



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

## Department of Biology

# GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

*Approved by the Department of Biology Faculty: November 2, 2020*

*Approved by the College of Science December 10, 2020*

*Approved by the Dean of Faculties \_\_\_\_\_*

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance	7
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	11
5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure	13
6. Annual Review	19
7. Mid-Term Review	26
8. Post-Tenure Review	28
9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status	31

### 1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Biology is to provide the highest quality biological education to all Texas A&M majors, while leading in fundamental biology research. The faculty of the Department of Biology deliver scholarly and technical expertise to the state, nation and world and prepare our students to become the next generation of scientific leaders. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed 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 of Biology 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.

In this document, the Department of Biology clarifies from its perspective the procedures and general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the department. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, the department head, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations. Evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the department depends upon the quality of these reviews.

This document articulates general Department of Biology 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	<a href="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf</a>
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure">http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/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.

It is critical to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the department. Furthermore, professional integrity and concern for the common good are hallmarks of the academician. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to develop a scholarly and balanced approach to his or her specialty, with full recognition of the requirements of the agencies and other administrative units that may share in their mission, responsibilities and/or compensation.

These documents are reviewed, interpreted and approved on a regular basis by the Department of Biology faculty, the College of Science, the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties and by the Provost.

## 2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

The Department of Biology has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities, however, most focus on some combination of research and teaching. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the department recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. Within the department, faculty may be tenure track and have an unmodified title or non-tenure track (academic professional track) and have a modified title. The nature of a faculty member's contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe model patterns of emphasis that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable annual, tenure, and post-tenure evaluations. Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles.

### I. Tenure Track

A specific system of faculty tenure underpins the integrity of an academic institution; it is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities, and reflects continued worth to the university and college in anticipated intellectual development and performance. The awarding of tenure allows the tenured individual freedom of teaching and scholarship. Tenure is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual's academic citizenship and service, teaching, and scholarship.

**Tenure.** Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable and productive in research, teaching and academic citizenship and service, and who have demonstrated over time they will likely continue to be especially productive. The tenure track is not considered appropriate for faculty members who are narrowly focused on either teaching or research activities. Faculty being evaluated and seeking promotion and tenure should

be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements from university, college and departmental perspectives. The Department of Biology conducts formal reviews of faculty on probationary status at two times: 1) near the end of the third year of service (mid-term review) and 2) during the penultimate (sixth) year of the probationary period (promotion and tenure review). In this document, the Department of Biology clarifies from its perspective the procedures defined in System Policy 12.01, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, and University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines (posted by the Dean of Faculties).

Included in the Tenure Track are the following unmodified titles/ranks: **Assistant Professor**, **Associate Professor** and **Professor**.

## **II. Academic Professional Track**

The Department of Biology recognizes the vital contributions that all faculty members make to our mission and is committed to career development and job stability. As such, appropriate evaluation and reward mechanisms for Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members is essential. Decisions on promotion of APT faculty members must accommodate their unique job descriptions and allow for evaluation and recognition of their contributions to the college and department. This document is designed to provide a means to appoint, evaluate, promote and retain APT faculty members, whose effectiveness and excellence make them beneficial members of the college and deserving of promotion and stability of appointment.

The expectations of the Department of Biology for its APT faculty are that they develop a balanced approach to their teaching or research, and service or scholarly activity when applicable. The nature of teaching requires both flexibility and freedom (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). The department may make Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments when programmatic needs can best be met by persons whose academic responsibilities would make appointments to the tenure-track inappropriate. Academic professional track (APT) faculty must have credentials appropriate to the title and consistent with SACSCOC rules for accreditation. APT faculty can be appointed at any academic professional track rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. This document provides a general set of guidelines and indicators of effectiveness and excellence for APT faculty member appointments, annual review, and promotion.

Research faculty members are also in the Department of Biology academic professional track and are usually under the direction of a tenure-track faculty supervisor. University guidelines for appointment and promotion of research track faculty are provided from the Dean of Faculties in the document Research Professor Hiring Guidelines.

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments in the Department of Biology include the Professional and Lecturer tracks and ranks. The Professorial track includes adjectival designations, such as "Instructional", "Research" and "Visiting". APT ranks in the Department of Biology are the following modified titles: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Senior Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Assistant Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Associate Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Professor, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, and Laboratory Instructor.

### **Instructional Track**

Appointment to APT instructional faculty rank generally requires, at a minimum, a Ph.D. degree and evidence of superior teaching experience. APT faculty can be assigned to graduate courses with the approval of the department head, as long as the instructor is properly credentialed.

