

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

College of Liberal Arts

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Faculty Tracks and Ranks	3
2.1	Tenure-Track and Tenured Titles	3
2.2	Academic Professional Track Titles	3
3.	Areas of Faculty Performance	4
3.1	Teaching	5
3.2	Research, Scholarly Activity of Creative Work	5
3.3	Service	6
3.4	Patient Care	6
3.5	Librarianship	6
3.6	Administration	6
4.	Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	6
4.1	Indicators of Excellence in Teaching.....	6
4.2	Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching	6
4.3	Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work	7
4.4	Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work.....	7
4.5	Indicators of Excellence in Service.....	7
4.6	Indicators of Effectiveness in Service	7
5.	Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	7
5.1	Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty.....	7
5.2	Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track).....	9
5.3	Evaluation Process for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Professor.....	13
5.4	Evaluation Process for Promotion in the Academic Professional Track	20
6.	Annual Review	21
6.1	Purpose.....	21
6.2	Focus.....	21
6.3	Time Period of Review	22
6.4	Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance	22
6.5	Required Components.....	23
6.6	Assessment Outcome that Require Action.....	24
6.7	Time-Line	25
6.8	Complaint Procedures If Annual Review fails to Follow Published Guidelines	25
7.	Mid-Term Review	25
7.1	Purpose	26
7.2	Process.....	26
7.3	Feedback for Midterm Review	
8.	Post-Tenure Review	27
8.1	Purpose.....	28
8.2	Peer Review Committee	28
8.3	Process.....	28
8.4	Professional Development Review	29

8.5	The Professional Development Plan.....	30
8.6	Appeal.....	30
8.7	Voluntary Post-Tenure Review.....	31
9.	Granting Faculty Emeritus Status	31

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Liberal Arts is to educate students for a rapidly changing world and instill in them a desire for lifelong learning through our faculty’s influential research, distinguished scholarship and creative work, inspirational teaching, and dedicated service—all in the context of the arts, humanities, and social and behavioral sciences. 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 *College of Liberal Arts* for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. ([UR 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2](#)) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general College of Liberal Arts guidelines for faculty annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/ Promotion-and-Tenure

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M1 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit. The following are titles within the College of Liberal Arts.

2.1 Tenure-Track and Tenured Titles:

Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or development leave appointments).

Instructor is a tenure-track appointment which is used for a person who was recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure-track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree on the date predicted. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title will be changed to Assistant Professor. (The unit and appointed faculty member may also consider the option of a non-tenure track title such as Visiting Assistant Professor, which would not start the tenure clock). Instructors are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service.

2.2 Academic Professional Track Titles:

Faculty with the title of **Lecturer** or **Senior Lecturer** will normally hold a master's or terminal degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in such service and administrative activities as is required to carry out their instructional duties (e.g. coordinating multiple sections of a large core curriculum course, or running placement exams for language instruction).

The standard teaching load per semester for a full-time Lecturer or Senior Lecturer is four courses. If necessary and with approval from the College, a department may determine the teaching load, but it should not exceed 12 semester credit hours per semester catalog (or up to 16 for faculty teaching 4- credit hour language courses). Only regular course offerings (major or general academic) will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for faculty on this track. Supervision of undergraduate reading and research courses (285, 291, 485, and 491) or internships (484) normally will not count as one of the four courses in the standard load except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head. Faculty in lecturer titles should not be assigned to graduate courses. Course loads in excess of four 3-to-4 credit hour courses per semester require the approval of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in research or service, but either may be taken into account in annual performance evaluations or for promotion in the category of Enhancing Instructional Effectiveness.

Faculty with the title of **Instructional Assistant Professor**, **Instructional Associate Professor**, or **Instructional Professor** normally hold a terminal degree in their teaching fields and will be engaged in both instruction and significant service. The category of service is understood broadly to include student advising and pedagogically-related activities outside the classroom.

The standard load each semester for a full-time faculty member with instructional in their title is 9 semester credit hours as defined by the course catalog (or up to 12 for faculty teaching 4-credit hour language courses). Additional weights for large classes cannot be added to bring the credit hours to 9. Normally, this is three courses. Only regular course offerings (major or general academic) will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for instructional faculty. Supervision of undergraduate reading and research courses (285, 291, 485, and 491) or internships (484) normally will not count as one of the four courses in the standard load except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head. This course load may be reduced in instances of a substantial service assignment (e.g.,

serving as director of undergraduate studies, serving as coordinator of large, multi-section courses). Both deviations from the standard course load and the assignment of instructional faculty to specific graduate courses will require the approval of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Once the Dean has authorized an instructional faculty member to teach a specific graduate course that authorization remains in effect for subsequent semesters.

Faculty in the Instructional titles are not expected to engage in research, but it may be taken into account in annual performance evaluations or for promotion in the category of Enhancing Instructional Effectiveness.

Faculty with the title of **Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor** will hold doctoral degree in an applied professional discipline and be licensed or license-eligible in that discipline. This appointment often involves teaching graduate students who are working toward a degree that leads to state licensure in an applied professional discipline and teaching pre-doctoral practica with close supervision and monitoring of students, consistent with national and state professional standards. The position may also involve graduate student committee work, faculty committee work, curriculum development, undergraduate teaching, advising, or other administrative duties, and scholarship as appropriate to working with graduate and undergraduate students. As part of their assigned duties, faculty in clinical title appointments may also serve clients within the University-operated programs for the purposes of providing learning opportunities to students, maintaining a department- supported service, or to generate revenue for programmatic activities. Expectations for teaching, service, and scholarship should be outlined in the offer of appointment and in annual renewal letters.

The standard teaching load for a faculty member in a Clinical title is comparable to the standard teaching load for the tenured and tenure-track faculty and determined by departmental needs and the objectives and responsibilities for the position. This may vary both within and across departments. Only regular course offerings (major or general academic) will normally count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for faculty on a clinical title. Supervision of undergraduate and graduate reading or research courses (285, 291, 485, 491, 685, and 691) or internships (484, 684) normally will not count as one of the courses in the standard load except in unusual circumstances approved by the Department Head.

Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and Assistant Professor of the Practice are non-tenure track appointments. These appointments are normally for faculty members who have had or maintain a primary employment in a profession outside of academia. Faculty with Practice in their titles will engage in instruction and significant service. The College standard teaching load for faculty with practice in their title is three courses a semester.

