

# Combined Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

## Department of Atmospheric Sciences

Guidelines approved on Dec. 22, 2016. Re-formatted in Nov. 2020. Revised version, Feb. 2021.

### 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 3-4
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure 4
6. Annual Review 4-9
7. Mid-Term Review 9-10
8. Post-Tenure Review 10-13

### 1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Atmospheric Sciences in the College of Geosciences at Texas A&M University is to be a destination-of-choice organization for innovative education and research. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department 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 Department; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates the Departmental 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
<b>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a>
<b>12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a>
<b>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a>
<b>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</b>	<a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines</a>
<b>Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</b>	<a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure</a>

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](#).

Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. Faculty in tenure-track and tenured appointments are expected to contribute to the teaching, research, and service in the department. The relative effort in each category may vary from year to year, depending upon departmental priorities and needs.

Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor are non-tenure track or Academic Professional Track (APT) appointments primarily focused on research. Faculty holding a research APT appointment are expected to actively contribute to scholarship in their research area, and to secure extramural funding to support their appointment. They may also supervise graduate students and occasionally teach courses.

Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer, and Lecturer are APT appointments primarily focused on teaching. The level of effort for the instructional APT appointment is based on the number of courses/sections taught in any given semester. This effort may vary from semester to semester, depending upon departmental priorities and needs.

## 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, particularly their contributions to the research, teaching and service missions of Texas A&M University. The standard level of effort for a tenure-track or tenured faculty member is 40% research, 40% teaching and 20% service (unless unique terms have been established by the department head in the annual appointment letter). While the absolute balance of time and effort may evolve over the course of a career, the College of Geosciences expects sustained excellence in each of the three dimensions. Sustained excellence in scholarly impact is based on the standards of impact valued within the specific discipline. Regardless of discipline, the College of Geosciences expects tenure-track and tenured faculty member to consistently seek external funding and advance the discipline through peer-reviewed publications at every career stage. Sustained excellence in teaching includes consistent revision of course materials and instructional methods/assessments based on the evolving nature of the discipline and standards of pedagogical excellence. Sustained excellence in service at a minimum consists of conscientious contributions to Department, College and University efforts as assigned or requested, as well as external service to the discipline. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

### 3.1 Teaching

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

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

classroom presentation, and (iii) reasonable evaluation of the student's performance. Items (i) and (iii) are generally handled by peer evaluation of appropriate materials, such as class syllabi, notes, and examinations. Some information on these two items may also be obtained from student evaluation. Item (ii) may be evaluated by student evaluations, classroom assessments by senior faculty and alumni surveys.

### 3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work:

Active production of scholarly work is expected and necessary for promotion and tenure. In addition, scholarly work should be appropriate in the context of supporting the mission of the Department. Pursuit of scholarship can be accomplished in teaching, research, or professional activities. A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated work. Scholarly activities are those that result in publications. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight. Publications in proceedings of international or national conferences (refereed) rank second, and presentations and publications in regional conferences rank last. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work and its impact on the field (as measured by citation metrics as well as peer assessment).

### 3.3 Service

Service includes service to the Department, the University, and the profession, and must be appropriate in the context of the mission of the Department. Serving as chair of major committees represents a leadership role and contributes to the stature of the Department and College. Typical service activities may include organizing national or international symposia or workshops; serving as a member of boards of international or national symposia, an officer in professional societies, referee or reviewer for funding agencies, professional journals, or textbook publishers; and participating in editorial boards of journals or textbooks and grant review panels.

## 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department 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.

Indicators of ***Excellence in Teaching*** includes, but is not limited to:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.
- Outstanding mentoring of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement, and subsequent development of graduate students
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award.
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum.
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.

4.1 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching*** includes, but is not limited to:

- Reflective response to peer review.
- Analysis of strengths/weaknesses of course materials and delivery.
- Analysis of student achievement of course objectives.
- Statement of goals for improvement.
- Participation in teaching workshops or other development activities.
- Evidence of student growth over the semester.
- Student performance in current and/or subsequent courses.
- Employer reports of student performance.

4.2 Indicators of *Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work* includes, but is not limited to:

- Publications in leading refereed journals.
- Receiving major external fellowship or externally funded research award.
- Frequent citation of publications.
- Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s).
- Awards for peer reviewed creative activities.

