

Department of Sociology and Anthropology Governing Policies
Adopted May 8, 2008
Revised May 26, 2013
Revised April 25, 2014

(1) Department Faculty (the “committee of the whole”)

The Departmental Faculty as a voting body shall consist of all current members of the departmental faculty, full time and part time, permanent and temporary. All have an equal vote. The jurisdiction of this body is all aspects of department functioning and governance, except as specified elsewhere in this document.

An important (but not exclusive) role of the committee of the whole is departmental vision and strategic planning. This includes (1) Long range plans in general; (2) Development of new programs (degrees, major curricular units, research and other emphases); (3) Facilities and budgets; (4) Major characteristics of requested faculty searches. The Department Chair is obligated to transmit the specific plans of the department (such as requested searches) to the Dean of the College.

The first meeting of each year is to be called by the Department Chair within two weeks after classes begin in the fall semester, and after that, meetings are to be called by the Chair as needed. A majority of the committee of the whole can call a meeting independent of the Chair. Agendas are set by the Department Chair, but new items for the agenda or changes in the agenda can be enacted by a majority vote of attendees.

(2) The Graduate Committees

The Graduate Committee consists of all members of the department who are members of the Graduate Assembly. Overall direction of the graduate program of the department and all matters related to curriculum and program at the graduate level are decided by this committee. The Graduate Advisor chairs this committee.

The Graduate Executive Committee shall consist of: (1) the current graduate advisor, (2) the previous graduate advisor, (3) the graduate advisor-elect, and (4) the department chair serving ex officio. It is called and chaired by the graduate advisor. The department will vote every two years on the graduate-advisor elect. After two years as graduate-advisor elect, this person will become graduate advisor. The graduate advisor must be a member of the graduate faculty, be tenured, and will serve for a period of two years. When unexpected vacancies occur, they shall be filled by election by the Graduate Executive Committee for the remainder of the year. The Graduate Committee can override decisions of the Graduate Executive Committee by majority vote.

The Graduate Executive Committee shall be charged with making admission decisions and assigning teaching assistantships. The graduate executive committee will advise the chair on graduate course offerings.

For all admission decisions and TA assignments, a quorum of three members is required (participation and voting may be electronic). The committee will make an email call for

requests from faculty regarding their need for TA help and suggestions for TAs they prefer at least one week before assigning TAs. The central goal of TA assignments is to support teaching, and relatedly, give graduate students experience in teaching and teaching-related tasks. TA assignments are a complex task; the Graduate Executive Committee will consider requests, past performance, faculty and student workload, student skills, student-faculty relationship, and so forth, but in the end no simple rules can control the assignments by the committee, and in the end the assignments should accomplish a reasonable equilibrium among all needs and considerations. The Graduate Executive Committee can assign TAs to non-tenurable faculty at its discretion.

The graduate advisor will be in charge of organizing all department activities related to recruitment, orientation, and socialization of graduate students including, but not limited to, the fall graduate school information session. The graduate advisor will be available throughout their term, including the summer, to personally advise current and prospective students. The graduate advisor will maintain a current list of names and contact information (e.g., email addresses) of current and prospective students.

(3) Chair

The Chair of the Department is the primary departmental administrator, with responsibilities as defined by the Institutional Supplement to the Regents' Rules. The department will recommend a candidate for Chair to the Dean of Liberal Arts; the Dean does the appointment. The term of the appointment is for three years; the appointment may be renewed using the same process.

The Chair promotes the departmental vision; hires, evaluates personnel, and meets annually with tenure-track faculty to review progress towards tenure and promotion; addresses student concerns; represents the department at the college and university levels; and advocates on behalf of the department and its individual members for equity and support in areas including, but not limited to, research funding, salaries, and technology acquisitions. The chair also oversees curricula development and evaluation, fund raising, the schedule, and the department website. The Chair can delegate some of these responsibilities and can create ad hoc committees to assist in departmental work. The Chair appoints all departmental staff, who serve at the Chair's discretion.

The policy of the UT System and the University is that Chairs have 12 month appointments. This includes compensation for administrative responsibilities during summer. The specific arrangements for this compensation will follow College and University policies.

The Chair of the department is recommended by members of the Department Faculty in a meeting of the committee of the whole. Any member of the department faculty can self-nominate or agree to nomination by others. Two-thirds of the members of the Departmental Faculty in residence must agree on the Chairperson to be recommended. The ballot is secret and candidates must recuse themselves from meetings where recommendation votes are taking place. The recommendation is then sent to the Dean of

Liberal Arts for appointment. Normally, she/he shall serve a three-year term, beginning in the Fall Semester. Recommendation for the Chair by the Departmental Faculty should be made no later than March 31 of the year in which the Chair assumes duties.