Faculty with the title of **Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor** will be primarily engaged in research, typically funded with extramural funds. They may engage in some instructional activities. Service is not required in these titles, but is not prohibited.

Senior Professor is a non-tenure title for retirees. See https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/hiring/Hiring-Guidelines_1.pdf for University guidelines on faculty in this title.

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

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance: *teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service; and administration (faculty-administrators, e.g., department heads and associate deans)*. 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.

Teaching Load. The College of Liberal Arts standard teaching load for tenure-track and tenured faculty is two courses a semester; the standard load of APT faculty with lecturer in their titles is four courses a semester; and the standard load for faculty with instructional and practice in their titles is three courses a semester. Any departmental adjustment to the College standard teaching load requires college review and approval. Each academic unit will specify for evaluation of performance the weight (percentage of 100% effort) of teaching expected of each title as appropriate for the assigned track and rank responsibilities.

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 (the College of Liberal Arts requires two peer assessments of classroom observations for midterm, tenure and promotion, and promotion reviews); 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are: the following College guiding criteria to assist each department and interdisciplinary program develop its own specific set of criteria:

- Clarity in the organization, preparation and presentation of course content that reflect a command of the area/s of instruction.
- Motivation of students and creation and maintenance of positive and engaging classroom environment.
- Productive rapport with students.
- Professional development that enhances instructional effectiveness.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work:

The motto for the College of Liberal Arts, "Knowledge for Life," captures one of our major goals, which is to create knowledge through distinguished research, scholarship, or creative work in a variety of academic fields of study in the Arts, Humanities, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to engage in continuous research and/or creative work conducted individually or/and collaboratively.

Effectiveness and Excellence in research are considered in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Given the diversity of fields and subfields represented in the College and even within departments, the College recognizes that evaluation of excellence and effectiveness of scholarship and creative work does not follow rigid College-prescribed criteria. Therefore, departments and interdisciplinary programs will develop appropriate unit-specific criteria for assessing the scholarship of its tenure-track and tenured faculty. The College offers the following major guiding criteria:

- Coherent, continuous scholarly agenda
- Demonstrable scholarly productivity (underscored by the volume of publications or creative work and grant and other related scholarly activities)
- Influential research or creative work that is highly regarded in sub/specialized fields and disciplines

Research Weight: Each department and interdisciplinary program will specify the standard percentage research effort required of its tenure-track and tenured faculty. With the approval of the College, a department or interdisciplinary program may modify a faculty member's research effort temporarily for a specified period. If the research effort is reduced, it should not be below 25%, except if the faculty member is engaged heavily in administration in the College or the University in the range of 50% and above (e.g. Department Head, Interdisciplinary Program Director, Associate Dean).

3.3 Service:

Significant service is expected of all faculty (except faculty with lecturer in their title) as part of the normal performance of duties and is taken into account in making an overall assessment of an individual's qualification for merit compensation and advancement. Departments and interdisciplinary programs should specify the standard weight of service as is appropriate for rank and title. While, in consultation with the College, departments and interdisciplinary programs may adjust temporarily the percentage of service effort of a faculty member, service contributions should not be less than 10% of the total effort of any faculty member with significant service as part of the required responsibilities in their track and title (Per university rule 12.01.99.M1). Service contributions include service to the department, the College, the University, the Profession and the community.

The College offers the following guiding criteria for assessing effectiveness and excellence in service:

- Active participation in the operation of the department.
- Productive contributions to College and University initiatives and activities.
- Contributions to student development outside assigned teaching responsibilities.
- Demonstrable contributions to the mission and activities of professional organizations and scholarly communities, as is appropriate for track and rank.
- Demonstrable contributions to non-scholarly local and regional communities.

3.4 Patient care, if applicable: **NOT APPLICABLE.**

3.5 Librarianship, if applicable: **NOT APPLICABLE.**

3.6 Administration: Faculty-administrators in the College—department heads, program and institute directors, and associate deans—will be evaluated for effectiveness and excellence in the performance of their administrative duties based on criteria and standards as specified in individual offer letters.

Other, if applicable: **NOT APPLICABLE.**

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The College of Liberal Arts 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 describes accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area. Departments and interdisciplinary programs will identify unit-specific indicators based on discussions with their faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of textbooks or other instructional materials
- Successful substantial curriculum development grants
- Receipt of major awards for outstanding teaching
- Placement of candidate's graduate students

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Development of new modes of instruction
- Development of new courses
- Number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate or attracted to the university by the candidate
- Participation in any workshop or program designed to improve teaching (if possible, identify outcomes or impact on candidate's instructional effectiveness)

4.3 Indicators of ***Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** include, but are not limited to:

- National or/and international reputation/prominence
- Citations that especially appraise the value of the work and its distinctive contributions
- Highly positive reviews of candidate's books or creative works
- Demonstrable transformative impact on sub/special field or/and discipline
- Funded research grant proposals
- Competitive external fellowships received
- Awards for scholarship or scholarly achievements
- Keynote addresses or other invited presentations in prestigious venues

4.4 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** include, but are not limited to:

- Journal impact factors
- H-indices in those disciplines where appropriate
- Citation counts
- Appearance of the candidate's work on graduate syllabi for courses in highly regarded programs
- Contextual information regarding presses or series in which books are published, especially if the press is not universally recognized as a leading one (e.g., other authors who have published in the same venue, composition of the press' editorial board, impact on the discipline of other books in same venue)
- Information on the quality of venues for exhibitions or performance of creative works

The standards and status of scholarly presses and journals vary considerably. Therefore, each dossier should contain a discussion of the quality of the press or journals in which the scholarly work appears, e.g., standing in the discipline or subdiscipline, acceptance rates, critical standards, membership of editorial or advisory board, and readership.