4.3 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work* includes, but is not limited to:

- Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research.
- Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research.
- Patents and/or commercialization of research.
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings.

4.4 Indicators of *Excellence in Service* includes, but is not limited to:

- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board;
- Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University;
- Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting;
- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal;
- Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization;
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large;

4.5 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Service* includes, but is not limited to:

- Being an officer in a national or international professional organization;
- Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee;
- Organizing national or international symposia or workshops;
- Serving as a referee or reviewer for funding agencies, highly ranked professional journals, or textbook publishers, and
- Serving on editorial boards of journals or textbooks and grant review panels.
- Diligent and conscientious service in departmentally assigned committee work as assessed by the committee chair and department head

## 5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

### 5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

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

- 5.1.1 Assistant Professor: Tenure-track faculty members in probationary periods are carefully evaluated each year so that they know, to the maximum extent possible, their level of progress toward tenure. Input material for such evaluations may be faculty members' curricula vitae, annual performance reports, and other sources of information. While it is recognized that College and Department priorities and faculty performance criteria will likely change over time, faculty members will be kept informed of current expectations and their evaluations conducted in a consistent manner. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty members are evaluated on their teaching, research, and service

contributions. Faculty are expected to develop up-to-date teaching materials and present it in an organized manner in the classroom to achieve the desired student learning outcomes. Mentoring graduate students on their timely progress to degree is also an important consideration. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate leadership in their area of research, as evidenced by publications, citation metrics, extramural peer-reviewed research grants, and peer assessment. Service contributions as appropriate for an early career faculty member, such as membership in committees and participation in the peer-review process, is also expected.

- 5.1.2 Associate Professor: For tenured Associate Professors, the Annual Review identifies progress toward promotion to Full Professor. Specific criteria are as follows:
- Demonstrate an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field, where those accomplishments are evidenced by outcomes such as publications, grants, and, where applicable, the development of patents and the commercialization of research;
  - Display professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;
  - Expertise in one or more areas germane to the programs of the College of Geosciences;
  - Show evidence of successful graduate student or post-doctoral fellow supervision, as part of an extramurally funded research program
  - Demonstrated commitment to maintaining the level of excellence in teaching (both undergraduate and graduate) and research expected of a tenured faculty member.
  - Demonstrated commitment to service within the university and to the profession in general
- 5.1.3 Professor: in general, full professors are evaluated from the following three perspectives:
- Demonstrate continued excellence in at least one of three domains - teaching, scholarship, or service - and sustained accomplishment in the other two;
  - Show evidence of successful graduate student supervision, and
  - Achieve substantial international recognition in research or another form of scholarly activity.
  - Sustained commitment to service

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

Faculty with Instructional in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on teaching-related activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

5.2.1 Instructional Assistant Professor: Instructional Assistant Professors are evaluated each year so that they know, to the maximum extent possible, their expectations of continued employment and promotion prospects. Input material for such evaluations may be faculty members' curricula vitae, annual performance reports, and other sources of information. While it is recognized that College and Department priorities and faculty performance criteria will likely change over time, faculty members will be kept informed of current expectations and their evaluations conducted in a consistent manner. Instructional faculty are expected to develop up-to-date teaching materials and present it in an

organized manner in the classroom to achieve the desired student learning outcomes. Any service activities that are part of the appointment will also be evaluated.

#### 5.2.2 Instructional Associate Professor:

- Display professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University
- Demonstrated commitment to maintaining a high level of excellence in teaching, including innovative pedagogy and high-impact learning activities
- Demonstrated commitment to student mentoring and service, as appropriate for that APT appointment

#### 5.2.3 Instructional Professor:

- Sustained commitment to maintaining a high level of excellence in teaching, including innovative pedagogy and high-impact learning activities
- Sustained commitment to student mentoring and service, as appropriate for that APT appointment

### 5.3 Evaluation Criteria for Research Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)

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.

