

Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

January 6, 2021

Approved by the Dean of Faculties Office February 10, 2021

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.M2](#).
- 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.
 - Dean of Faculties

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 Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture at Texas A&M University is to create experiences that advance teaching, research, and service through the application of knowledge in the preparation and development of quality educators and educational researchers; placing high value on collaboration, diversity, critical thinking, creativity, democratic governance, and global leadership. 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 Teaching, Learning and Culture for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach across 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.M2, 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	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/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.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit.

Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), 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 across teaching, research, and service. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Faculty categories of performance in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture include the following:

Tenure Track Faculty TT/T (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Full Professor)

Tenure track and tenured faculty members make a unique contribution to the education, research, engagement, and training mission in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. Tenure track and tenured faculty are full-time faculty engaged in teaching, research, clinical training, supervision, service activities, curricular development, program development, and/or other areas of practical application. In addition, TT/T faculty participate in grant and extramural funding activities, thesis and/or dissertation supervision, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate.

The responsibilities in all three areas of faculty duty include:

- Teaching
- Research
- Service

The typical load for TT/T faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture is 40% Teaching; 40% research; 20% Service. Faculty workload distribution of 0% (zero percent) appointment in any of the three categories is prohibited. The Department Heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable. One course release per year is provided for Assistant Professors on tenure track for the first three-years of their appointment to enable them to build their research program.

Academic Professional Track

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members make a valued and unique contribution to the education and training mission in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. APT faculty are generally full-time faculty who are not only engaged in teaching, but also are engaged in clinical training, supervision, service activities, program development, and/or other areas of practical application. In addition, Academic Professional Track faculty can participate in grant and extramural funded activities, thesis and/or dissertation committees, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate.

Clinical Faculty (Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Full Professors)

The responsibilities in all three areas of clinical faculty roles and responsibilities include:

- Teaching
- Research
- Service
- Professional development

The typical load for clinical faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture is 80% Teaching; 10% research; 10% Service. Faculty workload distribution of 0% (zero percent) appointment in any of the three categories is prohibited. The Department Heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable.

Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Professor of Practice

The responsibilities are in one area:

- Teaching

The typical load for lecturers and professors of practice in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture is 100%. Teaching; Faculty cannot go to 0% (zero percent) appointment. Department heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable and depending on the terms of appointment.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), 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 across 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 assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

According to Texas A&M University Guidelines to faculty titles, (http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/faculty_titles/guidelines_faculty_titles.pdf) the following faculty titles and the expected responsibilities and areas of performance are provided.

Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service.

Instructor is a tenure-track appointment which is used for a person recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure-track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree prior to the beginning of the appointment. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title will be changed to Assistant Professor. Instructors are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service.

Academic Professional Track (Clinical, Instructional, Research Scientist)

Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of scholarly research or creative work, or the area of service. Faculty with Research in the title will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to scholarly research or creative work and must contribute to teaching as well. Adjunct and Visiting are normally used for appointments to faculty members whose long-term primary employment commitment is not to TAMU. Visiting appointments should normally be used in cases where the faculty appointment is expected to cease after no more than three years (although the appointments are one-year or semester appointments, reappointment is possible), whereas Adjunct appointments will indicate an expectation that a longer term as a faculty member is expected.

Departments may use any of these non-tenure accruing appointments for faculty members who consistently and significantly contribute to all three areas, scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, if the unit and faculty member benefit from such a non-tenure-track appointment.

Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and Assistant Professor of the Practice

These are non-tenure track appointments. These appointments are normally for faculty members who have had or maintain a primary employment in a profession outside of academia.

Senior Lecturer and Lecturer

These are non-tenure track appointments for faculty members who teach but who are not required to consistently make significant contributions in either scholarly research and creative work, or the area of service.

Assistant Lecturer

This is a non-tenure track appointment used for less than five years for either candidates for a TAMU doctoral degree, or people who are not expected to fill a permanent faculty position at TAMU. These appointments are focused on teaching, and they do not normally confer eligibility for faculty voting rights in shared governance processes on campus.

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, 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 department'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 course evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include but not limited to:

- self-evaluation/reflective practice
- peer-evaluation
- student feedback
- student mentoring of learning
- mentoring of graduate student teaching
- student learning
- curriculum innovation
- academic course leadership
- external awards or recognitions of excellence in teaching.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work: Are defined as the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities (includes research, creative activities, and all other forms of scholarship -- creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and is communicated/disseminated in top-tier recognized outlets). Research or Scholarship in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture can be demonstrated in a combination of ways inclusive of but not limited to:

- peer-reviewed research and scholarly writings
- grant and extramural contract funding activities
- presentations at professional conferences
- workshops
- invited presentations or keynote' presentations
- reviewer for peer-reviewed professional publications and conferences; and
- judgments of peer review professionals in the faculty member's field provide the best and most reliable basis for making sound decisions about the quality of research.

These activities allow the level of accomplishment and potential to be viewed relative to disciplinary norms and standards as judged by faculty peers.

3.3 Service: service on department, college and university committees and task forces are expected of all tenure-track and academic professional track faculty aligned with their work-load distribution. Service can include significant professional development activities that lead to enhanced service provision, serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate, serving as an advisor to student organizations, serving in an administrative role within the department or college, serving as a member of a curricular review committee or accreditation review panel. Leadership roles similar to chair or membership on department, college, and university committees, leadership in professional organizations, member on editorial boards of journals in the faculty member's discipline. Planning and delivering workshops and other learning opportunities, involvement in creative works and performances, program/curriculum reviewer, membership on journal review boards, leading program-relevant programming for outreach to the community each serve as indicators of faculty service.

3.4 Administration, if applicable: Tenure Track, Tenured and APT Faculty in Administrative Roles in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. In rare cases where assistant professors on tenure track are appointed to administrative roles such as program chairs, division chairs or program leaders or tenured Associate or Full Professors being appointed as associate department heads, their contracts will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the service and administrative role. The annual evaluation will include their administrative roles and performance expectations toward promotion to the next rank in their appointment contracts. The same applies to academic professional track faculty such as Clinical Associate or Full Clinical Professors being appointed in administrative roles. Scholarship relevant to enhancing administrative role should be counted in the portfolio for promotion.

4.0 Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture 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. In the sections that follow are representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

- 4.1 Indicators of ***Excellence in Teaching*** includes, but is not limited to: Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, impact on student learning, and student learning outcomes, outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated in highly recognized scholarly outlets, selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award, evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials, developing a new course materials or instructional innovations that fills an identified need in the curriculum each serve as indicators of teaching excellence. Serving as chair of doctoral research committees, mentoring graduate student teaching, receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects, invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence, receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students, placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions, significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program, teaching designated writing intensive courses, teaching courses that are part of the university core curriculum), outstanding performance and awards as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor; each may serve as indicators of excellence in teaching.
- 4.2 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching*** includes but is not limited to: Peer evaluation of teaching, positive student course evaluations and impact on student learning outcomes, effective direction of graduate research, as evidenced by student feedback and graduate student outcomes in successful teaching. Additional indicators may include selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award, development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, development of new courses or major revision of existing courses, receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects, reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation, direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research, member of graduate student advisory committees. Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments, effectively coordinating a multi-section course, service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate), significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness and receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching, participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students.

