Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development
Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by Faculty Department, November 4, 2020
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

The Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development at Texas A&M University strives to design and adopt a faculty evaluation framework consistent with the goals and mission of this institution. 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 Educational Administration and Human Resource Development for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.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:

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 <u>University Rule 12.01.99.M2</u> and <u>University</u> Guidelines to <u>Faculty titles</u>. 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.

Faculty Categories of Performance in the College of Education and Human Development 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 College of Education and Human Development. 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 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 CEHD is 40% Teaching; 40-50% research; 10-20% Service. Faculty cannot go to 0% appointment in any of the three categories. Department heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable (e.g., a one course release for leading a program). We also have a one course release for assistant professors on tenure track for the first three years to enable them to build their research program.

Academic Professional Track
Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members make a unique contribution to the education and training mission in the College of Education and Human Development. 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, APT faculty can participate in grant 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 duty include:
- Teaching
- Research
- Service
- Professional development

The typical load for clinical faculty in CEHD is 80% Teaching; 10% research; 10% Service. Faculty cannot go to 0% appointment in any of the three categories. Department heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable (e.g., a one course release for leading a program).

Instructional Faculty (Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Full Professor)
The responsibilities in the two areas of instructional faculty duty include:
- Teaching
- Service

The typical load for instructional faculty in CEHD is 90% Teaching: 10% Service. Faculty cannot go to 0% appointment in any of the two categories. Department heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable (e.g., a one course release for leading a program).

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 CEHD is 100% Teaching; Faculty cannot go to 0% 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 in the areas of teaching; research, scholarly activity and/or creative work. 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.

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).

3.1 Teaching
Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation. 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

- **Record of courses taught during the year or over the period of evaluation**
    - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching
    - Strong and impactful teaching performance as evidenced by strong and impactful teaching
    - Effective and impactful teaching with technology or face-to-face
- **Course syllabi**
    - High impact teaching and learning activities as stated in the course syllabi
    - Student learning outcomes
    - Teaching activities that engage students in active learning
    - Creating effective pedagogical methods and materials
- **Teaching observations**
    - Peer evaluation feedback provided by faculty colleagues in the department, college or in the field
    - Evidence of very high quality of student engagement in learning activities
    - Design and successful delivery of new courses or major revisions of existing courses

- **Grading methods**
  - Nature of assignments
  - Class projects, team projects
  - Examinations
- **Professional development activities**
  - Evidence of participation in professional development activities
  - Engagement in continuing education and lifelong learning
  - Continuous course and teaching improvements
  - Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
  - Management of training grants to fund students and involvement in grants and contracts in support of teaching or scholarly activities
  - Competitive funding for teaching and curricular improvement activities
- **Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**
  - Scholarship of teaching and learning which advances understanding in a primary discipline of study
  - Scholarship of Teaching and Learning that act to translate the specifics of a discipline to a broader audience
- **Teaching awards earned**
  - Evidence of teaching excellence by receiving internal/external teaching awards
- **Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students**
  - Impactful doctoral mentoring as evidenced by chairing doctoral committees,
  - Student awards
  - Faculty or leadership position of former doctoral students,

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work:

Research or Scholarship in the department of Educational Administration and Human Resource and Development can be demonstrated through a combination of ways:

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).

Research, scholarly activity, or creative work is critical to the mission of the College of Education and Human Development and a core mission of Texas A&M University as a Research I institution. All faculty members with research appointments are expected to excel in research. Effectiveness and excellence in research significantly affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion for faculty members with research appointments. Research or Scholarship in CEHD can be demonstrated through a combination of ways:

Quality and quantity of publications and creative works
- Peer-reviewed research and scholarly writings
- Refereed articles in top-tier journals in the field
- Books and book chapters published by reputable publishers
- Apply and maintain Graduate Faculty Status at TAMU which is based on peer-reviewed research publications
- Authorship protocols within the discipline and authorship responsibility on joint publications

Grants and contracts
- Funded grant and contract activities
- Submission of grant/contract proposals
- Type of funding agencies such as IES, NSF, NIH, state, and private foundations
- Presentations at professional conferences, workshops
- Invited presentations or keynote

- Reviewer for professional publications and conferences

Upward trajectory for research progress
- Research quality and contribution improves over time
- Scholarly or artistic work perceived as outstanding in the field
- Faculty reputation in the field over a period of time

Awards and honors
- Research excellence as evidenced by research awards
- Development of creative products such as patent or intellectual properties
- Performing and creative activities

Recognition in the field based on expertise and impact on the field
- Serve as a member of review panels as a judge
- Service as Editor or Associate Editor of a top tier journal in the field
- Citation of published work by peers in the field

Collaborative and multidisciplinary research
- Participation on multidisciplinary research projects
- Joint publications with colleagues and graduate students

3.3 <u>Service:</u>

Service is essential to the mission of the College of Education and Human Development, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to engage effectively in service to their academic unit and the institution, to their profession, and to society. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Formal Service Roles:
- Membership in standing committees
- Leadership of standing committees
- Participation in or leadership of a temporary subcommittee or task force
- Liaison activities with donors, industry partners, and community partners

Informal Service Roles:
- Mentoring or peer-review of colleagues

- Serving as department chair/program chair/associate chair/department/college committee chair in a program or meeting
- Editor or Associate Editor of editorial board of a major journal
- Editorial Board Member of a peer reviewed journal
- Editorial Board Member of a non-peer reviewed journal
- Special Reviewer for a peer-reviewed research journal

4. **Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of <u>University Rule 12.01.99.M2</u>).

