

Department of Animal Science Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs on May 21, 2023

Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on March 1, 2023

Revised on February 10th, 2023

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties on February 10, 2021

Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on January 20, 2021

Updated guidelines approved by faculty vote on January 15, 2020

Updated guidelines approved by faculty vote on December 19, 2016

Original guidelines adopted on March 9, 2006

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.	FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS.....	4
3.	FACULTY MENTORING	4
3.1.	<i>Selection of Committee Members</i>	4
3.2.	<i>Mentoring Committee for Entry Level faculty members</i>	4
3.3.	<i>Mentoring Committee for First Promotion (mid-career) faculty members</i>	5
3.4.	<i>Responsibilities of the Mentee</i>	5
4.	AREAS OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE	5
4.1.	<i>Teaching</i>	5
4.2.	<i>Research, scholarly activity or creative work for Texas A&M University faculty</i>	6
4.3.	<i>Service</i>	7
4.4.	<i>Administration</i>	8
5.	INDICATORS OF FACULTY EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS.....	9
5.1.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Teaching</i>	9
5.2.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching</i>	9
5.3.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	9
5.4.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	10
5.5.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Service</i>	10
5.6.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Service</i>	10
6.	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE.....	10
6.1.	<i>Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</i>	10
6.2.	<i>Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)</i>	11
7.	ANNUAL REVIEW	13
7.1.	<i>Purpose</i>	13
7.2.	<i>Focus</i>	14
7.3.	<i>Time Period of Review</i>	14
7.4.	<i>Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance</i>	14
7.5.	<i>Required Components</i>	16
7.6.	<i>Assessment outcomes that require action</i>	17
7.7.	<i>Timeline</i>	17
7.8.	<i>Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:</i>	18
8.	MID-TERM REVIEW	18
8.1.	<i>Purpose</i>	18
8.2.	<i>Process</i>	19
8.3.	<i>Feedback from midterm review</i>	20
9.	PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	20
9.1.	<i>Purpose</i>	20
9.2.	<i>Process</i>	20
9.3.	<i>Extensions to the Probationary Period (“Tenure Clock”)</i>	22
9.4.	<i>Reconsideration in the Terminal Year</i>	22
9.5.	<i>Non-Reappointment of Tenure-track Faculty</i>	22
10.	POST-TENURE REVIEW	23
10.1.	<i>Purpose</i>	23
10.2.	<i>Peer Review Committee</i>	23
10.3.	<i>Process</i>	23
10.4.	<i>Professional Development Review</i>	24
10.5.	<i>The Professional Development Plan</i>	25
10.6.	<i>Appeal</i>	25
10.7.	<i>Voluntary Post-Tenure Review</i>	26
11.	GRANTING FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS	26

1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Animal Science at Texas A&M University is to improve lives through discovery, integration, dissemination, and application of science-based knowledge of animals and animal products. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. The Department of Animal Science proactively supports promotion and/or tenure of faculty members who contribute significantly to the teaching, research, Extension and service missions of the Department, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension and Texas A&M University. The Department of Animal Science seeks to retain and reward outstanding faculty members who excel in teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, develop exceptional research and/or Extension programs, and commit their time and professional expertise in service to the department, college, university, professional societies, and stakeholders. 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.

Other documents are available to provide means to promote and thus retain faculty members with appointments to Texas A&M AgriLife Research ([Texas AgriLife Research Procedures](#)) and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension ([Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf](#)).

The expectations of the Department of Animal Science for its faculty are that they [develop](#) a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, service and/or Extension 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 ([University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2](#)), ([Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf](#)) or ([Texas AgriLife Research Procedures](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University, College of Agriculture and Life Science \(COALS\), Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension](#) and the [Department](#); and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general Department of Animal Science guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University and Texas A&M AgriLife documents:

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
University Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure
Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Guidelines for Promotion Process	https://faculty.aglifesciences.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/119/2023/03/AgriLife-Research-and-Extension-Guidelines-for-Promotion-Process.pdf
AgriLife Extension Professional Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty	Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf
Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures	Texas AgriLife Research Procedures

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

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of University faculty ranks and tracks can be found at ([12.01.99.M1.pdf](#)) and ([Faculty-Titles-Review-5.pdf](#)).

The faculty_ranks for AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension can be found using the links below:

AgriLife Extension Professional Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty	Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf
Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures	Texas AgriLife Research Procedures

3. Faculty Mentoring

The Department is committed to providing faculty who are new, tenure-track and/or eligible for promotion the guidance and mentoring that is crucial to their future success in the Department of Animal Science, College of Agriculture and Life Science, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension, Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M University.

Mentoring of new faculty accomplishes the following:

- Creates an environment that promotes faculty success.
- Guides the new faculty through the Departmental, Agency, College and University procedures and requirements for tenure and promotion.
- Provides candidates with constructive feedback on preparation of their dossier that will be submitted for annual evaluations, mid-term review, and promotion and/or tenure.
- Provides candidates with constructive feedback on prioritization of potential opportunities and duties regarding scholarly activities required of entry level (junior) faculty members.

