College of Arts and Sciences

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by Texas A&M University Office of Faculty Affairs on 4/27/2023

Table of Contents

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The College of Arts and Sciences fosters innovative, world-class teaching and scholarship across a range of academic disciplines. Located at the heart of Texas A&M University, our students and faculty are pursuing transformative research, engaging in high-impact learning, and creating cross-disciplinary collaborations that address the challenges of a dynamic and complex world.

Appropriate evaluation guidelines are essential to support this mission. 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 Arts and Sciences for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research and/or creative work, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the university and the college; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators to help evaluate overall performance of faculty.

This document articulates college guidelines for faculty annual review, midterm review, promotion and tenure review, and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following university documents:

TITLES AND LINKS TO DOCUMENTS
12.01.99.M1 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (including Appendix I)
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review
Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual and Midterm Review
Faculty Affairs Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

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.

The following concepts are used throughout these guidelines:

- **Areas of Responsibility**. Areas of responsibility are different categories of work that are evaluated separately during a performance evaluation. Areas of responsibility vary by job title. There are three possible areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Tenure track faculty typically have responsibilities in all three areas. Some tenure track faculty may also have administrative responsibilities. Academic professional track faculty typically have responsibilities in one or two of the three areas. Some academic professional track faculty may also have clinical or administrative responsibilities.

- **Guiding Criteria**. Guiding criteria play a key role in the evaluation of faculty performance in general and serve as the college-level expectations for each area of responsibility and promotion to the next rank.

- **Specific Criteria**. Given the diversity of disciplines and the diversity of faculty roles within the College of Arts and Sciences, specific criteria for faculty performance evaluations are set at the department level for each faculty track.

  - Department-specific criteria may include certain indicators of performance that must be met in order for a faculty member to be promoted to the next rank. For example, a department might require tenure track faculty to publish a book or obtain external funding in order to be promoted to the next rank.

  - Departments may also allow for some flexibility in their criteria by stating that a successful dossier for promotion will typically include a variety of accomplishments in a given area of responsibility, but does not need to follow a set formula. For example, one candidate may meet expectations for service with a heavy and impactful record of service at the department level and a modest record of service within the discipline, while another candidate may meet expectations for service with a modest level of service at the department level and a significant level of service as a leader in national organizations.

  - Some of the indicators listed in these college-level guidelines may not be relevant for some departments within the college or for some faculty tracks.

- **Evidence**. For each type of performance review (e.g., annual review, promotion review), faculty submit information that serves as evidence that they have met guiding and specific criteria. Faculty committees and administrators conducting reviews should also cite evidence that criteria have been met or exceeded.

- **Rating Scale**. This refers to the categories used to rate faculty's annual performance (e.g., unsatisfactory, needs improvement, satisfactory/meets expectations, meritorious/exceeds expectations, and most meritorious/outstanding).

SECTION 2: FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS

The College of Arts and Sciences has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the college recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals.

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at *University Rule 12.01.99.M1* and *University Guidelines to Faculty Titles*. The faculty titles within the College of Arts and Sciences are outlined in subsections 2.1-2.3 below.

2.1   Tenure Track Titles

Professor, **Associate Professor**, and **Assistant Professor** are appointment titles of tenure track faculty members. In this document, "tenure track" includes untenured assistant professors, untenured associate professors, tenured associate professors, and tenured professors. Tenure track faculty in the

College of Arts and Sciences are expected to make significant contributions in all three areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for cause. The concept of tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom and is granted to a subset of faculty who have a strong record of research and/or creative work and who have demonstrated that they will continue to be productive in this area of responsibility, in addition to having strong records of teaching and service.

Assistant Professor. The position of Assistant Professor is a tenure track appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Assistant professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in all three areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Assistant professors are expected to come up for tenure at the end of a mandatory probationary period.

Associate Professor. The position of Associate Professor is typically a tenured appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. (In rare cases, a faculty member may be at the rank of associate professor without tenure.) Associate professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of research and/or creative work, teaching, and service. The status of tenure is recognition of excellence in all three areas of responsibility and entitles the faculty member to continue in their academic position unless dismissed for good cause.

Professor. The position of Professor is a tenured appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. The status of tenure is recognition of excellence in all three areas of responsibility and entitles the faculty member to continue in their academic position unless dismissed for good cause, and the promotion to the rank of professor is based on continuing accomplishment and national or international recognition for scholarship.

Instructor is a title that is used for an individual who was recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree prior to the beginning of the appointment. This title would normally be used for less than one year after hire. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title will be reclassified to Assistant Professor and the tenure probationary period will begin. Instructors are expected to make significant contributions in three areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service.

2.2 Academic Professional Track Titles

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty titles are general terms used to describe non-tenure accruing appointment titles that are eligible for promotion.

Faculty with the title of **Lecturer**, **Senior Lecturer**, or **Principal Lecturer** will normally hold a master's or terminal degree in the teaching field and will make significant contributions to teaching activity (usually at the undergraduate level). Lecturer faculty can also be assigned to service activity but are not expected

to consistently make significant contributions in either research and/or creative work or the area of service. Any activity outside of teaching should be a small percentage of their time and effort. In all reviews, lecturer faculty will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity.

Faculty with the title of **Instructional Assistant Professor**, **Instructional Associate Professor**, or **Instructional Professor** normally hold a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which the faculty member will teach and are expected to make significant contributions to teaching activity at undergraduate or graduate level. All faculty in these titles will also make significant contributions in either research and/or creative work or service. Typically, most of an instructional faculty's time and effort will be in the area of teaching, with an expectation to engage in professional development within the discipline or industry in which they teach. Faculty in these titles will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity, plus contributions to either the area of service or the area of research and/or creative work.

Faculty with the title of **Clinical Assistant Professor**, **Clinical Associate Professor** or **Clinical Professor** will make significant contributions to education in a clinical practice discipline or applied setting. If their work assignment requires a license or certification, clinical faculty members are expected to maintain the educational and practice requirements for active licensure or certification. In the College of Arts and Sciences, 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. As part of their assigned duties, faculty in these titles 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. Clinical faculty can also be assigned to research and/or creative work or service as an area of responsibility and typically these activities will be incident to clinical education and clinical practice. Usually, most of a clinical faculty member's time and effort will be in the education they provide in the clinical practice discipline or applied setting. Faculty in these titles will primarily be evaluated on the education they provide, plus contributions to either the area of service or the area of research and/or creative work that is integral to their clinical teaching and clinical practice work.

Professor of the Practice, **Associate Professor of the Practice**, and **Assistant Professor of the Practice** will make significant contributions to education in an area where they have substantial professional credentials or experience. Typically, faculty in these titles have a minimum of three years of professional experience, and an extraordinary record of accomplishment during their time in industry, government, or maintain a license or certification that qualifies them as a professional in their field. As part of their assigned duties, faculty in these titles may also make contributions in the area of service, but most of their time and effort will be in educating students within their area of professional credentials or experience.

Faculty with the title of **Research Assistant Professor**, **Research Associate Professor**, or **Research Professor** will make significant contributions to research activity, and their appointment is often associated with substantial research funding or work on a particular project. Research faculty can also be assigned to teaching or service activity, but typically these activities are central to research activity and involvement of students in research and requires approval by the Vice President for Research. If instruction is more than 50% of assigned duties, it is likely that a reclassification to an instructional track

is needed. Research faculty members will primarily be evaluated on research activity, and teaching or service activity incident to the context of their research expertise.

2.3   Other Faculty Titles

The College of Arts and Sciences also uses several "conscribed" faculty titles for appointments that are neither tenure-accruing nor promotion eligible. These faculty are subject to annual review, but not the other forms of faculty performance evaluation described in these guidelines.

ACES Assistant Professor is a non-tenure accruing appointment for faculty who are recruited through the ACES Fellows Program and are anticipated to transition into a tenure track appointment.

Senior Professor is a non-tenure accruing appointment for faculty who have completed a career trajectory as a tenured faculty member and are in the process of retiring within a specified period of time.

Visiting *[Faculty Title]* is a short-term appointment that is intended to be no more than three years and may be for just one or two semesters.

SECTION 3:   EXPECTATIONS FOR AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance of (1) teaching, (2) research and/or creative work, and (3) service. Alternate work assignments, such as administration, may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the department head and the Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties, including any administrative assignments. The nature of a faculty member's contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not contain a specific formula for faculty contribution; however, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable college evaluations. Appendix B of this document contains a list of sample indicators that are aligned with the rating scale. The tables in Appendix B provide suggested guidance for evaluating faculty performance in each of the assigned areas of responsibility. All faculty should strive to "meet expectations" (minimally) and to "exceed expectations" (ideally) in all their assigned responsibilities. Departments are responsible for using departmental guidelines to evaluate all faculty members annually according to their assigned area(s) of responsibility.

The TAMU Faculty Affairs Guidelines to Faculty Titles document outlines the expected responsibilities of all faculty members according to their title. More details regarding expectations of faculty within the various tracks are summarized in Section 8.

Tenure track faculty members (whether tenured or not) are expected to make substantial contributions in all three primary areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. For performance evaluation purposes, each department must specify the standard percentage of effort assigned to tenure track faculty members for each of the three primary areas of responsibility. With the approval of the college, a department head may modify an individual faculty member's research effort for a specified period of time. If the research and/or creative work area is reduced, it should not be

below 25%, except for faculty members whose percent effort in administrative duties at the department, college, or the university level is 50% or above.

Academic professional track faculty are expected to make substantial contributions in one or two of the areas of responsibility: research and/or creative work, teaching, and/or service. Each category of the academic professional track titles (i.e., lecturer, instructional, research, practice, clinical) have different expectations for the areas in which they are required to make substantial contributions. These expectations are outlined in section 2.2 of this document. For performance evaluation purposes, each department must specify the percentage of effort assigned to each academic professional track faculty member for each of their assigned areas of responsibility.

For academic professional track faculty, the percentage of effort in teaching should be no lower than 50%, with two exceptions: APT faculty in any research professor title and APT faculty whose percent effort in administrative duties (e.g., program director, assistant head, assistant dean, etc.) is 50% or above. Within the academic professional track titles, it is possible that two academic professional track faculty members may have different percentages of effort for assigned performance categories, even though they may have the same faculty title.

3.1   Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty with assigned teaching responsibilities. As such, all faculty members who teach are expected to:

(1) use teaching practices known to motivate and actively engage students in the learning process,

(2) contribute to meaningful instruction and acquisition of knowledge for all students,

(3) aim to continuously improve their teaching practices,

(4) foster a positive, inclusive, and equitable learning environment for students,

(5) promote and diversify the development of the college's instructional programs, and

(6) be a positive role model, mentor, or advisor.

3.2   Research and/or creative work

All tenure track faculty members (whether tenured or not) are expected to engage in continuous research and/or creative work conducted individually or/and collaboratively. For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publications. For some disciplines, this area of responsibility may include other forms of scholarly or creative activity, including fiction, poetry, and/or music. For this reason, this category is described as "research and/or creative work." Some academic professional track faculty may have a percentage of effort assigned to research and/or creative work. The evaluation of research and/or creative work is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion for those faculty who have percentage of effort assigned to research and/or creative work.

Given the diversity of fields and subfields represented in the College of Arts and Sciences, and even within departments, the college recognizes that evaluation of performance in scholarship and creative work does not follow rigid college-prescribed criteria. Therefore, departments will develop appropriate department-specific criteria for assessing research and/or creative work.

3.3   Service

Service contributions include service to the department, college, university, academic discipline, and the broader community. Service to the department, college, or university typically involves activities that are essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of these units. This can include, but is not limited to, actively serving on committees and task forces, coordinating departmental programs, or leading initiatives that improve the functions of the units. Service to the discipline includes reviewing scholarly work, coordinating disciplinary events, and leading scholarly organizations. Service to the broader community includes extramural service and outreach activities that benefit local schools, industry, local/state/national agencies, or community organizations. Service is an integral part of most faculty tracks (except for lecturer titles). However, the amount and the nature of a faculty member's service contributions are likely to vary depending on the faculty member's job title, track, career stage, and interest.

3.4   Administration

This area of responsibility is limited to faculty who have leadership roles within the department, college, or university (i.e., department heads, associate/assistant heads, program directors, associate/assistant deans, etc.) Appointment letters should clearly state the percentage of time and effort for the administrative appointment. The evaluation of administrative duties should be based on criteria and expectations specified in individual appointment letters.

SECTION 4:   SCALE AND GUIDING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE

This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance; it does, however, provide rating scales along with guiding criteria and indicators for evaluating faculty performance. A description of these tools for evaluating faculty performance are provided below.

- *A rating scale for evaluating faculty performance (Section 4.1)* The rating scale is most applicable for annual reviews, though the points along the scale are also relevant for assessing performance during midterm, promotion, and post-tenure reviews.

- *A set of guiding criteria describing general expectations of faculty within each assigned area of responsibility (Section 4.2)*. The guiding criteria are applicable for all reviews. The guiding criteria will be used by college-level committees when evaluating performance during midterm and promotion reviews.

- *A wide-ranging list of sample indicators, or common accomplishments, for evaluating faculty performance Appendix B)*. Sample indicators, aligned with both the rating scale and the guiding criteria associated with each assigned area of responsibility, are provided in a series of tables located in Appendix B.

Note: Departmental guidelines should identify specific criteria, or indicators, for evaluating faculty performance in each area of responsibility. The development of these indicators should be based on departmental discussions with all faculty (including faculty at the McAllen Higher Education Center).

4.1   Rating Scale for Annual Reviews

The College of Arts and Sciences uses the following five-point scale for evaluating faculty performance:

- Unsatisfactory
- Needs Improvement
- Meets Expectations
- Exceeds Expectations
- Outstanding

The five-point scale is most relevant for annual reviews. More information on the rating scale can be found in Section 5.0. This rating scale will be used consistently by all departments in the college. If the department's previous rating scale is inconsistent with the college rating scale (e.g., "exemplary" is used instead of "exceeds expectations"), departments may transition to the new rating scale by using two sets of labels (e.g., "exemplary/exceeds expectations") for any departmental report that is submitted to the college (e.g., annual reviews for untenured assistant professors).

4.2   Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Areas of Responsibility

4.2.1   Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

The College of Arts and Sciences will use the following **guiding criteria** in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of teaching:

- **Quality of Teaching -** Any review of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence the faculty member has an established record of high-quality teaching. Quality teaching encompasses a variety of skills and best practices including, but not limited to, (a) use of teaching techniques proven to motivate students and engage them in the learning process; (b) careful selection and preparation of course content (i.e., sequencing of topics, level of rigor, pacing of topics, etc.); (c) use of accurate, organized, neat, and up-to-date teaching materials; (d) appropriate methods to assess student work and progress in the course; (e) proper course management; (f) use of effective communication (i.e., clear explanations in class, timeliness of email responses, clarity of course or assignment expectations, etc.) ; and (g) maintaining a positive, inclusive, and equitable learning environment for all students.