4.1 Indicators of *Excellence in Teaching* include, but are not limited to:
- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes

- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
  - End-of-semester student ratings of instruction
  - Mid-semester questionnaires
  - Exit interviews
- Peer Reviews of other faculty
  - Peer critique of course materials
  - Peer critique of classroom teaching
  - Steady completion of Ed.D./Ph.D. students
- Progression of undergraduate students:
  - Evidence of student growth over the semester through authentic assessment procedures
  - Student completion of a research project under the faculty's leadership
- Creation of new courses - face-to-face/online - For Associates and Professors
  - Development of widely used innovative pedagogical methodologies
  - Utilization of new technologies to enhance instructional effectiveness
- New course preparations
- Significant innovations in existing courses
- Serve as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor
  - These include students who you are not chairing or advising
  - Undergraduate research experiences you led
- Presentation of an undergraduate students' independent study project at refereed meeting of a learned society
- Undergraduate/Graduate student outcomes
  - Student performance in current and/or subsequent courses
  - Placement of graduate students in academic or professional positions
  - Publication of graduate student thesis
  - Employer reports of student performance
  - Number of post-doctoral candidates
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Placement of graduate students upon graduating/university, Post Doc, organization, school (Keeping track of students over time)
  - Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions
  - Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- Placement of undergraduate students upon completion/graduation of course or attend a top tiered university graduate program
- Recipient of Outstanding/Distinguished Teaching Award at:
  - Department level
  - College level
  - University level
  - National level
  - International level
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- Invitation to teach at a peer or AAU institution or other center of learning/teaching
- Field based publications and presentations relative to the art of teaching (articles, chapters, conferences)
- Grants for Teaching, program development (Internal and external)
  - Receiving external grant support for Teaching/Learning projects to provide students for a critical need area?
  - Award of grant funds to support one's teaching activities
  - Training grants

- Informal work associated with teaching like:
  - Mentoring underrepresented students/groups
  - Conducting webinars, guest-lectures, seminars for students

4.2 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Teaching* include, but are not limited to:
- Maintain minimally acceptable teaching scores in face-to-face teaching
- Maintain minimally acceptable teaching scores in online teaching
- Meeting teaching load requirements
- Participate in peer review of teaching
- Consistent record of advising students to completion
- Develop face-to-face/online courses that meet all university requirements
- Develop syllabi that incorporate best instructional practices and meet all university requirements
- Serve as a graduate advisor for more than five students
- Serve as a member on six or more graduate student advisory committees
- Assess student satisfaction and student outcomes throughout teaching
- Teaching recognitions and awards
- Developing new courses or evidence of significant revision to existing courses
- Placement of undergraduate and graduate students upon graduation
- Applying effective pedagogical methods and materials
- Efficient and competent direction of graduate research
- Engagement in professional development activities to enhance teaching effectiveness
- Receiving internal funding to support teaching
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring of undergraduate students

4.3 Indicators of *Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work* include, but are not limited to:
- Publication of articles in high tiered journal (high rejection rate, higher circulation, and high impact)
- Publication of articles in leading refereed journals
- Publication of articles with teaching focus in leading refereed journals
- Publication of articles in high tiered journals that include indexes of 3.5-2.1
- Publication in refereed journals with lower indices (for specific programs only) but are perceived by the field as top tiered journals
- Publication in newspapers and magazines
- Publication of refereed and non-refereed journals that have high rates of circulation to practitioners (ASCD, Phi Delta Kappan, HRD, etc.)
- Non-refereed or state journals for practitioners with high circulation
- Primary authorship on journal articles
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
- Presentation of papers at state conference/state professional organizations presentation or national practitioner conference
- Major research award (fellowship, department, college, university, national, and international)
- Awards for creative activities
- Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, which leads to increased research and publication effectiveness
  - Provide a narrative of outcomes from the Faculty Development Leave
- Impact of a scholarly book/chapter/article that can be determined by:
  - Downloads
  - Citations (Google Scholar, Cabell, and Scopus)
- Books (Research) Press Edited Books (Editor of book)
  - Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s).
  - Note order of authorship/editorship and contribution

- - Add distinguish between the edited verses research
    - Development of textbooks or other learning materials that are used by teachers at other colleges and universities
  - Chapters in books (Research)
  - External funding secured as a PI/Co-PI from premier funding sources such as IES, NSF, NIH, other federal agencies, and foundations
  - Consistent effort in grant writing:
    - Number of proposals submitted
    - Number of grants written
    - Involvement in drafting and formatting a grant
    - Post-award phase
    - Number of accepted grants
    - Number of rejected grants
    - Evidence of grant renewal
  - Invited conference presentations:
    - Local
    - State
    - National
    - Regional
  - Internal research grants funded:
    - Source of funding (department seed grant, CEHD seed grant, TAMU T3 grant, and TAMU X-Grant)
    - Internal funding received where a faculty is the PI/Co-PI for the grant or a portion of the grant

4.4 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** include, but are not limited to:
  - Publication of journal articles in leading refereed journals
  - Publication of book chapters
  - Publication of scholarly book(s) with reputable publishers
  - Publication as Sole/Second/Third/Multiple Author
  - Publications with teaching focus in refereed journals
  - Publication in a non-refereed or state journals for practitioners with a high rate of circulation
  - Publication in newspapers and magazines
  - Publications that lead to a cohesive body of work building toward a unique expertise or perspective
  - Publication record that is congruent with a productive and independent research program
  - Scholarship which contributes to the vision, mission, and strategic initiatives for the department, college, and university
  - Presentation of papers at refereed national/international/state meetings of appropriate programs
  - Funded external research grant where you are a Co-PI or PI of a grant
  - Funded internal research grant where you are a Co-PI or PI of a grant
  - Research award from peer reviewed research organizations
  - Recipient of a research award from peer reviewed research organizations, university, department level or program level
  - Significant self-development activities such as a Faculty Development Leave that led to increased research and publication effectiveness