3.1. Selection of Committee Members

Mentoring of entry level (junior) tenure-track faculty will be accomplished using a mentoring committee that includes at least one tenure-track member from a discipline outside the faculty member's area of scholarship, as well as two senior tenure-track faculty members from within the Department of Animal Science.

Academic Professional Track (APT), AgriLife Research, and AgriLife Extension entry level (junior) faculty mentoring committees will consist of three committee members: a chair with the same ad loc appointment (Texas A&M University, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, or Texas A&M AgriLife Extension), as the faculty member, and may include at least one faculty members with different appointment. Appointment of committee members by the Department Head will be done within six months of the faculty member's initial appointment.

3.2. Mentoring Committee for Entry Level faculty members

The mentoring committee will have the following responsibilities:

- Meet with the faculty member being mentored at least one time per year, but more frequently early on in the process and just before applying for promotion and tenure, as needed.
 - Meetings should address various topics such as: progress in scholarly activities to meet expectations for promotion and/or tenure; successes and failures with teaching, research service, and/or Extension; work/life balance; time management; appropriate levels of service; recruitment of outstanding graduate students.
- Evaluate teaching by reviewing materials such as syllabi, assignments, examinations, and student evaluations, as well as attending an occasional lecture.
- Review the annual plan of work before submission to the unit head.

- Review the dossier of the faculty member that will be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion, as well as proposals for funding of research, and manuscripts for publication in refereed scientific journals, as needed.
- All written materials and conversations between the committee and mentee are confidential.
- Provide a report to the Department Head that details progress of the mentee towards promotion and/or tenure that describes areas of strength and weakness, as well as recommendations for improving scholarly activities.

3.3. Mentoring Committee for First Promotion (mid-career) faculty members

- Once the mentee has received their first promotion, the committee will consist of two Professors, preferably maintaining at least one mentor who served on the previous mentoring committee.
- Meet with the person being mentored at least annually to review his/her dossier and provide feedback on strengths and weaknesses regarding expectations for promotion.

3.4. Responsibilities of the Mentee

- Proactively seek advice and counsel from the mentoring committee.
- Provide up-to-date materials including CV, teaching evaluations, annual evaluation materials, and items of concern to the mentoring committee each year.
- Schedule meetings with the mentoring committee to indicate how previous recommendations have been addressed.

4. Areas of Faculty Performance

(Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member’s performance in the assigned categories of performance (**teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; Extension; service; administration**). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

Guidelines for Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty members can be found at the following links:

AgriLife Extension Professional Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty	Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf
Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures	Texas AgriLife Research Procedures

4.1. Teaching

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. The quality and level of participation of a faculty member in each of these indicators should be examined at the department level. The focus of the evaluation should not be limited to the materials themselves, but rather on the quality of thought and synthesis encouraged. In addition to the traditional indicators, the development of techniques or new modes of instruction, substantial revision of existing courses or the development of new courses should be considered. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching.

Measures/sources of information may include:

- **Surveys of student opinions of teaching:** The use of student comments and evaluations can provide an immediate response of student's perspectives.
- **Accomplishment of students:** The number and caliber of students guided through effective research programs which resulted in refereed publications and recognition of the development of the faculty members' reputation as a scholar and teacher.
- **Evidence of effective student learning:** The master of material in subsequent courses.
- **Creativity in programmatic development:** Indication that a faculty member has been a catalyst for the initiation of new approaches in teaching his/her own courses or new programs (new texts, teaching material used by other educational groups, new teaching technology development, utilization of distance education, etc.).
- **Professional peer evaluation:** A peer analysis of prepared materials can be utilized to evaluate the quality of preparation, clarity, and appropriateness of educational goals and methods of testing. Professional peer evaluation may involve site visits, departmental exit interviews or performance in subsequent courses.
- **Formal teaching recognition:** The receipt of awards for outstanding teaching or other formal recognition of teaching excellence by student clubs, the department, college, university, or recognition of contributions to the educational programs of a professional society.
- **Self-evaluation of teaching:** The instructor's self-evaluation can present a unique insight into the teaching philosophy and professional efforts in teaching activities.
- **Flexibility in teaching abilities:** When appropriate, the teaching flexibility demonstrated by each instructor should be considered with attention to the ability of the instructor to properly gauge student understanding and distinguish between introductory and advanced presentations.
- **Student advising and mentoring:** Involvement in student advising programs or honors and fellows programs provide an important component of student development. Faculty participation in internship management, the Master of Agriculture program, co-op programs and student placement are also important components of the teaching evaluation. Significant variable credit programs should be identified, and their uniqueness defined.
- **Continuing Education:** Continuing education provides an important aspect of the academic activities of some faculty members involved in adult education, K-12 teacher education, professional leadership, specialized training, etc. Significant ongoing participation and development of continuing education programs may be an important component of a faculty member's activities.

4.2. [Research, scholarly activity or creative work for Texas A&M University faculty](#)

Research is critical to the mission of the College and a defining element of our University as a Research I institution. All faculty members with research appointments are expected to excel in research. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to be nationally/internationally recognized leaders in their areas of study with demonstrated impact that advances their field or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status in the case for tenure-track faculty members. Effectiveness and excellence in research significantly affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion for faculty members with research appointments.