4.5 Indicators of ***Excellence in Service*** include, but are not limited to:

- Chairing a university, college, or department committee or task force
- Serving in key administrative roles within the department
- Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate
- Sustained service as an effective advisor to student organizations
- Professional editorial assignment for national refereed journals or for scholarly publishers
- Serving as program chair or other major program planning role or in a similar leadership position at a national or international research or teaching professional meeting
- Key leadership positions in state, regional, national or international organizations
- Serving on the board of local community organization

4.6 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Service*** include, but are not limited to:

- Serving actively on university, college, or department committees and task forces
- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Contributions to student organizations or initiatives
- Review of manuscripts for refereed journals and scholarly publishers
- Book reviews and encyclopedia entries
- Service to state, regional, or national professional organizations (not in leadership positions)
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness
- Contributing to initiatives of local community organization

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 College of Liberal Arts are as follows:

5.1.1 **Assistant Professor:** Assistant professors should have the terminal degree, or its equivalent, appropriate to their field. They should be well qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research in a special field. Over time an assistant professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of associate professor and the awarding of tenure.

5.1.2 **Associate Professor:** Associate professors with tenure should demonstrate meritorious performance in teaching, research or creative work, and service.

(a) Teaching must be shown to be consistently competent, and the evidence presented should be both substantial and sufficiently thorough to make a strong case. The College's expectation is that the evidence in successful tenure cases will show a genuine commitment to undergraduate and, where appropriate, graduate teaching. Moreover, the College also expects that the record will indicate that the courses taught by the successful applicant will be characterized by diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the students being taught, and fair and appropriate evaluation of students' tests and assignments. Finally, it is expected that any master's theses and dissertations that an applicant supervises will be of high quality.

(b) Research and creative work must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. A first book or series of articles based on the dissertation should be published as early as is consistent with practices in nationally visible departments. Third year reviews will evaluate a candidate's plans for completing work derived from the dissertation and development of a research program beyond the dissertation. In all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor, there must be evidence of a significant and sustainable research program that is beyond any book or series of articles derived from the dissertation and that is demonstrated in thematically or theoretically related externally peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity.

(c) Service must show signs of developing citizenship in the University and scholarly communities.

Over time an associate professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of professor.

5.1.3 **Professor:** Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate continued and outstanding accomplishment in research and teaching, and valuable contributions to leadership and professional service.

(a) Rather than simply evaluating the total productivity of a faculty member since tenure (e.g., completion of a second book, series of articles, or a specific number of grant awards), the College will assess as grounds for promotion the quality, trajectory, and impact on the field of a candidate's entire body of scholarship, as well as the candidate's national or/and international) visibility. More particularly, successful candidates for promotion to professor are expected to be well established and highly respected

figures in their fields, and should demonstrate achievements sufficient to merit such a promotion in any AAU institution aspiring to be a consensus top 10 public university. It is important that a candidate's standing in the field and the impact of the research record be documented by the department through multiple indicators. A prospective promotion candidate is encouraged to pursue productive "exploratory" discussions with her/his department head, professors in the department, and mentors to weigh her/his scholarly and professional stature as substantiated with specific accomplishments. If publications in the pipeline are indicative of scholarly impact and national or/and international recognition, a prospective candidate is encouraged to consider critically the stages of development of such works, assessing whether they are already effective in demonstrating scholarly impact and visibility at the level required for promotion to professor.

(b) Outstanding teaching is demonstrated by evidence of a strong motivation to engage students in the learning process, by the rigor and scope of the courses taught, by student achievements, and by leadership in programmatic and curricular development. A strong record of undergraduate teaching is essential, as is a commitment to graduate education and the mentoring of graduate students in departments with graduate programs.

(c) Outstanding service and leadership are demonstrated by engagement in departmental, College, University, and professional activities that further the intellectual and pedagogical profile of the institution.

5.1.4 Exceptions: In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1, 4.5.4, exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure, or more commonly promotion, may sometimes be warranted. Examples include (a) gifted and productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b) exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the University is unselfish, distinctive and outstanding, but whose teaching and research are only acceptable. In all cases, performance in the other two dimensions must be at least acceptable. Few faculty members will possess qualities such as these, but those who do, deserve recognitions and advancement. In those rare circumstances, it is expected that there will be ample evidence demonstrating the required excellence in one area to warrant such exceptions.

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.

Departments and interdisciplinary programs may set unit-specific criteria and indicators, but cannot impose research expectations on faculty in titles where research is not expected, nor can research be substituted for service in titles where service is required (i.e., in the Instructional ranks).

5.2.1 Lecturers:

Full-time Lecturers may be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Criteria for such promotion are:

- Demonstrated meritorious teaching as indicated by a combination of some of the following:
 - Strong teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
 - Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
 - Evidence of very high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
 - Successful development of new courses or major revision of existing courses

- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- Offering high impact experiences for students (e.g., study abroad, critical thinking seminars, directing senior honors theses, etc.)
- Receiving competitive funding for teaching
- Participation in University Honors or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award

5.2.2 Faculty in Instructional Titles

Criteria for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

- Demonstrated meritorious teaching as indicated by a combination of some of the following:
 - Strong teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
 - Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
 - Evidence of very high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
 - Successful development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
 - Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
 - Serving as a department graduate advisor
 - Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
 - Receiving competitive funding for teaching
 - Participation in University Honors or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
 - Offering high impact experiences for students (e.g., study abroad, critical thinking seminars, directing senior honors theses, etc.)
 - Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- Demonstrated meritorious service to the department as indicated by some combination of the following:
 - Serving actively on university, college, or department committees and task forces
 - Serving as an advisor to student organizations
 - Serving in administrative roles within the department
 - Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
 - Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness
 - Serving as a department graduate advisor

Criteria for promotion from Instructional Associate to Instructional Professor

- Demonstrated excellence in teaching as indicated by a combination of some of the following:
 - 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
 - Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
 - Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
 - Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
 - Receipt of awards for success in academic performance by the faculty member's students
 - Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program)
 - Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)

- Frequent offerings of high impact experiences for students (e.g., study abroad, critical thinking seminars, directing senior honors theses, etc.)
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Demonstrated excellence in service to the department, university, or profession as indicated by a combination of some of the following
 - Chairing a university, college, or department committee or task force
 - Sustained service as an advisor to student organizations
 - Serving in key administrative roles within the department
 - Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate
 - Sustained and significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness
 - Serving as program chair or other major program role or in a similar leadership position at a national or international meeting focusing on teaching

5.2.3 Reviews for promotion to Associate Professor of the Practice and Professor of the Practice will apply the instructional faculty criteria outlined above, taking into consideration any additional criteria specified in offer and renewal of appointment letters.