4.5 Indicators of ***Excellence in Service*** include, but are not limited to:
  - Serving as associate department head/program chair/associate chair/department, college committee chair
  - Editor/Associate Editor for major journal

- Editorial Board Member of a peer reviewed journal
- Editorial Board Member of a non-peer reviewed journal
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness
- High ranking officer such as president or vice-president in field association
- Conference Chair or Section Chair of a conference
- Serving as an advisor to student organizations like Graduate Representative Advisory Board (G.R.A.B.), Aggie Students in Human Resource Development (A.S.H.R.D.), and Technology Management Society (T.M.S.)
- Serving as program chair or similar position for Regional or State professional organizational meeting
- Serving on university, college, and department committees and task forces
- Serving as consultant
  - Evidence of professional service to the Local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
  - Using your scholarly expertise for serving as a consultant
- Serving in administrative roles within the department/college/university
- Involvement in university service
  - Serving as a Faculty Senate representative
  - Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
  - Member of a university committee such as scholarship award committee, faculty award selection committee, curriculum committee, internal grant proposal reviewer, or conduct committee
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
- Serving in local/state/national organizations that is expertise related
- Self-developmental activities:
  - Certification of mentoring, etc.
- Serving as a reviewer for proposals for professional organizations
- Serving as an officer in a national or international professional organization
- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
- Mentoring faculty
- Mentoring students not in a formal graduate advising capacity
- Public Scholarship:
  - Your influence in society and community related to your professional expertise
- Community service that is expertise related

4.6 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Service* include, but are not limited to:
- Serving on department or program committee
- Service as an editorial board for a peer-reviewed or non-peer reviewed journal
- Special reviewer for a peer reviewed research journal
- Conference chair or section chair of a national or state level conference
- Serving as a major advisor, facilitating activities, or supporting activities and attending meetings or being a guest presenter to student organizations like Graduate Representative Advisory Board (G.R.A.B.), Aggie Students in Human Resource Development (A.S.H.R.D.), and Technology Management Society (T.M.S.)
- Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting
- Serving as chair of university, college, and department committees and task forces
- Serving as consultant (on payment or nonpayment basis) providing leadership to organizations
- Serving on department committees for faculty/staff searches and in administrative roles within the department
- Serving in an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University

- Significant self-development activities like certification of mentoring, etc. that lead to enhanced service effectiveness
- Serving as a reviewer for national/international peer-reviewed conferences
- Serving as the President, Vice-President, Secretary/Treasurer or Officer in a National or International professional organization
- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
- Mentoring students not in a formal graduate advising capacity
- Community service that is expertise related

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/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   Associate Professor:

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor
- An **exemplary** level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field in the core areas of teaching, research, and service
- Professional conduct conducive to a **collegial work environment** and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University
- 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
- 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).
- 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
- The productivity of professors at the Associate Professor rank are measured against criteria at the level of "excellence" which include:
  - 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 in 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

5.1.3   Professor:
Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor
- An **exemplary** level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field in the core areas of teaching, research, and service
- Professional conduct conducive to a **collegial work environment** and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University
- 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
- 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)
- 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

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.

Clinical faculty members make a unique contribution to the education and training mission in the College of Education and Human Development. Clinical 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, clinical faculty can participate in grant activities,

thesis and/or dissertation committees, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate. There is a 10% FTE expectation in research for clinical faculty.

Initial employment requirements for the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor
- Doctoral degree or terminal degree
- Minimum of three 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 professionalprogram area
- Interest in and commitment to engage in professional leadership activities

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 thanone of the following categories (see section 4.4 for additional examples):
      - Peer-reviewed research findings (may be published in practitioner, discipline, orteaching-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 five years
  - Quality publications in refereed journals, these can be discipline or teaching focused
  - Publication of a book or chapter in a scholarly book published by a reputable publisher.
  - 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.
- At least five years in rank as an instructional assistant professor
  - 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

- o Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
- o 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, demonstrate evidence of excellence in teaching, and receive a rating of at least effective in service
- At least five years in rank as an instructional associate professor
    - o 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:
    - o 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
    - o Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
    - o 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)
    - o 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 Five years in rank and consistent performance.
- Excellence in Teaching is demonstrated by:

- o Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
- o Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes
- o High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research etc.)
- o 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

5.3. Tenure and Promotion Process (College specifies their process on college template; department process on dept guidelines).

Probationary Period and 3rd Year Review

As required by the College of Education and Human Development, in the spring of the third year as an assistant or associate professor on tenure track on a 3rd year review will be conducted. However, since tenure track faculty can extend their tenure and promotion clock "with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the department head, dean, and the Dean of Faculties." (12.01.99.M2 4.3.1) 2, the time of the 3rd year review will be determined by the new mandatory year.

Legitimate reasons for extending third year review and the tenure clock are a serious illness lasting several months; special child, spousal/partner, or parent care issues; etc. Assistant or associate professors hired on a 7-year probationary period must be reviewed for tenure and promotion during the sixth year of service as an assistant professor or associate on tenure track at the University, though any extensions of the tenure clock are not counted in the six-year time period. (All tenure track faculty must be reviewed during the penultimate year of their probationary period, if they are not reviewed prior to that penultimate year.) Assistant and associate professors on tenure track may be reviewed for tenure and promotion earlier than the sixth year if the tenure track faculty requests this. According to the CEHD Review, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines, "Non-tenured tenure- track faculty members may request consideration for tenure prior to the end of their probationary period. Such requests should be made to the department head, and careful consideration should be given to the strength of the faculty member's record in relation to department, college, and university performance criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service."