Effectiveness in Teaching and Advising Indicators Include but not Limited to:

Performance may be evidenced by the following:

- Course evaluations / peer evaluations / self-evaluations
- Courses taught
- Courses developed/major course revision
- Graduate student advisory committee membership/chairperson
- Undergraduate student advisory activities
- Program development activities
- Awards, honors, certificates
- Record of teaching effectiveness
- Mentoring students

Teaching Portfolios
Student Awards

- 4.3 Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** includes but is not limited to: Publications in top-tier indexed refereed journals, receiving major fellowship or research award, above peer average i10 and h-index citations of publications, publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable recognized publisher(s) and awards for publication of peer reviewed scholarship. Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization, presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings, receiving significant external peer-reviewed competitive funding for research, significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research, publications with teaching focus in leading refereed journals, evidence of creative professional practice each serve as indicators of excellence in research and scholarship.
- 4.4 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** includes, but is not limited to: Publication of scholarly book(s), publications in peer refereed journals, publication of a chapter in a scholarly book, editing a scholarly book, presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines, publications in edited refereed book chapters, publishing with graduate students, significant self-development research activities such as a Faculty Development Leave that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness, publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields, publications with teaching focus in refereed journals. Contributing to a significant external peer-reviewed competitive funding for research as Co-PI or senior research personnel also serve as indicators of effectiveness in research and scholarly activities.

Effectiveness in Research and Scholarship Indicators

Performance may be evidenced by the following:

- Published research articles
 - Published scholarly articles
 - Sponsored research (e.g., Federal, State, Foundation, University, Foundation, or Agency)
 - International, national, regional, and state conference presentations
 - Editor/Associate Editor
 - Authorship of scholarly books
 - Authorship of technical papers, monographs and reviews
 - Awards, honors, certificates
 - Planned efforts to increase one's competency in inquiry
- 4.5 Indicators of **Excellence in Service** includes, but is not limited to: Serving as Executive Editor or Editor-in-Chief of a major scholarly journal, being an elected officer in a national or international professional organization, serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board, serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University, serving as an academic program chair or in a similar standing position as an officer in the Faculty Senate, chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee, evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
- 4.6 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** includes but is not limited to: Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations. Being a committee member in national or international professional organization, serving as an officer in regional or state professional organization, serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting, serving as an active member of a standing college or University committee. Serving on University, college, and department committees and task forces, serving as consultant, being an advisor to student organizations, serving in ad-hoc administrative roles within the department, evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large each serve as indicators of effective service.

Effectiveness in Service and Outreach Indicators

Performance may be evidenced by the following:

- Workshop presentations
- Participation on University and System committees

Participation in College and Department committees
 Chairperson of active/standing committees
 Administrative duties
 Sponsorship of student organizations
 Committee member/chair or officer in professional organizations
 Membership in professional organizations
 Conferences attended/chaired
 Awards, honors, certificates
 Planned efforts to assist colleagues in improving instructional or inquiry competencies
 Editorial Board Member
 Reviewer for journals and other scholarly publications

* Note: Each of these listed indicators are suggestive and not exhaustive.

5.0 **Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure**

The University, College and the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture have as their goals the achievement of excellence and national prominence through the teaching, research, and service conducted by members of the faculty. Attainment of these goals requires the development and retention of faculty capable of contribution to these goals. It is the purpose of this criteria, therefore, to set forth the guidelines for promotion and tenure in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. The departmental policies in regard to promotion and tenure must be subservient to and congruent with the existing Texas A&M University and Texas A&M System policies and procedures related to promotion and tenure. Any questions not addressed by departmental procedures will be deferred to College and University policies.

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/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and 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 are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor:

Faculty members holding a tenure-accruing appointment with the rank of Instructor will be promoted to the rank of assistant professor upon the receipt of the terminal degree.

5.1.2 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor:

- An **exemplary** level of accomplishment in research for an associate professor is measured against the contributions of others in the field and the potential for impact over time; at least a rating of “effective” in the other two areas of teaching and service
- **Excellence in Research**
 - An area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority
 - Originality of contributions to the field; innovative or outstanding publications
 - Quality, significance, and impact of publications
 - Quantity of publications
 - Trajectory – Is this faculty member likely to become one of the leading figures in the discipline?
 - Overall assessment of standing in relation to others in their peer group who are working in the same field
- See criteria above for examples of effective teaching and service sections 4.2 and 4.6
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching

and research expected of a tenured faculty member (university rule 12.01.99.M2, p. 14).

- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University

While important, service contributions to the Department, College, professional societies, and public schools receive less emphasis as instructional and research/inquiry competencies become well developed. Although emphasis will be given to the dimensions of instruction and research, it is expected that the individual will exhibit at least effective performance in the service dimension.

Promotion to the rank of associate professor will be based on a cumulative assessment of achievement in teaching, research and service as judged by departmental peers and supported by external scholars representing the person's area of emphasis. Further, promotion will be contingent upon the perceived readiness of the individual to assume the role of associate professor. Consideration will be made of any special role responsibilities assumed by the faculty member with the concurrence of the department head during the review process.

5.1.2 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor: The rank of full professor is based on cumulative assessment (since last promotion) of teaching, mentoring junior faculty and graduate students, research and publications in refereed journals, publishing scholarly books and chapters, and /or curriculum materials, engaging in seeking extramural support for research [when appropriate for the field of study] and service as judged by both departmental peers and external scholars representing the person's area of emphasis. Faculty may choose to demonstrate excellence in one of the areas of research, teaching, or service, however, they must also meet the effective standards in the other areas. The role of full professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture holds the expectation of leadership through continued contribution to the body of professional knowledge, leadership in instructional program development and innovative approaches to instruction, leadership in the professional groups, public schools, and units within the University. The cumulative experience resulting from several years of service at the university level would also suggest involvement in faculty development efforts, especially mentoring assistant, and associate professors. Criteria for promotion to full professor includes but is not limited to:

- An **exemplary** level of accomplishment in research for full professor is measured against the contributions of others in the field and the realized impact of the individual's research on the field; at least a rating of "effective" in the other two areas of teaching and service
- Evidence of continuing growth as a teacher and researcher beyond the level attained upon promotion to associate professor should be provided.
- Evidence of continued growth to full professor in addition of meritorious performance, evidence of national and international impact is expected.
- **Excellence in Research**
 - Originality of contributions to the field; innovative or outstanding publications
 - Quality, significance, and impact of publications
 - Quantity of publications
 - Continuing accomplishment and some measure of **national or international recognition or impact** in research or another form of creative activity
 - Evidence of academic leadership through provision of valuable professional service
 - Scholarly or artistic work which is perceived as outstanding in the field
 - A strong reputation in the candidate's field of study
- See criteria above for examples of effective teaching and service sections 4.2 and 4.6
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member (university rule 12.01.99.M2, p. 14).

Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University.

DEPARTMENT PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Time Perspective

Promotion and tenure evaluations will be based on cumulative contributions and expected continued contributions. The probationary period for tenure is seven years; normally, up to three years' credit may be given to tenure track experience at another university.

An annual review of performance of all tenure track faculty is conducted by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee as well as the Department Head to assess progress is an essential process toward promotion and/or tenure. Non-Tenured faculty received feedback in writing concerning their progress toward promotion and tenure.

New non-tenured professors shall have the opportunity to have a full professor mentor who will advise them and provide assistance with professional development. New non-tenured professors may choose an advocate or have the option of requesting that an advocate be appointed by the department head.

During the third year at Texas A&M University, a non-tenured assistant professor's progress toward tenure and promotion shall have a formal review at the departmental level. The procedural guidelines for this third-year review will be similar to those for regular promotion and tenure and will include outside review as per college and university guidelines.

During the Spring semester of each year, the department head will issue a memorandum requesting faculty who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure to make an appointment to discuss the feasibility of promotion and/or tenure during the following academic year. If a faculty member wishes to pursue promotion and/or tenure after the conference has been held, documentation procedures will be initiated. The faculty member ultimately makes the decision to apply for promotion and/or tenure.

Documentation

Procedural guidelines and schedules for promotion and tenure review are issued annually by the University and College. The guidelines for submitting documentation for promotion and/or tenure are determined by the University and College.

Other Sources:

University Rules, 12.01.99.M2 –University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion.

