

Combined Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

College of Architecture

Approved by the College of Architecture 12/14/2020
Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties 12/20/2020

REQUIRED

- Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.
--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#).
- Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:
 - Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit
The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.
 - Dean of Faculties

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance 3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness 5
5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure 5
6. Promotion and Tenure Process 6
7. Annual Review 6
8. Mid-Term Review 11
9. Post-Tenure Review 12

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Architecture is to offer a top-notch education in a diverse range of disciplines that address critical, complex challenges in our natural, built and virtual environments. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the College of Architecture for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure

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

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit.

The College of Architecture is actively working to reduce the number of tracks utilized to classify faculty. The College currently utilizes the following ranks and tracks:

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

The following titles are used to classify professional track faculty at all ranks:

- **Visiting Professor:** Faculty with this title are hired to teach for a limited time, including research graduates who are hired to teach following graduation from doctoral programs.
- **Professor of Practice:** Faculty with this title are typically dually employed as visiting faculty at Texas A&M University while maintaining their professional practices.
- **Instructional:** Faculty with title are employed primarily for the purpose of teaching courses. They contribute, to a smaller degree, to either service or research.
- **Executive:** Executive professors are those who have or have had substantial industry experience that they bring to their teaching or research appointments. Equivalent to Clinical in non-clinical disciplines.
- **Lecturer:** Faculty with this title typically hold a bachelor's, non-terminal or Master's degree in an affiliated field. These faculty are only expected to contribute to the College's teaching mission.
- **Research Professor:** Research faculty are expected to hold terminal degrees in a given field with a preference for PhDs. Conducting and disseminating research is the primary foci of faculty with this title.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Section 4.4.1)

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

3.1 Teaching

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. Relevant work product includes but is not limited to: (1) receipt of grants to support pedagogical innovations; (2) receipt of internal and external teaching awards and accolades; (3) use of teaching materials by faculty at peer institutions; (4) publication of works used to support teaching, i.e. textbooks; (5) publication of articles in peer reviewed journals related to pedagogy, among other

evidence as relevant to the faculty's disciplinary training. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work:

Quality in research and creative activities is an important and necessary component in annual review and merit compensation decisions. However, this component is not sufficient on its own to ensure a positive promotion and tenure decision.

For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative activity. Architectural design, engineering technology, veterinary or medical technology, fiction, poetry, painting, music, and sculpture are examples.

Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge and the creation of new ideas are critical to our academic reputation for excellence. The University and College view high quality research and creative activities and dissemination of the results as fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and international prominence. Indices of quality include: publications in leading scholarly/professional journals in the relevant disciplines, inclusion in major exhibitions or solo exhibitions of creative work, successful participation in major design competitions, peer recognition via research or publication and design awards, citations or evidence of precedent-setting testimony, membership on prestigious scholarly or practitioner editorial boards or juries, and significant external funding for research or creative activities.

Collaboration in research and creative activities is desirable. However, a balanced record that includes clear evidence of individual contributions to the body of knowledge and expertise is encouraged, especially for Assistant and Associate Professors.

External funding of research or creative activities may be an indicator of excellence when such research seeks to contribute to the body of knowledge, the dissemination of creative ideas and/or to student development. External funding should serve as a means to quality dissemination of new ideas and/or student development.

The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research, scholarly activity or creative work performance are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

3.3 Service

This includes service to the institution—to students, colleagues, Department, College, and the University—as well as service beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

The College of Architecture serves a variety of constituencies including students, the academic profession, the design and construction industries, the public, and the University.

A variety of service roles contribute to the attainment of our goal of excellence and international prominence.

There is no attempt to prescribe the specific service roles an individual faculty member should perform.

However, all faculty members are expected to contribute, to the appropriate degree, in the service area. The amount and nature of the service contributions will differ as a function of both individual skills/interests and position expectations.

Quality in service is an important and necessary component in annual review and merit compensation decisions. However, this component is not sufficient on its own to ensure a positive promotion and tenure decision.

Given its small size, many faculty in the College of Architecture hold administrative appointments. They serve as research center and institute directors, program coordinators, assistant and associate department heads, department heads, and deans and associate deans. For these faculty, a significant percentage of their workload is dedicated to the leadership of the College. Administrative service is a factor appropriate for consideration in the Promotion and Tenure process in the College of Architecture. While administrative service alone will be insufficient to justify a promotion to Associate or Full Professor, promotion is appropriate when there is a demonstrated achievement over time AND the administrator also demonstrates excellence in teaching and/or research. A dossier must document the history of the achievement.

The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in service performance are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The College of Architecture recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. In our case, these vary significantly within each department. As such, the College, in its review, defers to the indicators established by each department. In its review, the College seeks to ensure that the departments have fairly applied their standards to the dossiers being reviewed. 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. 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.M2](#)).

4.1 Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

4.2 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Teaching** are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

4.3 Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

4.4 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

4.5 Indicators of **Excellence in Service** are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

4.6 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** are outlined in each department's faculty evaluation guidelines.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

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

5.1.1 **Assistant Professor:** Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a productive pattern of research, creative activities and publication. Service contributions should generally be focused on Department and College academic needs. Further, it is expected that Assistant Professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor and the awarding of tenure occur concurrently in the College of Architecture. Granting of promotion and tenure will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions.