- **Professional Development** – Any review of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member engages in professional development activities that enhance and improve their instructional effectiveness. This could include, but is not limited to, programs offered by the professional organizations, the Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Transformational Teaching and Learning Conference.

- **Curricular Development -** Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member creates, improves, or enhances the curriculum for a course or a set of courses, or a new course.

- **Impact Beyond the Classroom -** Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that a faculty member's teaching has an impact that extends beyond the classroom. This would include (a) supervising high-impact learning experiences (e.g., internships, honors contracts, study abroad, undergraduate research, etc.); (b) mentoring and advising

undergraduate and/or graduate students, (c) activities that contribute to the professional success of students (e.g., reviewing student's grant proposals or manuscripts, writing reference letters, etc.); and (d) disseminating teaching methods and course materials to other instructors.

4.2.1.1 Sources for Evaluating Teaching Performance

The evaluation of teaching is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement or the use of a single source of information (i.e., student evaluations of teaching). To better protect against potential bias and ensure a more holistic review of a faculty member's teaching performance, multiple sources of information must be considered.

The following two sources are required for any review (annual, midterm, promotion, or post tenure) of faculty performance in teaching:

(1) Faculty descriptions of their teaching contributions. These descriptions include information on new and revised courses, high-impact learning experiences, mentoring of students, professional development related to teaching, etc.; and

(2) Student feedback regarding their learning experience as judged by student's end of course evaluations.

For promotion reviews the college also requires:

(3) Two peer-evaluations via observation of teaching by a colleague at the university who holds a title that is at least the rank for which the candidate is seeking promotion. Consultants from the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) can do formative reviews of teaching so faculty can strengthen their teaching practice, but the CTE does not do teaching observations for promotion or midterm review purposes. Peer observations of teaching may be provided by departmental faculty who are not eligible to vote on a candidate's case (e.g., an instructional professor can conduct a peer observation for assistant or associate professor). Individuals who conduct these peer observations should provide documentation summarizing their review of the observation to the candidate and ideally discuss the observation with the candidate. For this purpose, departments may use either the sample classroom observation instrument provided in Appendix B, or the instruments available on the Center for Teaching Excellence website. The candidate should include two summaries of the observation in the teaching section of their promotion dossier. If a candidate has received more than two peer observations of teaching prior to promotion, the candidate may choose which two summaries of peer observations to include in their dossier. A candidate may choose to include information in their impact statement about how the peer feedback helped to improve or modify their teaching. This requirement will take effect beginning in the 2024-2025 promotion review cycle. More specifics about these peer-evaluations for promotion are in Section 7.6.3.

Other possible sources that can be used, but are not required, for annual, midterm, and promotion and post-tenure reviews are:

(1) Self-evaluation and reflective practices to improve teaching methodologies,

(2) Peer-evaluation of course materials including syllabi, assignments, and assessments,

(3) Peer-evaluation of the organization and layout of websites or the University's learning, management system to organize and disseminate course materials,

(4) Peer-evaluation of assessment techniques or grading rubrics,

(5) Evidence of student learning or attainment of learning objectives,

(6) Description of projects related to curricular innovation or development,

(7) Faculty member's grade distributions and course GPA relative to overall grade distribution and course GPA for all instructors who teach the course, and

(8) Quality of the mentoring of colleagues or graduate students for teaching.

Per university rules, departments must specify all sources of information to be used in annual reviews in their departmental guidelines. Sample documents and guiding questions that can be used for peer observation and self-evaluation of teaching can be found in Appendices C and D. University guidelines for promotion and tenure provide additional resources for evaluating teaching.

4.2.2 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Research and/or Creative Work

The College of Arts and Sciences will use the **guiding criteria** described below in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of research and/or creative work. The first criteria is relevant for all four types of faculty performance evaluation (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review and post-tenure review). The other three guiding criteria may be used for all types of review, but are of particular relevance for promotion reviews.

- **Productivity** - Productivity encompasses a variety of activities including, but not limited to, time and effort spent conducting research; the delivery of research presentations; the submissions of research proposals for funding (in disciplines where funding is available and normally expected); the production of digital scholarship (in disciplines where digital scholarship is relevant); and the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly or creative work. Each department will define specific indicators of performance regarding research productivity. Any review of faculty performance (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review or post-tenure review) will consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member is a productive scholar with an active research and/or creative work agenda.

- **Independence and Intellectual Leadership** - Any review of faculty performance will consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member has established an independent record of research and/or creative work that goes beyond early career mentors (particularly for early career scholars) and/or that the faculty member is regarded as an intellectual leader within a chosen area of specialty (particularly for senior scholars). To meet this guiding criterion, a faculty member's scholarly or creative work must be regarded as original, authentic, or innovative within the discipline and/or subspecialty. To achieve independence and intellectual leadership, a faculty member needs to have the skills and resources necessary to design and conduct a feasible study. In some disciplines, this would include serving as the principal investigator on external grants. In some disciplines, this would include the development of networks and collaborations critical for success.

- **Scholarly Impact** – Any review of faculty performance will consider evidence that the faculty member's work is making an impact. The impact may be limited to impacts on the discipline, but

may also include broader impacts to the local community, the state of Texas, the nation, or beyond. Broader impacts may include practical applications of research, including but not limited to the production of patents. Departmental guidelines must indicate how the department measures and assesses the impact of scholarly activities. For promotion reviews, external review letters should address the impact of a faculty member's research and/or creative work, and department reports and department head letters must provide information to help understand how individual metrics fit within the context of the discipline and subspecialty.

- **Positive Trajectory** - Any review of faculty performance will consider evidence that the faculty member is on a positive trajectory within the next 3-5 years, with projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future.

4.2.2.1 Sources for Evaluating Research and/or Creative Work

The evaluation of research and/or creative work is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Multiple sources of information must be considered when reviewing records of research and/or creative work. Each type of review (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review, and post-tenure review) requires a different set of required sources (as indicated in more detail in the sections below).

4.2.3   Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

The College of Arts and Sciences uses the following **guiding criteria** in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of service:

- **Institutional Engagement** - Institutional engagement includes activities that benefit the department, college, and university. This includes serving on committees commensurate with one's academic rank and job title and making meaningful contributions to the governance of the institution.

- **Academic Leadership** - Academic leadership exemplifies a commitment to the institution and the discipline. Leadership activities include, but are not limited to, chairing committees and task forces on campus, coordinating operations of multi-section courses, and serving as a leader to scholarly organizations and entities that serve academia.

- **Professional Mentoring** - Professional mentoring encompasses a variety of activities, including the informal and formal mentoring of colleagues, participating in and/or leading programs designed to provide professional development to others, serving as a faculty advisor to a student group, and writing letters of recommendation.

- **Commitment to the Discipline** - There is a wide variety of review work that falls outside the scope of committee work (e.g., reviews for internal and external grant programs, scholarly journals, awards programs, tenure and promotion reviews, program reviews, etc.) This work is a normal component of service activities. Invitations to review work signifies stature in the discipline, or interdisciplinary field, while providing review work demonstrates a commitment to the discipline.

- **Public Outreach and Engagement** - Public outreach and engagement consists of service and leadership activities that benefit the local community, the state, the nation, and the broader

society. This includes but is not limited to speaking engagements for broader audiences, publication of editorial opinions, outreach activities to local schools, serving on the board of a community organization (relevant to one's area of scholarly expertise), and providing testimony based on one's area of expertise.

4.2.3.1 Sources for Evaluating Service

The evaluation of service is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Evaluation of service should focus on the significance and impact of the service activities to the department, college, university, academic discipline, or the broader community relative to the faculty member's title and percentage of assigned responsibility. There is not a prescribed list of items or sources to use in the evaluation of service. The key sources of information for evaluating service include the CV, annual review form (for annual reviews), and impact statement (for midterm and promotion reviews). Faculty may opt to include additional evidence for their service performance, including, but not limited to, support letters and emails that denote service contributions.

SECTION 5: 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 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 must collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (see Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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 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 50% 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.

5.1   Purpose

The purpose of annual reviews of faculty performance are to:

(1) Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.

(2) Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced or improved.

(3) Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion or tenure as relevant (refer to Section 2.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

(4) Allow for an 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.

(5) Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

(6) Ensure that faculty members are in compliance with all university compliance requirements. (System Regulation 33.05.02 – Required Employee Training).

In the College of Arts and Sciences, the annual review process is also an opportunity to provide feedback to faculty regarding their progress toward future promotion. For faculty with mandatory probationary periods, the promotion progress review is a required element of the annual review process. For all other faculty, the promotion progress review is optional. (See Section 5.6).

5.2   Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual faculty member'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 untenured assistant professors, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty, the annual review evaluates performance in their assigned areas of responsibility and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable. For more information see Section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research and/or creative work, clinical work, service, and/or administrative work shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual faculty member's appointment, the annual review, and the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department, college, and university.

5.3   Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediate previous calendar year, but may also include an expanded window (e.g., three years) for the review period. The College of Arts and Sciences does not have a college-prescribed window, and thus each department will determine the appropriate review window for each assigned area of responsibility. A department may have a one-year window for one area of performance (e.g., teaching and service), and a three-year window for other areas of performance (e.g., research and/or creative work).

5.4   Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual review, performance in each of the areas of responsibility and overall annual performance rating will be rated using the five-point rating scale outlined below. Department heads may or may not choose to refine these ratings with plus/minus designations (or the equivalent) during the merit review process. Sample indicators that align with the guiding criteria for each of the possible ratings for faculty performance are provided in Appendix B.

- **Unsatisfactory** – Performance that falls below norms and expectations of *Needs Improvement.* Sources of information are absent of evidence that a faculty member satisfies guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Meets Expectations* within the required area of responsibility, as adjusted for job track and stage of career.

- **Needs Improvement** – Performance that falls below norms and expectations of *Meets Expectations*. Sources of information contain minimal evidence that a faculty member satisfies guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Meets Expectations* within the required area of responsibility (as adjusted for job track and stage of career).

- **Meets Expectations** – Performance that meets the general norms and expectations. Sources of information contain sufficient evidence that a faculty member satisfies guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Meets Expectations* within the required area of responsibility (as adjusted for job track and stage of career).

- **Exceeds Expectations** – Performance that satisfies and surpasses the norms and expectations of *Meets Expectation.* Sources of information contain strong evidence that a faculty member exceeds guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Meets Expectations* within the required area of responsibility (as adjusted by job track and stage of career).

- **Outstanding** – Performance that is exceptional and surpasses the norms and expectations of *Exceeds Expectation*. For example, this rating might be used for a faculty member in a year in which a faculty member receives a highly prestigious external award or a highly competitive external grant or fellowship, etc. Sources of information contain exceptionally strong evidence that a faculty member significantly exceeds guiding criteria (set by the college) and specific criteria (set by the department) for *Meets Expectations* within the required area of responsibility (as adjusted by job track and stage of career).

5.5   Required Components for Annual Review

5.5.1   Annual Report of Faculty Member's Activities

Each year, every faculty member must submit an annual report in Faculty 180 outlining activities within each of their assigned areas of responsibility. In the report, faculty members should point out the status of long-term projects, set the context in which annual activities have occurred, and state short-term and long-term goals.

5.5.2   Evaluations from Department Heads or Supervisors

The Department head (or primary supervisor in the case of significant administrative appointments) will write an evaluation for the calendar year in a memorandum transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member must indicate receipt of the evaluation memorandum by signing a copy of the document. Faculty members should be allowed to provide written comments about the memorandum for their permanent personnel file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgement of the evaluation document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, as well as the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's departmental

personnel file. Moreover, the memorandum shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research and/or creative work, and/or service. Heads should also provide promotion-eligible faculty with an assessment of their progress towards promotion.

5.5.3   Compliance Review

Per system regulation, no faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating (i.e., rating of Meets Expectations or above) if they have not complied with all required Texas A&M University System and Texas A&M 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. All faculty must certify that they are up to date on TrainTraq trainings and submit their TrainTraq transcripts with their annual review materials.

Annual review of faculty performance for teaching must also consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member complies with all policies, rules, and deadlines associated with teaching. The college recommends that the annual evaluation rating accurately reflect situations where a faculty member is out of compliance with the policies listed below for teaching:

- Course Syllabi and CV must be posted no later than seven days after the first class day as stated in Texas Education Code 51.974.

- All required midterm grades and final grades, including the grades for graduating seniors, must be submitted on time.

- All attendance certifications (e.g., First Day of Attendance Certification) must be submitted accurately and on time.

5.5.4   Meeting between the Department Head (or supervisor) and the Faculty Member

Department heads (and supervisors) must provide an annual opportunity for a personal meeting 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, supervisor, or faculty member. It is strongly recommended that the head (or an appropriate delegate, such as the Associate Head or P&T committee chair) meet with all untenured tenure track faculty on an annual basis to discuss their progress towards tenure.

5.6   Promotion Progress Review

5.6.1   Feedback on Progress towards Tenure for Untenured Tenure Track Professors

Members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee must participate in an annual review of untenured assistant professors (and untenured associate professor, as applicable). Using annual review materials, this review must provide candid assessment of whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards tenure and promotion (relative to their year on the tenure clock), and to provide constructive feedback on ways to strengthen their overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The feedback is reported to the department head. The feedback may include a vote of all eligible faculty on whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress, as well as a vote on whether the faculty member's appointment as a tenure track faculty member should be continued. If a

vote is used, department guidelines should identify voting eligibility (i.e., either all tenured faculty or the tenured faculty serving on a promotion and tenure committee) and voting procedures (i.e., use of a secret ballot, procedures regarding absentee voting, etc.) The department head should independently review all annual review materials and provide a written memo to the faculty member (incorporating feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process). A copy of the department head's written evaluation of a faculty member must be submitted to the college (to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs).

5.6.2   Optional Feedback on Progress towards Promotion for Promotion-Eligible Faculty

Promotion eligible faculty should understand that having a series of positive annual reviews is not the best indicator of whether somebody is ready to come up for promotion. In other words, a faculty member can be doing very good work and meet or exceed expectations during annual reviews, but not yet have a record that merits promotion. For that reason, tenured associate professors and academic professional track faculty who are not at the highest rank have the *option* of requesting *informal* feedback on their progress towards promotion as part of the annual review process. The purpose of this optional review is (a) to provide a candid assessment of how the faculty member's record of performance aligns with departmental and college criteria for promotion, and/or (b) to provide constructive feedback on how the faculty member might strengthen the overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The promotion process involves a much more extensive review of performance. For that reason, a "positive" promotion progress review should not be viewed as a guarantee for a successful promotion case.