**Instructional Assistant Professor.** The position of Instructional Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but also make additional contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Assistant Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field. Instructional Assistant Professors are not expected to

engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

***Instructional Associate Professor.*** The position of Instructional Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but also make additional contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Associate Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to be have a record of effective and excellent teaching. Instructional Associate Professors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

***Instructional Professor.*** The position of Instructional Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but also make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field. Instructional Professors are expected to be have a record of effective and excellent teaching and meritorious scholarly and/or service credentials. Instructional Professors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

### **Lecturer Track**

***Lecturer.*** The position of Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Lecturer title will normally hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. The typical teaching load is two large sections per semester. Lecturers are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

***Senior Lecturer.*** The position of Senior Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Senior Lecturer title will normally hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in some service or administrative activities, as is required to carry out or compliment their instructional duties. The typical teaching load is two large sections per semester. Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

### **Laboratory Instructors**

***Laboratory Instructors.*** The position of Laboratory Instructor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Lab Instructor position will normally hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field and primarily engaged in teaching the laboratory portion of our lab courses. They may be expected to engage in some service or administrative activities, as is required to carry out or compliment their instructional duties. The typical teaching load is six lab sections per semester. Lab Instructors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

***Progression between APT tracks.*** The Department of Biology considers progression from Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor to be a promotion based upon the evaluation criteria and evidence of teaching effectiveness and excellence described in this document. Such promotions follow the timeline set each academic year for tenure-track and tenured faculty member promotions.

### **Research Track**

***Research Assistant Professor.*** The position of Research Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but may make additional

contributions in teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Assistant Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the research field. Research Assistant Professors are not expected to engage in teaching, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Research Associate Professor.** The position of Research Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but may make additional contributions in teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Assistant Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the research field. Research Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent research. They are not expected to engage in teaching, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Research Professor.** The position of Research Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but also make additional contributions in teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent scientific research and meritorious scholarly reputation and appropriate service credentials. Research Professors are not expected to engage in teaching, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

If the Department of Biology needs to use other instructional titles (e.g., **Senior Professor, Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, Executive Professor** and **Professor of the Practice**), then credentials and responsibilities for these titles will be developed at that time. Appointments into any of these titles require the dean's approval.

### **Multi-year Instruction Track Appointments**

The Texas A&M University System policy 12.07 governing Fixed Term APT Faculty (<http://policies.tamug.edu/12-07.pdf>) does not authorize rolling appointments for APT faculty, therefore the following Department of Biology guidelines for the granting and extension of multi-year fixed term appointments for Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors have been established. Granting of the initial multi-year fixed term appointments will be made upon a peer review of the candidate's qualifications, as per the criteria stated in departmental guidelines. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided in the penultimate year of a multi-year appointment. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.

APT faculty members appointed at the **Lab Instructor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Instructional Assistant Professor** levels will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments, unless justified by the department head and approved by the dean.

Faculty members appointed to **Instructional Associate Professor** will have annual appointments. After serving continuously for five years, Instructional Associate Professors may be eligible for a three-year fixed-term appointment upon recommendation by the department head and with dean's approval.

Upon promotion to **Instructional Professor**, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment upon recommendation by the department head and with dean's approval.

The multi-year term appointment and/or renewal is not guaranteed, but it is awarded and/or renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the department and college. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed term appointment, shall be given in writing in the penultimate year of the fixed term and in accord with university standards (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed term appointment cannot be appealed.

### **3. Areas of Faculty Performance** (in accordance with [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; academic citizenship and service; and/or administration). Expectations for faculty members in their assigned areas of 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).

The nature of a faculty member's contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not provide a specific formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable performance evaluations. All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, and academic citizenship and service. Academic professional track faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in two of these three areas (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and citizenship and service), but, in some cases, can make contributions in all areas.

#### **Criteria for Review**

Faculty evaluations will be conducted at regular intervals, at least once per year, to support and retain faculty who have been hired by the department. The value of a faculty member to the department determines the degree to which the department is interested in retaining and promoting the faculty member. Thus, assessment of the value to the department of a faculty member is of importance. This assessment accounts for the diverse contributions by any faculty member to the many needs and missions of the department, as well as the assigned duties of the faculty member. Consistent with Texas A&M policy and the philosophy of the department, it should be emphasized that both an established track record of excellent performance and the potential for continued excellent performance are of primary importance. The relevant criteria applicable for annual evaluation of faculty performance are defined in the following sections.

#### **3.1 Teaching**

Teaching is central to the mission of the department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty, with the exception of those on research tracks or with other responsibilities (e.g., administrative assignments). 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 department'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 fully evaluate teaching. Evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in teaching shall include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; 4) student learning; and 5) comparison of student DFG rates.

Essential qualifications for Department of Biology instructors include the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. An accomplished teacher has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, skill at delivering material and presentations, respect for students, and enthusiasm for mentoring and teaching. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance include coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, effective classroom presentation, and reasonable evaluation of the student's performance. Student evaluations are central measures for the process of evaluating effective teaching. Peer evaluation may also be used assessing teaching performance. Indicators of outstanding performance include peer recognition, student satisfaction, and student learning outcomes.

Outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and professional development is an important measures of scholarly teaching. Receipt of awards is a key indicator of teaching success, such as selection for a college, university or professional society outstanding teacher award.

A **Teaching Evaluation Table** should be constructed that contains the following information for the evaluation year: a listing by semester of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

**Teaching Evaluation Table (Template)**

Semester	Course	Students	GPA	Evaluation	% D	% F	% Q
Spring 2015	BIOL111	144	2.39	4.1	16.7	0	4.2
Fall 2016	BIOL112	138	2.14	3.8	26.1	8.7	8.7

A definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained shall be provided.

The relevant criteria that may be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

**3.1.1 Teaching quality.** The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one's discipline.

**3.1.2 Essential pedagogy.** The use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.

**3.1.3 Educational innovation.** Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Examples of innovations in teaching are: taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness; developing new learning experiences, or developing unique methods to evaluate student learning.

**3.1.4 Teaching professionalism.** Mentoring students, using appropriate methods of evaluation and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching. Additionally, being aware of students' classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with students of all abilities are also measures of professionalism.

**3.1.5 Impact upon students.** A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

**3.1.6 Degree of teaching responsibility.** The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to departmental teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course and evaluating student learning through course assessments.

**3.1.7 Promotion of active, high-impact learning.** Student success requires active engagement in the material. Faculty members should engage in active learning approaches in their teaching, as possible.

### 3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

High-quality **research** and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence. Impactful **scholarly activity** is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers as original in content and communicated in an effective manner. Research and scholarly activity might encompass scholarly discovery and the creation of new knowledge, scholarly integration, whereby the relationships among isolated facts are compiled, elucidated, and given perspective, scholarly application, where a thesis proposes the application of existing facts and ideas to products and methods of procedure,



or scholarly teaching (which is distinct from effective or excellent teaching), where faculty engage in teaching-as-research to develop and communicate teaching resources and best practices in the field.

All tenured faculty members must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications will be evaluated on the quality and impact of their published and other scholarly work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate students, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustainable research program, candidates for Full Professor are expected to be respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or, international level.

A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated and published work. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals (with respect to one's field of study) carry the greatest weight. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work. Scientific research depends on appropriate levels of funding. Therefore, the capacity for identifying, seeking and obtaining research funding is a critical measure of sustainable scholarly productivity. In evaluation of research funding, emphasis is placed upon extramural granting sources. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence.

Some APT faculty titles require scholarly work beyond teaching. Scholarship is broadly defined here as creative intellectual work, typically validated by peers and communicated. For scholarly activities to be most effective, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge, as well as discipline-based expertise. Scholarly works might involve, but are not limited to, the creation of new knowledge or investigations into teaching, pedagogy and learning. Meritorious teaching scholarship is distinct from effective or excellent teaching.

The Department of Biology expects that all faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarship, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure or promotion. The relevant criteria that may be considered in evaluating research and scholarly activity performance are:

**3.2.1 Intellectual curiosity.** The foundation of quality scholarly activity is the identification of a topic needing study and motivation to conduct appropriate investigation of it.

**3.2.2 Scientific communication.** Original research and scholarly activity are considered evidence of scientific impact, but only after acceptance for publication or communicated at a scientific conference.

**3.2.3 Research funding.** Financial resources, particularly external grants, to conduct impactful scientific research are critical criteria for the assessment of excellence.

**3.2.4 Collaborative approach.** Although individuals are encouraged to develop an independent research portfolio and balanced publication record, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research are all valued by the Department of Biology.

**3.2.5 Education contributions.** Educating the next generation of scientific leader and researchers is an important departmental mission.

**3.2.6 Contributions to the field.** Scholarly activities, such as board membership, editorial boards or policy panel memberships, that benefit science outside of the university are important criteria for evaluation.

**3.2.7 Acknowledgements of impact.** Accomplishment in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. These are often best assessed by eminent scholars in the field and acknowledgements of research by peers are valued criteria for evaluation.

### **3.3 Academic Citizenship and Service**

Faculty academic citizenship and service are central to the mission of the department. The department must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence, and a variety of roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution a faculty member may make through his or her academic citizenship and by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, college and university. The amount and nature of the faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage of career; however, all faculty members are expected to be good academic citizens.

**Academic citizenship** is defined as a measure of one's commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the department, college, university, and profession through service. The key dimensions of academic citizenship are collegiality and teamwork. Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues. Colleagues are those explicitly united in a common purpose and respecting each other's abilities to work toward that purpose. Collegiality and teamwork are the positive, interactive relationships between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research and service.

The Department of Biology will not discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks and promoting resolution of differences. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2 states that "professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University" is a requirement for promotion and tenure.

**Academic Service** contributes to the Department of Biology's mission of advancing science locally, in the state and nation. All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the department, college and the university. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving academic programs and services, the growth of their profession, and the continuing education of the public at-large. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve in a professional capacity that enhances the stature and reputation of the Department of Biology.