Organization of Faculty Dossiers

According to DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, departments initiate the preparation of the faculty dossiers within Interfolio and then forward them to the candidate and ultimately their colleges for further processing and completion. Each electronic candidate dossier must be submitted in INTERFOLIO and include:

- Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet

Tab 1: Candidate statement on teaching, research, and service (Item 1)

Tab 2: Candidate CV (Item 2)

- Candidate CV
- Signed statement
- Candidate grant chart

Tab 3: Verification of contents statement (Item 3)

Tab 4: Department report of teaching (Item 4)

Tab 5: Department report of research (Item 5)

Tab 6: Department report of service (Item 7)

Tab 7: Department report of other activities (if applicable) (Item 7)

Tab 8: External reviewer letters (Item 8):

External reviewers' chart (list reviewers in alphabetic order by last name)

- Candidate & Department External Reviewer Checklists
- One example of external reviewer letter request
- External reviewer biographies (no longer than half a page each)
- External reviewer letters in alphabetic order (as listed in the external reviewer chart)
- List of peer departments if different from AAU

Tab 9: Department P&T discussion report (Item 9)

Tab 10: Department head report (Item 10)

Tab 11: College P&T Committee report (Item 11)

Tab 12: Dean report (Item 12)

Tab 13: Other materials and documentation (if applicable) (Item 13)

- Syllabi – Sample course syllabi should be provided showing learning outcomes, teaching activities, learning activities, examining procedures, projects, assignments, references.
- Standardized chronological table/peer review of student evaluation data
- Continuous improvement of factors identified in student evaluations
- Sample publications – A sample of 3-4 recent publications in the faculty's areas of research focus should be provided.
- Sample of tests administered examinations, projects, and assignments.

Solicitation of External Reviewers

The department will solicit outside review letters based on recommendation of the candidate, the tenure and promotion committee, and the department head. The external review letters should be obtained from individuals at comparable AAU institutions and at the rank of full professor. This is essential for credibility of the individuals' national impact. The candidate will supply the names of at least eight outside reviewers. The department tenure and promotion committee will also supply the names of at least eight outside reviewers. The candidate can review the list to veto any names that are not appropriate. The department head and the chair of the department tenure and promotion committee will work in consultation to attain more than six external reviewers and ensure that there is representation from the candidate's list. The external evaluation letters from nationally prominent scholars in the candidate's area of specialty will be solicited and archived in Interfolio.

Review Process Guidelines

1. The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture Promotion and Tenure Committee will consist of tenured professors [tenured associate and full]. The same committee membership will be used for either tenure or promotion to ensure consistency in the applications of standards. This committee will also review all non-tenured, tenure track faculty annually for developmental feedback towards tenure and promotion.
2. The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture Promotion and Tenure Committee will follow the university and college guidelines for promotion and tenure.
3. Materials for promotion and/or tenure will be available in Interfolio for review by committee members; sufficient time for a thorough review of such materials is to be provided by committee members. A sign-in to Interfolio tenure and promotion module will be used to document access to files.
4. The Department Head in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Chair will appoint two members of the Tenure and Promotion committee. One will present the research component and the second will present the teaching and service components of the faculty dossier under review. Eligible faculty will be: (1) full-professors or senior associate professors in the case of assistant professors, and (2) faculty who have not collaborated, mentored, or have a close relationship with the candidate.
 - a. Presenters will be selected in accordance with College Guidelines. To ensure that every candidate is represented equitably across all domains the presentation will follow this template format:
 - i. Slide 1 - Introductory slide presenting the focused research agenda evidenced by the body of work presented in faculty dossier.
 - ii. Slide 2 - Includes a graph or data of research productivity over time.

- iii. Slide 3 - Focus on the evidence of impact of the research agenda.
 - iv. Slide 4 - Includes a graph of teaching ratings over-time or across courses over time and summary of salient student comments.
 - v. Slide 5 - For service including a graph of activities by type of service during the review (categories include but not limited to department service, college service, editing, reviewing, leadership etc.)
 - vi. Slide 6 - Summary slide of positive comments from external reviewers (if any)
 - vii. Slide 7 - Summary slide of negative comments from external reviewers (if any)
5. All promotion and/or tenure deliberations and decisions made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee must remain in confidence and under no circumstances should any member reveal how he or she or any other member of the committee voted or repeat any statements of committee members that occurred during deliberations.
 6. Committee members as a committee of the whole have an independent vote in the overall process. The department head also has an independent vote. It is the department head who makes a recommendation on behalf of his/her department.
 7. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will report the vote (pro and con) to the Department Head immediately following deliberations. The Department Head will notify the candidate of the Committee's vote.
 8. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will assign various committee members to draft for approval by the committee of the whole separate statements for research, teaching and service. The Department Head will provide a copy of the statements to the candidate immediately upon receiving them.
 9. The chair of the department tenure and promotion committee will be elected by all tenure line faculty during the department's spring elections to a three-year term.
 10. The Department Head will develop a recommendation for the candidate and submit to the Dean and College Committee. A copy of this recommendation will be provided to the candidate at the same time it is submitted to the College.
 11. The Post tenure review Committee (PTRC) committee will be elected annually and comprises four elected members of the tenured faculty. The top three tenured faculty members with the most votes will comprise the PTRC. The fourth member elected will serve as an alternate should one of the three committee members be unavailable to serve. All tenured faculty are eligible to appear on the ballot unless a faculty member is subject to PTR during that year.

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.

Procedures for Promotion Review of Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members make a unique contribution to the education and training mission in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. Clinical faculty are generally full-time faculty (generally funded by the State) who are not only engaged in teaching, but also are engaged in research and service. Clinical faculty participate in grant activities, thesis and/or dissertation committees, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate.

Initial Employment Requirements for the Rank of Clinical Assistant Professor

- Doctoral degree or terminal degree
- Minimum of 3 years of relevant professional experience (e.g., teaching experience, clinical practice, supervision)
- Evidence of effective post-secondary teaching experience
- Where appropriate, history of license or certification in field of clinical expertise in the professional program area

- Interest in and commitment to engage in professional leadership activities.

Criteria for Promotion

The college and the departments will make available to each clinical faculty a copy of the college and departmental review and promotion guidelines. The guidelines will identify examples of meritorious performance under each of the areas of responsibilities.

Clinical faculty can be appointed at any academic rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements. All faculty workloads must include teaching and service and may include scholarship and other creative or performing activities, depending on the assignment. Professional development is an ongoing activity that cuts across teaching, service, and scholarship/creative/ performance activities. It is the expectation that clinical faculty will engage in professional development activities.

The categories below are the recommended requirements for promotion to the respective clinical faculty rank. Each department will provide indicators for meritorious performance in each of these categories for the specific rank. Appendix I to University Rule 12.01.9.M: *Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion* provides examples of indicators that may be applied in the evaluation of faculty.

Faculty must meet performance expectations in teaching and service. Performance expectations in scholarship/creative and performing activities apply to the extent to which participation and productivity in scholarly activities are in the individual faculty member's job description as stated in the initial letter of appointment and subsequent annual renewal letters.