5.1.2 **Associate Professor:** Associate Professors are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate effectiveness in all three performance dimensions. In addition, excellence is expected in instruction/teaching or research, creative activities and publication. Associate Professors, are expected to exhibit greater contributions in one or more of the areas of service effectiveness and excellence compared to Assistant Professors.

5.1.2 **Professor:** Promotion to Professor will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions. There may be significant diversity in the nature of the contributions by Professors. However, there is the continued expectation of examples of excellence in one or more performance areas. Merit compensation will be the primary extrinsic means of recognizing such excellence. Other potential means of recognition are through consideration for appointment to an endowed position or to a Distinguished Professorship.

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

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (APT; non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. The majority of APT faculty will be reviewed with respect to teaching and service. In some rare instances, the production and dissemination of research and creative work by APT faculty will bear on decisions related to promotion in the case that these activities are aligned with their appointments. APT 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. **Promotion and Tenure Process**

Tenure-track faculty are eligible for promotion and tenure when they have been in rank for five years. They may be considered for early promotion and tenure if their accomplishments are commensurate with the expectations for review. The process begins with the notification by the department head to the candidate of their eligibility for tenure and promotion. The candidate works with their mentors and the members of the departmental level promotion and tenure committee to complete a dossier. The dossier includes:

- A three-page statement related to the candidate's impact in the areas of teaching, research, and service;
- A CV
- A photograph
- Grants table
- Examples of work product, including, books articles, reports, photographs, drawing, etc.
- Copies of annual reviews and the third-year review

6.1 Process

The expected content of dossiers will be aligned annually with the expectations set by the University's Dean of Faculties.

The dossier will be prepared using the Interfolio system. These files will be made available to the Departmental promotion and tenure committee, the department head, the College promotion and tenure committee, the Dean, the Dean of Faculties and his or her designees, Provost, and President. The candidate will be advised by the Department Head of the vote (positive or negative) of each decision-maker. The process is managed by the Executive Associate Dean.

6.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty Promotion Process

APT faculty are eligible for promotion. These faculty may apply for promotion at any time. There is no requirement for time in rank. Their dossiers will be similar in form and content to those prepared by those being considered for tenure and promotion. The review process is also the same.

All dossiers will be reviewed at all levels under the lens of the Departmental promotion and tenure guidelines.

7. **Annual Review**

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

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

In the case of budgeted joint appointments, It is required that each departmental committee completes its own review. The cooperating department heads will write a joint letter of review for consideration by the College

Committee and the Dean. This process mirrors that for those with joint appointments who seek tenure and/or promotion within the College of Architecture.

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 and their department head, if the two are different.

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 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 in which the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
 - See [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

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. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

7.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.

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

using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance.

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.
- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

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

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

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

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

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.M2](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

7.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities.

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

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

The specific contents of the report of defined by the department but typically include: courses taught, innovations in teaching, teaching evaluations, professional development activities in teaching, research grants applied for and received, publications, reports, examples of creative work, interdisciplinary activities, projects contributing to the ██████████ college, completion of university reaching requirements, and service at all levels in and out of the college.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), (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 faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the

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

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

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

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

The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

7.5.4 Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual's appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University.

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, patient care...), or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

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

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 predetermined 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 Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.”

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 Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#)

8. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

All tenure-track faculty must have a written review, to assess progress toward tenure. The process for third-year review mirrors that of the promotion and tenure process. However, this review process is complete after the Dean completes his or her letter.

Upon the completion of a successful third-year review, department heads are authorized, if able, to grant tenure-track faculty a one-semester sabbatical from teaching to focus more intensely on research development.

8.1 Purpose

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

- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a mid-term (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)

8.3 Feedback from mid-term review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through mid-term review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

9. Post-Tenure Review¹

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

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

9.1 Purpose

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

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

- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

9.2 Peer Review Committee

Each Department within the College of Architecture has defined its PTR process and has prescribed the composition of the Peer Review Committee.

9.3 Process

- 9.3.1 Each department's PTR guidelines prescribes the materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee. These materials may include but are not limited to: updated CVs, teaching portfolios, examples of grants, reports, and publications, samples of creative work, etc.
- 9.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
- 9.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 9.3.4 A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 9.3.5. A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 9.3.6. A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 9.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the Post-Tenure Review guidelines of the unit in which the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.² If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 9.3.8 **By no later than May 31st**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's Post-Tenure Review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

² It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the Post-Tenure Review in both units.

9.4 Professional Development Review

A Professional Development Review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/ director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

9.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

9.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what “consultation” means.

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

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

9.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

9.4.5a 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,

9.4.5b 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 of [University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review

committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

9.5 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)

9.6 Appeal

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

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

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

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

9.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

10. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

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

See the Dean of Faculties website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

Contact Office

College of Architecture Office of the Dean, 979-845-1222, Langford A, Suite 202