The scope of department activities makes it appropriate for faculty members to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, advising, and special training or professional development programs. The Department of Biology also expects its faculty members to render extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens, executing minor administrative tasks with competence and thoughtfulness. Full Professors are expected to possess a much broader service portfolio and to provide considerable leadership in the Department, College and/or the scholarly community at large.

Some APT faculty titles require service to departmental goals beyond teaching. The contribution an APT faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, the college, and the university. The amount and nature of the faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage of career development.

The relevant criteria that may be considered in evaluating academic citizenship and service performance are:

**3.3.1 Personal integrity and accountability.** A faculty member's collegiality and fairness in the performance of required duties is essential to the function of a department. This includes, but is not limited to, timeliness and willingness to cooperate with colleagues.

**3.3.2 Profession communication.** Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators, and must work toward solutions of problems.

**3.3.3 Departmental engagement.** Engaging in activities that benefit others apart from oneself, including accepting reasonable amounts of committee work commensurate with one's academic rank.

**3.3.4 Colleague/Student mentoring.** Developing mentoring relationships with colleague and students, including those of diverse cultures, beliefs and backgrounds, is critical for program success. Additionally, serving as an advisor to student organizations is a valued endeavor.

**3.3.5 Academic leadership.** Serving in departmental, college or university taskforces, major committees or administrative roles (e.g., section chief, assistant/associate department head, or director titles) exemplifies a commitment to the academic whole.

**3.3.6 Service to the field.** Academic citizenship and service activities, such as society leadership, editorial boards or policy panel memberships, that benefit science outside of the university are important criteria for evaluation.

## 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Biology recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and 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 of teaching, scholarly activity and service. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

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

- outstanding evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visitation by mentors, peers, or external evaluators,
- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- selection for department, college, university, or professional association outstanding teacher awards,
- contribution to new instructional program development,
- serving as a co-chair or member of graduate advisory committees,
- publications with authorship by trainees (i.e., undergraduate writing education),
- successful curriculum development grants, and
- obtaining grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching or course development.

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

- positive evaluations in postgraduate questionnaires to evaluate knowledge and preparation,
- evidence of rigorous and equitable grading (i.e., DFQ rates that meet College expectations),
- development of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes,
- coordination of multi-disciplinary courses,
- development of a new course, honors course, or major revision of an existing course,
- direction of independent student research,
- Mentoring colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality,
- completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods,
- significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness, and
- development of innovative pedagogical materials or strategies for active learning.

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

- obtaining significant external competitive funding for scholarship activities,
- active participation in a prominent area of research or signature program,
- active participation in research within a university-recognized center or institute that is either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary,
- publication of peer-reviewed scientific articles, technical reports or monographs,
- presentation of papers of original research at professional meetings,
- publication of papers of original research in proceedings of regional professional meetings,
- contribution of area of expertise to scholarship of others,
- authorship of review articles,
- preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs,

- preparation and presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of science,
- recognition from peers in the field (e.g., awards, honors, invitations to present),
- publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s),
- evidence of leadership or significant contribution to successful team research/scholarly activities,
- national attention, as demonstrated by special recognition,
- key participation in collaborative research/scholarly efforts,
- dissemination of teaching materials at local, state or national workshops,
- creation of innovative technical approaches adopted by others, and
- patents, copyrights or royalty/licensing agreements.

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

- recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards,
- invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings,
- publications of original research in the leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines,
- favorable citation index listing of research publications within the appropriate disciplines,
- obtaining competitive external funding for research,
- effective contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention,
- key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry,
- significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements,
- coordination of or participation in interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary investigations and projects, including a variety of international programs,
- recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative contributions by others, e.g., use or review of electronic media by other institutions or scholars,
- evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the interface of academic disciplines,
- originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication of new understanding of, perspectives on, and uses of information and/or data,
- active participation in a university-centered scholarly or creative activity,
- contribution of expertise to the scholarship/education of others,
- sharing of knowledge about teaching within faculty groups, and
- adoption of innovative and communicated pedagogical methodologies by others.