Evaluation of research should focus on 1) how a faculty member has defined, developed and positioned their scholarship and field of study throughout their career to achieve impact and 2) evidence that their leadership and impact in their field of scholarship compares favorably to accomplishments and reputation typical of leaders in their discipline and field of study. This impact should be supported by demonstrated success in securing competitive extramural funding from federal, state, private and corporate funders; number, quality and impact of research publications in the leading journals; prestigious external awards and seminar invitations; number of citations and, where applicable, translational impacts. Leadership, impact and reputation in the faculty member's field should also be documented, for tenure/promotion, through peer evaluation letters from leaders in the same or closely related field from leading academic institutions. Leadership and impact should be demonstrated mainly from analysis of the content of the faculty member's work and how it has influenced and advanced their field of study.

Measures/sources of information may include:

- **Original peer-reviewed scientific publications:** The most traditional sense of original basic and applied research is the presentation of that material in formally peer-reviewed publications in scientific journals.
- **Invited review publications:** One of the more important components of developing national and international recognition for research capabilities is the publication of significant reviews in leading disciplinary scientific journals or review publications.
- **Book chapters and book editing:** Ongoing research activity may be published in books or specialized monographs of scientific meetings. While these may have varying value and occasionally be of major importance in chronicling or providing direction to a research area, they should not be interchanged with the invited reviews mentioned above.
- **Popular press articles and research application bulletins:** Publication opportunities exist which are targeted toward specific components of the lay audience in the popular press or applied agricultural service bulletins. This type of publication provides an important component of scientific education and application.
- **Textbooks, educational software and teaching materials:** There is an ever-increasing demand for educational materials for use in laboratories, lecture courses, workshops, and continuing education. Some of these materials find access to large interdisciplinary markets and some are used entirely within the local domain. The importance of these materials depends on the quality and extended impact of the materials on a wide community.
- **Products of research experiences:** As a result of research investigations, many products are developed which provide valuable end-products in themselves and traditionally represent a variety of integrated research and production-oriented activities. The utility of the research product should be examined in the performance criteria assessment. Included in this forum are the development of patented and non-patented products and/or techniques encompassing the formulation of germplasm/varieties, software, equipment, models, etc.
- **Technology transfer:** Invention disclosures, patents, copyrights, trademarks, consulting and participation in extension educational programs are important indicators of research performance.
- **Development of extramural funding activities:** Successful research programs in many areas are able to attract extramural research support from competitive state, federal and industrial sources. The development of competitive funding should be evaluated for the provision of a consistent, directed research program. In addition, it is becoming increasingly possible to develop extramural teaching/research funding relative to the national concerns regarding the future status of scientific education and research.
- **Participation in scientific meetings, invited seminars and related activities:** An indication of research activity can be demonstrated by participation in scientific meetings, particularly as invited speakers at major symposia. In addition, however, published abstracts and short published research reports associated with meetings can contribute to the evaluation of research quality.
- **Peer recognition, awards, and commendations:** The peer-recognition of research accomplishments and their impact on clientele groups provides a valuable indicator of the external impact and significance of the research program.
- **Solicitation of scientific expertise:** Requests to serve on decision-making panels (i.e. program reviews, consultation with government or industry, select scientific panels, publication editorial work, and peer grant review) represent measures of the potential importance of scientific effort.

Invited reviews, citations, and appraisals in the publications of others constitute a particularly significant testimony of importance. The record of research grant proposals and fellowships both submitted and awarded should be examined and interpreted. These components should demonstrate a positive pattern of professional development of the faculty member as a creative scholar. Original work typically should be considered as evidence of scholarly work and productivity only after acceptance for publication or presentation.

4.3. Service

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

Evaluation of service should focus on the significance and impact of the service activities to the academic unit, the institution, the profession, and society. Excellence in service should document how service activities contribute to national and international reputation and recognition for the faculty member and Texas A&M.

Measures/sources of information may include:

- **Departmental service:** All faculty are involved in various departmental services; however, the requirements of that service vary significantly. Some faculty members serve as Associate Heads of the Department or provide other major programmatic leadership. Included in these activities are student recruiting, placement services, departmental student club advising, and similar activities which provide nonacademic components of student development.
- **College or university service:** Selected faculty members provide major service on college or university-wide committees or task forces, public relations activities, and the Faculty Senate. Distinguished efforts in such activities provide important contributions to the Texas A&M University community.
- **Community or state-wide resource or leadership activities:** Some faculty members provide an irreplaceable resource for community development and continuing education. While these activities may or may not be a direct component of their professional responsibilities, extraordinary service or quality of community enhancement should be considered in a faculty evaluation. Of particular importance is the role that faculty have in youth education and development through both formal and informal programming. Another issue involves adult and continuing education activities which may or may not be a part of the professional responsibilities of a given faculty member.
- **Contributions to government, industry and commerce:** Many faculty members are asked to contribute their professional or scientific expertise to informational needs or to the solution of practical issues in the public and private domain. As appropriate, a statement should be provided relative to the service activities and problem-solving aspects of the faculty member.
- **International involvement:** In seeking to achieve a global perspective among students and professors, faculty at Texas A&M University are encouraged to contribute to worldwide economic and cultural development and enhance global understanding through their efforts at the international level. This includes assuming responsibility for international research enhancement grants, participation in USAID projects, and forging new **collaborative** relationships with international institutions.
- **Contributions to professional disciplines:** Many faculty members serve as officers and leaders in the disciplinary activities of their professional societies. The significance of these appointed and elected positions should be clearly explained.