If a faculty member is interested in having a promotion progress review, they should inform their department head at the time that they submit their annual review materials. If a faculty member requests a promotion progress review, the faculty member's annual review materials should be shared with all faculty eligible to review and vote on that faculty member's promotion case (i.e., members of the department's P&T committee eligible to review and vote on faculty at that rank and title). Members of the committee should review annual review materials and provide feedback to the department head. The department head should independently review all annual review materials and provide oral feedback to the faculty member (incorporating feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process).

In accordance with university guidelines, a faculty member may opt to come up for a non-mandatory promotion at any time. In other words, there is no requirement that a faculty member have an optional promotion progress review. Similarly, there is no requirement that a faculty member receives a successful outcome from a promotion progress review prior to coming up for promotion (though it would be inadvisable for a candidate to fully ignore advice from the department committee).

5.7   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:

5.7.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities, 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).

For tenure track faculty, 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 the department head, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, 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).

For academic professional track faculty, an unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean's office. In consultation with the Dean (and/or their delegates), the head will work with the faculty member to address areas of concern. An academic professional track faculty member who receives "Unsatisfactory" for more than one year may be subject to further action. For additional guidance, see System Policy 12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, and University SAP 12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty.

5.7.2 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, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching or service, this plan should take one (1) year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may (but is not required) take up to three (3) years to complete successfully with clearly identified milestones at least yearly. For additional guidance, see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

If an academic professional track faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation, they must work with their department head to develop a plan for improvement.

5.8 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.

5.9   Complaint Procedure

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 Vice President for Faculty Affairs. 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 Vice President for Faculty Affairs. 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. A faculty member, however, may choose to write a written response to the head's evaluation. The head may revise their evaluation in the event that an error(s) was made. Alternatively, the response may be added to the faculty member's personnel file.

SECTION 6:   MIDTERM REVIEW FOR UNTENURED ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

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 midterm review for untenured assistant professors subject to a probationary period (of five or more years) be conducted to determine the progress towards tenure. In the College of Arts and Sciences, midterm reviews occur in the spring semester.

6.1   Purpose

- A midterm review is intended to provide a formative review of untenured assistant professors near the midpoint of their probationary period.

- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the promotion and tenure process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the promotion and tenure decision. The review will mimic the promotion and tenure process as closely as possible, including the submission of dossier items by the faculty member, with the exception of external letters of recommendation.

- As with the promotion and tenure process, the midterm review will include reviews by the department's P&T committee, the department head, the college's Dean's Advisory Committee – Tenure Track (DAC-TT), and the Dean. Midterm reviews, however, do not go beyond the college. The department-level review may be conducted by a subcommittee of the P&T committee if this is allowed in the departmental bylaws, as long as the subcommittee has a minimum of five members.

- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress. The review must result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service to date. The review must also provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

- If an untenured faculty member is not progressing adequately towards the requirements for tenure, the review might result in action to not renew the appointment.

6.2   Process

In the College of Arts and Sciences, midterm reviews are normally conducted between March and May of the target academic year. The mandatory probation period (and the timeline for the midterm review) must be clearly stated in the faculty member's offer letter. The table below describes the timeline for a standard probationary period of 7 years.

First year in probationary period	Probationary Period	Midterm Review will occur between
2022-23	7 years	March-May 2025

Faculty with a shorter probationary period may come up for midterm review in their first or second year on the tenure clock, as indicated in their appointment letter. Faculty who are considering the option of coming up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year must come up for midterm review prior to coming up for tenure (unless otherwise stated in their appointment letter).

Midterm reviews are a significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of untenured assistant professors and are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews must be conducted carefully, and faculty members must be provided with accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period.

Department heads should set a deadline for candidates to submit their midterm review materials that allows sufficient time for the department's P&T committee to meet and review the candidate's materials and submit departmental reports to the department head. The head must also submit a recommendation prior to the college deadline for midterm reviews.

6.3   College-Level Requirements for the Midterm Dossier

Each candidate's dossier should be prepared in accordance with the guidance for tenure and promotion. Works under review or in progress should be included. External review letters are not required.

Each candidate's midterm dossier should include the following:

(1) The candidate's personal statement (a maximum of three pages, single-spaced, 12-point font). The statement should explain the quality, productivity over time, and impact of teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service accomplishments. Each of these three assigned areas of responsibility must be addressed separately.

(2) An annotated curriculum vitae (CV) that follows university guidelines for promotion and tenure. This can be done using the university template (word doc) or through the Interfolio Faculty 180 created vita. The CV should clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications and identify whether unpublished manuscripts have been accepted for publication or are under review. The CV must include a statement by the faculty member acknowledging that the CV is correct and up to date.

(3) Copies of all annual review letters written by the department head and signed by the candidate. These letters are on file in the department and should be provided by the department head for the candidate to include in their midterm dossier.

(4) If the candidate is affiliated with an interdisciplinary program, the candidate may choose to include a support letter from the interdisciplinary program director or coordinator. This item is optional.

(5) Materials submitted for the department-level review, including publications, course syllabi, course evaluations, peer observations of teaching, etc. Candidates for midterm review should have a minimum of one peer observation of teaching (beginning in the 2024-25 review cycle).

(6) Departments should submit a summary report with separate sections focused on each area of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). The report should also include a section that summarizes the discussion of the committee about the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure. The teaching section should include a summary of student evaluations of teaching and peer observation(s) of teaching. The report should include the P&T committees' yes/no vote on the following questions: "Is the candidate making satisfactory progress towards promotion with tenure?" and "Should the candidate's appointment be continued for another year?"

(7) The department must also submit a recommendation from the department head indicating their overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The head's letter should also indicate their vote on the two questions stated in (6) above. Finally, the head's letter must indicate any progress they think needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

6.4   Feedback for Midterm Review

All faculty members going through the midterm review process must receive feedback on their progress towards promotion. In a memo to the department head, the Dean will convey the assessment and recommendation of the Dean's Advisory Committee – Tenure Track (DAC-TT), as well as the Dean's assessment based on the Dean's independent review of the dossier. The review of the DAC-TT will also include two votes as stated above. The memo will provide formative feedback on the formulating, implementing, and monitoring of plans for necessary actions in the remainder of the probationary period. The department head should schedule a meeting with the faculty member to review the Dean's memo and work with the candidate on a plan to address recommendations from both the department and the college.

SECTION 7: COLLEGE-LEVEL PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

7.1   Purpose

- To recognize the growing expertise and contributions of faculty at Texas A&M University.

- To provide an objective evaluation of a faculty member's record of accomplishments at several levels of review (i.e., department, college, university). For tenure track faculty, the evaluation will include external letters of evaluation focusing on research and/or creative work.

- To assess the quality, significance, and impact of a faculty member's work, as well as the potential for continued excellence.

- To determine whether a faculty member's performance in all assigned areas of responsibility merits promotion to the next rank within the career track corresponding to their job title (i.e., promotion from tenure track assistant professor to associate professor (with tenure), promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, promotion from instructional associate professor to instructional professor).

7.2   Focus

The focus of the promotion review process will vary by track and the desired rank for promotion. It is important to understand the "promotion" (from a lower rank to a higher rank within a job title track) is distinct from "reclassification" (from one job title track to another job title track). Promotion is based on an assessment that a faculty member's achievements and accomplishments meet the expectations of the higher rank and requires multiple levels of review (as indicated in this document). Reclassification is reserved for exceptional circumstances and is outside the scope of this document.

When evaluating performance for promotion, the weights given to teaching, research and/or creative work, clinical work, service, and/or administrative work shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual faculty member's appointment, the annual review, and the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department, college, and university.

7.3   Time Period of Review

The promotion process is on a similar timeline for all promotions, regardless of job title (with the exception of Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH) reviews). The overall timeline is set by the Office for the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, with college-level deadlines set by the College of Arts and Sciences.

In the spring of each year, the College of Arts and Sciences will release the timeline for review and submission of promotion materials to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs for the following academic year. This includes the deadline for departments to submit a candidate's dossier materials for external review and the deadline for departments to submit the candidate's dossier (including departmental reports) to the college. Typically, departments solicit external review letters (for tenure track promotion cases) in the spring, and conduct department level reviews in the early fall. The college level review process takes place in October and November, and the college submits promotion cases to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs in December. The university-level review of promotion cases takes place in January. Promotion and tenure decisions are reviewed by the University President (for all cases) and the Board of Regents (in the case of tenure cases only) in the spring. Promotion and tenure decisions become effective on September 1st of each year.

7.3.1   Mandatory Promotion Reviews

The department head or chair of the departmental Promotion and Tenure-Committee should identify mandatory candidates for promotion and tenure in the early part of the calendar year. Faculty with mandatory promotion reviews will be informed of the timeline for their review, and asked to confirm that they intend to submit the documentation for promotion and tenure.

7.3.2   Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH)

Faculty who are hired at Texas A&M University at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH). Note that tenure is obtained only by a positive recommendation by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the University President. The review and submission process for TRUH is out-of-cycle for all TRUH candidates. The process may be expedited for TRUH candidates who are professors at aspirant peer institutions and/or professors who are members of the National Academy of Sciences. The University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure include information on external review letter requirements for TRUH cases.

7.4   Time Considerations

7.4.1. Assistant Professors (Tenure Track)

Assistant professors have a mandatory review date for tenure set at the time of hire. The "standard" tenure clock at Texas A&M University involves a 7-year probationary period, with a "mandatory" tenure review that starts at the end of the 5th year and takes place during the 6th year. Some faculty may be hired with a shorter tenure clock, particularly if they have years of experience in a tenure track position at a peer university.

7.4.1.1 "Early" Tenure Reviews

Candidates may opt to undergo review prior to their mandatory year (i.e., early tenure review), as long as they have completed the midterm review. Candidates considering this option are strongly encouraged to speak to their mentors and department head prior to indicating a desire to come up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year.

7.4.1.2 Tenure Clock Extensions

Candidates may request an extension to the probationary period in accordance with the University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure; Candidate Process Section. Requests for tenure clock extension are submitted by the faculty member, and approved by the department head, the Dean, and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Candidates who receive tenure clock extensions are held to the same standard as all other candidates. In other words, they should not be expected to have a stronger record due to a clock extension. Candidates who receive tenure clock extensions may later decide against using the clock extensions (as long as they inform their department head in the spring semester before coming up for tenure).

7.4.1.3 "Credit" for Accomplishments Prior to Employment on the Tenure Track at TAMU

In the College of Arts and Sciences, department and college-level reviews for promotion (with tenure) factor in the candidate's entire record of accomplishment (inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to their appointment on the tenure track at Texas A&M). The assessment of **scholarly impact** and **independence and intellectual leadership**, for example, will factor in all accomplishments. With the exception of candidates with a very short tenure clock (i.e. one or two years), assessments of **productivity and trajectory** will place greater weight on accomplishments achieved while on the tenure track at Texas A&M. In other words, there needs to be evidence that there is both a continuous and a positive trajectory.

7.4.2   Tenured Faculty

Candidates who are tenured do not have a mandatory time to undergo review to professor. Faculty may choose to become a candidate for promotion at any time. They need to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service, with national and/or international recognition. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in Section 5.6, and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors in order to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.4.2.1 "Credit" for Accomplishments Prior to Tenure

In the College of Arts and Sciences, department and college-level reviews for promotion to professor factor in the candidate's entire record of accomplishment (inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to obtaining tenure at Texas A&M or elsewhere). For this second promotion, **productivity** and **trajectory** continue to be important guiding criteria, while **scholarly impact** and **independence and intellectual leadership** increase in relative importance. In other words, candidates for professor must be able to demonstrate that they have continued to be productive (with a positive trajectory) since obtaining tenure. In addition, there must be increasing evidence that their work is innovative and impactful, and that they have become an intellectual leader in their chosen area of specialty.

7.4.3   Academic Professional Track Faculty

Candidates on academic professional tracks do not have a mandatory time to undergo review for promotion. Candidates need to demonstrate sustained excellence in their assigned areas of responsibilities, as defined in their letter of appointment. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in Section 5.6, and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.5   Other Special Considerations

7.5.1   Reviewing Faculty with Budgeted Joint Appointments

Reviews of faculty with funded joint appointments will follow guidance in the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Such faculty will be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by both units in accordance with guidelines from both units. Both units should collaborate on the selection of external reviewers.

7.5.2   Reviewing Faculty Transitioning to the College from University Libraries

Faculty members who transitioned from University Libraries into the College of Arts and Sciences will be evaluated based on expectations outlined in departmental and college guidelines. However, candidates who originally had appointments in the University Libraries may have unique records of accomplishments that draw on their areas of expertise. Faculty who have moved from University Libraries have the option to include an annual statement summarizing library and information discipline-related work with their other annual evaluation materials. As appropriate, annual appointment letters should indicate any ways in which their assigned areas of responsibility differ from the departmental

norm. For example, if part of their teaching responsibilities include providing instruction to students on how to conduct library-based research, this should be described in the appointment letter. Similarly, if part of their service responsibilities may include providing guidance to faculty on data management, the use of altmetrics, then this should be indicated in the appointment letter. Promotion reviews would then factor in the information that is provided in the annual appointment letters. When selecting external review letter writers for faculty transitioning from university libraries, it is acceptable to include letters from tenured faculty librarians at other universities (assuming all university criteria for the selection of external review letters are met).

7.5.3 Reviewing Faculty Appointed at the Higher Education Center at McAllen

Faculty at the Higher Education Center at McAllen (HECM) will be reviewed by the P&T committee of their academic department at the College Station campus. Candidates from HECM should not be disadvantaged in the review process by unique contextual factors that are beyond their control (e.g., lower enrollments, fewer service opportunities, less support resources for teaching, etc.) As appropriate, departments guidelines must specify how faculty members at McAllen will be evaluated.

7.5.4 Reviewing Faculty Whose Records Qualify as Exceptions to Normal Requirements

In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.5.4, exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure, or more commonly promotion to professor, 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 recognition 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.

7.6 College-Level Requirements for the Candidate's Promotion Dossier

The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the promotion dossier, as listed in the University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines. The following elements are **_required_** and must be submitted by any candidate seeking promotion.

7.6.1 Promotion Impact Statement

Candidates must submit an impact statement that explains the quality, productivity over time, and the impact of their accomplishments in each of their assigned areas of responsibility (teaching, research and/or creative work). Following university guidelines, the candidate's three-page narrative statement should:

- be organized with a separate section for any area of professional responsibility that applies to the candidate's job title,

- explain the quality, productivity, impact, and future trajectory of the candidate in each area of responsibility,

- be written to engage and be understood by both a general academic readership (e.g., dean, president) and by a professional readership (e.g., external reviewers),

- address the candidate's perspective on past, present, and future performance and accomplishments,

- should provide a clear context for any metrics provided as indirect proxies for impact, and

- provide a narrative that provides a context for understanding other items in the dossier.