Procedure for Removal of Chairperson:

A removal statement which: (1) contains the reason(s) for removal; (2) must be signed by two thirds of the department's tenured and tenure-track faculty; and, (3) is presented to the chairperson by two or more of the signatories, obligates the chair to step down from office within ten work days from receipt of the removal statement, unless the chair, during that ten day period, is able to obtain a written vote of confidence from at least two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Such a vote of confidence nullifies the removal statement. After a chairperson has been removed, a new one will be recommended to the University's Administration in compliance with section III of the department's Policies and Procedures. Copies of the removal statement will be sent to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

(4) Undergraduate Curriculum Committees

Undergraduate curricular matters are considered by committees of the faculty in the respective majors/minors (Sociology, Anthropology, and Geography). The Department Chair will convene meetings of the relevant faculty. If curricular matters cut across majors/minors, they should be considered by the department Committee of the Whole.

(5) Personnel evaluation and merit pay.

Faculty without named lines in the annual budget (most of the non-tenurable, part-time faculty) are evaluated as necessary by the Chair. Faculty with named budget lines are evaluated annually for merit pay; this evaluation is also used for annual reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty and for every-six-year post-tenure review. Annual evaluation follows the reporting forms, categories, criteria, and procedures of the College of Liberal Arts. The faculty evaluation committee is composed of all the tenured faculty; tenured faculty who are being evaluated recuse themselves from their own evaluation. The faculty evaluation committee reports in writing to the department chair, who conducts her or his own evaluation. These two evaluations are reported to College of Liberal Arts.

Annual Evaluation Process

- (1) Every year, all tenurable faculty are evaluated using information on the PARF. Unusual situations (e.g., leave that covers the whole evaluated calendar year) can be handled by sending a request to the chair for appropriate action. Non-tenurable faculty are evaluated by the chair.
- (2) The faculty member will submit the PARF electronically to the chair and the department administrator by the end of January. Unsubmitted PARFs will be downloaded by the Chair from Digital Measures.
- (3) The faculty committee is made up of all tenured faculty, with the evaluated person being recused on their own case. In the specific case of the performance of the

- chair, the faculty evaluation committee may gather information from untenured faculty also. The chair may call the faculty meeting, may be present at the meeting (only if agreed on by the faculty committee), and may participate verbally but will not vote.
- (4) Before the PARF meeting relevant to the evaluation of a given faculty member, each committee member will email the chair scores (see below) for the three categories, research, teaching, and service. The purpose of this provision is to induce the faculty committee members to be prepared for evaluation meetings, and the scores can change in the course of the meeting.
 - (5) The faculty committee is to complete its work—agreed-on quantitative score and write-up—and deliver them to the chair--no later than March 1. In the case of the chair, the evaluation goes directly to the Dean of the College at this point, and the chair is recused.
 - (6) The chair is to review the faculty evaluation, append whatever comments she or he feels are appropriate, and will deliver this draft to the evaluated faculty member by March 10. For non-appealed evaluations, this will be the final one at the department level, to be delivered to the Dean.
 - (7) The affected faculty member can appeal the draft evaluation in writing, delivered to the chair and all the members of the evaluating committee, within 5 business days. The appeal must be specific, and may address overall score and/or comments. The majority of the faculty committee (total membership) will decide whether to consider the appeal or not. Likewise, a majority of the faculty committee (total membership) can decide the outcome of the appeal. The decision on the appeal may be to modify or sustain any aspect of the evaluation. The appeal decision (with rewritten department evaluation) will be delivered to the chair. The chair may alter her or his comments depending on the specific rewrite following the appeal. After these steps, the evaluation is final at the department level. Faculty who have appealed are given a description of the outcome, and the changed evaluation if changes were made. Faculty are reminded that the appeal process is time-consuming and potentially conflictual, and appeals are best reserved for major concerns.
 - (8) The unappealed evaluations, unchanged appealed evaluations, and changed appealed evaluations are delivered to the Dean by April 1. A record is kept at the Department office. The affected faculty may discuss their score and write-up with the Dean. Action at that level is at the discretion of the Dean. The final evaluation from the College when received by the department is communicated in writing to the evaluated faculty member.
 - (9) The chair or a faculty member designated by the chair will meet with each tenure-track faculty member to discuss the PARF evaluation and progress to tenure. Tenured faculty are welcome to make appointments with the chair or a designated faculty to discuss the evaluation also; the chair may mandate such meetings when appropriate. In these meetings, the evaluation will be used not only as summative of the previous year's work but also formative guidance for future work.

Workload:

The standard workload for tenure-track faculty is 45% research/45% teaching/10% service; the standard workload for tenured faculty is 40% research/40% teaching/20% service. The graduate program director has a course release, but those duties also fit within teaching, so the workload expectation remains unchanged. Some faculty will have different workloads by arrangement with the department, which should be documented and on file in the department; the review committee will know this information in advance. Additionally, there may be extenuating factors regarding workload distribution, such as family or medical leave, university-granted course releases, reduced service and mentoring expectations for new hires, or release time from grants. In the latter case, individual faculty members are not required to re-calculate the percentages, but the review committee may opt to re-weight the categories.

Form:

The PARF is the existing College of Liberal Arts form as downloaded from Digital Measures. However, faculty members are responsible for several additions and alterations. (1) The content is to be cleaned and any missing relevant information included by the faculty member. (2) A one page single spaced summary statement is attached by the faculty member at the front. (3) A short statement (if relevant) addressing the following topic is to follow the summary statement. (4) A statement about any significant variation from the standard workload (see above).