5.2.4 Clinical Faculty

The relative importance of teaching, service, and scholarship for promotion in the Clinical titles will be defined in the initial letter of appointment and subsequent annual renewal letters.

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

- Candidates for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor must provide evidence of sustained instruction or training of graduate students working toward a degree that leads to state licensure in an applied professional discipline and further demonstrate meritorious teaching by a combination of some of the following:
 - Strong teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
 - Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
 - Evidence of very high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
 - Successful development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
 - Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
 - Management of training contracts to fund students and agreements with agencies/institutions for voluntary practica and field experiences of students
 - Demonstrated success in teaching/training aspects of graduate student work as defined in the initial letter of appointment and subsequent annual renewal letters
 - Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
 - Receiving competitive funding for teaching
 - Participation in University Honors or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
 - Offering high impact classes or experiences for students (e.g., study abroad, critical thinking seminars, directing senior honors theses, etc.)
 - Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- Demonstrated meritorious service evidenced by a combination of some of the following:
 - Service to state, regional, or national professional organizations
 - Planning and delivering workshops or other learning opportunities
 - Member of an academic or curriculum review team or accreditation review panel
 - Serving actively on university, college, and department committees and task forces
 - Serving as an advisor to student organizations
 - Serving in an administrative role within the department

- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness
- Demonstrated meritorious scholarship (as specified in the initial letter of appointment and subsequent annual renewal letters) as evidenced by a combination of some of the following:
 - Applied or basic research and scholarly publications
 - Presentations at professional conferences or workshops
 - Reviewer for professional publications
 - Research- or scholarship-oriented grant

Criteria for promotion to Clinical Professor:

- Demonstrated excellence and impact in teaching as measured by a combination of some of the following indicators
 - Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
 - Professional accomplishments of graduate students (e.g. publications, awards, or other honors)
 - Prestigious or significant placement of graduate students (either in internships or post-graduate employment)
 - Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
 - Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
 - Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
 - Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
 - Receipt of awards for success in academic performance by the faculty member's student mentees
 - Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program, professional development workshops for graduate students)
 - Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate mentor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)
 - Frequent offerings of high impact classes or experiences for students (e.g., study abroad, critical thinking seminars, directing senior honors theses, etc.)
 - Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Demonstrated excellence and impact in service as measured by a combination of some of the following:
 - Key leadership positions in state, regional or national organizations
 - Planning and delivering workshops or other learning opportunities
 - Chair of an academic or curriculum review team or accreditation review panel
 - Chairing university, college, or department committees or task forces
 - Serving as an advisor to student organizations
 - Serving in a key administrative role within the department
 - Serving as an officer of the Faculty Senate
 - Sustained and significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness
- Demonstrated excellence and impact in scholarship (as specified in the initial letter of appointment and subsequent annual renewal letters) as evidenced by a combination of some of the following:
 - Applied or basic research and scholarly publications
 - Presentations at professional conferences or workshops
 - Editor of a journal, book, or special issue of a journal or other professional publication
 - Research- or scholarship-oriented grant

5.2.5 Research Faculty

Promotion criteria must conform to the University guidelines on faculty with research in their titles:

<http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/hiring/Research%20Professor%20Positions%20Guidelines.pdf>

and be consistent with the research portion of college and departmental promotion guidelines for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

5.3 Evaluation Process for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Professor

5.3.1 Department Review

In the College of Liberal Arts, every tenured member of a department is a member of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. However, only members of equivalent or higher ranks than the rank for which a candidate is being evaluated are eligible to participate in the review. Every member of a departmental promotion and tenure committee is expected to participate fully and regularly in every cycle in every case for which she/he is eligible to review. Non-participation due to valid circumstances like recusals, leaves, and justifiable absences should be documented. Members who serve in administrative positions in the College or the University with responsibilities relating to tenure and promotion should not participate in tenure and promotion reviews in their departments. A fair and thorough evaluation of a candidate's tenure and promotion or promotion case by members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee is essential. Evaluation of a case must be based on the dossier—its contents at initial submission and materials added in the course of the review. The Department Head or Program Coordinator will establish an Evaluation Subcommittee for each candidate under review in accordance with the departmental/interdisciplinary program bylaws. The subcommittee will prepare three separate draft reports—on teaching, research or creative work, and service. A summary report is also required. The summary report must cover the discussion of the case at the department meeting and include the final vote of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. Therefore, the reports on teaching, research or creative work, and service cannot be finalized until after the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee meets, but the reports will be presented in draft prior to that meeting.

The draft reports prepared by the Evaluation Subcommittee will form the basis for the consideration of a case by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Evaluation Subcommittee will forward the reports along with the candidate's dossier to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee for review. Effective AY 2019-2020, the department head and program coordinator will NOT be in attendance at the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting. However, she/he will be available for consultation on procedure as necessary. The committee chair, or other designated member who is selected according to department/interdisciplinary program bylaws, will moderate the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee discussion of the case. The chair is also responsible for ensuring that the final version of the four reports represents the faculty voice with no input from the head. The final version of the reports must summarize the discussion of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee's meeting and record the vote of the committee. The bylaws (or Faculty Evaluation Guidelines) of each department shall indicate whether absentee balloting is permissible and under what circumstances. If absentee ballots are permitted, the bylaws (or Faculty Evaluation Guidelines) shall indicate the voting procedure.

Subcommittees and the larger departmental/interdisciplinary program promotion and tenure committee deliberating on cases must evaluate performance rigorously in each category by means of explicit evidence and supporting material in the dossier. Performance must be placed in context and interpreted qualitatively by committees. The quality of the performance in each area is assessed within the stated departmental and College requirements and in alignment with University requirements and standards. Although most candidates will show greater strengths in some categories than others, at least an acceptable level of performance in each category must be demonstrated. Having met a certain technical minimum performance standard in each of the areas of

teaching, research and creative work, and service may not be sufficient record for advancement.

Although the Evaluation Subcommittee is charged with preparing a complete dossier, the ultimate responsibility for assuring that all pertinent materials are available lies with the candidate. Candidates should keep relevant materials in anticipation of personnel considerations and make them available to the Evaluation Subcommittee. Relevant materials may include such items as syllabi, examinations, grant proposals, reprints of published work, teaching evaluations or evaluation summaries, copies of reviews, publishing contracts, unsolicited letters, and similar items. This list is not to be taken as a requirement, but as an example. What is relevant for one candidate may not be relevant for another, but in every case appropriate evidence is required.