The weighting of areas of responsibility will vary across title, rank, and departments, and the statement should reflect the weights assigned to the individual faculty member. For example, a faculty member who is assigned 75% responsibility in teaching should dedicate the majority of the statement to describing the impacts of their contributions to teaching. For more detailed guidance on how to craft a promotion impact statement, see the additional examples and guides in the university guidelines for promotion and tenure.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback on their impact statement from their mentors, P&T chair, department head and/or associate head prior to submission.

7.6.2   Annotated Curriculum Vitae (CV)

Candidates should prepare an annotated curriculum vitae (CV) following university guidelines for promotion and tenure. This can be done using the university template (word doc) or through Interfolio Faculty 180 created vita. Candidates are strongly encouraged to annotate their CV, as needed, to highlight the impact of their work and their specific contributions. Labels can also be added to indicate publications that include undergraduate, graduate or postdoc co-authors. In the areas of teaching and service, annotations can be added to describe new course preparations, modifications based on professional development activities, and contributions within a service role. Candidates should be careful to avoid padding their CV. For example, refereed publications should be listed separately from non-refereed publications, and publications that have been accepted but not yet published should be clearly labeled.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback on their CV from their mentors, P&T chair, department head and/or associate head prior to submission.

7.6.3   Teaching Materials/Portfolio

Candidates are required to submit the documents as evidence and examples of materials they use in courses they teach. Documents required in the teaching portfolio are:

(1) **Course syllabi**. Candidates for promotion (with tenure) should include copies of syllabi for all courses taught as an untenured faculty member at Texas A&M (e.g., one syllabus for each course prep). All other candidates for promotion should minimally include copies of syllabi for all courses taught within the past 5 years.

(2) **Representative sample of course assignments and exams**. Candidates should provide a sufficient range of materials to assess the scope, rigor, and quality of course offerings.

(3) **Student evaluations of teaching**. Candidates for promotion (with tenure) should include copies of all student evaluations of teaching for courses taught as an untenured faculty member at

Texas A&M. All other candidates for promotion should minimally include copies of student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught within the past 5 years. Candidates should include a table summarizing their teaching evaluations (as outlined in the university guidelines).

Peer observations of teaching. The College of Arts and Sciences requires ***two reports from peer observations of teaching*** prior to each promotion evaluation (beginning with the 2024-25 review cycle). It is the department's responsibility to ensure that peer observations of teaching are conducted; however, a faculty member may make their own arrangements, as long as they inform their department head. Departments may choose to arrange for more than the required number of peer observations (i.e., annual peer observations). Peer observations may be conducted by departmental faculty or faculty from outside the department, as long as the faculty member holds a title that is at least the rank for which the candidate is seeking promotion. Consultants from the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) can do formative reviews of teaching so faculty can strengthen their teaching practice, but the CTE does not do teaching observations for midterm review or promotion purposes. or consultants from the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE). Peer observations of teaching may be provided by departmental faculty who are not eligible to vote on a candidate's case (e.g., an instructional professor can conduct a peer observation for assistant or associate professor).

In the event that a candidate has had more than two peer observations of teaching, the candidate may choose which peer observations of teaching to include with their midterm and promotion reviews. Candidates may choose to include reports from peer observations of teaching from different academic years to give a longitudinal evaluation of their teaching. Alternatively, they may choose to include reports from peer observations from different types of classes to show their versatility. Untenured assistant professors may include the report submitted with their midterm review materials as one of the two required reports.

Individuals who conduct these peer observations should provide copies of the report to the candidate and the department personnel file. A sample document that can be used to write a report summarizing the peer observation of teaching is provided in Appendix B. Alternative instruments are available on the Center for Teaching Evaluation's website.

(4) **Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdocs**. This information should be listed on the CV and may also be in the narrative statement.

7.6.4 Research and/or Creative Work Materials

Candidates who have research and/or creative work as one of their assigned areas of responsibilities **are required to submit** the following materials:

(1) Selected publications that best exemplify a scholar's greatest research and/or creative contributions (Faculty may choose to include all publications, or a subset of publications)

Other sources that may be helpful, but are **not required**, to evaluate research and/or creative work include:

(1) Information regarding digital scholarship, performances, or creative work (other than published work),

(2) Copies of funded grant proposals,

(3) Copies of patents, and/or

(4) Information on scholarly metrics that are valued within the discipline or department, such as journal impact factors, H-index, etc. (If included, metrics should be contextualized within the discipline, and journal impact factors should be provided for all journals.).

7.6.5   Service Materials

There is not a prescribed list of items or sources to use in the evaluation of service. The key sources of information for evaluating service include the CV and the promotion impact statement. Faculty may opt to include additional evidence for their service performance in their dossier, including support letters, emails that acknowledge service contributions, etc.

7.6.6   External Review Letters

Requirements for external review letters vary by track and job title.

7.6.6.1 Tenure Track Faculty

External letters are required for candidates in tenure track positions seeking promotion to either associate professor or professor. Following university guidelines, the college expects a minimum of five letters, with a minimum of three letters selected by the departmental P&T committee. (Per university guidelines, potential reviewers that are on both the department list and the candidate list can count in either category.) Departments should follow university guidelines on procedures for selecting potential letter writers, sending solicitation letter, and for documenting such requests. Departments should request approval from the Dean for any letters that are not "arm's length" from the candidate as defined in the university guidelines. Departments should request no more than eight letters in the initial solicitation, ideally four from the department list and four from the candidate list. Those who review a candidate's dossier should not interpret a lack of response from a reviewer as a negative statement against the candidate. At no time should a candidate inquire about the status of reviewers they nominated or contact them about their review.

7.6.6.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty (Research Professors)

Following university guidelines, academic professional track faculty with research titles are required to have external review letters. All the requirements stated above for tenure track faculty apply to faculty in research titles. The solicitation letter should be modified, to reflect the candidate's job responsibilities.

7.6.6.3 Academic Professional Track Faculty (All Other Tracks)

For all other academic professional track job titles, external review letters are optional. Either a department or a candidate may choose to include external or internal review letters. If solicited, letters should be from faculty who are either tenured professors and/or academic professional track faculty (at an equivalent rank to the rank they are seeking) from other institutions.

The purpose of these letters may vary from one case to the next. For example, an instructional faculty member who has an active research agenda may benefit from external review letters that speak to the quality of their research. Similarly, an APT faculty member who has an active record of service with professional societies outside of the university might benefit from an external letter that speaks to the

impact of their service contributions. Finally, an APT faculty member who has made contributions within the university yet external to their department may benefit from internal letters from colleagues outside of their department.

If letters are desired, the department should work with the candidate to identify a short list of potential letter writers. The letter writer may or may not know the candidate; letters may come from faculty who do not meet the "arm's length" required for tenure track external review letters. All requests for external and internal letters should come from the department (not the candidate). The department should modify the solicitation letter template from university guidelines, as needed, to reflect the candidate's job responsibilities and the purpose of the letter. Letters for APT faculty (in non-research tracks) should be included in the "Other documents" (Item 13) section of Interfolio.

7.6.7   COVID-19 Impact Statement (Optional)

Faculty may include an optional COVID-19 impact statement in their promotion dossier that provides a context for evaluating performance in each of their assigned areas of responsibility. For most faculty, this would include a combination of research or creative work activities, teaching activities, and service activities. For some faculty in the college, this might also include clinical and administrative responsibilities. The option to include COVID-19 impact statements will continue until the point at which the timeframe for a given promotion review no longer includes the years that are covered by the COVID-19 impact statement (i.e., 2020 and 2021). The primary objective of the COVID-19 impact statement is to provide a context for understanding the impact of the pandemic on a faculty member's professional workload and responsibilities.

7.6.8   Verification of Contents Letter

This statement, written by the candidate, accurately describes the materials they have submitted for departmental review for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration.

7.7   College-Level Requirements for the Department Level Review

7.7.1   Department P&T Committee

Each department must identify procedures for identifying members of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee (i.e., committee of the whole vs. an elected or appointed committee) in their departmental guidelines. All P&T committees need to have a minimum of five eligible committee members, as required by university guidelines. All committee members should participate in the discussion and vote of each case, unless there is a legitimate reason for them to recuse themselves from the discussion.

7.7.2   Department Voting Procedures

Each department must identify voting procedures in their departmental guidelines, including policies regarding absentee voting and the timing of a vote. Eligible committee members should make every effort to attend the P&T committee meetings. Absences are allowed only with a justifiable cause, and that cause should be noted in the department report. Recusals are allowed only in cases where there is a conflict of interest. Individual votes must be confidential.

7.7.3   Department Report

The department must prepare a summary report with separate sections focused on each of the assigned areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). Sections should be proportional to weights assigned to each area of responsibility. The report should evaluate the level of accomplishment and trajectory relative to disciplinary norms and standards. The research section should include a review of the quality and impact of selected publications or works, and address the candidate's contributions to any multi-authored works. The teaching section should include a summary of student evaluations of teaching and peer observation(s) of teaching. The service section should explain the candidate's involvement and contributions, as well as the impact of their service activities. The report should also include a section that summarizes the discussion of the committee about the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure. The report must address any negative comments from external review letters (as applicable), identify any questions that emerged during the discussion of the case, and explain the votes, including the context and justification for negative votes (if discussed during the meeting). The department report and recommendation to the head is advisory in nature. The report should include the P&T committees' yes/no vote on the promotion case, following university guidelines. Departmental committee discussions must be kept confidential.

7.7.4   Department Head Recommendation

The department head letter must provide an independent review of the candidate's teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. The head's letter should provide a basis for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The head's letter should also provide relevant contextual information for understanding the case. This might include disciplinary and departmental norms regarding authorship, publication venues, citations, grants, teaching assignments, student evaluations of teaching, undergraduate and graduate student mentoring, service assignments (relative to job title and rank). The head's letter should address P&T committee reports that need clarification (e.g., low rate of participation, discrepancies between votes and assessment, unclear evaluative statements). The head's letter should also address any special considerations, including but not limited to unresolved issues with the candidate's professional conduct that resulted in documented sanctions, and restrictions or other personnel actions. If the department head's recommendation is contrary to the departmental committee's recommendation, the head should clearly explain the basis for their recommendation.

7.8   Dean's Advisory Committees (DAC)

The college-level review of promotion cases will be completed by two separate Dean's Advisory Committees (DACs); one will review promotion and tenure cases for tenure track faculty and the other will review promotion cases for academic professional track faculty. The purpose of the college-level review is to evaluate candidate's contributions relative to the college's expectations and within the context of the college mission. Committee members are nominated by the department heads and appointed by the Dean, and serve staggered three-year terms, with approximately one-third of each committee rotating each year. In selecting members for the DAC committees, the Dean will strive to form appropriately diverse committees that represent the gender, race and ethnic diversity of faculty at the highest rank of each track, as well as broad disciplinary diversity of faculty across the College of Arts

and Sciences. The names of all DAC members to be appointed to both committees will be presented to department heads and the college executive committee for endorsement.

(1) **The Dean's Advisory Committee – Tenure Track (DAC-TT)** reviews promotion cases for tenure track faculty. The DAC-TT consists of 10 faculty members at the rank of professor.

(2) **The Dean's Advisory Committee – Academic Professional Track (DAC-APT)** reviews promotion cases for academic professional track faculty. Beginning with the 2023-24 review cycle, the DAC-APT will consist of 8 academic professional track faculty at the highest rank in their job title (e.g., instructional professor, clinical professor, research professor, etc.) Research assistant and research associate professors will be reviewed by the DAC-TT, but will be eligible to serve on the DAC-APT.

7.9   Required Steps for College-Level Faculty Promotion Review

7.9.1   College Level Discussion of Candidates

The DAC-TT will review all tenure and promotion cases involving faculty with tenure track appointments (and APT faculty in research professor titles). The DAC-APT will review all promotion cases involving faculty with academic professional track appointments (with the exception of APT faculty in the research professor titles). Each promotion case will be presented to all DAC members by a primary and secondary reviewer who will be responsible for writing the Dean's Advisory Committee report for that case. Members of the DAC-TT and DAC-APT will recuse themselves from the discussion and will not vote on cases from their home department. At least one dean's delegate will attend in ex officio capacity to ensure proper procedures are followed and proper information is used by the committee. The dean's delegate will recuse themselves from the discussion on cases from their home department.

7.9.2   College Level Voting Procedures

All members of the DAC-TT and DAC-APT will vote by secret ballot if they were present for the discussion of the case. The committee's confidential vote will be tallied and shared with committee members after all cases for faculty in a particular faculty title have been reviewed. The nature of the vote (i.e., positive or negative) will be communicated to the department head to be shared with the candidate.

7.9.3   College-Level Report

As required by university guidelines, the Dean's Advisory Committee report will summarize the main points discussed during the meeting and record the committee vote. The college-level report should be consistent with the votes, and explain mixed votes. The primary and secondary reviewers will prepare a draft report that is shared with other members of the DAC. The primary and secondary reviewers will finalize the report, based upon comments from all members, and then all members who participated in the discussion will review and sign the report.

7.9.4   Dean's Review

The college-level review process concludes with the independent recommendation of the Dean. Following university guidelines, the Dean's report will provide a general basis for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the case, address any mixed or negative votes, and explain the decision for the Dean's recommendation.

SECTION 8: COLLEGE-LEVEL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

8.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of responsibility (teaching, research and/or creative work, and service), with primary emphasis on the guiding criteria for each area of responsibility. For promotion and/or tenure, candidates must demonstrate that they meet the guiding criteria (set by the college) and the specific criteria (set by their department). Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

Guiding criteria play a key role in the evaluation of faculty performance in general and serve as the *college-level expectations* for each area of responsibility and promotion to the next rank. Not all guiding criteria, however, are relevant for every promotion. See criteria by rank and job title outlined in the sections below. For descriptions of college-level guiding criteria, see Section 4.0. For sample indicators for promotion corresponding to each of the guiding criteria, see Appendix A.

8.1.1 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor (with Tenure)

To meet expectations for promotion to associate professor (with tenure), a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. The college criteria, with sample indicators, are described in Appendix A.

8.1.1.1 **Teaching**. Candidates for promotion to associate professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate, and where appropriate, graduate teaching. Candidates must have a record of *high-quality teaching*, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates should provide evidence that they have engaged in *professional development* activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness. Candidates should demonstrate that they have contributed to the *development of curriculum* in their department, though such contributions might be limited to the development of new courses. Candidates should demonstrate that they have provided an *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students, and as appropriate, graduate students and/or postdoctoral scholars under their supervision.