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

- engaging in activities that foster national and international collaboration,
- making personal contributions to the public mission of the university to forward its programs for the public good,
- engaging in activities that foster diversity, inclusion and a culture of respect,
- serving as an effective member of a committee within the department, college, or university,
- serving as an effective chair of a committee within the department, college, or university,
- serving as an officer or board member in a local, state or national professional organization in one's discipline,
- effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards.
- attraction of significant development support,
- consultation with state, national or international government offices or programs,
- selection for department, college, university, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards,
- service as an editor or associate editor of a publication in one's discipline, and
- service as a grant/contract reviewer for research organizations, institutions or foundations

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

- recognizing and responding to the needs of colleagues and/or the department, and assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs.
- actively and effectively striving to achieve departmental and college goals and mandates.
- engaging in or initiating activities that benefit others,
- making reasonable adjustments that accommodate others or enhance the greater good of the group,
- engaging in the creation of a university culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance,
- actively serving on departmental, college, and university committees and task forces,
- significant contributions to the promotion of unit diversity, inclusion and climate,
- actively serving as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations,
- contributing to external developmental efforts,
- serving as a mentor for junior faculty members ,
- promoting significant teaching, research or service experiences for students,
- promoting national and/or international experiences for students,
- serving as an advisor to student organizations,
- serving in formal administrative roles within the department, college or university,
- actively participating in K-12 or other public outreach,
- actively participating in publications describing the effectiveness of community-based projects, and
- presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of science.

## 5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

For promotion in the faculty ranks, faculty members shall be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. The promotion process, whether tenured and tenure-track or academic professional track is very similar and is on the same timeline for all promotions.

### 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, academic citizenship 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 promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Biology are as follows:

**5.1.1 Assistant Professor.** Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching, research scholarship, with attention to academic citizenship and service. Assistant professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship and research support, building their teaching skills and portfolio, taking on the role of mentor where applicable, and exploring select service roles that complement their other activities.

**5.1.2 Associate Professor.** Emphasis for the tenure-track individual should be placed on further development of scholarship within categories recognized by the College and indicated earlier in this document. This personal and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments in the individual's specialty area. Associate professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship and service, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen areas of research and scholarly activity. Associate professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must document effectiveness in instruction, as well as research and service. Tenure-track individuals must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record.

For promotion to Associate Professor in the tenure track, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

**5.1.3 Professor.** Continued excellence and national/international recognition are required. Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence are required of professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; evidence of academic citizenship and collegiality; and excellence in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of professors, sustained excellence in scholarship is expected for the tenured Professor.

For promotion to Professor, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.3 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

## **5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (non-tenure track)**

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track faculty.

The promotion process for APT faculty is governed by the Dean of Faculties guidelines (<https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Forms/DOF-TOA/2019-2020-P-T-Guidelines.pdf>), but departments have some flexibility in implementing these guidelines. Candidates for promotion will supply a current CV, and a teaching portfolio as part of the dossier. The Department of Biology requires, at a minimum, three internal letters of support for promotions to Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor. Candidates may request external letters, if they desire to do so. No letters are required for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Because the Department of Biology treats all changes in APT ranks as a promotion, dossiers will be evaluated through the same stages as tenure-track promotions (department, college, provost, and president) and on the same time frame.

Annual evaluation and considerations for promotion of APT faculty performance shall emphasize the **quality, significance, and impact** of the teaching, scholarship and service accomplishments. For faculty in the instructional and lecturer APT tracks, the criteria that may be used for evaluation, promotion, and the granting/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments (where applicable) are as follows:

### **5.2.1 Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer may include, but are not limited to:**

- experience as lecturer (or equivalent teaching experience),
- outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism, and
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

### **5.2.2 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Assistant Professor may include, but are not limited to:**

- experience as a senior lecturer position,
- outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism, and
- significant contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

### **5.2.3 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor may include, but are not limited to.**

- experience as an instructional assistant professor (or equivalent),
- outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- continued contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
- participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- program leadership, and
- evidence of scholarly activities or research, as applicable.

#### **5.2.4 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor may include, but are not limited to:**

- experience as an instructional associate professor (or equivalent),
- outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- major contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
- participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- program leadership
- evidence of scholarly activities or service, as applicable,
- seeking or obtaining grant funding to support teaching,
- invitations to present at national or international conferences,
- state, national or international outstanding teacher awards,
- placement of students in academic or professional positions,
- significant service to the college, university, or community, and
- significant service to state, national or international organizations.

#### **5.3 Timing of Promotion and Tenure Review**

The timing of the tenure and promotion review is mandated by university regulations that define the procedures for the mandatory (penultimate year) review. This thorough review in the penultimate year of probationary service is required. The start of a tenure-track faculty member's mandatory consideration year (academic year) can be calculated as follows: Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Fall semester of the tenure consideration year. Any individual hired for a tenure-track position will be required to submit materials for review during the academic year prior to the end of their probationary period. An early review for tenure and promotion can be conducted when requested by the candidate. While a candidate can choose to withdraw from the review process, doing so during the mandatory review also requires the submission of a written resignation.

Extension of the probationary period may be granted in special circumstances, pending approval of the department head, dean, and dean of faculties. Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances and with approval by the provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases: taken leave without pay or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year (provided the leave is not taken solely to enhance the faculty member's qualifications for promotion and tenure), encountered circumstances that seriously impede progress (e.g., serious illness or injury; primary care of a child or disabled or elderly relative), or serious disruption of the probationary period beyond the candidate's control.