The probationary period for tenure track faculty may include appropriate fulltime service at other institutions of higher education. If a faculty member has served a term of probationary service at one or more institutions, the probationary period at Texas A&M University may be for fewer than seven years. In such cases, however, the person's total probationary period in the academic profession may be extended beyond seven years." (12.01.99.M2 4.3.1) The timing of the promotion and tenure decision in these cases will be negotiated with the Department Head at the time of initial appointment.

Associate professors may initiate consideration for promotion to full professor at any time. As the CEHD Guidelines indicate, "Such request should be made to the department head, and careful consideration should be given to the faculty member's record in relation to departmental, college, and university performance criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service."

Initiating the Review Process and Preparing the Candidate's Dossier

The Department Head will appoint the Department Tenure and Promotion Review (TPR) Sub-Committee of associate and/or full professors, whichever is appropriate to the particular case, in consultation with the Department Executive Committee and with the candidate. The composition of the TPR Sub-committee for each individual's 3rd year review may not be the same. If possible and reasonable, this TRP Sub- Committee will include at least one faculty from the candidate's program area unless the Department Head, in consultation with

the Department Executive Committee considers this inappropriate because of extenuating circumstances. The Department Head will appoint a Chair of this TPR Sub- Committee. The Sub-Committee will be composed of three faculty members. The Sub-Committee will then distribute its responsibilities among its members (teaching, research, and service).

The TPR Sub-Committee Chair will meet with the faculty to be reviewed to ensure that both understand the nature of the process and the timelines. The TPR Sub-Committee will select at least three names from the external reviewer list provided by the faculty member who is being reviewed. The Sub-Committee will then choose enough external reviewers, preferably seven external reviewers, to reasonably guarantee that there will be a minimum of five completed reviews by external reviewers. The Sub-Committee Chair will work with the Department Head to contact the external reviewers and to obtain their agreement to participate within the appropriate timeline.

The faculty member who is to be reviewed will prepare her or his materials according to the guidelines of the College and within the timeline set by the College for faculty reviews.
The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a list of no more than six external reviewers. Preference will be given to potential reviewers who are at the rank of full at peer institutions, though if there are legitimate reasons to include appropriate faculty from other institutions, a justification must be included. In no case, however, can reviewers be at the same rank or below. This list will be provided to the Department Tenure, Promotion, and Review Sub-Committee (hereafter the TPR Sub- Committee) within the appropriate timeline.

According to the CEHD Guidelines: "External reviewers' letters should include at least one nominated by the candidate and one nominated by the department (Department Committee or program faculty). Letters should not be sought from individuals 'tainted' by close personal ties to the candidate (e.g., mentors, former students, close personal friends, frequent co-authors)." However, for EAHR Department, the external reviewers' letters should include at least three external reviewers nominated by the candidate for a minimum total of five letters.

Main considerations in selection of external reviewers:

o **Number.** The department must aim to receive 6-7 letters from external reviewers although the minimum number required is 5. All letters that have been requested and received must be included.

o **Nominators.** Review letters should include at least one nominated by the candidate and three nominated by the department (Department Committee or program faculty). Letters should not be sought from individuals "tainted" by close personal ties to the candidate (e.g., mentors, former students, close personal friends, frequent co-authors). Letters should not be sought from among the names on the "do not contact" list provided by the candidates.

o **Institutions.** Letters should come from "peer institutions or better" (i.e., top- tier, Research Extensive universities) but letters from notable leaders in the field who are not within a peer institution are also acceptable. In such a case, a rationale must be provided as to why the letter was solicited in the Description of the Qualifications of the External Reviewers. For assistant to associate professors, letter writers should hold the rank of full professor, except for some rare cases where the associate professor appointed as an external reviewer has an exceptional record of scholarship and is in the process of being promoted to full professor at his/her institution. Best practice is to NOT have multiple letters from the same institution in one case.

o **Letter Samples.** A sample of the letters or emails used to solicit external reviews should be included in the candidate's file. It is not recommended that the solicitation letter asks if the candidate would be granted tenure and/or promotion at their institution. Instead, the reviewer

should be asked to evaluate the candidate's work and its current and potential national and/or international prominence (or progress toward them in the case of mid-term reviews). The solicitation must contain the following statement: "Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state, and your review could be requested and relinquished."

Examples of letters are available from the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.

o **Letter Availability to Candidates.** Under Texas law, external letters are available to the candidate upon request to their department head in writing. These can be made available upon written request after the review process is complete.

The review materials include the candidate's vita, impact statement, three examples of scholarly work, a record of all student course evaluation scores and comments, teaching peer evaluation reports, and course syllabi, to name a few. Productivity after the submission of the dossier for review, such as a publication of a manuscript or election to be an officer in a professional organization, may be added at any point in the process. A more detailed explanation of the dossier requirements for Tenure/Tenure-track and Academic Professional Track is provided below.

Tenure Track Faculty
Candidate's Dossier

Candidate's Statement on Teaching, Research, and Service. These statements should be concise and more than a summary of the vita. Rather, they should help a reviewer make sense of the candidate's vita and clarify why the individual has chosen specific scholarship areas and how these areas will be developed in the future. Candidates should clearly state the impact of their work or potential for impact in the case of assistant to associate professors.