8.1.1.2 **Research and/or Creative Work**. Candidate for promotion to associate professor must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and their research record must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. Candidates for promotion to associate professor must provide evidence of *productivity* as appropriate for their discipline. Candidates for promotion to associate professor must also demonstrate that they have established *scholarly independence and signs of intellectual leadership* through a record of accomplishment that is separate from their dissertation and/or postdoctoral work. The candidate should also be making original research contributions within their area of specialty. The research record should also include some signs of *scholarly impact* within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline or the department). Candidates for promotion must also demonstrate that they are on a *positive trajectory*, as evidenced by projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future. For promotion to associate professor, the majority of research and/or creative work activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

8.1.1.3 **Service**. Candidates for promotion to associate professor must show evidence that they meet at least two guiding criteria for service: *institutional engagement* and *commitment to the discipline*. Candidates may also show evidence of achievements related to other three guiding criteria. Faculty members who have significant achievements in these three service criteria may substitute these service activities for a weaker record in either of the two required service criteria for promotion to associate professor. For promotion to associate professor, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

8.1.2 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to professor, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. The college criteria, with sample indicators, are described in Appendix A.

8.1.2.1 **Teaching**. Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate, and where appropriate, graduate teaching. The types of contributions in the areas of professional development, curricular development and impact beyond the classroom should be more substantial than that expected for promotion to associate professor. Candidates must have a record of *high-quality teaching*, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates should provide evidence that they have engaged in *professional development* activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness. Candidates for promotion to professor may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching. Candidates should demonstrate that they have contributed to the *development of curriculum* in their department. Contributions to curricular development should be substantial for those seeking promotion to professor. Candidates should demonstrate that they have provided an *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students, and as appropriate, graduate students and/or postdoctoral scholars under their supervision.

8.1.2.2 **Research and/or Creative Work**. Candidates for promotion to professor must show evidence accomplishment and stature sufficient to merit promotion at any major research university. Candidates for promotion to professor must provide evidence of continued *productivity* as appropriate for their discipline. Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate that they have established *scholarly independence and intellectual leadership* through their scholarly record, as well as the candidate's national and international visibility. The candidate's contributions to the discipline or area of specialty should be viewed as original and creative. The research record should include significant signs of *scholarly impact* within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline or the department). Candidates for promotion must also demonstrate that they continue to be on a *positive trajectory*, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future. For promotion to professor, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (see Appendix A).

8.1.2.3 **Service**. Candidates for promotion to professor must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for multiple guiding criteria for service: *institutional engagement, academic leadership, commitment to the discipline, professional mentoring,* and *academic leadership*. Candidates may also show evidence that align with the fifth guiding criteria: *public engagement and outreach*. Faculty members who have significant achievements in this last area may substitute these service activities for a weaker record in any of the other areas. For promotion to professor, candidates should have some Level

---

Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (as described in Appendix A).

8.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

Academic professional track faculty members will typically be reviewed by departments for promotion after five years in any rank. If an individual's record of accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of the rank of at the next level, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion prior to five years in rank.

Academic professional track faculty should be evaluated for promotion based on accomplishments in their assigned areas of responsibility (teaching, research and/or creative work, and/or service). For promotion, candidates must demonstrate they have meritorious accomplishments that align with the guiding criteria (set by the college; see Section 4.0), the specific criteria (set by their department), and demonstrate a high potential for continued excellence.

Candidates seeking promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, instructional associate professor, clinical associate professor, or associate professor of the practice must demonstrate impact within the university in their assigned areas of responsibility. Candidates seeking promotion to the rank of principal lecturer, instructional professor, clinical professor, research professor or professor of the practice must demonstrate significant and sustained impact within the university, or some achievements beyond the university in at least one of their assigned areas of responsibility. Departments may set unit-specific criteria and indicators but cannot impose research expectations on academic professional track faculty in titles where research is not expected, nor can research be substituted for service in titles where service is required.

8.2.1 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To meet expectations for promotion to senior lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to senior lecturer requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and demonstrated impact of the accomplishments within the university. Candidates seeking promotion to senior lecturer must have an established record of *high-quality teaching* and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in *professional development* activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate they have contributed to the *development of curriculum* in their department, as appropriate for the department, and may demonstrate *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students, though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title. Candidates may also have service and/or research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities, but these are not required for promotion within the lecturer track. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in Appendix A.

8.2.2 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Principal Lecturer

To meet expectations for promotion to principal lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to principal lecturer requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in

leadership, particularly as it relates to teaching, within the university or have some teaching related achievements beyond the university. Candidates seeking promotion to principal lecturer must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching and have an established record of *high-quality teaching*, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Contributions in the areas of *professional development* are required and should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to senior lecturer. For promotion to principal lecturer, candidates must have some achievements that demonstrate *impact beyond the classroom*. Achievements in *curricular development* are not generally required for this track, though may be appropriate in some departments. Candidates may also have service and/or research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities, but these are not required for promotion within the lecturer track. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in Appendix A.

8.2.3   Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to instructional associate professor, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to instructional associate professor requires demonstrated impact within the university in their assigned areas of responsibility. The evaluation for promotion must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letters. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarly work, and service are given in Appendix A.

8.2.3.1 **Teaching**. Candidates seeking promotion to instructional associate professor must have an established record of *high-quality teaching* and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in *professional development* activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate that they have contributed to the *development of curriculum* in their department (as appropriate for the department) and may have achievements that demonstrate an *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department), though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title.

8.2.3.2 **Service or Research/Creative Work**. Candidates seeking promotion to instructional associate professor must either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of research, but not both. In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for *institutional engagement*, and at least one of the other four guiding criteria: *academic leadership, commitment to the discipline, professional mentoring,* and/or *public engagement and outreach*. For promotion to instructional associate professor, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

In cases where research is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must provide evidence of research *productivity*. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have established *scholarly independence* through a record of accomplishment that is separate from their dissertation and/or postdoctoral work. The scholarly record should demonstrate some signs of *impact* within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline). Finally, candidates must also demonstrate that they are on a *positive trajectory*. For promotion to instructional associate professor, the majority of research and/or creative work activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities. In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have service contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

8.2.4   Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to instructional professor, a candidate should demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to instructional professor requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership within the university or have some professional achievements related to their areas of responsibilities beyond the university. The evaluation for promotion to instructional professor must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letter. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarly work, and service are given in Appendix A.

8.2.4.1 **Teaching**. Candidates seeking promotion to instructional professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching and have an established record of *high-quality teaching*, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must also provide evidence that they have significant contributions in *professional development* activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. The professional development activities should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to instructional associate professor. Candidates for promotion to instructional professor may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching. For promotion to instructional professor, candidates must have some meritorious achievements that demonstrate either *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department) or *curricular development*. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in Appendix A.

8.2.4.2 **Service or Research/Creative Work**. Candidates must either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of research, but not both. In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for *institutional engagement*, and at least two of the other four guiding criteria for service*: academic leadership*, *commitment to the discipline*, *professional mentoring* and/or *public engagement and outreach*. For promotion to instructional professor, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must provide evidence of research *productivity*. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have established *scholarly independence and intellectual leadership*. The scholarly record should demonstrate significant signs of *impact* within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline). Finally, candidates must also demonstrate that they continue to be on a *positive trajectory*. For promotion to instructional professor, the majority of research and/or creative work activities will continue to be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A), unlike faculty on the tenure track.

In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have research and/or creative work contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities. In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have service contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

8.2.5 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, a candidate should demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor requires demonstrated impact within the university in their assigned areas of responsibility. The evaluation for promotion must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarly work, and service are given in Appendix A.

8.2.5.1 **Teaching**. Candidates seeking promotion to clinical associate professor must have an established record of *high-quality teaching*, including training in a clinical setting, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must also provide evidence that they have engaged in *professional development* activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate that they have contributed to the *development of curriculum* in their department, as appropriate for the department and may have achievements that demonstrate an *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department), though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title.

8.2.5.2 **Service or Research/Creative Work**. Candidates must either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of research, but not both. In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet at least one of the five guiding criteria for service: *institutional engagement*, including clinical work that benefits the department. Candidates should also show evidence of achievements or activities relevant to one of the other four guiding criteria. For promotion to clinical associate professor, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

In cases where research is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must provide evidence of research *productivity*. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have established *scholarly independence* through a record of accomplishment that is separate from their dissertation and/or postdoctoral work. The scholarly record should demonstrate some signs of *impact* within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline). Finally, candidates must also demonstrate that they are on a *positive trajectory*. For promotion to clinical associate professor, the majority of research and/or creative work activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in [Appendix A](#)).

In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities. In cases where research is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have service contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

8.2.6 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to Clinical Professor, a candidate should demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to Clinical Professor requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership within the university or have some professional achievements related to their areas of responsibilities beyond the university. The evaluation for promotion to clinical professor must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letter. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarly work, and service are given in Appendix A.

8.2.6.1 **Teaching**. Candidates seeking promotion to clinical professor must have a record of ***high-quality teaching***, including training in a clinical setting, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must also provide evidence that they have engaged in ***professional development*** activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. The professional development activities should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to clinical associate professor. Candidates for promotion to clinical professor may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching or activities in the clinical setting. For promotion to clinical professor, candidates must have some meritorious achievements that demonstrate either ***impact beyond the classroom*** to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department) or ***curricular development***. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in Appendix A.

8.2.6.2 **Service or Research/Creative Work**. Candidates must either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of research, but not both. In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for ***institutional engagement***, including clinical work that benefits the department, and at least two of the other four guiding criteria for service***: academic leadership***, ***commitment to the discipline***, ***professional mentoring*** and/or ***public engagement and outreach***. For promotion to clinical professor, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (see Appendix A).

In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must provide evidence of research ***productivity***. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have established ***scholarly independence and intellectual leadership***. The scholarly record should demonstrate significant signs of ***impact*** within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline). Finally, candidates must also demonstrate that they continue to be on a ***positive trajectory***. For promotion to clinical professor, the majority of research and/or creative work activities will continue to be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A), unlike faculty on the tenure track.

In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities. In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have service contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

8.2.7   Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Research Associate Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to research associate professor, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to research associate professor requires demonstrated impact in research and in their other assigned area of responsibility. The evaluation for promotion must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in research and/or scholarly work, teaching, and service for research associate professors are given in Appendix A.

8.2.7.1 **Research and/or Creative Work.** Candidates for promotion to research associate professor must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and their research record must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. Candidates for promotion to research associate professor must provide evidence of *productivity* as appropriate for their discipline. Candidates for promotion to research associate professor must also demonstrate that they have established *scholarly independence and signs of intellectual leadership* through a record of accomplishment that is separate from their dissertation and/or postdoctoral work. The candidate should also be making original research contributions within their area of specialty. The research record should also include some signs of *scholarly impact* within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline or the department). Candidates for promotion must also demonstrate that they are on a *positive trajectory*, as evidenced by projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future. For promotion to research associate professor, the majority of research and/or creative work activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

8.2.7.2 **Teaching or Service**. Candidates for promotion to research associate professor may also be evaluated either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of teaching, but not both. If teaching is an assigned area of responsibility, candidates must have a record of *high-quality teaching* and provide evidence that they have engaged in some *professional development* activities for teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate that they have contributed to the *development of curriculum* in their department, as appropriate for the department. Candidates may demonstrate *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students, though this is optional for this track.

If service is an assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed criteria for *institutional engagement* and *commitment to the discipline* and may also show evidence of achievements related to other three guiding criteria (*academic leadership, professional mentoring,* and/or *public engagement and outreach)*, but it is not required. Candidates who have significant achievements for these three service criteria may substitute these service activities for a weaker record in either of the two required service criteria for promotion to associate professor.

8.2.8   Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Research Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to research professor, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to research associate professor requires significant impact in research and in their other assigned area of responsibility. The evaluation for promotion must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their

appointment letters. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in research and/or scholarly work, teaching, and service for research professors are given in Appendix A.

8.2.8.1 **Research and/or Creative Work**. Candidates for promotion to research professor must provide evidence of continued *productivity* as appropriate for their discipline. Candidates for promotion to research professor must demonstrate that they have established *scholarly independence and intellectual leadership* through their scholarly record, as well as the candidate's national and international visibility. The candidate's contributions to the discipline or area of specialty should be viewed as original and creative. The research record should include significant signs of *scholarly impact* within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline or the department). Candidates for promotion must also demonstrate that they continue to be on a *positive trajectory*, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future. For promotion to research professor, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A), comparable to faculty on the tenure track.

8.2.8.2 **Teaching or Service.** Candidates for promotion to research professor may also be evaluated either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of teaching, but not both. If teaching is an assigned area of responsibility, candidates must have a record of *high-quality teaching*. Candidates should provide evidence that they have engaged in *professional development* activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness. Candidates for promotion to instructional professor may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching. Candidates should provide evidence that they have contributed to the *development of curriculum* in their department. Candidates should demonstrate that they have provided an *impact beyond the classroom* to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department).

If service is an assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for *institutional engagement*, and at least two of the other four guiding criteria for service*: academic leadership*, *commitment to the discipline*, *professional mentoring* and/or *public engagement and outreach*. For promotion to research professor, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A), unlike faculty on the tenure track.

8.2.9   Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor of the Practice

To meet expectations for promotion to associate professor of the practice, a candidate must demonstrate meritorious accomplishments in the area of teaching and demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching (and graduate teaching as appropriate). Candidates must have demonstrated impact of accomplishments within the university. The evaluation for promotion must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching and service are given in Appendix A.

8.2.9.1 **Teaching**. Candidates seeking promotion to associate professor of the practice must have a record of *high-quality teaching* and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in *professional development* activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate that

they have contributed to the ***development of curriculum*** in their department (as appropriate for the department) and may have achievements that demonstrate an ***impact beyond the classroom*** to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department), though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title.

8.2.9.2 **Service or Research/Creative Work**. Candidates must either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of research, but not both. In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for ***institutional engagement***, and at least one of the other four guiding criteria. For promotion to associate professor of the practice, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must provide evidence of research ***productivity***. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have established ***scholarly independence*** through a record of accomplishment that is separate from their dissertation and/or postdoctoral work. The scholarly record should demonstrate some signs of ***impact*** within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline). Finally, candidates must also demonstrate that they are on a ***positive trajectory***. For promotion to associate professor of the practice, the majority of research and/or creative work activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A).

