

Department of Hispanic Studies
Faculty Annual Performance Review
Appendix to the Bylaws
December 2, 2022

I. Annual Performance Review for promotion-eligible faculty

The FEC will meet to assign Annual Performance Review scores for each tenured, tenure-track, and promotion-eligible non-tenure-track faculty member other than themselves. The Executive Committee (except the department chair) will meet to assign Annual Performance Review scores for members of the FEC. In cases where a faculty member belongs to both the FEC and the Executive Committee, the remaining members of both committees (except the department chair) will meet to assign Annual Performance Review scores for that person. In all cases, the committees' scores will be based on the material that individual faculty members have submitted regarding their research/scholarship/creative, teaching, and service activities in the prior calendar year.

Committees will generate scores from 1-5 for each person reviewed in each of three categories: teaching, research, service. An overall weighted score will be calculated from these scores. For tenured and tenure track faculty, normally, the calculation will be as follows: 40% for teaching, 40% for research, 20% for service. For promotion-eligible non-tenure-track faculty the weighting will be divided between teaching and service only; NTT-PE faculty are normally not evaluated on research, but they may request that research and creative activity be considered as an addition to their annual record, in recognition that such activity can enhance teaching and contribute to the departmental disciplinary reputation. For all faculty, these weights and the assessment of performance will be adjusted in recognition of variations in workload assignments. In a timely manner the committee will report all four scores to each faculty member, along with the weighting formula used to calculate the overall score. Scores in each area will be assigned using the following as a guide:

Research (All research must be arms-length peer-reviewed.)

5: Outstanding Research Book published in an academic press; book published the previous year; 3 articles or book chapters published in peer-reviewed journals/volumes; major external research grant or award; principal investigator of a long-range and large-scale DH project that has been published (see DH addendum). [A 5 in research, plus a minimum of 3 in the other two categories will automatically render a 5 overall.]

4+: Excellent Research Edited book or editions (at the discretion of the committee if the research contributed by the individual is substantial) or important external grant (depending on the competitiveness and the status of the funder as national or regional); principal investigator/director or co-director of a DH project that is more complex or advanced than a 4 rating (see DH addendum).

4: **Strong Research** Book in press, 2 articles or book chapters published in peer-reviewed journals/volumes; internal or external grant; principal investigator/director or co-director of a DH project (see DH addendum).

3+: **Research Active (High)** 1 article or book chapter published in a peer-reviewed journal/volume; internal or external grant, keynote speakers, several academic conference presentations, work in progress on a book (copies of the work may be submitted to the FEC). PI project or collaborator on a DH (see addendum on DH).

3: **Research Active (Moderate)** A combination of work(s) accepted for publication; work(s) submitted for publication; conference presentation(s); small internal or external grant(s).

2: **Research Active (Low)** Conference presentation(s) with some evidence of work in progress for publication.

1: **Research Not Meeting Expectations** No scholarly or creative activities in progress for publication.

Teaching

5: **Outstanding Teaching** Teaching award (university or college level). Major curriculum development (i.e., new program or a combination of innovative changes) and major external grants with a combination of outstanding teaching evaluations.

4+: **Excellent Teaching** Excellent teaching evaluations plus a combination of important curriculum development; dissertations directed; MA thesis directed; honors thesis directed; workshops/lectures as a guest, etc.; external/internal important grants in pedagogy. Substantial contributions to departmental instruction through extra-classroom activities such as organizing workshops, mentoring student-teachers, etc.

3+-4: **Good Teaching** Good teaching evaluations plus a combination of curriculum development; dissertation committee member; MA thesis member; honors thesis member.

3: **Acceptable Teaching** Acceptable teaching evaluations.

2: **Marginally Acceptable Teaching:** variable teaching evaluations across classes; needs to show improvement in coming year.

1: **Teaching Not Meeting Expectations** Substandard performance in multiple classes.

Service

Note: service expectations for Associate and Full Professors are higher than for those at lower ranks.

5: Outstanding Service Outstanding service at the international/national and university levels; substantial service within the discipline (such as, tenure and promotion reviews, manuscript reviews, grant reviews, administrative responsibilities, etc.); substantial amount of community engagement.

4-4+: Excellent Service Director of program; substantial service at any level to the Department/college/university.

3+: Good Service Normal service to the department, college and/or university.

3: Acceptable Service Normal service to the department.

2: Marginally Acceptable Service 1 or 2 minor committees.

1: Not Meeting Service Expectations Negligible service.

II. Annual Performance Review for Instructors who are not promotion eligible

The Directors of the Basic Language and Heritage Language programs, in conjunction with the Undergraduate Director and Department Chair, will conduct annual evaluations of all departmental instructors who are not promotion-eligible faculty members. These assessments will be based on student evaluations of teaching and may also take account of classroom observation and other relevant information. Those responsible for the evaluation will ensure that all instructors receive an annual evaluation document that explicitly states whether the instructor's teaching in the past calendar year met (or did not meet) departmental expectations, and that explains what evidence was used to reach this determination.