Information to be included on form:

When editing the PARF from Digital Measures, please be sure to include discussion of the following (some but not all are included in DM, but be sure to cover all this material):

- 1. Publications:** Explain your contribution to *each* publication, and its significance or importance to the field. Include full citation (including precise sequence of authors), your role in authorship, precise status in the calendar year (under review, R & R, accepted, published), publication venue (discuss significance for your area of work of the venue, impact factor if relevant), if the item was refereed, and the exact publisher in the case of books (books series and series editor, if relevant). Note collaborations with current or former Sociology & Anthropology graduate or undergraduate students. The publication date may be for an on-line or print version (faculty member's choice), but publication of a given piece can only count in one calendar year (i.e., do not list on-line publication for one year and the print version the following year). Publications in progress (not submitted) should be included under "Other research-related activity," not here.
- 2. Conference Presentations:** Include the title, organization, and significance of the venue where it was/will be presented. Include precise authorship and your contribution to each item. Include whether a paper was submitted before acceptance, or only an abstract. Note collaborations with current or former Sociology & Anthropology graduate or undergraduate students. Include highlighted roles such as keynote or invited speaker, discussant, or panel organizer.
- 3. Creative or other scholarly production:** E.g., published fiction or poetry; museum or gallery exhibits; public artistic performance; media interview, op-ed or newspaper

column on area of academic expertise. Describe why this matters to your scholarly or educational role at UTEP. Include Title, Medium, Your role, Venue, and Date.

- 4. Grant and Contract Proposals:** Include the agency's or foundation's acceptance rate for proposals, if available. Note collaborations across disciplines or institutions, as well as inclusion of funding to support students. Include Title, Funding source \$ Amount / duration, Your role (PI, co-PI, evaluator, etc.), Status (submitted, pending, funded, declined), Date submitted and/or funded, Collaborators (list affiliation), Support for students.
- 5. Other research-related activity:** e.g., non-funded data collection or analysis, work in progress, editing of journals or collected volumes. Include Activity title, Your role, Hours per month.
- 6. Honors and awards for scholarship:** Include the nature and source of the award, Awarding institution, Significance of the award for your area of scholarship, Financial compensation, if any.
- 7. Teaching documentation (organized courses):** Course evaluations for all sections taught; a syllabus and one sample assignment for each distinct course title; course modality (on-line, face to face, course level, total enrollment as of Census Day, other issues relevant to teaching evaluation), notable innovations (field trips, service learning, etc.). Peer observation (attach if applicable).
- 8. Teaching documentation (student supervision):** Publications, performances, exhibitions, or conference papers by students who have worked under your direct supervision, including Name of student, Title, Activity, Venue, Date, Hours dedicated. Supervision of M.A. theses/doctoral dissertations or graduate or undergraduate independent study, including Name of student, Project Title, Semester; specific activity whether Independent Study (indicate if completed), Thesis 1, Thesis 2, Non-chair committee member, Successful defense of thesis (chair), Successful defense of thesis (committee member).
- 9. Advising:** Number of undergraduate students advised (specific undergraduate names not needed); graduate students advised by name. List position as graduate advisor, but the graduate advisor does not list numbers/names of advisees here since it involves a course release.
- 10. Other teaching activities:** New courses or programs developed (including on-line versions of existing F2F courses); include Courses or program title; Description (include level & scope); Documentation. Administration/coordination of departmental programs; include Program title, Description (level & scope), Enrollment, and a complete description of duties, your contribution, results. Other evidence of your direct contributions to the department's instructional program. This could include organizing events to recruit students, running a booth at new student orientation, organizing a student panel to present at a conference, giving informal student workshops (e.g., on grant-writing, thesis-writing, or a particular data collection technique), or participation in professional development activities such as those offered by CETAL. Include description of activity, dates, time spent, relation to department or institutional mission.

- 11. Internal service:** Service on UTEP committees, or other activities directly related to the functioning of the university; include Dept.-level committees, College-wide committees, UTEP-wide committees or Faculty Senate, and Other (library liaison, advisor to student groups, etc., event organizer, etc.); include Name/purpose of committee, Duties, and Hours per semester.
- 12. External service:** Service to the profession (such as manuscript or proposal reviewing, editorship of a journal, or holding office in a regional or national professional organization), as well as community service related to UTEP’s broader mission (membership on community boards, other volunteer work); include Organization, Duties, and Hours per semester.

Evaluation rubric:

Start by determining the faculty workload

Faculty workload formula listed here:

Standard 40 research/40 teaching /20 service load

Alternative work loads for specific faculty

Chair load is always 70 service/15 research/15 teaching

Modified loads for specific years (weighted by faculty committee)

Other considerations:

The overall quantitative PARF evaluation score is to be reported to units of one tenth (e.g., 4.1 or 4.0).

The rubric allows for “extra credit” for outstanding performance in a particular area (Scholarship, Teaching, or Service), thus allowing weakness in one area to be compensated, **to a limited degree**, by truly exceptional contributions in another. This creates a mechanism for recognizing outstanding contributions, while avoiding a generalized “halo effect.” Subscores may be higher than 5.0 but the overall score is capped at 5.0.