Vita. The candidate's vita should distinguish between peer-reviewed (refereed) publications and non-peer-reviewed publications. The candidate's role in grant and contract activities should be clearly specified. It is advisable for the vita to make clear the candidate's role in multi-author publications. It is strongly encouraged that if any coauthors are the candidate's graduate students (past or present), they are delineated in a manner so that this relationship is discernible. The curriculum vita should be accurate, concise, and padding should be avoided.

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 – Samples of course syllabi (1 Face-to-Face and 1 Online if applicable) should be provided showing learning outcomes, teaching activities, learning activities, examining procedures, projects, assignments, references.
- Student Course Evaluation Chart - Standardized chronological table/peer review of student evaluation data
- Peer Review Report of Teaching – feedback from an informed colleague for the purposes of improving one's practice (formative assessment) and/or evaluating it (summative assessment).
- Peer Review of Syllabi – Assessment of syllabi to ensure that university requirements are met
- Publications – A sample of 3 recent publications in the faculty's areas of research focus should be provided.

Steps in the Promotion and Tenure Review Process

The department tenure and promotion process involve levels of review that begin at the department and culminate at the university administrative level: 1) Department Tenure and Promotion (TPR) Sub-Committee, 2) Department TPR Committee, 3) Department Head, 4) College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, 5) Dean, 6) Provost.

Department TPR Sub-Committee. The TPR Sub-Committee will review the faculty member's materials and the external reviewers' letters and prepare summary reports on Teaching, Research and Service activities to be distributed to the Departmental T&P Committee. In particular, each report will state whether the record in that area is appropriate to a successful review for promotion to associate professor with tenure (in the case of assistant or associate professors going up for promotion and tenure or tenure, respectively). These reports must address any negative issues in the record under consideration.

Department TPR Committee. After drafting of the reports by the TPR Sub-Committee, the Department Head will convene a meeting of all appropriate tenured Department professors which will be called the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPR) to discuss and vote on the review. The composition and operation of the Department Committee shall be determined by each department, consistent with University policies and rules. For 3rd year reviews and for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate, the T& P Committee includes all tenured associate and full professors. For promotion from associate to full professor, the T&P Committee includes all tenured full professors. The meeting will be led by the Chair of the TPR Sub-Committee. Only those on the Departmental T&P Committee with the appropriate rank may be in the room for the discussion of the candidates. However, to participate in this vote, the faculty member has to have examined the candidate's record with the examination logged by a staff member, and each member has to sign the following: "I have reviewed the entire dossier." Those who are thus qualified will be the only faculty allowed to vote. Participation by all eligible members is important. This is the most important role a faculty member can take on at this university. Full participation *involves careful review of the dossier and pre-preparation including reading of included articles.*

During the review, tenure or promotion meeting for tenure track faculty, the TPR Sub-Committee will explain its evaluation for all the three areas of teaching, research, and service, and explain its evaluation of the qualityand impact of the candidate's teaching; judgement of the leadership and programmatic development; and judgment of the quality of service and the TPR Sub-Committee Chair will lead a discussion on this matter. A staff member will take thorough notes on this discussion so that there can be an informed report about the vote of the T&P Committee. Participation is not advocacy; it is a constructive evaluation and analysis of documented performance. All cases have strengths and weaknesses and should be pointed out. An emphasis will be placed on a professionally oriented vote on the issues in the record and not on personal attitudes or feelings. By University policy (12.01.99.M2.4.5.3), "An improper standard [for critiquing the tenure and/or promotion case] is any criterion not related to the professional performance of the faculty member." In other words, critiquing the candidate for any reason not related to "professional performance" is not appropriate. When there has been sufficient time for discussion, the committee chair will initiate an anonymous ballot to all eligible committee members in attendance. Abstention as a category has been eliminated (only have **Yes, No and Recuse** voting options). One can only recuse themselves if there is a conflict of interest (spouse, voting on another committee). In recording voting results, do not confuse absence with recusal. After the voting, faculty will be provided with papers to provide any justification for the votes (yes, no or abstain) without disclosing their names. A "no" vote will require a justification statement.

The vote will be officially recorded by the TPR Sub-Committee Chair or the Review and Promotion Committee chair. Attendance of tenure and promotion and review and promotion meetings is mandatory, and members must be physically present to vote. Absentee ballots by members not present at themeeting will not be counted. The TPR Sub-Committee Chair will then finalize reports for teaching, research and service and the summary report that records the vote and discusses the vote, including any negative issues. The three area reports should include the statement *"The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the T&P Committee." The summary report should include the* signatures of all voting members. *The report must be reviewed and edited by all Departmental T&P Committee members until it is accepted as being accurate by the entire voting committee.* The Department Head cannot be at this meeting during the deliberations and vote.

The Department Committee is responsible for preparing the Department Evaluations of Teaching, Research, and Other Activities (these evaluations should not be prepared by the candidate or the Department Head) and the Department Committee Report and Recommendation. Authorship of these statements must be identified and individuals who have a close relationship with the candidate should not prepare the evaluation statements. For example, to avoid conflict of interest, the candidate's former graduate advisor or a co-author/ collaborator should not write the evaluation statements.

If committee members differ in terms of their evaluation, that should be noted in the evaluation statement, and the department statement should clearly communicate the areas of difference and explain their rationale. All negative comments from external reviewers should be addressed by the departmental committee and/or the department head. Members of the Department Review Committee should have the opportunity to review the candidate's Evaluations of Teaching, Research, Service, and Other Activities prior to submission to the Department Head. The Department Committee Report and Recommendation should contain a record of the vote and should address the reasons for any negative votes or abstentions among committee members.