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

- Candidates applying for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching and at least effective in service and research expectations.
 - Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
 - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
 - Demonstrate impact on student learning, examples might include Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes; or High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research etc.).
 - Design and successful delivery of new courses or major revisions of existing courses as needed for the program
 - Trajectory – engagement in continuous professional development in areas related to teaching and learning outcomes including the option of applying for or managing funding related to teaching or curricular improvement activities. This growth in trajectory is particularly important if initial teaching evaluations or peer observations reveal areas of challenge
- Demonstrated effective service evidenced by a combination of some of the following activities; additional examples found in section 4.6:
 - Active service on department, college, or university committees and task forces
 - Significant professional development activities that lead to enhanced service provision
 - Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
 - Evidence of involvement in commitment to continuous improvement (e.g., peer review and support of quality teaching, providing teaching workshops, leading continuous program improvement, serving as a reviewer for other programs)

- Demonstrated effective scholarship of research as evidenced by both:
 - Dissemination and application of research to the field, practice, and policy across more than one of the following categories (see section 4.4 for additional examples):
 - Peer-reviewed research findings (may be published in practitioner, discipline, or teaching-focused journals)
 - Other scholarly writings, such as books and book chapters published by a reputable publisher or discipline-specific newsletters
 - Professional presentations, such as conference presentations or delivery of research-based workshops
 - Creative products
 - Measures of Impact of scholarship (Associate Professors should provide at least one)
 - Impact factors of journals or assessment of journals as high quality by external reviewers
 - Application of writings/curriculum/training by those in the field as demonstrated
 - Number of individuals currently using materials
 - Number of trainings of practitioners based on scholarship/writing completed and evaluation of those trainings as effective
 - Implementation of curriculum in districts with evaluation of curriculum effectiveness
 - Application of writings/curriculum/training into policy at district, state, or national level

*In addition, Clinical Assistant faculty members are expected to apply for and maintain Graduate Faculty Status at TAMU at the time of promotion to Clinical Associate (*which is based on one peer-reviewed research publication every 5 years).*

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Full Professor

- Candidates must demonstrate excellence in teaching and be rated at least effective in service and research.
 - Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
 - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
 - Key leadership of course, program, and curriculum development efforts at department level
 - Demonstrate impact on student learning, examples might include Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes; or High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research, professional development workshops for graduate students, etc.)
 - Receiving a department, college, university, professional or a national outstanding teacher award
 - Leadership in offering high impact practice courses such as study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research, etc.).
 - Actively applying for or receiving internal or external grant support related to teaching or applied disciplinary work (e.g., management of training contracts to fund students, involvement in grants and contracts in support of teaching or scholarly activities, receiving competitive internal or external funding for teaching and curricular improvement activities)

- Demonstrated effective service as evidenced by the following activities; additional examples found in section 4.6:
 - Evidence of service/engagement/leadership within the department, the college, the institution, and/or the profession (e.g., leadership/membership on department, college, and university committees)
 - Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
 - Evidence of leadership in commitment to continuous improvement (e.g., peer review and support of quality teaching, providing teaching workshops, leading continuous program improvement, serving as a reviewer for other programs)
 - Engagement in significant professional development activities that lead to provision of enhanced service
- Demonstrated effective research as evidenced by the following activities, see section 4.4 for additional examples:
 - Apply and maintain Graduate Faculty Status at TAMU which is based on one peer-reviewed research publication every 5 years
 - Evidence of continuing growth as a teacher and researcher beyond the level attained upon promotion to associate professor should be provided.
 - Evidence of continued growth to full professor in addition of meritorious performance, evidence of national and international impact is expected.
 - Quality publications in refereed journals, these can be discipline or teaching focused
 - Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
 - Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines
 - Continued public activity in performing or diverse arts

Instructional Faculty

Initial Employment Requirements for the Rank of Instructional Assistant Professor

- Appointment to this rank generally requires a terminal degree; however, in the College of Education and Human development, the minimum requirement is a master's degree. Under extraordinary circumstances, other degrees, certifications, and other qualifications may be considered that demonstrate evidence of exceptional accomplishment in a field that the individual will be teaching (For example, exceptional athletic experience with national prominence, renowned performing artist, nationally renowned educator/teacher, etc.)
- Relevant professional experience
- Evidence of superior teaching experience
- Where appropriate, history of license or certification in field of expertise in the professional program area
- Interest in and commitment to engage in professional leadership or scholarly activities

Criteria for Promotion

Instructional professors can be appointed at any academic rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. See below:

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

To be promoted to instructional associate professor, the candidate must meet the requirements for instructional assistant professor, demonstrate excellence in teaching and at least receive a rating of effective in service.

- Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
 - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
 - Demonstrate impact on student learning, examples might include Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to

- support student learning outcomes; or High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research etc.).
- Design and successful delivery of new courses or major revisions of existing courses as needed for the program
- Trajectory – engagement in continuous professional development in areas related to teaching and learning outcomes including the option of applying for or managing funding related to teaching or curricular improvement activities. This growth in trajectory is particularly important if initial teaching evaluations or peer observations reveal areas of challenge.
- Demonstrated effective service as evidenced by the following activities; additional examples found in section 4.6:
 - Active service on department, college, or university committees and task forces
 - Significant professional development activities that lead to enhanced service provision
 - Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
 - Evidence of involvement in commitment to continuous improvement (e.g., peer review and support of quality teaching, providing teaching workshops, leading continuous program improvement, serving as a reviewer for other programs)

Promotion to Instructional Professor

Must meet the requirements for instructional associate professor and demonstrate evidence of excellence in teaching and receive a rating of at least effective in service

- Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
 - Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
 - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
 - Key leadership of course, program, and curriculum development efforts at department level
 - Demonstrate impact on student learning, examples might include Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes; or High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research, professional development workshops for graduate students, etc.).
 - Receiving a department, college, university, professional or a national outstanding teacher award.
 - Leadership in offering high impact practice courses such as study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research, etc.).
 - Actively applying for or receiving internal or external grant support related to teaching or applied disciplinary work (e.g., management of training contracts to fund students, involvement in grants and contracts in support of teaching or scholarly activities, receiving competitive internal or external funding for teaching and curricular improvement activities).
- Demonstrated effective service as evidenced by the following activities; additional examples found in section 4.6:
 - Evidence of service/engagement/leadership within the department, the college, the institution, and/or the profession (e.g., leadership/membership on department, college, and university committees)
 - Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)

- Evidence of leadership in commitment to continuous improvement (e.g., peer review and support of quality teaching, providing teaching workshops, leading continuous program improvement, serving as a reviewer for other programs)
- Engagement in significant professional development activities that lead to provision of enhanced service

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

- Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers do not follow the typical process outlined below. In consultation with the department head, lecturers may be reclassified to senior lecturers after 5 years in rank and consistent performance. Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
 - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
 - Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes
 - High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research etc.).
 - Trajectory – engagement in continuous professional development in areas related to teaching and learning outcomes; this is particularly important if initial teaching evaluations or peer observations reveal areas of challenge

5.3 Process

DEPARTMENT PROMOTION AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

Time Perspective

Clinical faculty are evaluated annually in accordance with College and University policies for annual performance evaluations of faculty. In addition to the annual evaluation requirement, a departmental and college level review will be required in the third year of appointment. Clinical faculty are strongly encouraged to consult with the department head and appropriate departmental faculty before they formally request to be considered for promotion (clinical assistant to clinical associate or clinical associate to clinical full clinical professor). Assistant and Associate Clinical professors shall have the opportunity to have a Clinical full professor mentor who will advise them and provide assistance with professional development.

Mid-term reviews for Clinical Assistant Professors take place in the spring of the initial third year of employment. For purpose of review, adjunct clinical professors are considered part-time/short term and will not be evaluated in the third-year or for promotion.

During the Spring semester of each year, the department head will issue a memorandum requesting faculty who wish to be considered for promotion to make an appointment to discuss the feasibility of promotion during the following academic year. If a faculty member wishes to pursue promotion after the conference has been held, documentation procedures will be initiated. The faculty member ultimately makes the decision to apply for promotion.

Documentation

Procedural guidelines and schedules for promotion and review are issued annually by the University and College. The guidelines for submitting documentation for promotion are determined by the University and College.

Other Sources:

University Rules, 12.01.99.M2 –University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion.