The year being evaluated is the calendar year preceding the evaluation. The overall philosophy is that only acts occurring in the calendar year are evaluated, though other items may be considered in terms of formative advice. How this is applied in specific instances is integrated into the evaluation rubric. The publication date may be for an on-line or print version, but publication of a given piece can only count in one calendar year.

Section I: SCHOLARSHIP

The score for this section is based on a global assessment of all activities described in sections 1-6 below.

0.0-1.5	Scholarly activity scant or non-existent : no peer-reviewed work submitted, presented, accepted or published; no grant proposals submitted; no research activity in progress.
1.6-2.5	Minimal activity, e.g. 1-3 conf. papers or encyclopedia entries. No peer-reviewed articles submitted or published, weak or non-existent research program.
2.6-	Some scholarly activity , but below what it should be. Work in progress (or submitted), but no acceptances or publications in peer-reviewed journals; no funded research or grant proposals

3.5	submitted.
3.6-4.0	Acceptable level of activity: at least one research publication accepted; active research program; active pursuit of research funding
4.1-4.5	Good: at least one research publication published or book ms. in progress (documented); added qualities include include manuscripts submitted or accepted, and/or active research program, and/or externally funded research continuing, and/or external funding applied for, and/or non-major external funding received, and/or involvement of students in research activities
4.6-5	Strong: multiple peer-reviewed publications or a published book or receipt of a major externally funded grant; additional qualities considered include manuscripts submitted or accepted, and/or active research program, and/or externally funded research continuing, and/or external funding applied for, and/or non-major external funding received, and/or involvement of students in research activities
+ .5 pt.	Above and beyond: Multiple active research strands, numerous manuscripts in various stages of publication, supporting graduate assistants with research funding and publication opportunities, and/or awards or other institutional recognition of research contributions.

Products of applied social science (e.g., technical reports) appropriate to the work of the faculty member can be counted as equal to scholarly publications, if the faculty member makes a suitable case for their relevance and the review committee accepts that case. Contracts for applied work are to be considered part of external research funding.

Actual publication during a calendar year is significantly more meritorious than accepted/forthcoming (but see books, below). Either electronic publication or physical publication can be considered as “publication,” but only one form of publication can be counted for each item. The way the item is listed on the PARF (i.e., as published) indicates which calendar year such an item appears.

Books containing original scholarship (single or multiple authored monographs, edited original scholarly books) count as meritorious for three years, the year of publication and two subsequent years. Readers and text books do not have this three year effect.

Grant/contract proposals are evaluated as meritorious in the calendar year they are submitted (as valued act of submission), in the calendar year they are awarded (as demonstrated research accomplishment), and while they continue in activity (as on-going research effort).

Section II: TEACHING / CONTRIBUTIONS TO INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM
(max: 45 pts)

The score for this section is based on a global assessment of all teaching activities: classroom and online teaching, course or program development, administration of existing programs, supervision of student work, and advising or mentoring of students. Documentation should include a syllabus and a sample assignment for each course title (but not repeated sections), and the DM summary of UTEP student evaluations for all sections taught. (At this time, the department does not require qualitative student evaluations. Copies of narrative student evaluations, or excerpts of same, are permitted but not required.)

Documentation should be attached to the end of the PARF. Advising is considered in this section (undergraduate, graduate, graduate program advisor, albeit with attention to course release in the latter case). The narrative summary for this section should include reflections on pedagogical challenges and how they were addressed, as well as innovations and how they were received.

0.0-1.5	Poor: Very low evaluations (generally below 3.4), failure to fulfill teaching responsibilities, no documentation of teaching, no advising or mentoring of students, no participation on thesis committees.
1.6-2.5	Minimal: Very low evaluations (generally below 3.4), barely adequate attention to teaching responsibilities, incomplete documentation of teaching activities, minimal advising or mentoring of students, no participation on thesis or dissertation committees.
2.6-3.5	Fair: Mediocre evaluations (generally in the 3.4-3.9 range); no evidence of innovative teaching, minimal documentation (e.g., syllabus only); no participation on thesis or dissertation committees.
3.6-4.5	Acceptable: Good evaluations (generally in the 3.9-4.4 range), solid documentation of teaching activities. Some mentoring of students outside the classroom, participation in a few thesis or dissertation committees.
4.6-5	Strong: High evaluations (generally in the 4.5-5.0 range), and robust documentation including reflections and narrative evaluations, evidence of innovative and engaging teaching, mentoring of students outside the classroom, involvement of students in research or service-learning activities, mentoring of graduate students (including serving on thesis or dissertation committees), all as appropriate.
+ .5 pt.	Above and beyond: Excellent course evaluations, robust documentation including reflections on teaching, evidence of innovative teaching, active mentoring of students (graduate and undergraduate), including awards or institutional recognition related to teaching.

Evaluators should take into account that large introductory or online courses, and some challenging required courses, tend to score lower on evaluations, while smaller courses and especially graduate seminars tend to score higher.