The departmental representative to the College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee should not attend and/or vote at the department level meeting since the representative attends the College meeting and votes at the College level. The intent of this practice is to ensure that one person has an influence over or vote in only one level. The report should reflect that the CTPAC tenured faculty member did not attend the departmental meeting due to the service on the college-level committee.

Members are reminded that deliberations at the departmental committee review meeting must remain confidential and must not be shared with the candidate or with anyone outside of those eligible for membership on the committee. A college-level confidentiality agreement, representing these shared community commitments, is typically signed before cases are discussed.

Department Head. The Department Head is responsible for preparing the recommendation. The Department Head's recommendation should provide a composite evaluation of the candidate's record and include sufficient information to support judgments regarding teaching, research, and service. Negative comments from reviewers and/or the Department Committee and negative votes or abstentions from the Department Committee should be addressed in the Department Head's recommendation, even if these comments are factually wrong or misguided.

College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee. The committee has five members. Each department elects one tenured, full professor representative to the committee for a 3-year term. All tenure track faculty members are eligible to vote for their departmental representative and for the College at-large member. Individuals who hold administrative positions as Department Heads or who serve on the dean's staff are not eligible to serve on the committee.

The fifth member is an associate professor representative elected as a college at-large representative who serves a 2-year term. The at-large representative cannot be from the same department for two consecutive terms. The at-large representative participates in discussions and votes in cases involving third year reviews and tenure and promotion to associate professor. In order to capitalize on the developmental opportunities for associate professors, the at-large representative may be present during discussions involving promotion to full professor but does not vote on promotion to full professor. In the event the associate professor representative is reviewed for promotion to Full Professor during this two-year term, the individual will not complete his/her term, and an election for a new 2-year position will be held.

This committee is responsible for preparing the College Committee's Report and Recommendation. All members of the committee are expected to represent the College rather than to serve as advocates for their departments. The Report and Recommendation of this committee should include sufficient information to support its judgments on teaching, research, and service and should address the reasons for negative votes or abstentions among its members.

Dean's Review and Decision. The dean will inform the department head and the faculty member of approval or denial of the request for promotion. When the dean does not concur with the departmental recommendation, he/she will inform the department head of the reasons for disapproval. The department head shall then have the opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials have been properly enclosed with the dossier and that all relevant arguments have been put forward. If the dean still disapproves the request for promotion, she/he shall inform the department head and the faculty member of the reasons for the disapproval. If the dean approves the request for promotion, the dean notifies the department head and the candidate of the decision.

Provost Review and Decision. The candidate's portfolio is forwarded to the Provost's and President's offices through the Office of the Dean of Faculties unless the candidate requests in writing to withdraw his/her application.

Informing Faculty Members. A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against promotion by the Department Head at each level of review in a timely manner.

The Appeals Process. In the case of not granting tenure or non-renewal of the contract, the faculty member has the right to appeal, and the process is stated in sections 5.2, 5.3, and 9.0 of the [University rule12.01.99.32](#).

Academic Professional Track
Clinical Faculty
The requirements and procedures of the promotion review process for Academic Professional Track are very similar to tenure, tenure track with notable exceptions:

External Reviewers
The Department Head will select a minimum of two reviewers external to the department, college, or university. One reviewer is to be selected from a list of potential reviewers given by the faculty member; the other is 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. Individuals selected should be or be familiar with faculty holding similar responsibilities at other institutions. Selected individuals should be full clinical or instructional faculty or associate/full tenure-track faculty. 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 and are especially relied upon to rate the research and quality of the syllabi in the field. 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.

Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee (Promotion)
The CFRC will review the candidate's dossier of teaching, service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative and performing activities, credentials, and letters from external reviewers. 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.

Department Head Review and Decision
Upon review of the recommendation for promotion by the CFRC, the department head will make an independent evaluation and recommendation to the dean. The department head's letter will make reference to, and include as an attachment, a job description for the candidate. The dossier must be forwarded to the dean's level and beyond unless the candidate withdraws in writing from the promotion process

After department review, the CFRC and department head forward recommendations to the office of the dean of the College of Education and Human Development for review by the Academic Professional Track Advisory Committee (APTAC) and subsequent review and recommendation by the dean.

College Academic Professional Track Advisory Committee (APTAC) Review
The role of this committee is to advise the dean on matters related to appointment, review, and promotion. Members of this committee represent the college and not their own departments. The college APTAC reviews candidates for mid-term review (re-appointment) and promotion and submits written reports, recommendations, and reports on its votes on each file to the dean. The APTAC consists of four members (twoClinical Professors and two Instructional Professors) . Additionally, two APT Associate Professors (one Clinical and one Instructional) are elected as college at-large representatives.

The clinical associate professor does not participate in the review and promotion considerations for clinical full professors.

Dean Review and Decision
The dean will review all applications for promotion forwarded by department heads and the APTAC. The dean will inform the department head and the faculty member of the dean's vote for or against promotion. When the dean does not concur with the department head's positive recommendation for promotion, the dean will give the department head the opportunity to present new arguments or new data not presented before. The dean must notify the department head and the faculty member, in writing, of his or her final decision.

Provost's Review and Decision
The candidate's dossier is forwarded to the Provost's and President's offices through the Office of the Dean of Faculties unless the candidate requests in writing to withdraw his/her application.

Informing Faculty Members
A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against promotion by the Department Head at each level of review in a timely manner.