5.3.1 Research Assistant Professor: Research Assistant Professors are evaluated each year so that they know, to the maximum extent possible, their expectations of continued employment and promotion prospects. Input material for such evaluations may be faculty members' curricula vitae, annual performance reports, and other sources of information. While it is recognized that College and Department priorities and faculty performance criteria will likely change over time, faculty members will be kept informed of current expectations and their evaluations conducted in a consistent manner. Research faculty are expected to demonstrate leadership in their area of research, as evidenced by publications, citation metrics, extramural peer-reviewed research grants, and peer assessment. Any service activities that are part of the appointment will also be evaluated.

#### 5.2.2 Research Associate Professor:

- Demonstrate ability to build a viable research program with extramural funding
- Demonstrate an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field, where those accomplishments are evidenced by outcomes such as publications, grants, and, where applicable, the development of patents and the commercialization of research;
- Display professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University
- Expertise in one or more areas germane to the programs of the College of Geosciences
- Demonstrated commitment to service, if appropriate for the particular APT appointment

#### 5.3.3 Research Professor:

- Demonstrate continued excellence in maintaining a successful research program.

- Achieve substantial international recognition in research or another form of scholarly activity

#### 5.4 Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee

All faculty below the rank of Professor are reviewed annually by the departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee (T&P Committee) to assess their past performance and their readiness for tenure or promotion. These reviews are in addition to other procedures that departments may undertake to assess suitability for salary increases and other University requirements.

The T&P Committee is comprised of all tenured faculty members, except for the Department Head. The Department Head designates a Chair from among the full Professors. A candidate for promotion will only be evaluated by faculty of equal or greater rank to that sought by the candidate. For annual evaluation and promotion decisions of faculty with tenured Associate Professor rank, only faculty with the rank of tenured full Professor will participate. (Faculty who are not part of the committee, including APT faculty, may provide input to the committee regarding the candidates.)

For evaluation of Instructional APT faculty, all Instructional APT faculty of equal or greater rank to that sought by the candidate will also be part of the T&P committee.

For evaluation of Research APT faculty, all Research APT faculty of equal or greater rank to that sought by the candidate will also be part of the T&P committee.

As part of the annual review, which happens in April/May, the T&P committee may recommend promotion or early tenure consideration, as appropriate. Prior to the annual review, candidates may also request that they be considered for promotion (or early tenure).

The Chair of the T&P committee and the Department Head will meet individually with each faculty member below the rank of full Professor to discuss their annual reviews and progress towards promotion.

For tenure-track Assistant Professors, the T&P committee is also responsible for carrying out the mandatory mid-term review as well as the mandatory tenure and promotion review during the penultimate year of the probationary period, consistent with college and university guidelines.

### **6. Annual Review**

Annual reviews of performance are 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 head is responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads will collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In 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 with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

### 6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  - See [University Rule 12.01.99.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.

### 6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

### 6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews focus on the immediately previous calendar year. The annual review process is performed by the Department Head in the spring semester of each calendar year. In addition, the Tenure and Promotion Committee provides an independent evaluation of all faculty who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, including lecturers and research and instructional professors.

### 6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on five categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement," "Satisfactory", "Exceeds Expectations", and "Exemplary".

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

- Unsatisfactory – No demonstrable impact on student education. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Persistent negative student evaluations;
  - Regular and unresolved student complaints;
  - Indifference to teaching;
  - Persistent presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information;

- Disorganized presentation of course materials and poor communication of course requirements;
  - Unwillingness to mentor students;
  - Persistent inattention to university requirements including timely posting of current course syllabi, curricula vitae and student grades;
  - Excessive cancellation of class;
  - Persistent lack of progress to degree of students being mentored;
  - Refusal to comply with the department's request to teach a course needed for the department curriculum, for which the faculty member is qualified, and which falls within the normal expectations for faculty in the department.
- **Needs Improvement** – Underperforming with respect to peers on student education commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
    - Pervasive and/or significant negative student evaluations;
    - Inattention to university requirements including timely posting of current course syllabi, curricula vitae and student grades;
    - Presentation of some out-of-date or incorrect information;
    - Unresolved student complaints;
    - Lack of progress to degree of graduate students being mentored.
- **Satisfactory** – Performing as expected with respect to peers on student education commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
    - Presenting accurate, up to date, well organized information and concepts;
    - Demonstrating interest in the course subject and the process of teaching;
    - Receiving acceptable teaching evaluations;
    - Satisfactory resolution of student complaints;
    - Timely graduation of and/or achievement of appropriate progress to degree of mentored students;
    - Using technology and active learning methods in the classroom;
- **Exceeds Expectations** – Performing above expectations with respect to peers on student education commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
    - Effective implementation of a new exercise or technique in the classroom;
    - Design and successful implementation of new courses;
    - Extensive implementation of new laboratory exercises;
    - Contributing to textbooks or other instructional materials;
    - Effective use of technology and active learning methods in the classroom;
- **Exemplary** – Performing well above expectations with respect to peers on student education commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
    - Receipt of external grant support for teaching/learning projects (e.g., NSF REU grants);
    - Consistently excellent student evaluations or other indications of excellent instruction;
    - Authoring textbooks or other instructional materials;
    - Selection for a university or professional society teaching award;
    - Significant efforts in enhancing students' study-abroad experience;
    - Successful implementation of innovative pedagogy including course content likely to be effective with and supportive of students with diverse backgrounds and learning styles.

- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic scholarly or professional positions;
- Significant efforts in mentoring students from groups under-represented in the Geosciences.

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

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

- *Unsatisfactory* – No demonstrable impact on the field. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Persistent lack of publication in peer reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs, or special papers over multiple years;
  - Inability and/or unwillingness to obtain extramural research support;
  - Absence of other forms of scholarly activity, e.g., lack of authorship of non-peer-reviewed publications.
  - Persistent absence from departmental seminars.
- *Needs Improvement* – Underperforming with respect to peers in the specific field commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Limited publication in peer reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs, or special papers;
  - Few proposals for extramural research support;
  - Limited other scholarly activity such as attendance at scientific meetings, and limited authorship of non-peer-reviewed publications.
- *Meets Expectations* – Performing as expected with respect to peers in the specific field commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Regular publication in peer reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs, or special papers;
  - Active and occasionally successful pursuit of extramural research support;
  - Regular performance of other scholarly activities such as attendance at scientific meetings, authorship of non-peer-reviewed publications (e.g., some kind of review articles or electronic publications).
- *Exceeds Expectations* – Performing above expectations with respect to peers in the specific field commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Regular publication in prestigious peer reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs, or special papers;
  - Success in obtaining external funding for research program;
  - Attendance and presentations at scientific meetings.
- *Exemplary* – Performing well above expectations with respect to peers in the specific field commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Conducting ground-breaking research and disseminating the research findings via high profile peer-reviewed journals;

- Consistently prolific in research, i.e., consistently large number of publications in prestigious peer-reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs, or special papers;
- Consistently successful in obtaining external funding for research program
- Leadership in obtaining funding for large-scale, interdisciplinary, or multiple-investigator projects;
- Receipt of major professional society fellowships or research awards;
- Frequent citation of publications;
- Highly visible profile of other scholarly activities such as memberships in preeminent scientific teams.
- Invited presentations at major scientific meetings and invited seminars/colloquia at prestigious institutions on a regular basis.

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

- **Unsatisfactory** – No demonstrable impact on service to the department, college, university, or community at large. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Failure to attend faculty meetings regularly;
  - Refusal to serve on departmental, college or university committees;
  - Lack of contributions to departmental, college or university committees on which the faculty member is serving;
  - Persistent insensitive or discriminatory comments and/or actions toward individuals or groups based on individual identity;
  - Behaviors and actions (e.g., non-courteous, insensitive, abusive or disrespectful language, and/or behavior) that lead to a hostile working environment.
  
- **Needs Improvement** – Underperforming with respect to peers on service to the department, college, university, or community at large commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Minimal contributions to departmental, college and/or university committees;
  - Limited participation in professional societies;
  - Irregular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in other faculty activities such as those for student and faculty recruitment or seminars.
  - Insensitive or discriminatory comments and/or actions toward individuals or groups based on individual identity.
  
- **Meets Expectations** – Performing as expected with respect to peers on service to the department, college, university, or community at large commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in other faculty activities such as those for student and faculty recruitment;
  - Contributions to departmental, college and/or university committees;
  - Performance of substantive service to the larger scientific community such as through manuscript and grant reviews;
  - Serving in an administrative role at Texas A&M University;
  - Contributions to enhancing or expanding diversity of faculty, students, and staff.