Contents

Candidate's Portfolio Candidates for mid-term review and/or promotion submit a portfolio of teaching, service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative and performing activities. The portfolio will contain, but not be limited to the following:

1. Candidate's Statement

(a) a concise statement (not to exceed three pages) which allows the candidate to explain the QUALITY, productivity overtime, and IMPACT of their teaching, research/scholarly work, and service accomplishments. Each of the three areas, as applicable, should be individually addressed. This statement should report on the past accomplishments, present activities, and future plans of the candidate across all the areas that apply. It should provide the candidate's perspective on and interpretation of these matters and go beyond simple reiteration of the content of the vita. The statement, in conjunction with the CV should provide evidence that good ideas and teaching and research activities are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise;

(b) curriculum vitae

(c) evidence of quality performance in the areas of assigned responsibility as applicable within the general headings of:

(i) teaching, which must include a table of courses taught (face-to-face and online), student evaluations for each course and departmental average of student evaluations for equivalent courses;

(ii) service/engagement/ professional activities provided within the institution and to professional organizations and/or

(iii) scholarship and/or performing and creative activities.

2. A job description provided by the department head.

3. A-1 form for the current year.

4. A-2 forms for the previous three years. This portfolio will be submitted to the department head no later than the first day of the spring semester.

Organization of Faculty Dossiers

According to DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, departments initiate the preparation of the faculty dossiers within Interfolio and then forward them to the candidate and ultimately their colleges for further processing and completion. Each electronic candidate dossier must be submitted in INTERFOLIO and include:

- Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet

Tab 1: Candidate statement on teaching, research, and service (Item 1)

Tab 2: Candidate CV (Item 2)

- Candidate CV
- Signed statement
- Candidate grant chart

Tab 3: Verification of contents statement (Item 3)

Tab 4: Department report of teaching (Item 4)

Tab 5: Department report of research (Item 5)

Tab 6: Department report of service (Item 7)

Tab 7: Department report of other activities (if applicable) (Item 7)

Tab 8: External reviewer letters (Item 8):

External reviewers chart (list reviewers in alphabetic order by last name)

- Candidate & Department External Reviewer Checklists
- One example of external reviewer letter request
- External reviewer biographies (no longer than half a page each)
- External reviewer letters in alphabetic order (as listed in the external reviewer chart)
- List of peer departments if different from AAU

Tab 9: Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee discussion report (Item 9)

Tab 10: Department head report (Item 10)

Tab 11: College APT Advisory Committee report (Item 11)

Tab 12: Dean report (Item 12)

Tab 13: Other materials and documentation (if applicable) (Item 13)

- Syllabi – Sample course syllabi should be provided showing learning outcomes, teaching activities, learning activities, examining procedures, projects, assignments, references.
- Standardized chronological table/peer review of student evaluation data
- Continuous improvement of factors identified in student evaluations
- Sample publications – A sample of 3-4 recent publications in the faculty's areas of research focus may be provided.
- Sample of tests administered examinations, projects, and assignments.

External Reviews

The Department Head will select a minimum of five reviewers external to the department, college, or university. Three reviewers are to be selected from a list of potential reviewers given by the faculty member; the other three are to be selected from a list developed by the CFRC committee and/or department head in consultation with departmental faculty within the candidates' area of expertise. These external reviewers should be selected based on the clinical faculty candidate's assignment and responsibilities. For example, appropriate reviews might include a teaching evaluation (by a faculty member outside the candidate's department with expertise in this area), an evaluation by a

school-based professional who has interacted with the faculty member (e.g., principal); clinical practitioners (e.g., licensed psychologists or licensed exercise physiologists); or faculty with similar responsibilities at other institutions. Care should be taken in selecting outside reviewers to ensure that they are persons whose objectivity is not open to challenge – that is, not co-authors, personal friends, former students, or former mentors unless more than the minimum of two reviews are requested. The external reviews shall be considered as one piece of information needed to make a determination for promotion. Candidate's dossier and job description will be submitted to the external reviewers. External reviewers should be asked to provide a written assessment of the candidate's areas of responsibility and performance expectations. (Responsibilities include teaching and service/engagement and may or may not include scholarship and/or creative and performing activities).

Promotion and Review Process Guidelines

Departmental Clinical Faculty Review (CFRC) Committee

The Departmental Clinical Faculty Review Committee (CFRC) will consist of a minimum of 4 -6 faculty members at the rank of Clinical Associate or Clinical Full Professor elected by clinical faculty. For review of Clinical Full Professor, the committee will consist of Clinical Full Professors only. In the event there are insufficient clinical faculty at the ranks of Clinical Associate or Clinical Full Professor, the committee will be composed of clinical faculty members of appropriate rank from the department and either tenured departmental faculty members with knowledge of the clinical faculty role or clinical faculty members of appropriate rank from other departments in the college. The candidate's portfolio of teaching, curriculum and program development, professional development, and professional activities as well as service to the University, College and Department and professional organizations will be reviewed by the CFRC.

Mid Term Review After a review of the candidate's portfolio and credentials, the CFRC will vote on whether the candidate has had a positive mid-term review or not and whether the candidate is on a positive trajectory toward promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. This vote and associated CFRC recommendations will be forwarded in writing to the department head. The CFRC recommendation should be based on the individual's performance expectations of the written job description.

Promotion Review The CFRC will vote on promotions and produce separate reports to address each of the areas of performance, as well as an overall report that integrates or summarizes the committee deliberations and explains the outcome of the vote. This vote and associated CFRC reports will be forwarded to the department head. The CFRC reports should be based on the individual's job description and appropriate performance expectations.

Departmental Approval Upon review of the recommendations by the CFRC, the department head will make a recommendation to accept or deny the recommendation. The department head will forward the recommendation, along with results of the vote of the CFRC and its recommendation, to the Office of the Dean.

College Academic Professional Track Advisory Committee The College Academic Professional Track Advisory Committee (APTAC) reviews candidates for midterm and candidates for promotion. It is responsible for conducting a thorough review of each portfolio that is submitted by departments. It is also responsible for submitting in writing to the dean its recommendations for progress made for mid-term review or promotion and a report of its vote on each portfolio. The APTAC also advises the dean on issues pertaining to appointment, review, and promotion, such as guidelines for promotion and procedures for conducting reappointment and promotion reviews. Membership on the APTAC consists of four APT Full Professors (2 Clinical and 2 Instructional) elected by APT faculty. Additionally, two APT Associate Professors (Clinical and Instructional) are elected as college at-large representatives. Each member of the committee serves a 3-year term. All APT faculty are eligible to vote for their departmental representative and for the at-large representative. Members of the committee are expected to represent the College rather

than to serve as advocates for their departments. The APTAC recommendation should be based on the individual's performance expectations of the written job description.

Dean's Review The dean will review all applications for mid-term review and promotion and will inform the department head and the faculty member of approval or denial of promotion. When the dean does not concur with the departmental recommendation, the dean will inform the department head. The department head shall then have the opportunity to present new evidence or new arguments to the dean to request a reconsideration of the decision. If the dean still disapproves the request for promotion, the dean shall inform the department head and the faculty member of the reasons for the disapproval of promotion. In the case of mid-term review, the dean will inform the department head and the candidate on whether the review is positive or negative and the reasons for the decision.

6.0 Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (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.M2](#) 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.M2](#). 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 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, 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.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 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 annual review is for the immediate calendar year attenuated for a rolling three-year average. An annual review of performance of all tenure track faculty is conducted by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee as well as the Department Head to assess progress is an essential process toward promotion and/or tenure. Non-Tenured faculty receive annual performance evaluations in addition to feedback in writing concerning their progress toward promotion and tenure.

New non-tenured professors shall have the opportunity to have a full professor mentor and coach who will advise them and provide assistance with professional development. New non-tenured professors may choose an advocate or have the option of requesting that an advocate be appointed by the Department Head.

During the third year at Texas A&M University, a non-tenured assistant professor's progress toward tenure and promotion shall have a formal review at the departmental level in accord with College third-year review guidelines. The procedural guidelines for this third-year review will be similar to those for regular promotion and tenure and will include outside review as per College and University guidelines.