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the department head and with the agreement of the dean and the provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a department head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration.

Complete promotion and tenure packets, including dossiers, external letters and departmental recommendations, are due to the Dean of the College of Science in late fall each year, **approximately the first day of November.**

#### **5.4 Promotion and Tenure Review Dossiers**

The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the dossier, as listed in the University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines. These include the candidate's personal statements, curriculum vitae, and various charts and tables. Typically, this information is provided in the summer semester (the date determined each year by the associate head of operations), so that it may be included with requests for outside letters. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers, and, optionally, a list of names of those who should not be reviewers. The department does not require any justification for anyone named to the 'Do Not Contact' list. The department may request additional items from the faculty candidate. The dossier will include all elements required by university regulations.

***Dossiers for promotion and tenure review.*** Of the two, formal college-level reviews (mid-term and promotion and tenure), the review in the sixth year normally includes consideration for tenure and is, therefore, more comprehensive than the review in the third year. Still, there is an important connection between the midterm review and the tenure review. The promotion and tenure review will take into consideration, in part, whether or not the faculty member's post-midterm activities incorporated the feedback, recommendations and requests at the midterm review. A fair and thorough evaluation of the candidate's tenure case by tenured members of the department is essential. Candidates' dossiers should be prepared in accordance with University guidelines for tenure and promotion and departmental discussions, reports and votes will be consistent with University rules. The final version of the reports, prepared by the faculty rather than department heads, must summarize the discussion at departmental meetings and reflect the vote.

**Candidate's curriculum vitae and statements.** The curriculum vitae documents the faculty member's entire academic career and contains precise narratives of accomplishments where appropriate. Publications and other scholarly contributions must be differentiated into those peer-reviewed and those not. The teaching, research and service statements should clearly articulate the accomplishments of the faculty member and provide context for evaluation of those accomplishments listed in the curriculum vitae. The extent and quality of formal teaching efforts must be defined with a quantitative assessment of student evaluations, qualitative evaluation relative to departmental standards, and identification of any unique aspects of the faculty member's teaching accomplishments. The involvement of the faculty member in international and/or interdisciplinary activities should be clearly defined. Extraordinary accomplishments involving service should be clearly represented with an indication of their importance.

**Outside letters of evaluation.** To enhance the effectiveness of the candidate's dossier, the dossier must contain letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and potential. Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. The candidate will suggest 10 potential reviewers, and the Annual Review Committee (ARC) will suggest an additional 10 potential reviewers. The department head, in conjunction with the associate head of operations will contact five reviewers who could provide a fair and objective analysis of the candidate's credentials.

Ideally, most reviewers will be full professors at leading and/or peer institutions. A short biographical statement on the credentials of each external reviewer should be provided in the promotion/tenure package to facilitate an assessment of their credentials. **All letters for P&T candidates must be "arm's length"**. Letters from previous collaborators, former supervisors or other colleagues who are not arm's-length will



not be considered. These external letters are of considerable and special importance in the evaluation of scholarly research activity.

### **5.5 Department-Level Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

The initial responsibility for ensuring that the candidate's dossier is correctly assembled lies with the candidate, his or her mentors, and the associate head of operations. The Annual Review Committee acts as the preliminary Promotion and Tenure Review committee for the Department of Biology. The formal tenure and promotion committee in the department is a committee of the whole, meaning that all faculty members of the appropriate rank, may discuss and vote on candidates for promotion to the rank they hold or lower.

The Annual Review Committee, acting as the departmental preliminary P&T committee, is responsible for the collection of additional evaluation resources as needed for a fair and thorough review of the candidate's teaching, research and service activities. With regard to teaching evaluation, the ARC shall undertake a thorough examination of all course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and exams. The ARC shall compile and submit a Candidate's Teaching Evaluation Table, which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate for the length of the probationary period (for midterm reviews or promotion and tenure reviews). This table will contain the following information for all years since the previous promotion (or last 5 years): a listing by semester and year of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the required Candidate's Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

#### ***Candidate's Teaching Evaluation Table (Template)***

<b>Semester</b>	<b>Course</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>GPA</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>% D</b>	<b>% F</b>	<b>% Q</b>
Spring 2015	BIOL111	144	2.39	4.1	16.7	0	4.2
Fall 2016	BIOL112	138	2.14	3.8	26.1	8.7	8.7

The Candidate's Teaching Evaluation Table shall accompany a narrative describing the faculty member's teaching that includes multiple indicators of the quality and effectiveness of that teaching. The narrative shall contextualize evaluation scores and grade distributions with respect to departmental standards and expectations. Note that numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units. Therefore, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained and how they are to be interpreted shall be included in the narrative. Additional context may be offered as appropriate (e.g., nature of courses taught).