In cases where research is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities. In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have service contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

8.2.10 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Professor of the Practice

Professors of the Practice are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in their activities, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters. To meet expectations for promotion to professor of the practice, a candidate must have meritorious accomplishments in the area of teaching and demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching (and graduate teaching as appropriate). Candidates must have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership within the university or have some professional achievements related to their areas of responsibilities beyond the university. It is also necessary that professors of the practice to demonstrate meritorious accomplishments in their secondary area of activity as well as any contributions to education in their professional area in which they are credentialed or have extensive experiences. The evaluation criteria outlined in Appendix A serve as the suggested indicators for the guiding criteria for promotion to associate professor of the practice.

8.2.4.1 **Teaching**. Candidates seeking promotion to professor of the practice must have an established record of ***high-quality teaching*** and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must also provide evidence that they have significant contributions in ***professional development*** activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. The professional development activities should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to associate professor of the practice. Candidates for promotion to professor of the practice may also be leading

professional development activities related to teaching or their field of expertise. For promotion to professor of the practice, candidates must have some meritorious achievements that demonstrate either **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students (and graduate students as appropriate for the department) or **curricular development**. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in [Appendix A](#).

8.2.4.2 **Service or Research/Creative Work**. Candidates must either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of research, but not both. In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for **institutional engagement**, and at least two of the other four guiding criteria for service**: *academic leadership*, *commitment to the discipline*, *professional mentoring*** and/or ***public engagement and outreach***.

In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must provide evidence of research ***productivity***. Candidates must also demonstrate that they have established ***scholarly independence and intellectual leadership***. The scholarly record should demonstrate significant signs of ***impact*** within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline). Finally, candidates must also demonstrate that they continue to be on a ***positive trajectory***. For promotion to professor of the practice, the majority of research and/or creative work activities will continue to be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A), unlike faculty on the tenure track.

In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities. In cases where research and/or creative work is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates may also have service contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

SECTION 9: POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

There are two different levels of post-tenure review:

(1) Annual performance reviews conducted by the department head or supervisor responsible for conducting a faculty member's annual performance evaluation. (See Section 5 of these guidelines).

(2) Periodic peer review by a committee (as described in this section).

The College of Arts and Sciences does not have a college-specific set of guidelines for Post-Tenure Review. Each department should have department-specific guidelines following university rules and guidelines as stipulated in [Standard Administrative Procedure (SAP) 12.06.99.M0.01, "Post-Tenure Review](#). All department post-tenure review guidelines and subsequent revisions must be reviewed and approved by the college.

9.1   Purpose

    (3) Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.

    (4) Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.

    (5) Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.

    (6) Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

9.2   Peer Review Committee

Departments 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/associate deans, assistant/associate provosts, assistant/associate provosts), 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.

9.3   Process for Periodic Peer Review

9.3.1   Materials

Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

    (7) Updated CV

    (8) Annual review report for most recent three years

9.3.2   Responsibility of Peer Review Committee

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 department guidelines and should be consistent with annual performance evaluations.

9.3.3   Process for Each Rating of Review

9.3.3.1 Satisfactory

If all 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 department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

9.3.3.2 Unsatisfactory

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

9.3.3.3 Needs Improvement – Two Categories

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

9.3.3.4 Needs Improvement – Single Category

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 and the faculty member.

9.3.4   Joint Appointments

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

9.3.5   Department Responsibility to Submit Information on Tenured Faculty

Every year, no later than May 31st, each department will submit the following information to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs (through the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences):

(9) The year when each tenured faculty member in the department last underwent a review.

(10) Faculty members reviewed that year for post-tenure periodic peer review.

(11) The outcome of each periodic peer review conducted that year and any required follow-up plans.

(12) Faculty members scheduled to be reviewed the following year.

9.4   Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews or one "Unsatisfactory" periodic peer review or upon request of the faculty member. The department head will inform the faculty member that they are subject to a Professional Development Review and provide information on the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head or supervisor, with 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 the Dean. The faculty member, review committee and department head/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan." The professional development plan is reviewed by the executive associate dean or associate dean for faculty affairs and approved by the Dean.

9.4.1 Objectives for Professional Development Review

There are three objectives for the Professional Development Review:

(13) Identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance,

(14) Develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies, and

(15) Monitor progress toward achievement of the Professional Development Plan.

9.4.2 Ad Hoc Review Committee

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 Executive Associate Dean and/or Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Dean, the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. Specifically, the dean's office will identify individuals to serve on the ad hoc committee and will confirm their availability (without identifying the faculty member), and then consult with the department head and the faculty member to determine that the committee composition is acceptable. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with one or more of the selected committee members (due to personal conflicts or conflicts of interest), the dean's office will identify a potential alternate(s). When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

9.4.3 Faculty's Review Dossier

The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements that they deem relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of the Professional Development Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. The dossier will include at minimum the following items:

(16) a current curriculum vitae,

(17) a teaching portfolio,

(18) a statement summarizing current research and/or creative work, and

(19) a statement summarizing current service responsibilities.

9.4.4 Department Head's Review/Addition to Dossier

The department head will add to the dossier any further materials deemed 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.

9.4.5 Professional Development Review Timeline

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:

(20) No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and the Dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.

(21) 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.

(22) 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 the Dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" which is reviewed by the executive associate dean and the associate dean for faculty affairs, and approved by the Dean.

9.5 Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the department guidelines) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head/supervisor, and the dean's office, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, 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).

9.6 Appeal Process (Post-Tenure Review & Professional Development Review)

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 Grievance Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

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. (See Section 6 of University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

If the faculty member, department head/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 Vice President for Faculty Affairs. (See Section 6 of University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

9.7 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 or supervisor. (See Section 6 of University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01)

APPENDIX A – TABLES WITH SUGGESTED CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

Table A.1 – Suggested Criteria Related to Teaching for all Promotions.

Teaching	
All candidates seeking promotion to any title with teaching as an assigned area of responsibility must provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluations of teaching, and student outcomes. The candidates must have a strong record of high-quality teaching performance and can be evidence by some of the activities listed below. This is **not an exhaustive list** of criteria and should **not be viewed as a checklist** of requirements, but rather as a guide to activities typically viewed favorably by college-level promotion committees.	
Quality of Teaching (Required for all titles)	• Successful implementation of teaching techniques and pedagogical strategies to motivate students and engage them in the learning process. • Consistent use of high-quality teaching materials that are accurate, organized, neat, and up to date. • Appropriate preparation, organization, and management of course content (i.e., selection and sequencing of topics, level of rigor, pacing of topics, etc.) • Consistent use of appropriate methods to assess student work and progress in the course (i.e., aligns with course objectives, meaningful and timely feedback, level of difficulty, etc.) • Proper course management (i.e., grades are updated, accurate and submitted on time; meets deadlines for Disability Resource Office, posting of course materials, etc.) • Effective communication to students (i.e., clear explanations in class, timeliness of email responses, clarity of expectations, etc.) • Methods used to create a positive, inclusive, and equitable learning environment for all students. • Selection for a teaching award at the department, college, or university level. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Professional Development	• Participation in workshops organized by the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE). • Participation in the Transformational Teaching and Learning Conference. • Participation in panels devoted to teaching (at a disciplinary conference). • Participation in seminars, workshops, or conferences organized by discipline-specific professional societies and/or organizations focused on college-level teaching (e.g., American Association of Colleges and Universities [AAC&U], Texas Association of College Teachers [TACT], etc.)
Curricular Development	• Redesigning an existing course introduced by self or others. • Developing high-quality curriculum for new courses or redesigning curriculum for existing course. • Developing quality materials for a course that meet departmental needs and/or have unique characteristics (e.g., online courses, study abroad, internship courses, large enrollment courses, writing intensive courses, laboratory courses, etc.) • Developing new curricular programs (e.g., new degree programs, minors, certificates, etc.) • Creating high-quality open education resource materials for a course.
Impact Beyond the Classroom	• Supervising high impact learning experiences for undergraduates (e.g., internships, honors contracts, undergraduate research, study abroad, service learning, etc.) • Mentoring and/or advising students outside the classroom. • Serving as a teaching mentor for colleagues or other instructors of record. • Activities that contribute to the success of students (e.g., writing reference letters, reviewing student manuscripts or grant proposals, reviewing internship applications, etc.) • Serving on and/or chairing graduate committees. • Presenting or sharing teaching methods and/or course materials with other colleagues. • Collaborating with other faculty on teaching initiatives with broader impacts. • Securing external grant support for teaching or learning projects. • Contributions to industry partnerships that impact student learning.

Table A.2 – Suggested Criteria Related to Research and/or Creative Work (Level One Activities)

Suggested Criteria Related to Research and/or Creative Work (Level One Activities)	
All candidates seeking promotion to any title with research and/or creative work as an assigned area of responsibility must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise and must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. Evidence of the four guiding criteria may be demonstrated through items in the lists below. The lists are **not an exhaustive list** of criteria and should **not be viewed as a checklist** of requirements, but rather as a guide to activities typically viewed favorably by college-level promotion committees. Faculty seeking either their first or second promotion are expected to have activities and accomplishments that are identified as Level One Activities.	
Productivity	• A quantity of peer-reviewed publications as appropriate for the discipline. • A level of external research funding as appropriate for the discipline (in disciplines where funding is available and expected). • The production of other scholarly work, such as digital work and/or creative work (as appropriate for the discipline).
Independence and Intellectual Leadership	• An appropriate level of publications as the sole or "lead" author (in line with authorship norms for the discipline). • Serving as the lead PI on an externally funded research project (in disciplines where external funds are available and expected). • Invitations to present research at other universities.
Scholarly Impact	• Metrics appropriate to the discipline (e.g., number of citations (relative to others in the same field), quality of book reviews, etc.) • Awards based on research activities (particularly internal awards) • Evidence that research activities are having broader impacts on the local community, the state, the nation, or beyond. • Patents or commercialization of research (particularly with evidence of impact and use).
Positive Trajectory	Candidates for promotion must also demonstrate that they are on a positive trajectory, as evidenced by projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future.

Table A.3 – Suggested Criteria Related to Research and/or Creative Work (Level Two Activities)

Suggested Criteria Related to Research and/or Creative Work (Level Two Activities)	
For some promotions (See Section 8), there is an expectation that faculty accomplishments in the area of research and/or creative work also include Level Two activities (See Section 8).	
Independence and Intellectual Leadership	• Serving as the lead (or sole) author on a highly visible publication. • Invitations to write a review essay for a top journal in the field (signifying stature in the field). • Serving as the lead PI on a large collaborative research project.
Scholarly Impact	• Invitations to present research at top universities in the U.S. and beyond. • Invitations to give keynote and plenary lectures at conferences. • External research awards. • Metrics appropriate to the discipline that place a faculty member at the top of their discipline (or interdisciplinary area)

Table A.4 – Suggested Criteria Related to Service (Level One Activities)

Suggested Criteria Related to Service (Level One Activities)	
The guiding criteria for service can be met through a variety of service activities and accomplishments. Section 8.1 and 8.2 indicate relative importance of the guiding criteria below for each track. This is **not an exhaustive list** of criteria and should **not be viewed as a checklist** of requirements, but rather as a guide to activities typically viewed favorably by college-level promotion committees. For the first promotion in most tracks, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities.	
Institutional Engagement (required for all candidates with assigned service)	• Serving as an active member on university, college, or department committees or task forces. • Serving as an active faculty advisor to student organizations. • Active participation with an interdisciplinary program on campus. • Consistent and active engagement in the instruction of Hullabaloo U courses. • Actively participating in activities that demonstrate a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Academic Leadership	• Serving on a program committee for a national conference. • Serving as an officer for a national scholarly organization. • Serving as a coordinator of multi-section courses for the department. • Supervision of departmental programs that improve student success or their experience at the university. • Serving as a coordinator or director of program that contributes to the advancement of departmental teaching, research and/or creative work, or service mission. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Professional Mentoring	• Serving as a faculty advisor for graduate or undergraduate students. • Serving as a mentor for graduate students who serve as instructor of record. • Serving as departmental sponsor for student professional organization (e.g., medical professionals, teaching profession, actuaries, meteorologists, journalists, etc.) • Mentoring of postdoctoral scholars or junior colleagues. • Participation in activities that contribute to the professional development of others. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Commitment to the Discipline	• Serving as a reviewer for grant proposals. • Serving as a reviewer for journal manuscripts. • Serving on committees associated with professional/scholarly organizations. • Organizing panels at scholarly conferences. • Organizing academic or professional seminars. • Reviewing award nominations (outside of committee work). • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Public Engagement and Outreach	• Volunteering to assist with outreach activities at local schools. • Volunteering to assist with activities that benefit the local community. • Presenting research to a local community organization. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.

Table A.5 – Suggested Criteria Related to Service (Level Two Activities)

Suggested Criteria Related to Service (Level Two Activities)	
For most job titles, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments before coming up for the "second" promotion (e.g., promotion to Professor, Principal Lecturer, Instructional Professor, etc.) This is **not an exhaustive list** of criteria and should **not be viewed as a checklist** of requirements, but rather as a guide to activities typically viewed favorably by college-level promotion committees.	
Institutional Engagement (required for all candidates with assigned service.)	• Serving as an active member on university or college-level committee or task force. • Active participation with an interdisciplinary program on campus. • Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Academic Leadership	• Chairing a university-, college-, or department-level committee or task force. • Serving as an elected officer for a scholarly organization. • Leading the development of a new interdisciplinary initiative. • Serving as a coordinator of multi-section courses for the department. • Organizing and leading activities that demonstrate a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. • Supervision of departmental programs that improve student's success or experience at the university. • Sustained service and leadership as an advisor to student organization(s) • Serving in a leadership position on the Faculty Senate. • Serving as program chair or other major leadership position for a national or international conference. • Serving in a key administrative role within the department. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Professional Mentoring	• Informal or formal mentoring of postdoctoral scholars, junior colleagues, and/or scholars at other institutions. • Developing and facilitating professional development workshops for others. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Commitment to the Discipline	• Organizing symposia, seminars, etc. • Reviewing promotion and/or tenure cases for other institutions. • Serving on editorial board for a journal or book series. • Service as an editor/associate editor for a journal or book series. • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.
Public Engagement and Outreach	• Directing, organizing, or leading outreach activities at local schools. • Directing, organizing, or leading outreach programs that bring community members to campus. • Directing, organizing, or leading activities that benefit the local community. • Providing testimony based on one's scholarly expertise. • Publishing editorial essays (relevant to one's area of expertise). • Other items as appropriate for the discipline.

APPENDIX B - SAMPLE INDICATORS FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

The College of Arts and Sciences recognizes there are multiple indicators of various levels of faculty performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This appendix includes a list of sample indicators for evaluating faculty performance in each of the assigned areas of responsibility. The following points must be taken into consideration when applying these sets of sample indicators to faculty performance reviews:

- The five ratings (Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory) are primarily intended to be used for **annual** faculty performance reviews.