The candidate may meet with the Evaluation Subcommittee before it begins deliberation of the case to confirm the status of the dossier and to provide or receive any information pertinent to consideration of the case. Thereafter, a candidate for tenure and promotion, or promotion shall not attend any committee meeting at which the candidate's case is being considered, unless invited for a specific purpose. **Individual members of the tenure and promotion committee may not discuss the ongoing review with the candidate by sharing with the candidate their individual assessment or that of other members of the committee.**

5.3.2 Joint Appointments:

Note: The procedures outlined below are one possibility for joint appointments between an interdisciplinary program and a department. An appointment that is 100% within a single interdisciplinary program will be governed by any specific guidelines of the interdisciplinary program and in alignment with college and university guidelines. For joint appointments, specific procedures used for the tenure and promotion process will follow the interdisciplinary program bylaws/Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and those of the department where the joint appointment is held. Any specific procedures negotiated during the hiring process will also be followed. The following is a general set of College guidelines for conducting tenure and promotion, and promotion reviews of faculty with joint appointments in the college.

The candidate will prepare one dossier in accordance with College of Liberal Arts Procedures.

The department and the interdisciplinary program will work together to identify a single set of seven external reviewers who will be acceptable to the P&T committee in each unit. The head/coordinator of the units and an additional representative from each unit will meet in the fall or spring of the 5th year to identify specific steps for soliciting names of potential external reviewers from the candidate and from each of the candidate's two academic units. This group will create a final list of individuals to be contacted.

The academic unit in which the candidate is administratively located will be responsible for contacting external reviewers and securing letters, vita, and short biographies from external reviewers.

The dossier will be reviewed by the respective units in the same manner as would occur for any other faculty member. Each unit's Evaluation Subcommittee will prepare research/creative work, teaching, and service draft reports. Following preparation of these draft reports, a joint meeting of the promotion and tenure committees of the department and interdisciplinary program will be convened. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the dossier and share information regarding the candidate's evaluation from the perspective of each of the two units in which the candidate is appointed.

Following the joint meeting, the promotion and tenure committee of each unit will meet separately for further discussion to approve the unit's reports on research or creative work, teaching, and service, and to vote on tenure and promotion or promotion. A summary report of the discussion and vote at each unit's promotion and tenure committee meeting is required. Following these meetings, the completed file (including the two sets of final subcommittee reports of research or creative work, teaching, service, summary report of the promotion

and tenure committee, and letter from the head/coordinator of each unit) will be uploaded to interfolio for access by the Dean's office for evaluation by the Dean's Advisory Committee and the Dean.

5.3.3 The Dossier

Materials to be included in the tenure and promotion/promotion dossier. Always refer to **current year** of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost "Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines." For 2021-2022 see: <http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure>

Item 1. Candidate's personal statement and acknowledgment. Candidates must submit a personal statement (a maximum of three pages, single spaced; 10 or 12 pt font; 1 inch margins) that explains the quality, productivity over time, and impact of teaching, research/scholarly work, and service accomplishments. Each of these three areas should be addressed separately. See DoF guidelines for relevant promotion and tenure cycle.

Item 2. The curriculum vitae. The curriculum vita should include at least the information listed below starting with items a & b. The CV should not include any personal information such as home address, home telephone, social security number, personal e-mail address. Please keep CV within a reasonable length.

- (a) Degrees received, including dates, institutions, and fields of study;
- (b) History of prior academic and related employment, including dates (eg. Fa 2010-Su 2017) and various ranks;
- (c) Fields one is qualified to teach, including areas of special interest;
- (d) Record as:
 - (i) supervisor of independent work of undergraduate or graduate students and
 - (ii) principal adviser of graduate students working on advanced degrees, distinguishing between completed and uncompleted degrees;
- (e) Record of publications with complete citations making clear the distinction among the following categories:
 - (i) books and monographs,
 - (ii) articles, indicating which are refereed,
 - (iii) notes and comments,
 - (iv) chapters in books,
 - (v) fellowship and research grants received,
 - (vi) papers presented at professional meetings, and
 - (vii) abstracts and book reviews.

Creative products and performances such as poems, novels, dramatic productions outside of normal teaching responsibilities, or musical performances, should be listed in an appropriate analogous form. Beginning and concluding page numbers should be included for each article or essay cited; co-authors should be acknowledged in the order in which they appear on the publication; and the date of publication, the press, and the total number of pages should be cited with each book or monograph. Only materials that are actually in print or for which a final written acceptance has been received should be listed, unless a separate In-Review section is shown. Creative activity such as exhibitions or reviews of performances should be cited with similar specificity;

- (f) Professional and service activity, both intramural and extramural, such as committee or other assignments, membership or leadership in scholarly societies, editorial services to scholarly publications, consulting activity, honors and special recognition received, and public service related to professional expertise.
- (g) A signed statement indicating that the curriculum vitae being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature. NOTE: This is different from the Verification of Contents sheet. See item 3 below.
- (h) The TAMU Grants Summary Chart that lists candidate's complete grant information (see Forms here: <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms.>)

Item 3. Verification of Contents sheet. This is a fillable form within Interfolio. It consists of a detailed, specific list of ALL materials submitted by the candidate (not including outside letters) to the departmental review committee as well as a signed and dated (on the date on which materials are submitted to the department) statement by the candidate acknowledging the contents of the dossier.

Item 4. The teaching report. The teaching report must be based on multiple indicators of the quality and effectiveness of the candidate's teaching. The Evaluation Subcommittee must undertake a thorough examination of all materials turned in by the candidate in support of teaching. These should include syllabi for courses, assignments, exams and handouts. If available, course websites prepared by the candidate should also be examined.

All teaching reports must be accompanied by a table reporting course evaluation scores for the candidate (for the length of the probationary period for tenure and promotion reviews; and for the period since receiving tenure or for the last five years [whichever is shorter] for promotion to professor). To contextualize these scores, additional information must be provided: mean grade for the course, number of students enrolled, number of students responding to the evaluation, and departmental means for comparable courses (i.e., compare lower-division courses to all lower-division courses, upper-division courses to all upper-division courses, graduate courses to all graduate courses). Additional context may be offered as appropriate (e.g., if a candidate's teaching load consists principally of generally unpopular required courses or if a particularly significant event in a given semester might have influenced the course evaluations). A template for this table is appended to this document and will be provided electronically to all departments (Appendix II).