Process for Promotion Review for Instructional Faculty
Instructional professors make a unique contribution to the educational and training mission in the College of Education and Human Development. Instructional professors are generally full-time faculty who are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and service. As part of the teaching functions, they are often engaged in supervision, program/curriculum development, and/or other academic activities. In addition, instructional professors can participate in grant activities and serve on various committees and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate. They will also be required to demonstrate evidence of continuing professional development.

Procedures for Promotion
The general requirement for time in rank before promotion consideration is five years. Under unusual circumstances, a request can be made to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development to consider time in an equivalent faculty rank. For example, a senior lecturer who has served the required number of years and met or exceeded performance expectations may meet the requirement for instructional associate professor.

The Promotion Process to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor includes the following elements:
Instructional professor review for promotion within the College requires a review by the Departmental APT (or Instructional) Professor Review Committee, the Department Head, the College APT Advisory Committee, and the Dean. This review will begin in the fall semester with the submission of the candidate's dossier promotion. Please see section 8.3 for full details on dossier preparation.

Department APT or Instructional Professor Review Committee (IPRC)
Academic professional track faculty in each department will elect a committee of 6 members consisting of APT faculty members at the associate professor rank or higher for review of instructional assistant to instructional associate and full professor rank or higher for review of instructional associate to instructional full professor. Most departments review instructional and clinical faculty with the same committee. If a department chooses, they may have a separate committee to review instructional professor faculty at the appropriate ranks. Occasionally, the department may not have enough eligible members in a particular rank to create a full committee, in that case, members of the following faculty groups from either the department or another department within the college with the appropriate rank can be used: clinical faculty group, tenured faculty

group, providing that members have knowledge of the instructional faculty role. The department head in consultation with the dean selects these committee members.

The IPRC will review the candidate's dossier of teaching, leadership, service, and professional activities. The IPRC will vote on promotions. This vote and the committee's recommendations will be forwarded to the department head. The committee's recommendation should be based on the individual's job description and appropriate performance expectations as described in the criteria above. The departmental review committee is responsible for providing a written evaluation of the candidate's job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility. This written evaluation provides the basis for the committee's decision regarding promotion.

Department Head Review and Decision
Upon review of the candidate's portfolio and the recommendation by the IPRC, the department head will make a recommendation to the dean's office whether to deny or recommend the promotion. The department head's letter will make reference to, and include as an attachment, a job description for the candidate. At any point in the process, candidates for promotion may elect, by written request, to withdraw their names from further consideration.

After departmental review, the department head forwards the departmental committee's vote and recommendation together with his/her recommendation to the office of the dean of the College of Education and Human Development for review by the College APT Advisory Committee (APTAC) and ultimately a review and decision by the dean.

Dean's Review and Decision
The dean will inform the department head and the faculty member of approval or denial of the request for promotion. When the dean does not concur with the departmental recommendation, he/she will inform the department head of the reasons for disapproval. The department head shall then have the opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials have been properly enclosed with the dossier and that all relevant arguments have been put forward. If the dean still disapproves the request for promotion, she/he shall inform the department head and the faculty member of the reasons for the disapproval. If the dean approves the request for promotion, the dean notifies the department head and the candidate of the decision.

Provost Review and Decision
The candidate's portfolio is forwarded to the Provost's and President's offices through the Office of the Dean of Faculties unless the candidate requests in writing to withdraw his/her application.

Informing Faculty Members
A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against promotion by the Department Head at each level of review in a timely manner.

6. **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 toprovide 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.

  o 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 communicationbetween 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 ofjob 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, 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 largely on the previous calendar or academic year (January 1 or December 31), but will also include an expanded window (e.g., three years) to capture the full scope of peer refereed journal article publication productivity.

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 three categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Meets expectations/Satisfactory," "Exceeds Expectations." A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Satisfactory", "Exemplary", and "Most Meritorious" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five

categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance. The evaluation as a whole should involve a blend of qualitative and quantitative indicators.

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

- *Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.*

  o Course evaluations over the year below 3.2
  o Demonstrates little to no progress in completing graduate students

- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.*

  o Course evaluations from 3.3-3.9 over a period of a year
  o Incomplete or missing course evaluations
  o No peer review of teaching
  o Demonstrates little to no progress in completing students

- *Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.*

  o Course evaluations from *4.0-4.3* over a period of a year
  o At least one request for peer review of teaching
  o Revising courses to meet evolving standards and requirements
  o Chairing students that will be completed (at the graduate level)

- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.*

  o Course evaluations from 4.4-4.7 over a period of a year
  o Graduating students one or more during the year
  o Revise or create course to meet program needs
  o Demonstrates evidence of participation in professional development in teaching
  o Utilization of High Impact Practices (at the undergraduate and/or graduate level)
  o At least two requests for peer review of teaching
  o Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary collaborations
    - Examples: designing and/or teaching interdisciplinary courses; team teaching with colleagues from other disciplines; guest lecturing in other disciplines or at other institutions; designing programs involving one or more other disciplines or institutions; submitting teaching grant proposals with colleagues from other disciplines or institutions; and providing internship opportunities for students
  o Enhancing diversity
    - List activities that enhance students' knowledge of disparities and differences experienced by diverse groups and building skills necessary to live and work with people of diverse cultures
  o Internationalization of program, curricula, and pedagogy
    - List efforts to bring an international dimension to the program, curricula, and teaching, research, and service practices. These may include study abroad courses and programs; teaching/student exchanges; expanding the curricula by incorporating global and international issues; using students and faculty from

other cultures as guest speakers; and self-improvement through professional development activities