4.4. Administration

Faculty members in the Department of Animal Science may, at times, be asked to take on administrative roles either within the department, in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, one of the Texas A&M University System agencies (i.e., AgriLife Research or Extension), or an administrative unit at Texas A&M University (i.e., a Center or Institute administrative role, or administrative office). Some of these appointments may be temporary and others may be permanent; however, these appointments will be based on terms jointly agreed upon by the Department Head and faculty member. In addition, a memo describing the terms will be signed by the relevant administrative leaders, which will include the expected proportion of time associated with the administrative appointment. When a faculty member has an administrative appointment, they may be evaluated on their effectiveness to (among other things):

- Align, motivate, and inspire people they supervise to believe in a vision and attain specific outcomes.
- Identify and hire capable and qualified individuals.
- Organize and manage projects effectively.
- Communicate effectively.
- Be flexible to adjust to change both within the unit and to outside factors.
- Budget appropriately and manage in a fiscally responsible manner.

5. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Animal Science recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

Evaluation criteria for promotion of Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty are described in the links below:

AgriLife Extension Professional Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty	Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf
Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures	Texas AgriLife Research Procedures

5.1. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

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

- Outstanding peer or student evaluations weighted in regard to the demands of the course and distribution of grades
- Selection for a university, college or professional society award for teaching
- Development of innovative teaching methods and materials
- Teaching Honors, Writing Intensive, Communication or Study Abroad courses
- Submission of new course proposals that fill an identified need in the curriculum
- Significant involvement in student professional training
- Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Significantly exceeding the defined teaching load for appointment

5.2. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

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

- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Effective teaching of undergraduate and/or graduate courses
- Evidence of high quality in-class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
- Advising and counseling
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness

5.3. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

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

- Manuscripts published in leading refereed scientific journals
- Receiving significant grant proposal funding
- Remarkable citation indices or downloads
- Invited reviews, books, and chapters published
- Research awards
- Development of intellectual property

- Significant research accomplishments
- Outputs from establishment of new national and/or international, extension, or transdisciplinary collaborations
- Undergraduate research mentorship (leading to some form of output, e.g., research report)
- Demonstrable contribution to Departmental Areas of Excellence

5.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

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

- Manuscripts submitted (peer-reviewed scientific and non-refereed technical articles) (individual faculty shall establish a programmatic goal (quality vs. quantity) to determine appropriate expectations for satisfactory performance)
- Grant proposals submitted
- Presentations at scientific/industry/commodity meetings (faculty member/graduate student)
- Evidence of sustained accomplishments of research project objectives
- Evidence of collaboration (rank/appointment appropriate)

5.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service

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

- Editorial contributions (editorial board, advisory board, guest review activities)
- Professional honors and awards
- Professional leadership (offices held, committees, task forces)
- International and diversity activities
- Grant panel review activities
- Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate

5.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service

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

- Membership on Committees (University, College, Department)
- Professional organizations (membership and activities)

6. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

Evaluation criteria for promotion of Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty are described in the links below:.

AgriLife Extension Professional Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty	Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf
Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures	Texas AgriLife Research Procedures

6.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

6.1.1. For promotion to Assistant Professor

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

6.1.2. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

- **Research:** Excellence in Research (see indicators described in 5.3 and 5.4) is an expectation of tenure-track faculty seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate independence in scholarship, demonstrate meaningful and nationally recognized impact in their field of research and be recognized as leaders in their field of study, or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status. Except in the discipline of education, scholarship of teaching and learning should be secondary to scholarship in the research discipline. Collaborative work is encouraged where each member of the group documents their major and independent contribution to the impact of the research. The applicants for promotion should have advanced their field nationally and internationally, demonstrated by specific examples.
- **Teaching:** Effectiveness in teaching and a commitment to excellence in teaching (see indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2) are expectations of all tenure-track faculty. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student research. Teaching effort and load should be documented and reviewed. Teaching course load and assignments should be consistent with the teaching effort associated with the faculty member's appointment, which may vary across disciplines nationally. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students should be documented.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of all tenure-track faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally.