Section III: PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE

This section includes both internal service (e.g., serving on UTEP committees) and external service (e.g., reviewing manuscripts for journals). It distinguishes between service activities that are directly relevant to UTEP's mission and those that contribute only indirectly to UTEP larger mission vis-à-vis the surrounding community. Private service unrelated to UTEP's mission (such as serving on church committees or singing in a public choir) should not be included. However, service activities undertaken via private or religious institutions that are directly related to the discipline or to UTEP's mission may be included, if the justification is given. Activities that integrate service to the broader community with the faculty member's research or teaching interests (for example, serving as an expert witness, advising a community agency that serves one's research population, or involving one's students in service activities) are particularly valuable.

Tenured faculty:

0.0-1.5	Poor: No service activities, or failure to comply with service obligations undertaken.
1.6-2.5	Minimal: Service activities requiring only minimal participation, e.g., membership on 1-2 committees that meet once a semester or less to “touch base,” but with no concrete products.
2.6-3.5	Fair: Service at more than one level (deptl., college-wide, university-wide, discipline, community), that require less than two hours a month. No leadership roles in service activities.
3.6-4.5	Acceptable: Participation in service activities at multiple levels, up to 3-4 hours a month; no leadership roles in service activities.
4.6-5	Strong: Robust engagement in service activities at multiple levels. Demonstrated leadership (as appropriate) in service activities. Good integration of service activities with the broader UTEP mission.
+ .5 pt.	Above and beyond: Service at all levels (deptl., college-wide, university-wide, discipline, community), including some leadership roles, constituting 10 or more hours per month. Integration of service activities with teaching and research foci. Involvement of students in service activities. Awards or institutional recognition for service.

Tenure-track faculty

Service expectations for untenured faculty are reduced, in the recognition that their top priorities should be a) advancing their research program and publishing activity, and 2) developing an effective teaching practice. The rubric below reflects this reduced expectation; additionally, as discussed above, the weighting is 45-45-10 for untenured faculty, as opposed to 40-40-20 for tenured faculty.

3.0-3.5	Poor: Failure to comply with assigned service tasks.
3.6-4.0	Acceptable: Fulfills service activities requested by the chair.
4.1-4.5	Strong: Participation in service activities at multiple levels (e.g., reviewing manuscripts and serving on a committee).
4.6-5	Excellent: Participation in service activities at multiple levels; integration of community service with the faculty member’s research goals and/or UTEP’s broader mission.

Merit Pay

It is the policy of the Department to consider for merit raises only those faculty members who have been evaluated by their students in all classes taught during the preceding year unless evaluation was not possible for reasons beyond the control of the faculty members.

- (1) Merit pay pool amounts are provided to the department by the College.
- (2) Merit pay does not include raises for promotions (including promotion and tenure) and likewise does not include market or matching pay raise adjustments. The latter are handled in an ad hoc fashion, passing through the Chair to the Dean. The former are discussed below.
- (3) Merit pay set by the department does not include pay raises for Chairs, due to conflict of interest. These raises are handled by the Dean; we do request that the Dean attend to PARF evaluation scores and write-ups of chairs emanating from the department.
- (4) All faculty with PARF evaluation scores of 3 to 5 receive merit pay raises.

- (5) Merit pay raises are strictly based on PARF evaluation scores.
- (6) Merit pay raises are assigned in absolute dollar amounts, not percentages of existing salary.
- (7) The curve of the distribution of PARF evaluation scores is not normal; it has unpredictable peaks and a rigid upward bound at 5.0. Likewise, the pool provided by the College is unpredictable. No simple rule can be created for awarding dollar amounts to evaluation scores. Nevertheless, the ratio of the raise (conceptually, share of the pool) for top performance to lowest rewarded performance should be approximately 2:1 (that is, 1.33 for the top performance, 1.0 for the “middle” performance, and .67 for the lowest performance). Equal scores should get equal dollar amounts, and ratios of scores should be consistent with ratios of dollar amounts (that is, 4.1 should be .05% higher than 4.0, since .1 is one-twentieth of the 2.0 point score range). This must be worked out by trial and error.
- (8) The department chair shall make such merit pay recommendations to the Dean, without faculty participation (such participation takes place at the time of PARF evaluation). The Dean has final say-so.
- (9) Pay raises for promotion should move the affected faculty member into bottom of the range of faculty with that title (Associate or Full), with the proviso that recommended promotion raises should never be less than \$5,000.
- (10) When there are year(s) without merit pay raise funds, then the next time merit pay raise funds are available, the PARF evaluation basis for the pay raise will be the average of all the years since the last time funds were available, including the most recent year.
- (11) Recommendations by the chair can be appealed in writing to the Dean. The affected faculty member may ask the tenured faculty (without the Chair) to meet to discuss the appeal; if such a meeting is held, the faculty committee will communicate their findings to the Dean. All salary information is public, and faculty are entitled to fact-find from the Chair in terms of salary amounts, raise recommendation amounts, and PARF evaluation scores, for self and others. Faculty should realize that appeal can be a complex, conflictive, and intrusive (on others) process, and appropriate appeals should be grounded in compelling matters of justice, process, and equity.