- Faculty do not need to achieve every sample indicator listed in the tables to achieve that rating in any given year. Some of the sample indicators may be more relevant for faculty in some career tracks and/or at later career stages. For example, an APT faculty member may work with Ph.D. students, but would not be expected to mentor the Ph.D. students. Similarly, an untenured assistant professor may not yet have the record to receive an external award, or to be the leading PI on a major collaborative grant project.

- Some of the sample indicators are not relevant for some disciplines or departments (e.g., patents and books are not relevant in some disciplines; external grants are not critical to the success of faculty in some departments).

- If a particular indicator is relevant to a discipline and a career track, this rubric may be useful in showing the range from "Unsatisfactory" to "Outstanding."

- Individual faculty records may not fit perfectly into a single rating category. For example, a faculty member may have "needs improvement" on one item, and "meets expectations" for several other items. The overall rating should be based on a holistic assessment of the overall record in this area of performance. The preponderance of evidence should line up with one of the rating categories.

- For annual reviews, certain guiding criteria may take precedence over other guiding criteria. For example, "productivity" may carry more weight than "scholarly impact" and "positive trajectory" in the area of research and/or creative work.

- The list of sample indicators is not a comprehensive list. A faculty member may have other activities that demonstrate the guiding criteria for an assigned area of responsibility.

B.1 Rating Scale and Sample Indicators for Evaluating Teaching

Table B.1.1: Sample Indicators for "Unsatisfactory" in Teaching

Quality of Teaching - Unsatisfactory
Failure to use teaching strategies and techniques that engage students, maintain the students' attention, and lead to positive learning opportunities.
Repeatedly unprepared for class.
Repeatedly late to class, dismisses class early, cancels class without valid reason, or otherwise fails to make effective use of class time.
Repeatedly receives student complaints (that are investigated and validated by administration) regarding certain aspects of instruction.
Failure to provide feedback to students on graded assignments in a timely manner.
Failure to offer opportunities (e.g., office hours) to help students be successful in the course.
Failure to show up to office hours or other prearranged opportunities to help students.
Failure to demonstrate a concern about poor or declining classroom instruction or overall teaching performance.
Declines appointment requests from students or is unprofessional to students during meetings/appointments.
Professional Development - Unsatisfactory
Multiyear record of not meaningfully engaging in meetings, conferences, or seminars related to teaching.
Curricular Development - Unsatisfactory
Curricular materials used in the course are viewed as inappropriate by peer evaluators
Repeatedly uses outdated or inaccurate curricular materials in the course.
Impact Beyond the Classroom - Unsatisfactory
Multiyear record of not serving as chair of doctoral research committees
Multiyear record of not serving as chair of master's committees
Failure to implement teaching strategies suggested by an assigned teaching mentor.
Failure to mentor undergraduate or graduate students in any capacity.

Table B.1.2: Sample Indicators for "Needs Improvement" in Teaching

Quality of Teaching - Needs Improvement
Lack of commitment to using teaching strategies and techniques that engage students, maintain the students' attention, and lead to positive learning opportunities.
Lack of commitment to facilitate student learning in the course.
Some of the curricular materials are outdated or inaccurate.
Feedback from multiple sources cite inadequate preparation for class.
Professional Development - Needs Improvement
Attends teaching related professional development activities (e.g., workshops, meetings, seminars, conferences, etc.) organized by the department, college, or university but does not integrate techniques and strategies learned in professional development activities into the course.
Curricular Development - Needs Improvement
Some instances of using outdated or inaccurate curricular materials in a course.
Impact Beyond the Classroom - Needs Improvement
Lack of commitment to chairing doctoral research committees.
Lack of commitment to chairing master's committees.
Lack of commitment to mentor graduate or undergraduate students.
Lack of active engagement in mentoring activities related to teaching.
Lack of commitment to implementing teaching strategies suggested by an assigned teaching mentor.

Table B.1.3: Sample Indicators for "Meets Expectations" in Teaching

Quality of Teaching - Meets Expectations
The assessment of student work is transparent and done in a timely and equitable manner.
Committed to using teaching strategies and techniques that engage students, maintain the students' attention, and lead to positive learning opportunities.
Meets all deadlines for teaching related responsibilities (e.g., submit grades by deadline, post syllabus on time, etc.)
Expectations regarding assignments, projects, essays, exams, or any other form of assessment are clear for students.
Feedback on student work is appropriate and provided in a timely manner.
Provides the minimum number of opportunities (as required by the department) for students to get help and be successful in the course.
Uses teaching strategies that address the diverse learning needs of students.
Creates a learning environment that supports academic success for all students.
Follows minimum syllabus requirements.
Professional Development - Meets Expectations
Attends teaching related professional development activities (e.g., workshops, meetings, seminars, conferences, etc.) organized by the department, college, or university and integrates techniques and strategies learned in professional development activities into the course.
Curricular Development - Meets Expectations
Uses quality teaching materials that are accurate, organized, neat, and up to date.
Impact Beyond the Classroom - Meets Expectations
Chair of at least one doctoral research committee.
Active engagement in working with doctoral or master's students.
Chair of at least one masters committee.

Table B.1.4: Sample Indicators for "Exceeds Expectations" in Teaching

Quality of Teaching - Exceeds Expectations
Selection for a departmental outstanding teaching award.
Provides multiple opportunities (more than generally recommended) for students to get individualized help outside of class.
The faculty member's performance in instruction serves as a model for others across the department or college.
General instruction, organization of the course, management of students, and overall performance of teaching duties is highly noteworthy and highly recognized by peers and students.
Courses are taught at a rigorous and challenging, yet appropriate, level. Students are motivated to investigate concepts more deeply.
Uses teaching strategies and techniques that result in high levels of student participation, frequently engage students in the learning process, and lead to very positive learning opportunities.
Professional Development - Exceeds Expectations
Active participation in a variety of workshops, programs, conferences, or seminars that are designed to improve teaching practices.
Curricular Development - Exceeds Expectations
Assisted in the development of a new course that filled an identified need in the curriculum
Assisted with creating high-quality instructional materials widely adopted or acclaimed.
Assisted in redesigning an existing course or instructional program.
Received internal grant funding or support for teaching or learning projects.
Impact Beyond the Classroom - Exceeds Expectations
Serves as a teaching mentor for colleagues within their department.

Significantly contributing to the mentoring or development of students (undergraduate or graduate) for professional employment opportunities.
Outstanding work as chair of doctoral research committees.
Outstanding direction or guidance of graduate research or creative activity.
Significantly contributing to enhancing or extending the academic or professional growth of students (e.g., working with University Honors program, leading undergraduate research opportunities, etc.)

Table B.1.5: Sample Indicators for "Outstanding" in Teaching

Quality of Teaching - Outstanding
The faculty member's performance in instruction serves as a model for others across the college, university, or other institutions across the country.
Selection for a college, university, or professional society outstanding teaching award.
Invited to give a talk or presentation at the university or another institution to share their teaching practices.
Professional Development - Outstanding
Leading, facilitating, or other significant involvement in workshops, programs, or seminars that are designed to improve teaching practices of others.
Invitation or accepted proposal to give a talk or presentation at a major conference, meeting, workshop, or seminar about effective teaching methodologies or pedagogies.
Invitation(s) to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
Curricular Development - Outstanding
Create, authored, had a major role, or led an initiative to create high-quality instructional materials widely adopted or acclaimed.
Develop a new high-quality course and corresponding curricular materials that fills an identified need in the curriculum.
Received external grant funding or support for teaching or learning projects.
Significant or major contributions to redesigning an existing course or instructional program.
Impact Beyond the Classroom - Outstanding
Receipt of awards for outstanding research or academic performance of a faculty member's students.
Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions.
Publications with authorship by mentees or trainees (i.e., undergraduate or graduate mentees).
Serves as a teaching mentor for colleagues at the college or university level.

B.2 Rating Scale for Evaluating Research and/or Creative Work

Table B.2.1 Sample Indicators of "Unsatisfactory" in Research and/or Creative Work

Productivity - Unsatisfactory
Absence of any new publications-in-progress during the period of review
Absence of any research presentations during the period of review
Absence of any grant proposals (submitted or funded) during the period of review
Independence and Intellectual Leadership - Unsatisfactory
Absence of any evidence of new original research
Absence of any evidence of participation in new collaborative research projects
Scholarly Impact - Unsatisfactory
Minimal new citations of earlier work/no citations of recently published work
No reviews of previously published books (that should have received a review by now)
No invitations to present research
No internal or external research awards
No other evidence of impact and innovation
Positive Trajectory - Unsatisfactory
No evidence that progress is underway on new research or creative projects

Table B.2.2 Sample Indicators of "Needs Improvement" in Research and/or Creative Work

Productivity - Needs Improvement
No new publications, but a sufficient level of manuscripts that are in progress or under review
No competitive funding received, but funding proposals may have been submitted (in disciplines where funding is available and expected)
Independence and Intellectual Leadership - Needs Improvement
Minimal evidence of progress on original research project
Minimal contributions to collaborative research projects
Scholarly Impact - Needs Improvement
Minimal new citations of published work
No significant invitations to present research
No internal or external research awards
Minimal other evidence of impact or innovation
Positive Trajectory - Needs Improvement
Minimal evidence that substantial progress is underway on new research or creative projects

Table B.2.3 Sample Indicators for "Meets Expectations" in Research and/or Creative Work

Productivity - Meets Expectations
Publication(s) in respected peer-reviewed journals (as appropriate for the discipline)
Publication(s) of creative work in respected venues (as appropriate for the discipline)
Publication(s) of a book chapter in an edited volume
Publication(s) of an invited reference piece (i.e. encyclopedia entry)
Presentation(s) of creative work (e.g., performance work, etc.) (as appropriate for the discipline)
Development of a digital database, archives or research tools
Proposal(s) submitted for a competitive external grant (as appropriate for the discipline)
Funding received for a fairly competitive internal funding program
Independence and Intellectual Leadership - Meets Expectations
Publishing as a contributing co-author for peer-reviewed journal article(s)

Presentation(s) of original research at a professional meeting
Participatory role(s) in a collaborative research project(s)
Scholarly Impact - Meets Expectations
Favorable record of citation (relative to norms in the discipline and/or subspecialty)
Positive review(s) of a scholarly book
Invited talk(s) at other universities and venues
Competitive internal award for research (at department, college or university level)
Patent or commercialization of research (with limited evidence of impact or use)
Positive Trajectory - Meets Expectations
Progress on a new research or creative project
Publication(s) under review
Internal grant(s) under review
Shortlisted for a research or creative award

Table B.2.4 Sample Indicators for "Exceeds Expectations" in Research and/or Creative Work

Productivity - Exceeds Expectations
Publication(s) in a leading or top-tier peer-reviewed journal (as appropriate for the discipline)
Publication(s) of a book with a leading university press (as appropriate for the discipline)
Publication(s) of creative work with a top-tier university press (as appropriate for the discipline)
Publication(s) of book chapter(s) in a special edited volume with a competitive selection process
Publication(s) of invited review article in a leading journal
Presentation of creative work in highly regarded or prestigious venues
Development of a highly visible and substantial digital database, archive, or research tools whose creation involves serious intellectual work consistent with best practices in digital scholarship
Competitive funding from a major external grant program (as appropriate to the discipline)
Independence and Intellectual Leadership - Exceeds Expectations
Publishing as the leading author for a peer-reviewed journal article (based on disciplinary norms for authorship and/or candidate's stated contribution as the PI for a collaborative project)
Presentation of invited keynote or plenary address at a professional meeting
Leading role in a significant collaborative research project (e.g., serving as the PI for a large, externally funded collaborative project)
Scholarly Impact - Exceeds Expectations
Impactful record of citation (i.e., citations appraise the value of the work and its distinctive contributions; in fields with co-authored publications, the publications where the candidate is the lead author tend to be the most frequently cited publications)
Positive reviews of a scholarly book
Prestigious invited talks at other universities (based on audience size, prestige of venue, etc.)
Competitive external award for research or creative work
Patent or commercialization of research (with some evidence of impact and use)
Positive Trajectory - Exceeds Expectations
Moderate progress on one or more new research or creative projects (with preliminary products)
Publication(s) under review with leading journal (with revise and resubmit from editor)
External grants under review for a highly prestigious program
Shortlisted for a prestigious external award

Table B.2.5 Sample Indicators for "Outstanding" in Research and/or Creative Work

Productivity – Outstanding
Publication of multiple article(s) in a leading or top-tier peer-reviewed journals
Publication of book(s) with one of the most prestigious university presses in the discipline
Publication of creative work with one of the most prestigious presses for that area of work
Publication of chapter(s) in a special edited volume with a competitive selection process in one of the most prestigious presses for the discipline
Publication or presentation of creative work in the most prestigious venues
Development of a highly visible and substantial digital database, archive, or research tools whose creation involves serious intellectual work consistent with best practices in digital scholarship
Competitive funding from a highly regarded federal grant program (e.g., NSF CAREER program, NSF IGERT program, etc.)
Independence and Intellectual Leadership - Outstanding
Publishing as the lead author of a significant journal article in one of most prestigious peer-reviewed journals in the discipline
Presentation of the keynote address at a major disciplinary conference
Leading role in a significant collaborative research project (i.e. serving as the PI for a large, externally funded collaborative project)
Scholarly Impact – Outstanding
Unusually strong record of citation relative to the discipline (e.g., citations appraise the value of the work and its distinctive contributions; candidate's contributions to highly cited works are substantial)
Highly positive reviews of a scholarly book in multiple journals by leading scholars in the field
Prestigious invited talks at other universities (based on audience size, prestige of venue, etc.)
Competitive external award for research or creative work (particularly those designated as pathway awards or highly prestigious awards)
Patent or commercialization of research (with demonstrable impact and use)
Positive Trajectory – Outstanding
Significant progress on one or more new research or creative projects (with evidence of preliminary products)
Multiple publication(s) under review with leading journals (with revise and resubmit from editor)
External grants under review for a highly prestigious program
Nomination/semi-finalist for a highly prestigious research or creative award

B.3   Rating Scale for Evaluating Service

Table B.3.1   Sample Indicators for "Unsatisfactory" in Service

Institutional Engagement – Unsatisfactory
Unexcused absences for a significant number of faculty and/or committee meetings
No evidence of participation on committees beyond the department level
Failure to fulfill commitment as an appointed or elected committee member
Negative contributions to the department climate (i.e., toxic attitude)
Academic Leadership – Unsatisfactory
No evidence of leadership on department, college, or university committee work
No evidence of leadership to scholarly organizations
Professional Mentoring – Unsatisfactory
No evidence of formal or informal mentoring of colleagues
Commitment to the Discipline – Unsatisfactory
No service contributions to professional organizations
No reviews of scholarly journals, grant proposals, tenure & promotion cases, etc.
Public Outreach and Engagement – Unsatisfactory
No evidence of any service contributions that benefit the local community, state, the nation, or broader society.
No outreach activities to local schools
No evidence of any other forms of public engagement and outreach
Failure to fulfil commitment to assist or participate in any outreach activity.