6.1.3. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

- **Research:** Excellence in Research (see indicators described in 5.3 and 5.4) is an expectation of tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professors. They are expected to be recognized leaders nationally and for most fields internationally who demonstrate impact that has advanced their field. It is incumbent on applicants for promotion to clearly define their field of research/scholarship and its relevance, value and impact for the department, TAMU/TAMUS, the State of Texas, the nation, and the world. The applicants for promotion should provide specific examples of how they have advanced their field nationally and internationally; activity alone is not a sufficient measure of impact. Leadership and impact of research should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member's career.
- **Teaching:** Effectiveness in teaching and a commitment to excellence in teaching (see indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2) are expectations of all tenured faculty. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student research. Teaching effort and load should be documented and reviewed. Teaching course load and assignments should be consistent with the teaching effort associated with the faculty member's appointment, which may vary across disciplines nationally. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students should be documented. Impact of teaching should grow throughout the faculty member's career.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of all tenured faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member's career.

6.2. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Instructional or Practice in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching. University faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their

research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

6.2.1. For Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer. Teaching excellence can be demonstrated with outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and professional conferences; recognition of excellence by internal and external teaching awards; continued professional development in teaching, and other appropriate indicators as described in 5.1.

6.2.2. For Promotion from Instructional Assistant Professor to Instructional Associate Professor or Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor (University Research faculty members)

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of an Instructional Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Instructional Associate Professor. Teaching excellence and effectiveness should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.7 and 5.8) are an expectation of Academic Professional Track Assistant Professor seeking promotion for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development, program supervision, ensuring program accreditation and other service activities that are critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. Significant service contributions to the institution and profession are expected and these contributions can often have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching.
- **Research:** Excellence in research for research faculty and a high potential for continued excellence in research is expected of a Research Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Research Associate Professor. Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research are an expectation of the Instructional Assistant Professors seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty. Research excellence and effectiveness should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 5.3 and 5.4.

6.2.3. For Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Senior Lecturers seeking promotion to Principal Lecturer. Teaching excellence can be demonstrated with outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and professional conferences; recognition of excellence by internal and external teaching awards; continued professional development in teaching, and other appropriate indicators as described in 5.1.

6.2.4. For Promotion from Instructional Associate Professor to Instructional Professor or Research Associate Professor to Research Professor (University Research faculty member)

Teaching: Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of an Instructional Associate Professor seeking promotion to Instructional Professor. Teaching excellence and effectiveness should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2. Leadership and impact in teaching and scholarship of teaching should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member's career.

- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.7 and 5.8) are an expectation of Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professors of the

Practice seeking promotion for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development, program supervision, ensuring program accreditation and other service activities that are critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. Significant service contributions to the institution and profession are expected and these service contributions should have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member’s career.

- **University Research Faculty:** Excellence in research and a commitment to excellence in research are an expectation of the Research Associate Professor seeking promotion to Research Professor. Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research are expected of the Instructional Associate Professor seeking promotion for whom teaching is the assigned secondary duty. Research excellence and effectiveness should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 5.3 and 5.4. Leadership and impact in research should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member’s career.

7. 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, COALS, AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible. Annual reviews guidelines for AgriLife faculty members can be found at the links below:

<p>AgriLife Extension Professional Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty</p>	<p>Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf</p>
<p>Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures</p>	<p>Texas AgriLife Research Procedures</p>

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

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

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

7.1. Purpose

- Provide information on the accomplishments of the faculty member to the Department Head and guidance from the Department Head to the faculty member regarding assessment of progress.

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

7.2. Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. At the same time, expectations should be clearly defined and performance metrics transparent to ensure that expectations are reasonable and yet sufficiently rigorous to increase the likelihood for promotion. The annual review will serve as an opportunity for individual faculty to establish a clear and executable Plan of Work that is mutually beneficial to the goals of the faculty member’s individual program and the overarching goals of the Department, College, and University. The Unit Head may modify the proposed activities as necessary and the finalized Plan of Work will be the basis for the Annual Review in the subsequent year, and as the standard for “Satisfactory”. For tenure-track faculty, the annual Plan of Work will be reviewed by the faculty member’s mentoring committee prior to submission to the Unit Head and the finalized Plan of Work will be provided to the Mentoring Committee following the Annual Review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

7.3. Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year’s efforts while also taking into consideration the previous three year’s efforts to build a more holistic evaluation of the faculty member’s program that accommodates the grant-research-publication cycle. Additionally, there may be exceptions to the annual evaluation window for those faculty with circumstances that seriously impede progress in work, which are outlined in bullet #4 of section 9.3 (Extensions to the Probationary Period).

7.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on five categories: “Unsatisfactory,” Needs Improvement,” “Satisfactory,” “Exemplary,” “ Most Meritorious” based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

7.4.1. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching

- *Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in teaching based on indicators previously described.*
- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of students, didactic/laboratory teaching, or other indicators previously described.*

- *Satisfactory– appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees, and other indicators previously described.*
- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments and other indicators previously described. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.*
- *Most Meritorious- those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member based on indicators previously described. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and/or solicited involvement in professional organizations.*

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**.

7.4.2. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

- *Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity based on the indicators previously described.*
- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, for example, funding, manuscripts, citations, presentations, book chapters, or other indicators previously described.*
- *Satisfactory – strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, or other indicators previously described.*
- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include quality publications, funding, citations, and invited presentations and other indicators previously described.*
- *Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member based on indicators previously described. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.*

7.4.3. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service

- *Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in service based on indicators previously described.*
- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in service based on indicators previously described. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.*
- *Satisfactory – adequate evidence of effectiveness in service based on indicators previously described. Those in this category will have involvement in local service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.*
- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in service based on indicators previously described. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as*

chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations (e.g., officer or chair) would be typical.