Peer Teaching Evaluations

Mandatory peer evaluations of teaching are done in conjunction with the third year review (in the spring of the third tenure-track year), in the fall of the year of tenure evaluation, and in the fall of the post-tenure review year as set by University policy. Peer evaluations are governed by procedures to be kept on file in the department. Peer evaluations may be done at other times by choice of the faculty member, and results of voluntary peer evaluations do not have to be released to the files for annual or tenure/promotion evaluation of the faculty member.

(6) Promotion and tenure; emerita/us

Review and recommendations for tenure, promotion, and emeritus status are governed in all regards by the Regents’ Rules and the Handbook of Operating Procedures. The

department process will adhere, as far as practically and reasonably possible, to the UTEP Recommended Processes and Best Practices for Tenure and Promotion or Promotion.

The review and recommendation begins with a committee of all faculty equal to or higher in rank than the person requesting promotion. Positive recommendation requires a majority of that committee; the numerical vote is reported, as well as a thorough written review of the application. The application is then evaluated by the Department Chair, providing a positive or negative recommendation and a thorough review of the application. Whatever recommendations are made, all the application and review materials are then sent to the College, unless the candidate withdraws her or his application for promotion in writing.

The criteria for tenure and promotion, or promotion, must follow the guidelines in the Handbook of Operating Procedures. Within that guidance, the criteria should include all components discussed in Section 5, the Annual Evaluation Process; and should be weighted consistently with the assigned distribution of workload described in that section, as appropriate for the particular faculty member. Documentation provided by the candidate and reviewed by the committee shall be consistent with those evaluative criteria, as applicable to the candidate's specific activities; committees can solicit relevant documentation and candidates can submit relevant documentation. However, tenure and promotion, or promotion, are unitary "yes/no" decisions, unlike annual evaluations. Therefore, tenure and promotion, or promotion, derives from an overall assessment of the full set of criteria discussed here, and cannot be reduced to a narrower set of criteria or simple quantitative list of requirements.

Recommendation to the Chair, Dean, and University concerning emerita/us status shall be made by a majority vote of all non-emerita/us tenured faculty.

Instructors and Assistant Professors must be notified before December 15 or according to established A.A.U.P. guidelines (whichever is earlier) if they are not to be reappointed in the following academic year.

(7) Third Year Review

The third year review process in the department follows the College of Liberal Arts Third Year Review guidelines, which include materials to be reviewed and process of review. A mandatory peer teaching evaluation is done in conjunction with this review. The review is done in the spring semester of the third academic year on the tenure track, except for modifications under exigent circumstances. It is to be completed and delivered to the Dean and the reviewee no later than the end of that semester. The third-year review is entirely a formative evaluation, and does not constitute a reappointment process for tenure-track faculty; annual reappointment is discussed in section 6, above.

(8) Comprehensive Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

The departmental process will be governed by the University of Texas System guidelines and the Handbook of Operating Procedures. Nothing in the departmental policies shall be interpreted or applied to infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights, nor to establish new term-tenure systems or to require faculty to reestablish their credentials for tenure. The purpose of comprehensive evaluation is to:

- provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development,
- assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals,
- refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate,
- provide assurance that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the University and the State of Texas, and
- assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.

The six-year review period starts with the first full academic year after hire into a tenured position or upon award of tenure via the promotion process. The review period restarts at the time of promotion to full professor, or appointment as dean, provost, or president. Thereafter, the review will be conducted in the Fall semester following completion of six full academic years of service. The evaluation may not be waived for any active faculty member, but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period coincides with approved leave, comprehensive promotion review, or appointment to an endowed position. A deferral request must be submitted by the department chair via the dean to the Provost's Office and no deferral may extend beyond one year from the scheduled review. Except for leaves occurring in the sixth year, periods when a faculty member is on leave will still count towards the six-year requirement. For administrators whose administrative appointment is reviewed every sixth year, the periodic evaluation shall be scheduled in the same year and the two evaluations coordinated to the extent possible. Faculty due for a six-year evaluation shall receive at least six months' notice of intent to review. Notice shall be provided no later than March 31 that the review will be conducted the following Fall. All faculty in the sixth full year of service since their last review must be notified unless a deferral has been approved by the Provost's Office.

The comprehensive review shall focus on individual merit relative to assigned responsibilities, and contributions consistent with that of a tenured faculty member. These contributions may vary widely in terms of individual professional responsibilities, (e.g., administrative duties, reassignment from research to teaching). For faculty members performing substantial duties in other departments or programs, the evaluation committee shall consider information from others familiar with the faculty member's performance outside the department, if provided. The basis of the review is the record of teaching, scholarship and service. The following materials for the years under review are to be assessed:

- Annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR)
- Current curriculum vita
- Student evaluations of teaching, including all written student comments
- Peer teaching observations

- Additional materials as available, such as any documentation pertaining to the record of teaching, scholarship or service, and information submitted by the faculty member.

The rating assigned shall be an aggregate based on overall judgment of the faculty member's activities.

Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories:

- Exceeds expectations – a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, discipline, or unit.
- Meets expectations – normally expected level of accomplishment.
- Does not meet expectations – a failure beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.
- Unsatisfactory – failing to meet expectations in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

The review will be done by the tenured faculty of the department; their review will be submitted for independent review and comment by the chair; and the packet containing reviewed materials and all the evaluations will be submitted to the Dean.

Evaluation Results

- a. Before submitting its evaluation, the committee shall notify the faculty member of the results of the preliminary evaluation and provide an opportunity to meet with the committee, submit additional material or comment on the committee's findings. Written comments submitted by the faculty member will be included with the final evaluation.
- b. The evaluation report and supporting materials are submitted to the department chair for review and comment. The department chair or dean may request additional information or ask the faculty evaluation committee to reassess all or portions of the evaluation.
- c. If the department chair disagrees with the committee, he or she shall prepare a separate statement that indicates the different rating category and clearly articulates the basis for disagreement with the faculty committee evaluation.
- d. The evaluation report(s) and supporting materials shall be submitted to the college for review, if applicable (see Section 6).
- e. By February 1, the evaluation committee shall communicate its final evaluation in writing to the faculty member, department chair, and dean. The evaluation shall state the rating category, and include any additional statements provided by the department chair or dean.
- f. The written report shall advise the faculty member of any areas that need improvement.
- g. If the overall evaluation is unsatisfactory, the written report shall contain sufficient documentation to identify the area(s) of unsatisfactory performance and the basis for the committee's decision. The report shall refrain from speculating on the reasons why the performance is unsatisfactory.

Faculty Development Support

Faculty members, regardless of review category, whose performance in one or more areas of contribution indicates they would benefit from assistance may be placed by a department chair or dean on a development support plan and referred to available institutional support, such as teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues/service expectations. Establishing a development support plan is not a disciplinary action. It is an instrument for committing to specific professional development goals and strategies for the upcoming year.

Does Not Meet Expectations and Unsatisfactory Ratings

For all faculty ultimately receiving “does not meet expectations” or “unsatisfactory” ratings, the department chair, in consultation with the dean and faculty member (and for unsatisfactory ratings, the provost), shall establish a faculty development support plan within 30 days of receiving the written evaluation. Should the 30-day period end after the conclusion of the academic year it may, by mutual agreement, be extended until September 15. The plan will:

- include a follow-up schedule (with specific dates), benchmarks, and tangible goals for evaluating improved performance,
- indicate the University resources available to provide appropriate support for the faculty member in achieving the goals of the plan, and
- indicate who will monitor the implementation of the plan and support the faculty member through the process (for example, a faculty mentor).

A copy of the written evaluation and development plan shall be submitted to the Dean (and in the case of an unsatisfactory rating, the Provost’s Office). The department chair, in consultation with the peer review committee, will assess evidence of improvement over the subsequent academic year and, if insufficient, take appropriate administrative action. A one-year status report is to be submitted to the dean (and, if appropriate, the provost) by October 1.

Nothing in this policy is intended to alter faculty members’ rights to avail themselves of existing appeals channels, and to request review for procedural irregularities or academic freedom violations.

(9) Faculty searches and appointments

Full-time faculty appointments are recommended to the Dean of Liberal Arts by the Chair after appropriate consultation, as follows:

Position specifications are defined by the Committee of the Whole (Section One), in dialogue with the University administration. The requirements for a position to be filled shall be defined as precisely as possible, disseminated as widely as possible, and meet all University regulations and procedures. The Chair, as spokesperson for the Committee of the Whole, has the responsibility of advertising or otherwise publicizing the precise requirements, and soliciting their help in making nominations for the position and/or their advice and assistance in seeking candidates.

Candidates for full-time academic positions are recommended for employment as follows: A search committee of appropriate faculty members is appointed by the Chair to review applications for positions (search committees shall have no fewer than three

members). Vitae of candidates are reviewed by the members of the Search Committee which also consults with other faculty. Any faculty member who is not a member of the Search Committee may also peruse the vitae and other documents relating to applicants. The Search Committee recommends to the Department Chair and the Committee of the Whole those applicants whom it judges best qualified. Other faculty members may also make recommendations to the Chair and the Committee as Whole. Candidates for tenurable positions must have a formal visit to the Department, during which their potential for teaching, research, and service (and when appropriate, administration) are considered. The Department Committee of the Whole meets, discusses all candidates, and makes hiring recommendations to the Dean of the College (transmitted via the chair). The vote is secret, the results are recorded, and no candidates shall be hired without at least a majority vote. More than one candidate may receive an affirmative recommendation, but in such cases, the recommendations must include a prioritization of candidates. The Department Chair reviews the candidates and also makes a hiring recommendation to the Dean of the College; but the Department Chair is not to make an affirmative recommendation in cases where the candidate did not receive the votes of a majority of the Department faculty. The rank of the appointment is to be consistent with the candidate's established scholarly record, and for a candidate to be appointed with tenure, they must pass department, college, and university tenure review.

Part-time faculty appointments are to be made by the Department Chair, following informal consultation with faculty members.