***Evaluation Process and Voting Procedures.*** The Annual Review Committee is responsible for reviewing outside letters of evaluation and preparing the statement on credentials of outside referees. The committee also prepares individual reports evaluating the candidate's teaching, research and service. Following a confidential discussion, the committee-of-the-whole conducts an anonymous vote (i.e., Yes, No, Absent or Recuse) on each faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure. Typically, the department head should not attend this discussion nor participate in the vote. In cases where it is necessary for the head to attend the discussion, his or her involvement will be limited to answering specific procedural or administrative questions. Under no circumstance should the department head engage in discussion of the merits of the case.

All eligible faculty members are expected to participate in the discussion and vote for all tenure and promotion cases. If absolutely necessary, absentee voting is allowed, but this privilege should be used only in extenuating circumstances. Voting for tenure and promotion cases will be done through an electronic voting system.

**Recommendation of the Departmental P&T Committee.** The candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion, including strengths and weaknesses of the case, must be included in a signed committee report. This report is submitted to the department head as a memorandum that accurately expresses the nature of the faculty discussions and presents in tabular form the vote. This document forms a part of the faculty member's promotion/tenure recommendation packet.

**Recommendation of the Department Head.** The department head prepares and submits an independent recommendation to the dean, notifying the candidate at the time of this communication to the College of Science. The department head makes a clear recommendation that summarizes the achievements of the faculty member under consideration and explains the perspective of the department-at-large in a memorandum to the Dean. This memorandum is limited to three pages in length and includes a summary of the strong and weak points of the faculty member under consideration. In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. Candidates shall be informed, through the department head, of the recommendations at each step of the promotion and tenure evaluation process and this information shall be transmitted in writing.

### **5.6 College-Level Promotion and Tenure Review**

After receipt of the candidate's dossier, the Dean or their designee ensures that all necessary documents are present. If deficiencies are found, for example, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee's teaching report does not include explicit consideration of the necessary spectrum of evaluation information (student evaluation scores for individual courses, narratives based on peer review, etc.), the dossier is returned to the Department Head for further action by the departmental committee. If the omission is merely clerical in nature, provision of the necessary documents to the College P&T Advisory Committee may suffice. If the departmental review committee evaluation was not based on the appropriate body of information, the college review committee is responsible for requesting that a proper reevaluation be conducted.

### **5.7 Promotion to Professor**

The procedures for promotion to Full Professor are exactly the same as for the promotion and tenure review to Associate Professor, except that only full professors on the ARC will serve as the department's preliminary review committee. When selecting potential sources for outside letters, the candidate and ARC should ensure that at least some of the sources are able to comment credibly on the candidate's international reputation. The departmental review committee will prepare a candidate's teaching evaluation chart to accompany the teaching evaluation narrative (see section III above). For promotions to full professor, the candidate's teaching evaluation chart will report course evaluation information for the period since receiving tenure or for the last five years (whichever is shorter).

### **5.8 Tenure of Associate Professors and Professors**

Faculty may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure. Tenure-seeking Associate Professors are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Assistant Professors being reviewed for tenure and promotion. Full Professors under review for tenure are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Associate Professors being reviewed for promotion to Full Professor, although in some cases an expedited process can be approved by the Dean and Dean of Faculties.

### **5.9 Joint Appointments**

Joint appointments in cases where a scholar's expertise is appropriate may be made between academic units. The qualifications for such an appointment shall be the same as those for full appointment in the Department of Biology. For appointments funded jointly across multiple departments, more than 50% of the appointment shall be located in one department and the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation. For purposes of promotion and tenure, if the faculty member has their primary appointment elsewhere in the University, the joint appointment in the Department of Biology affords no privilege of tenure. If the faculty member being considered has a joint appointment funded in two or more departments, then the department in which the faculty member is administratively located (ad loc) has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is conducted in accordance with university, college and departmental

promotion and tenure guidelines. If the faculty member being considered has an appointment with an intercollegiate faculty in addition to a departmental appointment, then the department must request a review and evaluation from the chair of the intercollegiate faculty.

### **5.10 Appeals**

University policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.1 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual's professional performance, and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If the faculty member alleges such a violation, he/she should discuss the matter with the department head and, if necessary, the dean. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

## **6. 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). In this document, the Department of Biology provides general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the department. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty member, department heads, department and college evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Dean of Science. Evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the department depends upon the quality of these reviews.

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

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment who 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 members 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.

Department of Biology annual reviews will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members. The following annual review procedures, developed with communication between the faculty and department administration. The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank and the review should be conducted differently depending upon the stage of a faculty member's career. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance and for merit salary increases.