- *Exceeds Expectations* – Performing above expectations with respect to peers on service to the department, college, university, or community at large commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Fulfilling a large service role without reduction in other responsibilities for the research community such as through panel reviews;
  - Membership on advisory boards, or serving as an associate editor of a peer-reviewed scientific journal
  - Substantive contributions to departmental, college and/or university committees;
  - Communication of basic research results to the general public.
- *Outstanding* – Performing well above expectations with respect to peers on service to the department, college, university, or community at large commensurate with rank. Examples include but are not limited to:
  - Shouldering a pivotal service role without reduction in other responsibilities;
  - Performance of service to the larger scientific community through leadership in professional societies;
  - Serving as an editor-in-chief or editor for a peer-reviewed journal;
  - Serving on a major governmental commission, task force or board;
  - Leadership in enhancing or expanding the diversity of faculty, students, and staff;
  - Effective outreach to the K-12 community and general public through informal learning and summer programs;

## 6.5 Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

### 6.5.1 *Faculty member's report of previous activities.*

- Updated CV
  - The *Faculty Activity Report for Geosciences (FARG)* form
  - Course evaluation summaries
  - Other materials if relevant and appropriate
- The FARG form is focused on the immediately previous calendar year, but faculty members may point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
  - Faculty members will articulate their short- and long-term goals and reflect on their progress toward last year's goals in the FARG form.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

### 6.5.2 *A written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations.*

The department head 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 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 written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

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

#### 6.5.3 Meeting between the department head and the faculty member.

The department head may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. The meeting is mandatory for the ranks of Assistant and Associate Professor. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.

#### 6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

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

### 6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

#### 6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

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

#### 6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

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

### 6.7 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling the department head to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.”

### 6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#).

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

## 7. **Mid-Term Review**

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

### 7.1 Purpose

The goal of the Mid-Term Review of Assistant Professors is to assess the faculty member’s mid-term progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. To accomplish this goal, faculty candidates compile a dossier that is nearly identical to the tenure and promotion dossier in terms of content (see Section 2.5). The two exceptions are:

- Departmental review committees do not solicit letters from external referees. Instead, committees are strongly encouraged to obtain one or more letters of recommendation from within the University, and
- The faculty candidate’s dossier does not proceed beyond the College.

### 7.2 Process

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

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

### 7.3 Feedback from midterm review

The Departmental T&P Committee and Department head will produce written reports that mimic those that are required for tenure and promotion dossiers. Prior to the Committee vote, it is desirable that the dossier be discussed by the Department’s tenured faculty so that opinions regarding progress toward tenure be shared with the Committee. The Committee’s vote consists of a yes/no vote on whether the voter feels that the faculty member is making adequate progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

The College T&P Committee reviews the dossier and prepares its own report and vote. The report results and vote are added to the dossier and forwarded to the Dean, who in turn provides a written evaluation and recommendation. At this point, the contents of the dossier are returned to the Department Head for discussion with the faculty member (with the exception of the letter(s) of support from within the University).

## 8. **Post-Tenure Review**<sup>1</sup>

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

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head.
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

### 8.1 Purpose

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

### 8.2 Peer Review Committee

The Department Head appoints the committee of three full professors. One committee member may be from outside the department.

### 8.3 Process

- 8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
  - Updated CV

---

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



- The *Faculty Activity Report for Geosciences* form
  - Other materials if relevant and appropriate
- 8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The post-tenure review rating (Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory) for this six-year period is determined based on criteria that are consistent with the departmental annual review policy described previously. (For post-tenure review, Meets Expectations rating is regarded as equivalent to the annual Satisfactory rating.)
- 8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.4 A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5 A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.6 A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.
- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.<sup>2</sup> If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.8 **By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>**, the department will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

#### 8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The department head

---

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

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 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 shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy

is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

#### 8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

#### 8.6 Appeal

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

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head, 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, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

#### 8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

### 9. **Granting Faculty Emeritus Status**

[University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for

emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

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

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

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

---

### Contact Office

---

Theresa Morrison, Business Administrator, Department of Atmospheric Sciences, e-mail: [tmorrison@geos.tamu.edu](mailto:tmorrison@geos.tamu.edu)  
Approved by the Dean of Faculties Office March 4, 2021