- *Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member based on indicators previously described. These faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and/or solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.*

7.5. Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

7.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities.

Each faculty member will submit achievements for the previous calendar year through the Interfolio Faculty180 portal prior to the annual review deadline. Faculty will also submit an annual plan of work through the Interfolio portal.

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of possible content for the report are:

- a statement of assigned duties, consistent with the appointment letter or current position description
- a list of activities, accomplishments, and awards
- evidence of student learning
- evidence of effectiveness in service

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

7.5.2.A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations.

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

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

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

7.5.3. Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member

The department head, director, or supervisor will meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. A meeting is scheduled between the Department Head and faculty member to discuss all aspects of faculty performance, including identification of areas in need of improvement. The Department Head offers constructive comments to facilitate the continued success of the faculty member and discusses progress towards promotion where appropriate. The submitted Plan of Work is discussed and revised, as appropriate. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

7.5.4. Performance Assessment

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, Extension, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual's appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University. The Department Head assigns a ranking (clearly outstanding, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations or unsatisfactory) for each category (teaching, scholarship, Extension and/or service) along with an overall ranking.

7.6. Assessment outcomes that require action

As per [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

7.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration), or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an "Unsatisfactory" periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

7.6.2. Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of "Needs Improvement" can stay as "Needs Improvement" as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to "Unsatisfactory". The rating of "Needs Improvement" should be changed to "Satisfactory" when pre-determined milestones are met.

7.7. Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Office of Faculty Affairs' Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, "These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year."

7.8. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the 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](#)

8. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure. These mid-term reviews are often referred to as “3rd year reviews” because most tenure-track faculty are hired with a 7-year probationary period; therefore, the mid-term review occurs in the third year. Tenure track faculty with a probationary period of less than five years are also encouraged to have a mid-term review. All academic track faculty will also complete a mandatory comprehensive mid-term review within three years of hiring. This includes AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension Faculty members. Guidelines for AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension faculty members can be found using the links below:

Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Guidelines for Promotion Process	https://faculty.aglifesciences.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/119/2023/03/AgriLife-Research-and-Extension-Guidelines-for-Promotion-Process.pdf
AgriLife Extension Professional Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty	Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf
Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures	Texas AgriLife Research Procedures

8.1. Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track and academic professional track (non-tenure-track) faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensures that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress with respect to expectations set forth in the letter of appointment.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member documenting scholarly activities and accomplishments; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/ director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- In addition, non-tenure-track faculty will have a mid-term review that should be similar to the promotion review process, including the submission of dossier materials documenting activities and accomplishments with respect to conditions of their appointment.

- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for meeting expectations for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

8.2. Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2019	7 years	Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)

The P&T Committee Chair and Mentoring Committee will contact the candidate to advise and assist in obtaining and developing the documents necessary for the review process, including:

- Candidate’s statements on teaching, research and service
- Curriculum Vitae

The candidate’s packet of materials shall be consistent with the current requirements of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Texas A&M University. Once the candidate’s dossier has been completed, the P&T Committee will be provided a copy and directed to consider the qualifications of the candidate based on the materials submitted. Committee members will then submit a written vote with a ranking for promotion and/or tenure consideration. The Committee Chair will call a formal meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee wherein members will confidentially consider and/or discuss each candidate’s packet and an official vote will be recorded. Following the Committee meeting, the Chair will prepare a summary report on each candidate’s teaching, research, service/outreach and other activities. This report will follow all guidelines established by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs and will become a part of the candidate’s dossier. The department head will also provide a written statement that will become a part of the candidate’s dossier. The candidate’s dossier will be forwarded to the College P&T Committee and then forwarded to the Dean, Director or Vice Chancellor for review. The candidate will then receive written feedback from the mid-term evaluation that will be discussed with the Department Head. Documents and recommendations will also be shared with the mentoring committee.

Evaluation and voting on progress of a faculty member toward tenure (or continued appointment) will be based on information in the mid-term packets and will be based on evidence that the faculty member is or is not making satisfactory progress toward meeting expectations of tenure (or their continued appointment). Thus, indicators of what is expected of a faculty member to be tenured or promoted will be used to make a recommendation regarding satisfactory progress toward meeting tenure (or continued appointment). Candidates may not have met all expectations for tenure but should show clear progress and promise toward achieving acceptable levels of scholarly activities.

8.3. Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. The candidate will receive feedback from the mid-term evaluation, and recommendations for going forward from the department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty, which will be discussed with the Department Head. Documents and recommendations will also be shared with the mentoring committee.

