivalent to a major research monograph), awarded the year the peer-review was conducted and the project released.

Contact Office: Texas A&M University Department of History, historydept@tamu.edu