All teaching reports must also include assessments of teaching capability based on peer observation. The college requires that a minimum of two peer assessments of classroom observation be included in the dossier. At least two members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee (i.e., the tenured faculty for cases of promotion and tenure, full professors for cases of promotion to full) should observe the candidate's teaching on separate occasions (i.e., two members of the committee should attend different classes. Both observers may attend the same course on different days or observers may attend two different courses). The report should indicate the frequency of observations, as well as criteria for assessment of performance. **Observations should be done in the semester in which the department considers the candidate's case or the previous academic year.**

Observations from earlier in the candidate's career may be included if available, but the teaching report should not assess teaching solely on observations that were made several years prior to the time at which the candidate is being considered for tenure and promotion. While the peer teaching evaluations may be summarized and referenced in the subcommittee teaching report, entire peer assessments should not be incorporated into the committee's report. They should be placed in the dossier in the section on teaching as accompanying documents. The responsibility for arranging classroom visits rests with the Evaluation Subcommittee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, or the Department Head, not with the candidate. (See DOF Guidelines for further guidance on reporting peer classroom observation).

Item 5. The research/creative activities report. The research/creative activities report should include an evidence-based assessment of the quality and impact of the candidate's body of work. A few works of high quality are more important than numerous insignificant works. Emphasis on the quality of work requires attention to the candidate's contribution to works that are not single authored and the quality of the journals or presses in which the work appears.

In the evaluation of publications and other creative and professional accomplishments, interpretations by the most qualified members of the discipline as well as by outside referees of national reputation in the discipline are extremely valuable, but research reports must be based on tangible evidence as well as individual judgments. Reviews and citations and appraisals in the publications of others constitute particularly significant testimony. Use of bibliographic citation indices is often helpful. The record of research grant proposals and

fellowships applied for and awarded should be examined and interpreted. A positive pattern of professional development as scholar or creative artist should be demonstrated.

Creative work in such areas as theater, music, or creative writing should be evaluated by the testimony of persons eminent in their fields. Not only the number, but the place and quality of exhibitions, readings, or performances should be taken into account, as well as reviews. Just as in areas in which research is being evaluated, creative work should be clearly distinct from teaching activities.

Reports on candidates for promotion to associate professor should consider works that have been published, exhibited, or performed as well as work that is scheduled for publication or performance. Written evidence of acceptance for publication, exhibition or performance must be provided.

Reports on candidates for promotion to professor, though based primarily on the substantiated impact of works that are in print or that have been exhibited or performed, may also consider works in the pipeline, if they are at a proven advanced stage of the publication process and are indicative of the candidate's scholarly and professional stature. Instances of scholarly or creative works that have increased in stature and importance after initial publication should be documented through such evidence as reviews, republication in anthologies, and significant citations.

Reports for all candidates should address the following questions:

- Are the individual works an integral part of an ongoing research or creative program?
- How is the work regarded by scholars in the field?
- Does the record offer evidence of an ongoing research agenda?

For a candidate being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure the report in addition should address:

- Does the work show promise of impact?
- Does the work reveal evidence of significant post-dissertation research?

For a candidate being considered for promotion to professor the report in addition should address:

- The actual impact of the candidate's body of scholarship on the discipline
- The national or international reputation of the candidate

Members of both the Evaluation Subcommittee and the Departmental (or interdisciplinary program) Promotion and Tenure Committee should personally examine publications and other examples of creative work that are listed in the dossier. Copies of publications, or selected examples of publications, should be made available (either in the departmental or program office or in a secure online location) to all members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee while the case is under consideration.

The standards and status of scholarly presses and journals vary considerably. Therefore, each dossier should contain a discussion of the quality of the press or journals in which the scholarly work appears, e.g., standing in the discipline or sub discipline, acceptance rates, critical standards membership of editorial or advisory board, and readership.

Item 6. *Service Report.* Service is expected of all faculty as part of the normal performance of duties and should be taken into account in making an overall assessment of an individual's qualifications for advancement.

Some examples of service to be considered are effective academic advising of students; discipline, college, or university committee work, particularly involving authorship of reports that subsequently are adopted as policy; special assignments undertaken at the request of the administration such as curriculum development projects;

chairpersonships; work with student organizations or initiatives of students; professional consulting activity; honorific membership or leadership in scholarly societies; leadership in national professional associations; professional editorial assignment for national refereed journals or for scholarly publishers; and honors and special recognition awarded. Work on supradisciplinary grant proposals may be considered under teaching, research, or service, as appropriate, at the discretion of the Evaluation Subcommittee. Administration of grant awards, when not clearly a case of research or teaching, is properly considered an instance of university service.

Item 7. *Other Activities Report.* Report on any activities that do not obviously fit into any of the other three categories. It may be omitted if it is not relevant to the candidate.

Item 8. *Outside letters of evaluation of research or creative work.* Letters of evaluation from scholars outside the university are required in all cases of tenure and promotion, and promotion to professor. The preponderance of outside letters (at least 4) should be from peer institutions or better. In cases where the stature of a particular program or the letter writer is not obvious, the reason for soliciting a particular reference needs to be stated. A minimum of five letters must be included. The Dean of Faculties requires five letters but prefers seven letters to be included in the dossier. Each discipline is different and the number of letters requested should be based on expected response rate. The candidate may submit a list of persons to be considered as referees, and may also submit a second list of persons who should not be consulted. The Evaluation Subcommittee should select referees using its own independent judgment of propriety and qualification, subject to one constraint: about equal number of letters requested must be from a referee on the candidate's preferred list if such a list has been submitted. Whenever lists are submitted by a candidate, they must become part of the official dossier that is forwarded.

The first item in this section should be the **TAMU External Reviewers Chart** that lists all reviewers to whom a solicitation letter was sent, even if the reviewer subsequently declined or failed to send a review (template available here: <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms>)

All letters that have been requested and received must be included.