9. Promotion and Tenure Review

Guidelines for the promotion of AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension faculty can be found using the links below:

Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Guidelines for Promotion Process	https://faculty.aglifesciences.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/119/2023/03/AgriLife-Research-and-Extension-Guidelines-for-Promotion-Process.pdf
AgriLife Extension Professional Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty	Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf
Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures	Texas AgriLife Research Procedures

9.1. Purpose

Tenure is granted to recognize demonstrated leadership and impact in a [research](#) field nationally and a demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and outreach/service. Promotion to Professor is granted for international leadership and impact in a research field and demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and service. In exceptional and rare cases, national/international leadership and impact in teaching and service can be the basis for promotion from associate to full professor (see [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

9.2. Process

Any individual hired in a tenure-track position will be required to submit his/her dossier for tenure review during the academic year prior to the year of mandatory consideration. Such reviews may be made earlier and are, in fact, encouraged whenever it appears appropriate. If an early review does not result in a favorable decision for promotion or tenure, a review will be conducted again at the mandatory time.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mandatory Review (at all levels) will occur:
Calendar Year 2014	7 years	2019-2020

Procedures for the development of the candidate’s dossier can be found on the website of the [Texas A&M Office of Vice President for Faculty Affairs](#). Particular attention should be paid to the dossier template format for a candidate being considered for promotion. Colleges or departments stipulate requirements regarding the template for a CV. **Agency candidates should order the CV so that the primary area upon which they are being evaluated is listed first.** Tenure-track faculty should put research/scholarly activity/creative work as the first section. The candidate’s Mentoring Committee is expected to provide guidance and feedback on preparation of the dossier prior to its submission.

Texas A&M AgriLife Research Faculty should refer to the [agency’s procedures](#) as procedures and expectations are often unique to Texas A&M AgriLife Research.

Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Specialists should refer to the [agency’s guidelines](#) for policies and procedures unique to Texas A&M AgriLife Extension.

Faculty members appointed by Texas A&M University on the Research track follow the [guidelines](#) posted on the website of the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Texas A&M Instructional track faculty (Lecturers, Instructional Assistant Professors, Instructional Associate Professors) also follow the Office of Faculty Affairs guidelines and the same timelines for promotions.

Department of Animal Science Standard Operating Procedures are:

1. This document (“Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation”) will be reviewed at least every three years by the Faculty Advisory Committee in the Department of Animal Science to ensure that it remains consistent with the policies of Texas A&M University and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension. Any substantive changes to this document that are not mandated by the University or its agencies must be approved by a majority vote of the Animal Science faculty members including tenure-track, APT, AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension faculty.
2. This document will be available to all tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty within the statewide program of the Department of Animal Science on the department intranet or available upon request to the department administration.
3. The most recent version of this document will be posted on the web site of Texas A&M University College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (<https://faculty.aglifesciences.tamu.edu/promotion-tenure/>).
4. Texas A&M University faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure, or scheduled for mandatory midterm reviews, must prepare their dossiers according to guidelines of the College of Agriculture and Life Science as appropriate to the appointment of the specific candidate, and submit the dossiers to the chair of the P&T Committee for University faculty or an AgriLife Research/Extension departmental committee by the department deadline in spring semester (early May).
5. External reviewers are identified (using Faculty Affairs, COALS, AgriLife Research or AgriLife Extension criteria) for candidates whose applications require external reviews and dossiers are sent to external reviewers. Letters are requested to be returned to the Department of Animal Science before a scheduled department review committee or AgriLife College Committee meeting. The candidate is asked to provide a minimum of 5 potential reviewers and the department is asked to provide at least 5 potential reviewers. The goal is to receive a minimum of 5 qualified letters for each candidate.
6. The Department of Animal Science’s University faculty P&T review committee consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Full Professors and all Academic Professional Track faculty of equivalent rank. Academic Professional Track faculty may only review, deliberate and vote on Academic Professional Track dossiers. When dossiers are evaluated for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, only members at the rank of Professor may deliberate and vote. The review committee has a chair and two co-chairs assigned by the Department Head who ensures that all departmental promotion and tenure policies are adhered to. If a committee member has a conflict of interest (e.g. has served as an advisor or member of graduate committee of the candidate) they must recuse themselves from review, discussion, and voting.
7. Dossiers are distributed to the members of the P&T Committee at least two weeks prior to the August/September committee meeting for review. All committee members are strongly encouraged to attend the meeting in-person, although a conference line or video conference is always available to enable off-campus committee members to participate by phone and/or video conferencing. All committee members are encouraged to express their views on each candidate, various perspectives are collectively discussed. All committee discussions and deliberations are confidential. The Chair of the committee will assign three committee members to collect the comments from committee members and to subsequently write individual report sections on teaching, research, and service within the singular report. In addition, the assigned primary author of each letter is responsible for coordinating the editing and committee approval of the committee report.

8. Within a few days of the committee meeting the summary report is finalized and submitted to the Committee Chair. Committee members cast their confidential votes. Voting options include yes, no, or recuse. Committee members should utilize the “recuse” option only when they have a clear conflict of interest with the candidate that has been validated by the Department Head. The final committee report will be submitted to the Department Head at least 10 days prior to the College deadline.

For a non-tenure track promotion case with a negative outcome, a minimum of ONE YEAR must elapse before resubmission is allowed (e.g. if a candidate was not recommended for promotion during the academic year 2018-2019, the earliest they can submit the dossier again is academic year 2020-2021). Requests for an exception can be made to the Vice President for of Faculty Affairs only with concurrence of the Department Head and Dean.