Table B.3.2   Sample Indicators for "Needs Improvement" in Service

Institutional Engagement - Needs Improvement
Minimal participation in department meetings (i.e., frequent absences, passive attendance, etc.)
Minimal participation on departmental or college committees
Minimal contribution to diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts at the department level
Academic Leadership - Needs Improvement
Minimal signs of quality leadership at the department, college or university level
Minimal signs of quality leadership to the discipline
Professional Mentoring - Needs Improvement
Minimal evidence of informal or formal mentoring of colleagues (e.g., assigned a mentee but don't meet with them or provide effective mentoring)
Minimal or no evidence of professional development of others
Commitment to the Discipline - Needs Improvement
Minimal/infrequent service contributions for scholarly organizations and associations
Minimal/infrequent service contributions to scholarly journals
Minimal/infrequent service contributions as a reviewer of external grant proposals
Public Engagement and Outreach - Needs Improvement
Minimal/infrequent service contributions to the local or regional community
Minimal/infrequent outreach activities to local schools
Minimal evidence of any other forms of public engagement and outreach

Table B.3.3   ***Sample Indicators for "Meets Expectations" in Service***

Institutional Engagement - Meets Expectations
Regular attendance and participation in department meetings
Regular attendance and participation on departmental and/or college committees
Regular attendance and participation with an interdisciplinary program on campus
Regular attendance and participation with faculty senate
Some evidence of contribution to diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts at the department level
Serves as a faculty adviser to student organization and attends the organization's events.
Academic Leadership - Meets Expectations
Some evidence of leadership at the department level (e.g., satisfactory performance as the chair of a department committee)
Satisfactory performance in an administrative role at the department level (e.g., director of undergraduate studies)
Some evidence of leadership at the college or university level
Some evidence of leadership to the discipline (e.g., serving on the program committee for a national conference, serving as a minor officer in a scholarly organization, etc.)
Occasional participation in professional development activities for academic leaders
Professional Mentoring - Meets Expectations
Informal or formal mentoring of colleagues in the department
Informal or formal mentoring of colleagues outside of the department
Occasional participation in activities that contribute to the professional development of others (e.g., serving on a panel on grant writing)
Commitment to the Discipline - Meets Expectations
Reviewing manuscripts for scholarly journals (average frequency for rank)
Serving as an ad hoc reviewer of grant proposals (average frequency for rank)
Serving as a reviewer for tenure and promotion cases (average frequency for rank)
Serving as a reviewer for an awards competition (outside of committee work) (average frequency for rank)
Public Engagement and Outreach - Meets Expectations
Active service contributions to the local or regional community
Some engagement on policy issues (e.g., publishing an editorial commentary and/or an article in the *Conversation*)
Some engagement or participation in outreach activities to local schools
Some engagement or participation in other forms of public engagement and outreach

Table B.3.4   Sample Indicators for "Exceeds Expectations" in Service

Institutional Engagement - Exceeds Expectations
Active participation in department meetings (with meaningful and constructive contributions) and volunteers to lead/complete action items that arise in the meetings.
Active participation on departmental and/or college committees (with meaningful and constructive contributions) and volunteers to lead/complete action items that arise in the meetings.
Active participation with an interdisciplinary program on campus (e.g., organizing, leading).
Assists in the organization of diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts at the department level.
Serving as an Officer on the Faculty Senate.
Serves for one semester for Hullabaloo U course
Active participation in seminars or workshops hosted by university units (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellences, Office of Diversity, etc.)
Participates in university initiatives related to student success or underrepresented groups.
Academic Leadership - Exceeds Expectations
Significant evidence of leadership at the department level (i.e., meritorious performance as the chair of a department committee or coordinator for departmental programs)
Meritorious performance in an administrative role at the department level (e.g., director of undergraduate studies)
Significant evidence of leadership at the college or university level (i.e., meritorious performance serving as the chair of a college or university committee)
Significant evidence of leadership to the discipline (i.e., serving as an elected officer in a scholarly organization)
Organizes, prepares, or has a leading role in professional development activities for academic leaders
Professional Mentoring - Exceeds Expectations
Significant evidence of effective mentoring of colleagues in the department
Significant evidence of effective mentoring of colleagues outside of the department
Frequent participation in activities that contribute to the professional development of others (e.g., leading and/or developing professional development workshops)
Commitment to the Discipline - Exceeds Expectations
Reviewing manuscripts for scholarly journals (high level of frequency for rank)
Serving on the editorial board of a scholarly journal
Serving as an ad hoc reviewer for grants (at a high level of frequency for rank)
Serving on a grant review panel for a federal agency (or the equivalent)
Serving as a reviewer for tenure and promotion cases (high level of frequency for rank)
Serving as a reviewer for an awards competition (outside of committee work) (high level of frequency for rank)
Serving on an external program review (for a department at another university) (at a high level of frequency for rank)
Public Engagement and Outreach - Exceeds Expectations
High level of active and meaningful service contributions to the local or regional community
Service on the board of a community organization (relevant to area of scholarly expertise)
Frequent engagement on policy issues (e.g., publishing an editorial commentaries and/or articles in the *Conversation*)
High level of active outreach activities to local schools

Table B.3.5   Sample Indicators for "Outstanding" in Service

Institutional Engagement – Outstanding
Chairing a major college or university committee
Leading the development of new department initiatives (i.e., new degree program, strategic planning, etc.)
Leading sustainable diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts at the department level
Serving as the chair of a senate executive committee
Serving as the instructor of Hullabaloo U courses for multiple semesters
Leading or facilitating conferences, seminars, or workshops supported by university units (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellences, Office of Diversity, etc.)
Leading university initiatives related to student success or underrepresented groups
Academic Leadership – Outstanding
Serving on college or university committees that require a significant amount of time, effort, and expertise (i.e. dean's advisory committee)
Leading the development of a new interdisciplinary initiative at the college or university level
Leading diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts at the college or university level
Professional Mentoring – Outstanding
Leads and organizes departmental mentoring programs
Leads and organizes mentoring programs outside the department
Serves as a mentor to other mentors.
Commitment to the Discipline – Outstanding
Serving as the president of a national or international scholarly organization
Serving as the program chair for a large national or international conference
Serving as the editor or associate editor for a top-tier scholarly journal
Serving as a panel reviewer for federal grant program
Public Engagement and Outreach – Outstanding
Leads and organizes outreach events to reach beyond the local region.
Using scholarly expertise to serve on the board of a local or state community organization
Providing testimony based on one's scholarly expertise (on a frequent basis)
High level of engagement on policy issues (e.g., frequent editorial commentaries)

APPENDIX C - SAMPLE DOCUMENT FOR PEER OBSERVATION OF TEACHING

The prompts and questions below are adapted from the TAMU Center for Teaching Excellence's framework of Faculty Teaching Performance Evaluation. This document should serve as a guide to things the visitor should look for during the observation and for writing up the final summary of the observation.

General Course Information

Instructor being observed: Date & Time of observation:

Course/section: Location of class meeting:

Visitor/Observer's Name :   Course Attendance/Enrollment:

Topic(s) Covered:

Instructional Preparation and Organization:

Provide information regarding the instructor's level of preparation for the class meeting and overall organization of the course structure. Some guiding questions that may be helpful to assess this are:

- Did the class meeting start and end on time?
- Did the instructor appropriately manage the class time? Was the pacing of the content appropriate for the audience? Was the pace too fast? Too slow? Did it seem they ran out of time and did not cover all intended topics? Did they end class early because there was not enough content planned for the class meeting?
- Did the instructor have a plan or agenda for the class meeting?
- Did the instructor come to class with prepared notes for the class (e.g., written notes, prepared slides, etc.)?
- Did the instructor plan the content at the appropriate level of rigor for the audience?

Teaching Techniques used for Delivery of Content

Provide information regarding techniques the instructor used to motivate and engage students. Cite specific instances that indicate students were actively engaged in the academic content. Some guiding questions that may be helpful to assess this are:

- Did the instructor put students in small groups for discussion or to work on a specific task?
- Did the instructor ask thought provoking questions and then appropriately facilitate discussion based on student responses? How often did this occur?
- Did the instructor use the "think-pair-share" strategy to encourage the sharing of ideas?
- Did the instructor use the "I do, you do" strategy to allow students the opportunity to engage in problem solving?
- Did they use multiple representations (e.g., pictures, graphs, charts, written words, etc.) to convey a topic?
- What were most of the students doing during the class meeting? Were they taking notes, asking questions, paying attention, and participating? Were they distracted by other things (e.g., scrolling through Apps on their phones, looking at websites not related to the class content, etc.)
- What active learning strategies did the instructor use to engage and motivate students? Did these strategies seem effective and encourage students to engage with the content at a deeper level?
- What methods/techniques did the instructor use to deliver the content to the students (i.e., PowerPoint presentation with discussion, use of tablet to annotate notes electronically, etc.)? Did these methods/techniques seem effective for the audience?

- Did students have opportunities to discuss the academic content with each other? What was the frequency and effectiveness of these interactions?

Communication

Provide information regarding techniques the instructor used to communicate course expectations (i.e., assignment due dates, participation expectations, etc.) and course content. Guiding questions that may be helpful to assess this are:
- Did students seem to know and follow class expectations or routine assignment/activity expectations?
- Did routine class logistics seem clear or unclear to students?
- Were explanations of concepts clear at a level appropriate for the audience?
- Was the instructor confident and in command of the subject?
- Did the instructor repeat questions asked by other students before giving their response?
- Did the instructor speak loud and clearly enough for all students, including the ones in the back of the room, to hear them? Did they speak too fast or too slow? Did they use voice inflection when communicating or was their voice monotone?
- Were students able to hear, see, and understand (verbally and written) what the instructor was trying to communicate?

Student Assessment of Learning

Provide information regarding techniques or methods the instructor used to assess student learning and attainment of the objectives/concepts being taught during the class meeting. Guiding questions that may be helpful to assess this are:
- Did the instructor use a clicker system (e.g., Poll Everywhere, iClicker, Learning Catalytics, etc.) to assess student learning and, if needed, redirect their instruction?
- Did the instructor walk around and listen to student discussions or view student work? Did they use this to redirect student thinking or learning?
- What evidence from students did the instructor use to determine whether students were learning the intended concepts or topics?

Student Interaction and Inclusive Class Environment

Provide information regarding the learning environment created by the instructor and the interactions the instructor had with students. Guiding questions that may be helpful to assess this are:
- Did the instructor routinely engage with or talk to the students (individually or as a whole class)?
- Did the instructor address students by their names when talking with them?
- Did the instructor demonstrate an awareness of the variety of backgrounds, skill sets, and ability levels of the students? Did they use particular techniques to address these differences?
- Did the instructor have a positive, unbiased demeanor when talking with students?
- Did the instructor show enthusiasm for teaching and engaging with the students?
- Did the instructor's approach to instruction address the needs of a diverse population of students? What did the instructor do to create a welcoming environment to all students?

Overall Impression
- How successful was this class meeting? Describe your overall impression of the class meeting.
- What did the instructor do that seemed particularly effective?
- Was there anything the instructor did that was impressive or particularly outstanding?
- What could the instructor change to become more effective or improve their teaching?

APPENDIX D - SAMPLE DOCUMENT FOR SELF-REFLECTION ON TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Section I. Current Teaching Goals and Intended Outcomes

State the goals and intended outcomes you had regarding teaching for this annual review period. Discuss what you wanted your students to know and be able to do upon completion of the course.

Section II. Self-Reflection on Teaching Performance

For this annual reporting period, describe the goals and objectives set for the courses you taught and reflect on what you did to achieve or attain each goal or objective. In your descriptions, you can discuss:

a) strategies you implemented to address student learning and mastery of concepts,
b) evidence you gathered to assess the level at which students are learning the course objectives,
c) techniques and strategies you used to foster a positive classroom environment,
d) new instructional techniques you tried and how they affected student learning or engagement,
e) technology you implemented in the course and how it affected student learning or engagement.
f) how you give students feedback on their learning and how that informs your instruction,
g) how do you structure your course to meet the needs of a diverse population of students, and
h) anything else you focused on in your classes to help students be successful?

Give your thoughts on the effectiveness of the techniques or strategies you use in your teaching. Discuss what worked well in your teaching as well as what did not. What would you like to modify for future semesters and what will you keep the same? Some questions to help you think about your teaching in different categories are listed below.

a) General Instruction and Delivery of Content
   - What techniques or strategies did I use to help my students strive to be curious, inquisitive, and independent learners?
   - What techniques or strategies did I use to make the course content current and dynamic? How well did they work? What should I change to make them more effective?
   - What techniques or strategies did I use to help students realize the relevance of the course content in today's society? How well did they work? What should I change to make them more effective?
   - What techniques did I use to help students learn the content and meet the expectations of my learning objectives? How well did they work? What should I change to make them more effective?
   - What active learning strategies did I use to motivate and engage my students? How well did they work? What should I change to make them more effective?
   - What type of group or cooperative learning do I use in my courses, and how do I facilitate the groups so all students are successful?
   - What techniques or strategies did I use to prepare students to be successful in my course? Were they effective? What should I change to make them more effective?
b) Assessment of Learning
   - How do I assess student learning? Is it working and how do I know?

- What types of formative assessments (low-stakes, for improvement) and summative (high- stakes, for evaluation) assessments did I use and why? How well did they work and is there anything I should change to make them better?
- How do I monitor student learning beyond the use of summative assessment?
- How do I know that students are adequately prepared for the course assessments? What do I do to help them prepare for the assessments?
- How do I gather information about student learning and the student learning experience? Once I have this information, how does it inform my instruction?

c) The Learning Environment
- What techniques or strategies did I use to show students I am eager to teach and interact with them?
- What techniques or strategies do I use to show students I am excited about the content in my discipline?
- What strategies did I use to invite and encourage students' questions?
- What strategies do I use to encourage student participation, and what do I do to let students know that participation is expected?
- What behaviors did I use to model professionalism to my students?
- What techniques do I use to meet the learning needs of all students in my course?
- Is my approach to instruction able to address the needs of a diverse population of students?
- Do I teach students who learn as I do as well as those who do not?

Section III. Summary of Student Evaluations

For the annual reporting period, review your student's course evaluations and summarize your students' thoughts/opinions regarding your course and teaching. How will these thoughts/opinions from your students inform your future instruction?

Section IV. Updated Teaching Goals and Intended Outcomes for Future

Based on your reflection of teaching over the last year, what do you plan to change and what will your goals and intended outcomes be moving into the next review period.