- *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 educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.*

  - Course evaluations from 4.7-5.0 over a period of a year
  - Graduating students two or more doctoral students
  - Develops course(s) needed that required university approval
  - Complete three or more peer review teaching evaluation of faculty or clinical professor
  - Demonstrates evidence of participation in professional development in teaching
  - At least two requests for peer review of teaching
  - Utilization of High Impact Practices (at the undergraduate and/or graduate level)
  - Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary collaborations
    - Examples: designing and/or teaching interdisciplinary courses; team teaching with colleagues from other disciplines; guest lecturing in other disciplines or at other institutions; designing programs involving one or more other disciplines or institutions; submitting teaching grant proposals with colleagues from other disciplines or institutions; and providing internship opportunities for students
  - Enhancing diversity
    - List activities that enhance students' knowledge of disparities and differences experienced by diverse groups and building skills necessary to live and work with people of diverse cultures
  - Internationalization of program, curricula, and pedagogy
    - List efforts to bring an International dimension to the program, curricula, and teaching, research, and service practices. These may include study abroad courses and programs; teaching/student exchanges; expanding the curricula by incorporating global and international issues; using students and faculty from other cultures as guest speakers; and self-improvement through professional development activities

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

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

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

  - Absence of minimally acceptable publication of peer-refereed journal articles, presentations, grant proposal efforts

- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.*

- *Satisfactory – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.*
  - To achieve satisfactory, you must have a minimum of one peer reviewed journal and one other publication average over the last three years
  - Peer reviewed as Third, Fourth, Fifth etc. Author on publication(s)
  - At least one peer reviewed conference presentation
  - Departmental Research Award
  - Applied for an external research grant in the last three years or have ongoing funding from an existing grant. For assistants: No expectation of grant applications (Tenured faculty)
  - Invited presentation at Local/State conference
  - Applied for an internal research grant in the last three years or have ongoing funding from an existing grant (Tenure/Tenure-Track)
  - No expectation of grant applications (Tenure-Track/Assistant Professors)

- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. **Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.***
  - Two or more peer referred articles that are in a mixture of mid and/or high tiered journals
  - Publication as Second author
  - Research award from university
  - Published edited book based on research with a reputable publisher
  - Sole author in a book chapter based on your research
  - Funded external research grant where you are PI for a sub award, or Co-PI for a designated portion of the grant
  - Invited speaker at four State level and/or practitioner conference
  - Funded internal research grant where you are PI for a sub award, or Co-PI for a designated portion of the grant

- *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 excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.*
  - As a way to receive a most meritorious ranking in areas of peer referred journal article publications, you must have a combination of at least one high tiered journal along with a minimum of two others in high, mid, or low tiered journals (at least three total)
  - Sole author in a peer refereed publication
  - Sole author in a book chapter based on your research
  - Funded external research grant where you are PI of the grant
  - Invited speaker at national research conference
  - Funded external research grant where you are PI of the grant for a designated portion

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

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

- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.*

- *Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.*

  o Serving as a chair for a department/college committee
  o Board member for a non-peer refereed organization
  o Associate Editor for a board
  o Conference organizer for a State conference
  o Supporting student organizations by responding to requests
  o Serve as a member of a committee (department, college, and university)
  o Reviewer for a refereed and/or non-refereed organization at the State and/or National level
  o Officer for Local/State/National/International organization

- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.*

  o Serving as a program chair
  o Editorial Board member or as needed article reviews for at least two journals.
  o Editor-in-Chief for a non-peer review journal
  o Guest Editor of a book or special issue
  o Facilitate activities for seminars for the Graduate Representative Advisory Board (G.R.A.B.)
  o Serve as a chair for State meetings and/or national field associations
  o Chair of college or department committee
  o Serve as Vice President for national or international peer refereed organization

- *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.*

  o Serving as associate department head
  o Editor in Chief/Associate editor
  o Editor in Chief-Non peer reviewed journal
  o Guest editor of a special issue
  o Conference chair or section chair of a national conference
  o Serve as a liaison for Graduate Representative Advisory Board (G.R.A.B.), Aggie Students in Human Resource Development (A.S.H.R.D.), and Technology Management Society (T.M.S.)
  o Serve as a program chair for peer refereed conferences
  o Chair of university level standing committee(s)
  o Provide leadership as a consultant using your scholarly expertise
  o Serving on department committee (search, climate, etc.)
  o University Service (Officer in the faculty senate, adhoc committee, internal grant reviewer, etc.

- o Serving on school board
- o President of a national professional organization

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

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.

- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate.

- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of possible content for the report are:
- ***Curriculum vitae inclusive of research, teaching, and service productivity for the review period***
- ***Student evaluations***
- ***Course teaching loads***
- ***Student advising loads***

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, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations.

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the department head's, director's, or supervisor's written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

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

6.5.3 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.   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. Post-Tenure 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) 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 peer review committee is selected by the department head and is comprised of tenured faculty member representatives from each of the programs.

8.3 Process
8.3.1   Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- *Prior department faculty member evaluations*
- *Records of prior remedial interventions (growth plans)*
- *Personal statement on research, teaching, and service*
- *Curriculum vitae*
- *Student evaluations*

8.3.2   The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

---

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

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

8.3.4   A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.5.   A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.6.   A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

8.3.7   For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.[2] If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

8.3.8   **By no later than May 31st**, each unit will provide to the dean and the 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

---

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

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.   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 Educational Administration and Human Resource Development, Department Head Dr. Mario Torres, mstorres@tamu.edu.