9.3. Extensions to the Probationary Period (“Tenure Clock”)

The “tenure clock” for a tenure-track faculty member is calculated as follows:

Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Fall semester of Tenure Consideration Year (e.g., regardless of month, if the contract start date is in 2013 + 7 years of probation – 2 years = 2018. The candidate’s dossier will be assembled in Spring 2018. The mandatory review will start in the Fall 2018. If successful, the Board of Regents will grant tenure in Spring 2019, and the promotion and/or tenure will become effective on September 1, 2019).

- Extensions to the probationary period may be granted upon petition by the faculty member and approval and, recommendation by the department head and dean, and final approval by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.
- Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer probationary period may be requested if there are compelling extenuating circumstances. The request must be submitted prior to the mandatory year for granting of tenure. Any extension of greater than one year must be approved by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases:
- The faculty member is taking leave without pay, or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year, provided the leave is not taken solely for the purpose of pursuing activities that will enhance the faculty member’s qualifications for promotion and tenure.
- The faculty member has encountered circumstances that may seriously impede progress toward demonstrating qualification for the award of promotion and tenure. Such circumstances might include (but are not limited to):
 - serious illness or injury;
 - having responsibility for the primary care of an infant or small child;
 - having responsibility for the primary care of a close relative who is disabled or seriously ill; or
 - any serious disruption in the probationary period for unexpected reasons beyond the faculty member’s control.
 - The above guidelines for extension of the probationary period for tenure were developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the president of Texas A&M University.

9.4. Reconsideration in the Terminal Year

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the Department Head and with the agreement of the Dean and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The sole ground on which a department head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration. The Vice President for Faculty Affairs will discuss procedures should such a case arise. Reconsideration does not entail an additional terminal year.

9.5. Non-Reappointment of Tenure-track Faculty

Since the probationary period consists of a series of one-year appointments, a decision not to reappoint an individual who is on probation can be made at any time up to the year of the mandatory review. Non-reappointment should be considered if performance is unsatisfactory to the point that it is clearly unlikely the person will meet the expectations for tenure, as neither party benefits from prolonging an unsatisfactory

situation. Such a decision is made, of course, with great care and only in compelling circumstances. Please note that notification of non-renewal may be made in spite of a prior decision to extend the probationary period. However, once notification of non-renewal is made, no request for extension of the probationary period may be made.

10. Post-Tenure Review

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution. The evaluation should be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research, scholarship, or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities, and must include peer review of the faculty member. In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 7) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 10.2).

10.1. Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

10.2. Peer Review Committee

A Peer Evaluation Committee will be established for each faculty member as an *ad hoc* committee of the departmental promotion and tenure committee. Membership of this committee will be determined by the Department Head. The faculty member under review may request certain individuals to be excluded as a member of the post tenure review committee. An existing mentoring committee cannot be used as the post-tenure review committee. The Peer Evaluation Committee will be composed of three faculty peers of the same or higher academic rank. The Peer Evaluation Committee cannot be comprised of any faculty being peer reviewed that year.

10.3. Process

Prior to the sixth anniversary of the date of the awarding of tenure and at least once every six years thereafter, peer evaluation will be a component of the faculty member's annual review.

Each tenured faculty member to be reviewed will submit to the Peer Evaluation Committee a six-year cumulative summary of the faculty member's activities and accomplishments associated with the academic position.

The Peer Evaluation Committee will review the faculty member's scholarly productivity in teaching, research and service in accordance with the criteria for categories of performance as defined in (a) the departmental promotion and tenure guidelines (Section 9), and (b) the departmental annual review guidelines (Section 7). The Peer Evaluation Committee will consider the faculty member's position description when making the determination of merit.

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 departmental guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations. The Peer Evaluation Committee will make a merit determination of the faculty member's performance and accomplishments and report this determination to the Head of Department as satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.

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

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

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

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

For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.¹ If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

Timeline for this review will be coordinated with the College and University calendars for tenure and promotion review each academic calendar year. The faculty member undergoing post-tenure review will be notified as soon as the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Promotion and Tenure calendar is released, and deadlines have been set.

10.4. Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 7) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 10.3) or upon request of the faculty member. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process. If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/ director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see Section 10.5) acceptable to the dean.

The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

¹ It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. On behalf of the Dean, the Executive Associate Dean will solicit a list of names of potential committee members from the faculty member and a list of individuals that should not be contacted. The department head will give feedback on the submitted names and have the opportunity to provide additional names. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work

The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

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:

- No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,
- Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4,
- Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

10.5. The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the unit guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, director, or supervisor and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review)

10.6. Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of [University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01](#) (Faculty Grievances Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. After consultation with the faculty member, department

head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

10.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the department head, director, or supervisor (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

11. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

[University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see [Institutional Rule 31.08.01](#), which indicates the process for this situation.

See the website of the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

Contact Office

Department of Animal Science, Office of the Department Head, e-mail carwile@tamu.edu.