The value of outside letters depends on the choice of appropriate persons who are discerning judges and who are familiar with the candidate's work or will take the trouble to study it. Letters from the candidate's major professor, or the candidate's graduate student colleagues, are generally less persuasive to a case than more clearly objective sources and would not count towards the minimum requirement of five letters. External reviewers should be arm's length from the candidate with no conflict of interest. Either the department head or the Evaluation Subcommittee should establish clearly the professional standing of the outside reviewers. As much as possible, most of the letters should be from scholars with national reputations at leading institutions or noted departments. Copies of outside letters and a summary/short biography highlighting ~~an evaluation of~~ the credentials of the referees prepared by the chairperson of the Evaluation Subcommittee should accompany the dossier. Further, a copy of the letter soliciting the external evaluation should be included as part of the dossier. With minimal revisions, the university External Reviewer Solicitation Letter Template has been customized for use in our college. Please see Appendix III.

The following conventions should be followed in arranging for outside reviews:

- (a) The candidate is to be informed what materials (e.g., manuscripts, proposals, and publications) are being sent out for review. The materials to be reviewed need not include all of the candidate's work, but should not exclude material the candidate judges indispensable to the assessment of his or her case.
- (b) Most outside reviewers should be from peer institutions or better. Letters from clear leaders in the field are also acceptable but the file should still include at least ~~three~~ four letters from individuals in peer programs/universities.

(c) An external reviewer’s rank at their institution should be equivalent or higher than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. If circumstances necessitate letters from out-of-rank outside reviewers, these circumstances should be explained and approval sought from the college before an invitation to review is extended.

(d) The external reviewer is to be provided:

(i) a copy of the candidate's statement, curriculum vitae and the principal research/creative work materials on which the assessment is to be based; and

(ii) sufficient time for a complete and conscientious assessment, as a rule not less than one month.

For detailed guidance on external review, see DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.”

Item 9. Departmental (T&P) Committee Summary Report and Recommendation. The P&T Committee discussion report and recommendation to the head is advisory in nature. The report must include the vote of the full P&T Committee, the number of committee members absent, and the number of committee members eligible to vote. **NOTE: Abstention is not an option. Please copy table exactly as indicated below.**

	Yes	No	Absent	Recused	Total Eligible
Votes					

Item 10. Department Head’s Recommendation. The department head’s letter should report the process used in assembling the dossier and his/her recommendation. The report may also include the vote of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (include the total number of faculty members eligible to vote in the tenure and promotion decision). The department head’s report should also provide an explanatory context by describing the department with respect to such matters as its size, discrete teaching fields or subfields represented, and disciplinary norms or special circumstances affecting decisions in that department.

Items 11 & 12. College Committee’s Report and Recommendation and Dean’s Recommendation and Summary. Please make tabs in the dossier for each of these items.

Item 13. Annual Reviews (for candidates for tenure & promotion to associate professor). All the candidate’s annual reviews by department head and midterm review from dean should be included in the section labeled "Other Materials".

5.3.4 College Review:

The Dean’s Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion (DAC-TP) comprises six faculty members at the rank of professor, three from the humanities and three from the social sciences. Committee members are chosen by the Dean, and serve staggered three-year terms. The Dean appoints a chair or convener of the committee. The names of members to be appointed to the committee are presented to department heads and the Liberal Arts Council for endorsement after which they are published on the College website.

Dossiers of faculty being considered for tenure and promotion/or promotion are read and discussed by the DAC-TP. DAC-TP members are recused from cases of candidates in their own departments and do not participate in the committee’s discussion and voting on such cases. Additionally, individuals associated, in accordance with the System policy on nepotism (33.03), with a faculty member being considered for tenure and promotion, or promotion to full professor may not participate in either departmental or college-level discussions or vote on a case that is covered by that System policy. In accordance with university recommendations, the Dean, or her/his representative, will not attend the meetings of the DAC-TP. The Associate Dean for Faculty will be available for

consultation throughout DAC-TP meetings. The DAC-TP will communicate its assessment, votes, and recommendation on each case to the Dean in a report that will be added to the dossier.

The Dean conducts her/his independent evaluation of the complete dossier, including the candidate's statement, the departmental reports, external letters, the head's/interdisciplinary program coordinator's letter, and the DAC-TP report. The dean makes her/his recommendation in a report that is included in the dossier. The dossier, with the contents of the departmental and college reviews, is submitted to the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

5.4 Evaluation Process for Promotion in the Academic Professional Track

All promotions in the Academic Professional Track will follow the same process and timeline as for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the College of Liberal Arts. While the timeline and the contours of the process are the same, there are important differences in specified responsibilities between the tenure stream and APT, and even within the APT track. Promotion reviews of APT faculty will review the candidates' performance within their track and title responsibilities. Only members (both tenured and APT faculty) of equivalent or higher ranks than the one for which the candidate is being evaluated are eligible to participate in the review. Therefore, it is important to note that, while tenured members do review promotion cases of non-tenured, Academic Professional Track faculty, an Evaluation Subcommittee and the Departmental Promotion Committee will be comprised of tenured and APT faculty who are in equivalent or higher ranks than the one for which the candidate is being reviewed. Departments and interdisciplinary programs may provide unit-specific guidelines for the promotion review of their APT faculty. However, they should adhere to College policy including the following:

Evaluation letters, both external and internal are NOT required for all APT titles; therefore, they should not be solicited for candidates being reviewed for promotion to the following titles: Senior Lecturer, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor. Letters are required for APT faculty with research and clinical titles. Solicitation of outside letters for these APT faculty must follow the process required for outside letters for reviews in the tenure stream. Letters may be required for promotion to Associate Professor of the Practice and Professor of the practice. Departments (and interdisciplinary programs) should consider on a case by case basis whether letters should be required for a candidate being reviewed for either of these titles.

5.4.1 College Review:

The Dean's Advisory Committee on Promotion of Academic Professional Track (DAC-PAPT) reviews promotion cases in the Academic Professional Track. This committee comprises a minimum of two Academic Professional Track faculty at the rank of professor (to the extent possible) and a minimum of one tenured faculty member at the rank of professor. Committee members are chosen by the Dean. The names of members to be appointed to the DAC-PAPT are presented to department heads and the Liberal Arts Council for endorsement after which the names are posted on the College website. DAC-PAPT members are recused from cases of candidates in their own departments and do not participate in the committee's discussion and voting on such. Additionally, individuals associated, in accordance with the System policy on nepotism (33.03), with a faculty member being considered for promotion may not participate in either departmental or college-level discussions or vote on a case that is covered by that System policy. In accordance with university recommendations, the Dean, or her/his representative, will not attend the meetings of the DAC-PAPT. The Associate Dean for Faculty will be available for consultation throughout DAC-PAPT meetings. The DAC-PAPT will communicate its assessment, votes, and recommendation on each case to the Dean in a report that will be added to the dossier.