(10) Grievances

Any grievances concerning any aspect to departmental operation, or recommendations for action by the appropriate departmental committee, by any member of the departmental faculty are to be in writing and submitted to the appropriate committee or the committee of the whole. The appropriate Committee must then act in response to the grievance or the request.

Any grievances concerning any aspect of departmental operation that are carried orally or in writing to administration officers above the Chair must be made known to the Chair in order that there be no doubt of his/her awareness of the problem and that he/she may be alerted to the need for further attention to the matter.

(11) Travel

Travel at the state expense shall be approved by the Chair on the following bases of priority: (1) attendance at a professional meeting of the discipline in order to present a paper; (2) recruitment of departmental faculty; (3) participation in programs of professional bodies as section chairperson, discussant, committee member, etc.; (4) all other reasons. Tenure-track faculty are to be allocated more travel money than senior faculty. Travel allocations (e.g., use it or lose it, versus rollover of unused money) are governed by College and University policy.

(12) Course Loads and Scheduling

Teaching loads are governed by the University of Texas System rules concerning Teaching Load Credits (TLCs). These include TLCs assigned for administrative or institutional duties, following explicit and documented agreements, including the agreement of the department chair. As of May, 2014, the department itself provides 12 TLCs of administrative release for the Chair and 3 TLCs of administrative release for the Graduate Advisor. TLC calculations also take into consideration internally and externally funded course releases, which should be supported by explicit documentation including the agreement of the department chair. The policy of the department is to schedule faculty to achieve at least the 18 TLC minimum from all sources, but within that guideline, to use the TLC system to minimize the number of organized courses assigned to faculty. The chair should develop these workload calculations in consultation with the faculty member involved, though final decisions remain with the chair. In the case of faculty who have an agreement with the department to be evaluated on teaching and service only, and not on research, the minimum workload will be 8 organized courses a year (such faculty can also receive funded and administrative course releases). Faculty can appeal workload assignments and decisions to the Committee of the Whole and/or the College Dean.

Course offerings, times/days, capacities, and so forth are a very complex matter, and must be viewed as a totality. These decisions belong to the Chair. Appeals may be made to the Committee of the Whole and/or the College Dean, although course schedules set in place well in advance of the semester must be fulfilled and appeals are best suited to long term patterns and practices. The best practices in course scheduling include (1) use of a matrix that addresses required offerings at graduate and undergraduate levels, and courses in regular cycles, and also spreads courses across days and times, and face-to-face and on-line modes of delivery; (2) a consultative process in which the chair or designated scheduler provides a detailed draft assignment (course, capacity, day/time) to the faculty member and allows the faculty member to have two weeks for comment/alteration; (3) adherence to teaching obligations once the course schedule is finalized, allowing for mutually agreed reassignments for funded course releases and administrative assignment; (4) as far as possible, assignments clustered in groups of days (MWF, TR, MW, etc.); (5) specific consultation about evening and weekend courses and courses at satellite locations; (6) specific consultation about on-line courses; (7) repeated preparations as much as possible, with consideration to the needs of the department and the wishes of the faculty member to teach new courses; (8) assignment to appropriate subject matters to the expertise of the instructor; (9) allowing the chair to agree to or veto requests for new course topics, especially specialized topics; (10) enabling all members of the graduate faculty to cycle through teaching graduate courses, either by teaching required courses or elective courses; (11) in accord with standard meeting times; (12) meeting in as suitable rooms as possible, given the discretion of the university about room assignments; (13) attention to annual TLC numbers, as discussed above; (14) other such considerations as the Chair can appropriately justify to the Committee of the Whole. Course schedules, by their nature, are not subject to formal appeal once they are set in place (the Chair is encouraged to look for informal means of problem-solving, however); but longer-term issues with course scheduling can be appealed to the Committee of the Whole.

While following all University and College policies, the department does allow uncompensated summer courses to be included in TLC calculations, and uneven distribution of TLCs across fall, spring, and summer terms. This must be arranged with the agreement of the Chair in advance of submission of the final course schedule. Compensated summer teaching is governed by the policies and budgets of the University and is subject to the discretion of the chair.

(13) Student awards

Student honors and awards are made by the Chair. Best practice is to have consultation with the faculty. At the time of writing (May, 2014) the department has no awards or scholarships with monetary benefits attached. If such awards/scholarships are created in the future, the department should develop a clear process for their awarding, and include it in this document.

(14) Leaves of Absence and Resignations

Professionalization of the faculty is advantageous to the department and the University. Hence, leaves of absence for purpose of professional development (finishing a degree, research and publication, fieldwork outside the local area) are encouraged. However, the convenience and well-being of the department and university must also be considered when leaves are requested and granted. Hence, an early decision date regarding intention to leave or to resign is expected. Resignation and request for leaves of absence should be submitted to the chair no later than May 1st for fall semester and October 1st for spring semester unless compelling circumstances require a later date.

The Department will adhere to University policies for sick and FMLA leave. The Department affirms the importance of these policies, and will act within the spirit as well as the letter of these policies.

(15) The Amendment of Policies and Procedures

The Policies and procedures of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology may be amended by a majority vote of the Departmental Faculty of the Sociology and Anthropology Department.