During the Spring semester of each year, the department head will issue a memorandum requesting faculty who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure to make an appointment to discuss the process and procedures for promotion and/or tenure during the following academic year. If a faculty member wishes to pursue promotion and/or tenure after the conference has been held, documentation procedures will be initiated for dossier preparation. The faculty member ultimately makes the decision to apply for promotion and / or tenure.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on at least four categories. The Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture use the following four categories: "Needs Improvement", "Meets Expectations", "Meritorious", and "Most Meritorious" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

Tenure Track Faculty

- 6.4.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Teaching for Tenure Track Faculty** are:

*Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching is characterized by but not limited to:*

- Not meeting their regularly scheduled class at their appointed time(es),

- Not teaching their class(es) effectively
- Not administering a final during scheduled times in each undergraduate class
- Not evaluating graduate classes appropriately
- Teaching less than a 40% teaching load (every change of 10% equals 1 course).
- Not providing an updated syllabus for all courses to the department and online system (currently HOWDY)
- Not incorporating current scholarship and research best practices into their teaching
- Not successfully completing all university mandatory training requirements

Meets Expectations - is characterized by but not limited to:

- Meeting their class(es) on a regular basis at appointed scheduled times,
- Teaching their class(es) effectively
- Administering a final during scheduled times in each undergraduate class
- Evaluating graduate classes appropriately
- Having an appropriate course load where 40% teaching load (every change of 10% equals 1 course).
- Providing an updated syllabus for all courses to the department and online system (currently HOWDY)
- Incorporating current scholarship and research best practices into their teaching
- Completing all university mandatory training requirements successfully
- Other teaching activities as appropriate

*Meritorious – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees. Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving meets expectations and characterized additionally by but not limited to items in this list:*

- Earning student course evaluation scores above 4.0 on their teaching evaluations (this does not include any non-didactic courses, 485, 680, 684, 685, 691 or 692)
- Being nominated for the TAMU Association of Former Students Teaching Awards
- Being nominated for a College of Education and Human Development awards for teaching and/ or mentoring
- Being nominated for a national teaching award
- Being nominated for a teaching-based national grant (PI or co-PI) including doctoral training grants, teaching development grants, as examples
- Engaging in scholarly activities: Journal articles, books, or book chapters authored with a student
- Mentoring a student receiving a competitive award at the college, university, state, regional, national, or international level (do not include travel funding, awards from grants, PI, or Co-PII; GSA; graduate assistantships, or the student fellowship awards prior to admission or as incentive to apply). Only awards in which the students make application, and one or more faculty must write a letter of support or recommendation
- Developing a new course, including extending the course for on-line instruction
- Earning certification for an on-line course
- Having presentations accepted and presented with students
- Other activities as appropriate

*Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have a majority of the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, awards, and*

involvement in educational organizations as evidenced by meeting a representative sample of criteria. Most Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving Meritorious and characterized by items but not limited to in this list:

- Receiving the TAMU Association of Former Students Teaching Awards
- Receiving a College of Education and Human Development awards for teaching and or mentoring
- Receiving a national teaching award
- Receiving a teaching-based national grant (PI or co-PI) including doctoral training grants, teaching development grants, as examples
- Receiving Texas A&M University teaching development grants
- Mentoring of graduate students in teaching their courses when not assigned as part of the teaching workload
- Serving as Ph.D. Dissertation or Ed.D. Record of Study Chair or Co-Chair
- Serving as MS Thesis Chair or Co-Chair
- Serving as a Member on a Ph.D. Dissertation or Ed.D. Record of Study
- Serving as M.Ed. Committee Chair or Co-Chair
- Serving as MS/M.Ed. thesis committee member
- Serving as M.Ed. Committee member for a student
- Participating in the Peer Evaluation of Teaching
- Having doctoral students in place at top institutions or earning promotion at their institution
- Other activities as appropriate

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**. The department has regular shared conversations about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the department.

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Tenure Track Faculty Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are:

*Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.*

- Having fewer than two (2) articles published in peer-reviewed national or international journals for the year and a three-year rolling mean fewer than two (2).

*Meets Expectations- The attainment of one **effectiveness** criterion*

- Meets is demonstrated by achieving a minimum of two (2) national or international peer reviewed published publications or a three-year rolling average of at least two (2).
- List h-Index
- List i10 Index
- List Number of Citations for the evaluation year from Google Scholar
- List individual faculty Google Scholar webpage link

*Meritorious – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts in high impact indexed journals, extramural funded grants, national and international presentations, citations above peer average,*

and other factors. Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving all of the Meets Expectations and characterized by but not limited to items in this list:

- Publishing more than two articles in peer-reviewed national or international journals with at least 1 being in an indexed journal (SCIMago Journal Rank (SJR in SCOPUS) or Journal Impact Factor (JIF in Web of Science)
- Being nominated for the TAMU Association of Former Students Research Award
- Being nominated for a College of Education and Human Development awards for Research
- Being nominated for a national Research award
- Presenting a research paper at a conference with graduate students
- Publishing state or regional articles and publications
- Publishing in conference proceedings in peer-reviewed and published—but not indexed—outlets
- Presenting at regional and state conference (research-based and external to Texas A&M only)
- Publishing other scholarly products at the national level focus and quality, such as creative works, technical products to external national agencies
- Writing editorials in nationally distributed newspapers or magazines
- Publishing in conference proceedings with a separate peer-review and copyright agreement
- Submitting a Federal or other national/international competitive grants beyond expected requirement as PI or co-PI
- Administering a research grant as PI or co-PI or assistant professor with a significant attributed role on a grant
- Administering a State government or regional/state nonprofit foundation or corporation grants or contracts
- Having been awarded a Texas A&M, College of Education, or Teaching Learning and Culture grants
- Being nominated for the TAMU Association of Former Students Research Awards
- Receiving a College of Education and Human Development awards for research
- Other research and scholarly activities as appropriate

*Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for impact and excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies. Most Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving meritorious and characterized by items but not limited to in this list:*

- *Published at least three (3) articles and at least two are indexed journals with a Journal Rank (SJR in SCOPUS) or Journal Impact Factor (JIF in Web of Science)*
- Receiving the TAMU Association of Former Students Research Award
- Receiving a College of Education and Human Development awards for Research
- Receiving a national Research award
- Receiving Texas A&M University Research development grant
- Receiving a Federal or other national/international competitive grants awarded (PI or CoPI)
- Receiving a state government or regional/state nonprofit foundation or corporation competitive grants or contracts that are external to the Texas A&M University System or its constituent parts
- Receiving local, school, or other awarded contracts as PI or co-PI
- Publishing as a Full Professor with an Authored book (not edited monograph or edited series) with a national or internationally recognized publisher

- Publishing peer reviewed manuscripts with graduate students
- Receiving a national research award from national associations or organizations
- Other activities as appropriate

6.4.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Tenure Track Faculty Service** are:

*Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.*

- Not attending regularly scheduled department faculty meetings
- Not participating in committees of the whole
- Not presenting at tenure and promotion committee meetings if applicable
- Not presenting at graduate or appropriate undergraduate faculty committee meetings if applicable
- Lack of participation in department governance, decision-making and engagement as a member of the academy and University, College or Department community

*Meets Expectations- will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time/workload assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment. *Meets* is characterized by but not limited to items on this list:*

- Attending regularly scheduled department meetings
- Participating in committees of the whole
- Being present at tenure and promotion committee if applicable
- Being present at graduate, and where appropriate, undergraduate faculty committee meetings if applicable
- Serving effectively on a range of activities related to the department, college, and university
- Serving on a regional, state, government, or national level service role in a relevant professional organization

Meritorious - is demonstrated by achieving meets and characterized by but not limited to items in this list:

- Serving a relevant professional organization as officer, appointed, or elected to service position
- Being nominated for the TAMU Association of Former Students Service Award
- Being nominated for a College of Education and Human Development awards for Service
- Being nominated for a national Service award
- Engaging in national/international/regional and state service activities relevant to the missions of TAMU, CEHD, and the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
- Serving on national/ federal panels or national and state legislative committees
- Serving as a reviewer for national grant proposal panels
- Serving as a national level conference paper reviewer
- Serving as an external reviewer for program or faculty promotion at another university
- Mentoring or continuing mentoring of new or junior faculty
- Organizing or presenting at department or program area seminars beyond one or two activities
- Serving as an editor or co-editor of a journal, book, special issue, or proceedings
- Presenting a service-related talk or paper
- Reviewing for grants or conference paper
- Serving as a newsletter editor

- Lecturing to non-professional groups
- Serving as a committee or board member for district or community agencies
- Serving on school-based committees
- Providing professional development in services for school personnel
- Editing community newsletters
- Providing support for community grant writing projects
- Applying for community seed grants related to community issues
- Making classroom presentations or model teaching lessons to Pk-12 students
- Being elected or appointed committee member of a prominent state or national organization
- Other service and outreach activities as appropriate

*Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations. Most Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving meritorious and characterized by but not limited to items in this list:*

- Receiving the TAMU Association of Former Students Service Award
- Receiving a College of Education and Human Development awards for service
- Receiving a national Service award
- Receiving Texas A&M University service development grant
- Developing a new department program
- Receiving national service/outreach awards
- Serving as a letter writer and nominator of a student receiving an award (Excluding travel awards, recruitment awards, and departmental awards)
- Serving in an executive board role, committee chair or elected officer of a prominent state or national organization
- Serving as an advisor for a student organization
- Chairing a department, college, or university committee (does not include graduate student committees)

Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

Clinical Faculty (APT) members make a unique contribution to the education and training mission in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. Clinical faculty are generally full-time faculty (generally funded by the State) who are not only engaged in teaching, but also are engaged in research and service. Clinical faculty participate in grant activities, thesis and/or dissertation committees, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate. The standard annual workload distribution differs from that of tenure track faculty. Clinical faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture are recognized for their significant contribution to teaching (80%), engagement in research (10%) and service (10%).

6.4.4 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Teaching** for **APT Track Faculty** commensurate with an 80% workload expectation are:

*Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching is characterized by but not limited to:*

- Not meeting their regularly scheduled class at their appointed time(es),
- Not teaching their class(es) effectively
- Not administering a final during scheduled times in each undergraduate class

- Not evaluating undergraduate and graduate classes appropriately
- Teaching less than an 80% teaching load (every change of 10% equals 1 course)
- Lack of evidence of continued professional development
- Lack of evidence using innovative technology to enhance instruction
- No engagement in mentoring graduate or undergraduate students
- Not providing an updated syllabus for all courses to the department and online system (currently HOWDY)
- Not incorporating current scholarship and research best practices into their teaching
- Not successfully completing all university mandatory training requirements

Meets Expectations - is characterized by but not limited to:

- Meeting their class(es) on a regular basis at appointed scheduled times,
- Teaching their class(es) effectively
- Administering a final during scheduled times in each undergraduate class
- Evaluating graduate and undergraduate classes appropriately
- Engaged in course curriculum improvement efforts
- Documented engagement in mentoring graduate or undergraduate students
- Having an appropriate course load where 80% teaching load (every change of 10% equals 1 course).
- Providing an updated syllabus for all courses to the department and online system (currently HOWDY)
- Evidence of appropriate use of effective technology to enrich instruction and student learning
- Incorporating current scholarship of teaching/instruction and research best practices into their teaching
- Completing all university mandatory training requirements successfully
- Other teaching activities as appropriate

*Meritorious – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees. Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving meets expectations and characterized additionally by but not limited to items in this list:*

- Earning student course evaluation scores above 4.0 on their teaching evaluations (this does not include any non-didactic courses, 485, 680, 684, 685, 691 or 692)
- Being nominated for the TAMU Association of Former Students Teaching Awards
- Being nominated for a College of Education and Human Development awards for teaching and/ or mentoring
- Being nominated for a national teaching award
- Being nominated for a teaching-based national grant (PI or co-PI) including doctoral training grants, teaching development grants, as examples
- Engaging in collaborative scholarly activities: Journal articles, books, or book chapters authored with a student or other faculty member
- Mentoring a student receiving a competitive award at the college, university, state, regional, national, or international level (do not include travel funding, awards from grants, PI, or Co-PII; GSA; graduate assistantships, or the student fellowship awards prior to admission or as incentive to apply). Only awards in which the students make application, and one or more faculty must write a letter of support or recommendation
- Developing a new course, including extending the course for on-line instruction

- Earning certification for an on-line course
- Having presentations accepted and presented with students
- Other activities as appropriate

***Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have a majority of the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, awards, and involvement in educational organizations as evidenced by meeting a representative sample of criteria. Most Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving Meritorious and characterized by items but not limited to in this list:*

- Receiving the TAMU Association of Former Students Teaching Awards
- Receiving a College of Education and Human Development awards for teaching and or mentoring
- Receiving a national teaching award
- Receiving a teaching-based national grant (PI or co-PI) including doctoral training grants, teaching development grants, or curriculum project grants as examples
- Receiving Texas A&M University teaching development grants
- Mentoring of graduate students in teaching their courses when not assigned as part of the teaching workload
- Serving as Ph.D. Dissertation or Ed.D. Record of Study Chair or Co-Chair
- Serving as MS Thesis Chair or Co-Chair
- Serving as a Member on a Ph.D. Dissertation or Ed.D. Record of Study
- Serving as M.Ed. Committee Chair or Co-Chair
- Serving as MS/M.Ed. thesis committee member
- Serving as M.Ed. Committee member for a student
- Participating in the Peer Evaluation of Teaching
- Other activities as appropriate

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

- 6.4.5 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **APT Track Faculty Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** commensurate with a 10% workload expectation are:

***Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.*

- Having no authored or co-authored articles published in peer-reviewed journals within a three-year rolling mean period. No annual national or State level conference presentations.

***Meets Expectations**- The attainment of one **effectiveness** criterion*

- Meets is demonstrated by achieving a minimum of one (1) national or international peer reviewed published publications within a three-year rolling average.
- National conference presentation with abstract or paper
- International conference presentation with abstract
- Conference proceeding and or presentation with student/s
- Paper or abstract presented and published with student/s

- Book chapter author or co-author, edited chapter, or book
- Non peer reviewed publications, technical reports, publish curriculum etc.

***Meritorious** – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts in high impact indexed journals, participation in extramural funded grants, national and international presentations, citations above peer average, and other factors. . Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving all of the Meets Expectations and characterized by but not limited to items in this list:*

- Publishing more than one (1) articles in peer-reviewed national or international journals.
- Being nominated for the TAMU Association of Former Students Research Award
- Being nominated for a College of Education and Human Development awards for Research
- Being nominated for a national Research award
- Presenting a research paper at a conference with graduate students
- Publishing state or regional articles and publications
- Publishing in conference proceedings in peer-reviewed and published—but not indexed— outlets
- Presenting at regional and state conference (research-based and external to Texas A&M only)
- Publishing other scholarly products at the national level focus and quality, such as creative works, technical products to external national agencies
- Writing editorials in nationally distributed newspapers or magazines
- Publishing in conference proceedings with a separate peer-review and copyright agreement
- Submitting a Federal or other national/international competitive grants beyond expected requirement as PI or co-PI
- Administering a research grant as PI or co-PI or other collaborating faculty with a significant attributed role on a grant
- Administering a State government or regional/state nonprofit foundation or corporation grants, teaching project or contracts
- Having been awarded a Texas A&M, College of Education, or Teaching Learning and Culture grants
- Being nominated for the TAMU Association of Former Students Research Awards
- Receiving a College of Education and Human Development awards for research
- Other research and scholarly activities as appropriate

***Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for impact and excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies. Most Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving meritorious and characterized by items but not limited to in this list:*

- Published at least two (2) articles and at least one is indexed journals with a Journal Rank (SJR in SCOPUS) or Journal Impact Factor (JIF in Web of Science)
- Receiving the TAMU Association of Former Students Research Award
- Receiving a College of Education and Human Development awards for Research
- Receiving a national Research award
- Receiving Texas A&M University Research or Teaching development grant
- Receiving a Federal or other national/international competitive grants awarded (PI or CoPI)

- Receiving a state government or regional/state nonprofit foundation or corporation competitive grants or contracts that are external to the Texas A&M University System or its constituent parts
- Receiving local, school, or other awarded contracts as PI or co-PI
- Publishing collaboratively an Authored book (not edited monograph or edited series) with a national or internationally recognized publisher
- Publishing peer reviewed manuscripts with graduate students
- Receiving a national research award from national associations or organizations
- Other activities as appropriate

6.4.6 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **APT Track Faculty Service** commensurate with a 10% workload expectation are:

*Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.*

- Not attending regularly scheduled department faculty meetings
- Not participating in committees of the whole
- Not presenting at promotion committee meetings if applicable
- Not presenting or participating in graduate or appropriate undergraduate faculty committee meetings if applicable
- Lack of participation in department governance, decision-making and engagement as a member of the academy and University, College or Department community

*Meets Expectations- will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time/workload assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment. Meets is characterized by but not limited to items on this list:*

- Attending regularly scheduled department meetings
- Participating in committees of the whole
- Being present at tenure and promotion committee if applicable
- Being present at graduate, and where appropriate, undergraduate faculty committee meetings if applicable
- Serving effectively on a range of activities related to the department, college, and university
- Serving on a regional, state, government, or national level service role in a relevant professional organization

Meritorious- is demonstrated by achieving meets and characterized by but not limited to items in this list:

- Serving a relevant professional organization as officer, appointed, or elected to service position
- Being nominated for the TAMU Association of Former Students Service Award
- Being nominated for a College of Education and Human Development awards for Service
- Being nominated for a national Service award
- Engaging in national/international/regional and state service activities relevant to the missions of TAMU, CEHD, and the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
- Serving on national/ federal panels or national and state legislative committees
- Serving as a reviewer for national grant proposal panels
- Serving as a national level conference paper reviewer
- Serving as an external reviewer for program or faculty promotion at another university

- Mentoring or continuing mentoring of new or junior faculty
- Organizing or presenting at department or program area seminars beyond one or two activities
- Serving as an editor or co-editor of a journal, book, special issue, or proceedings
- Presenting a service-related talk or paper
- Reviewing for grants or conference paper
- Serving as a newsletter editor
- Lecturing to non-professional groups
- Serving as a committee or board member for district or community agencies
- Serving on school-based committees
- Providing professional development in services for school personnel
- Editing community newsletters
- Providing support for community grant writing projects
- Applying for community seed grants related to community issues
- Making classroom presentations or model teaching lessons to Pk-12 students
- Being elected or appointed committee member of a prominent state or national organization
- Other service and outreach activities as appropriate

*Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations. Most Meritorious is demonstrated by achieving meritorious and characterized by but not limited to items in this list:*

- Receiving the TAMU Association of Former Students Service Award
- Receiving a College of Education and Human Development awards for service
- Receiving a national Service award
- Receiving Texas A&M University service development grant
- Developing a new department program
- Receiving national service/outreach awards
- Serving as a letter writer and nominator of a student receiving an award (Excluding travel awards, recruitment awards, and departmental awards)
- Serving in an executive board role, committee chair or elected officer of a prominent state or national organization
- Serving as an advisor for a student organization
- Chairing a department, college, or university committee (does not include graduate student committees)

6.5 Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities.

The faculty member's report of previous activities must include the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years) and 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 and service as required in accordance with the appropriate faculty workload distribution (tenure track and APT faculty).
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Contents of the annual faculty report of activities must contain:

- Appropriate evidence to support achievement and impact in each section of the evaluation. Explanation of other/additional materials to be considered by the department peer evaluation committee and department head.
- Updated and most recent CV must be included.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

6.5.2 A written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations.

The department head 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/service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head 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.

6.5.3 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.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, 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.

6.6 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:

6.6.1 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 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 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 9), 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.

6.7 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ 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 Dean of Faculties. 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 Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#).

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.M2](#)

7.0 **Mid-Term Review**

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#) (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, patient care, 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.

8.0 **Post-Tenure/Periodic Review**¹

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 Post Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) committee in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture will be elected annually and comprises four elected members of the tenured faculty. The top three tenured faculty members with the most votes will comprise the PTRC. The fourth member elected will serve as an alternate should one of the three committee members be unavailable to serve. All tenured faculty are eligible to appear on the ballot unless a faculty member is subject to PTR during that year.

PTR Committee Tenets:

1. The department head/PTRC should limit an increased rating due to development activities to a maximum of one level, if such an increase results in a satisfactory ranking the faculty member will be deemed to have successfully completed the PTR process.
2. For faculty with approved leave, (e.g., maternity, paternity, faculty development, sick etc.) will be reviewed considering year(s) of approved leave counting as satisfactory. In consultation with the department head the PTR process may be postponed for up to the number of years of approved leave.
3. For the calendar years, faculty members who had an unsatisfactory rating in one or more years in a row in one category of the A-1 but then improved to a meritorious ranking for the remaining years prior to PTR will be considered as making progress (see Tenet 1). In addition, if a faculty member has "Highly Meritorious" ranking in a category for 4 years on the A-1 evaluation but then has an off year with an unsatisfactory or needs improvement ranking in the 5th year of the A-1, the committee can recommend no more than to collaborate with the department head and chair of the P&T committee to develop an improvement plan and no further review unless there is no improvement (see Tenet 1).
4. For the inaugural review period, that is 2017 and 2018 calendar years, which are not triggered by poor performance as evidenced on the A-1, new standards will not result in ratings of Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory Ratings.
5. All evidence for the review must have been shared with the faculty member prior to the review with sufficient time to draft a response and/or to provide counter evidence to the committee.

8.3 Process

Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

The tenured faculty member will submit to the department head and the department post-tenure review committee a portfolio documenting performance. The portfolio must be comprised of the following:

- 1 a current curriculum vitae highlighting accomplishments covered by the review period.
- 2 evidence of teaching, research and service accomplishments covered by the review period.
- 3 any other documentation deemed relevant by the faculty member under review.
- 4 The department post tenure review committee (PTRC) will review the materials and

render a recommendation to the department head of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of the three areas of responsibility. In the case of a satisfactory recommendation, the PTRC will include comments about the faculty member's identified areas of excellence and/or possibilities for future professional development. In the case of a needs improvement or unsatisfactory recommendation, the PTRC will make recommendations about the faculty member's future professional development.

- 5 The department head will submit an assessment of the faculty member indicating whether performance has been satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of three areas of responsibility over the past five years. The candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
- 6 The department head *recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member, and the dean.

*The department head will review the evaluations prepared by the PTRC and provide his or her own written assessment of the candidate's overall performance to include budget considerations to cover professional development costs if recommended in a professional development plan. The department head will send this written evaluation to the faculty member, dean of faculties/provost. The college and the dean of faculties will each maintain a copy of the evaluation in the candidate's permanent personnel files.

- 8.3.1 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.
- 8.3.2 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 guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.3 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

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

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 Dean of Faculties, 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 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 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 Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost 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 Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (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](#)).

9.0 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 Dean of Faculties 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

Units may choose to annotate the revisions to previous versions of their evaluation guidelines

Contact Office

Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture Office of the Department Head, e-mail demiranda@tamu.edu