The Dean conducts her/his independent evaluation of the complete dossier, including the candidate's statement, the departmental reports, the head's/program coordinator's letter, and the DAC-PAPT report. The dean makes her/his recommendation in a report that is included in the dossier. The dossier, with the contents of the departmental and college reviews, is submitted to the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

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

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

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

6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
 - See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window. The College of Liberal Arts does not have a College-prescribed window. Each department and interdisciplinary program will identify its expanded window, if it has one.

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.

Note: Departments in the college may use more than the five categories upon College review and approval.

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

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.*
- *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.*

- ***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.**
- ***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.

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.
- ***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.
- ***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.

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.M1](#), (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, patient care, 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:

- Departments and interdisciplinary programs should discuss and adopt appropriate examples that reflect disciplinary and professional exphases of the department or program.

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

6.5.2 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.

Annual evaluation of probationary faculty shall include two votes of the tenured faculty or tenured members of the departmental advisory committee: the first vote indicates whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward promotion with tenure; the second vote recommends reappointment or termination of the employment of the faculty member. The department head's written annual evaluation of the faculty member shall report the results of the two faculty votes and shall state whether the head concurs or disagrees with the voting results. A copy of the department head's written evaluation of a faculty member on probation must be submitted to the College.

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 Time-Line

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The 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.M1](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#)

7. **Mid-Term Review**

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#)(University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.

- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, 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)

Mid-term reviews (normally conducted in the spring semester of the candidate’s third year of service) are a significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty, and are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews must be conducted carefully, and faculty members must be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period.

Candidates’ dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for the tenure and promotion dossier, except that work under review or in progress should be included and external letters are not required. The dossier should include:

- a) The candidate’s personal statement (a maximum of three pages, single spaced, 12-point font), which explains the quality, productivity over time, and impact of teaching, research/scholarly work, and service accomplishments. Each of these three areas should be addressed separately.
- b) An up-to-date curriculum vitae that clearly distinguishes between refereed and non-refereed publications and identifies whether unpublished manuscripts have been accepted for publication or are under review. **Includes faculty acknowledgment that the CV is correct and up-to-date.**
- c) Copies of all annual review letters sent by the Department Head to the candidate.

- d) Separate reports on teaching, research or creative activities, and service, and a summary report, written by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. A summary of the numerical teaching evaluations from courses taught at TAMU must be included in the teaching report. The college requires that two peer assessments of classroom observation be included in the dossier. While these peer teaching evaluations may be summarized and referenced in the committee teaching report, entire peer assessments should not be incorporated into the committee's report. They should be placed in the dossier in the section on teaching as accompanying documents.
- e) Votes of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee on the questions 1) Is the candidate making satisfactory progress toward promotion with tenure? and 2) Should the candidate be reappointed?
- f) Recommendation letter from the Department Head (or Program Coordinator) indicating her/his overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period. Effective AY 2019-2020, the College requires that department heads (and program coordinators) NOT attend the meetings of the departmental tenure and promotion committee in which Midterm cases are discussed. However, the head/program coordinator will be available for consultation on procedure as necessary.

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.

In a memo to the department head, the dean will convey the assessment and recommendation of the Dean's Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion (DAC-TP). The memo will also include the dean's assessment based on her/his independent review of the dossier. Her/his assessment will be accompanied by specific recommendations with guidance on formulating, implementing and monitoring plans for necessary actions in the remainder of the probationary period. The department head will discuss the outcomes of the midterm review with the candidate and work with her/him in addressing departmental and college recommendations.

8. Post-Tenure Review¹

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

- 1) 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.).

The College of Liberal Arts does not have a college-specific set of guidelines for Post Tenure Review. It requires academic departments and interdisciplinary programs to develop unit-specific guidelines following university rule and guidelines as stipulated in Standard Administrative Procedure (SAP) 12.06.99.M0.01, "Post Tenure Review" <https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf>. All department and interdisciplinary program post-tenure review guidelines and subsequent revisions must be reviewed and approved by the College.

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

Every year, no later than May 31st, each department and interdisciplinary program will submit to the Dean of Faculties through the Dean of the College the following information:

- The year when each tenured faculty in the unit last underwent a review.
- Faculty members reviewed that year for post tenure Periodic Peer Review.
- The outcome of each Periodic Peer Review conducted that year and any required follow-up plans.
- Faculty members scheduled to be reviewed the following year.

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

Departments and interdisciplinary programs that have faculty with 100% appointment will state clearly in their guidelines the composition of and selection process for their peer-review committee. For faculty with administrative positions at the college or university level (e.g. assistant and associate deans; assistant provosts; assistant and associate vice presidents) Periodic Peer Review will be conducted by a committee to include other college/university administrators and department faculty as appropriate for the position and administrative effort.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- *Example 1 – As determined by the department or interdisciplinary program reflecting disciplinary, departmental, and professional emphases*
- *Example 2 – As determined by the department or interdisciplinary program reflecting disciplinary, departmental, and professional emphases*
- *Example 3 – As determined by the department or interdisciplinary program reflecting disciplinary, Departmental, and professional emphases*
- *Tenured faculty with administrative appointments will submit materials pertinent to their administrative responsibilities. (Note: these are in addition to materials on teaching, research, and service requested by the department)*

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

8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department 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 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

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

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.

Upon being notified by a faculty member of her/his intention to retire, the department head or program coordinator will initiate the process to consider the faculty member for emeritus status if she/he fulfills the criteria outlined in [University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#). Upon receipt of the faculty member's CV and any other review materials, the department will review the case and make a recommendation based on the standards specified by the University. If a faculty member does not wish to be considered for emeritus status, the department head will convey this to the college.

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.

Contact Office

College of Liberal Arts Office of the Associate Dean for Faculty, e-mail bjobling@tamu.edu

Approved College of Liberal Arts: 6/21/2021

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties 6/21/2021