The annual review procedures described below include the following elements: purpose of annual review, period of evaluation, aspects of performance to be evaluated, annual activity report format and content, basis for evaluation, timeline and procedures for evaluation, and complaint procedures. These elements are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

The annual review must include the following components: faculty member's report of annual activities, a written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations, annual opportunity for a meeting between faculty member and department head to discuss the written review and expectations, and a performance assessment. The components are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

The Department of Biology requires that APT faculty are evaluated annually in accordance with college and university policies for annual performance evaluations of faculty. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for APT faculty. Faculty members should be evaluated largely on their primary responsibility of teaching. However, significant contributions in scholarship and/or service, including their effectiveness and excellence, shall be evaluated as appropriate for specific job responsibilities. Annual reviews of performance are conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

All University-employed faculty members, including APT faculty, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible. For annual reviews of APT 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 an APT faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities, such as teaching, 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 members 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. APT faculty members should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

## **Annual Review Policy for the Department of Biology**

**6.1 Purpose and Procedure of the Annual Review:** The Department of Biology performs an annual evaluation of each faculty member's teaching, research/scholarship, and professional service. The purpose of the evaluation is to recognize a level of performance and productivity that is appropriate and desirable for the department, and provide guidance when performance and productivity is less than satisfactory. The review process provides an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his or her department leadership. The annual reviews also form the basis of Post-Tenure Review, as described in the Department of Biology Post-Tenure Review Policy. See section 8 of this document.

### **6.2 Focus**

#### ***Assistant Professors***

Each year, in addition to evaluating the previous year's performance, the ARC will provide an evaluation and a written summary of overall progress toward tenure and promotion, with particular emphasis on mid-term reviews. The guidelines for promotion and tenure are provided in the Department of Biology Policies for Tenure and Promotion document. Success in research/scholarship, teaching and service will be recognized, and any areas of concern will be identified. The ARC will advise the department head that the candidate is making 1) excellent progress (meritorious), meaning the candidate is excelling in all aspects of his/her position; 2) satisfactory progress, meaning the candidate is on track toward tenure and promotion; 3) needs improvement, meaning the candidate is very close to an unsatisfactory mark and will need to make improvements in one or more categories to stay on track toward tenure and promotion; 4) unsatisfactory progress, meaning significant deficiencies in one or more categories must be addressed in order to be considered for tenure and promotion. The department head will consider the advice of the ARC and determine the rating for progress towards tenure and promotion. This information will be included in the evaluation report.

#### ***Associate Professors***

For tenured faculty, the annual review takes a broad perspective of progress in research/scholarship, teaching, and service, using standard evaluation criteria (examples listed below). It is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence of having a scholarly impact on their field (e.g. publications, invited

seminars, grant and manuscript reviews, editorial positions, education enhancement). The ARC evaluates and provides recommendations to the department head for potential promotion of associate professors to professor according to the guidelines in the Department of Biology Policies for Tenure and Promotion document. The department head provides a written report of progress towards promotion.

### **Professors**

For tenured faculty, the annual review takes a broad perspective of progress in research/scholarship, teaching, and service, using standard evaluation criteria (examples listed below). It is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence of having a sustained and significant scholarly impact on their field (e.g. publications, invited seminars, grant and manuscript reviews, editorial positions, education enhancement).

### **Academic Professional track and temporary faculty**

The ARC annually evaluates the quality of the faculty member's performance, which is primarily based on teaching and related activities, and provides a recommendation to the department head, who will determine the overall performance rating. Additional performance recognition is given for research/scholarship participation, publications, and service.

**Mechanism of the Annual Review:** The department head performs an annual evaluation of faculty. The Annual Review Committee (ARC) serves in an advisory capacity to the department head and provides a written report of yearly performance and productivity, and a recommended rating in each category of research, teaching, and service. A copy of the ARC report is provided to the faculty member, along with an evaluation report from the Department Head. Pre-tenure faculty members will meet with the department head to discuss their annual review and any issues arising from it. Tenured faculty members may request to meet with the department head to discuss their review.

**Composition of the Annual Review Committee:** The Annual Review Committee is composed of the associate head of operations (ex officio and voting member) and 6 tenured faculty elected by the department, with no fewer than 3 Full Professors. At least one senior APT faculty member will be appointed to the ARC to assist with other APT faculty reviews. ARC members will be evaluated by the associate head of operations, who will be evaluated directly by the department head. ARC members will serve a three-year term.

**Performance to be Evaluated:** Members of the ARC summarize and evaluate annual reports provided by the faculty on their research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in accordance with a standard weighting of 60% research/scholarship (e.g. grant proposal preparation, manuscript preparation, conference attendance, invited talks, compliance), 30% teaching (e.g. formal courses, graduate and undergraduate research training), and 10% service (e.g. major departmental, college, or university committees, grant and manuscript reviews and other service to the field). Modified loads are discussed with the head and approved by the dean. Any approved changes to the standard load for an individual faculty member will be communicated to the ARC by the department head. Each faculty member also provides an up-to-date curriculum vitae, and any additional materials they deem relevant for the committee's consideration. The department provides student evaluations of teaching to the committee.

**Report:** The ARC provides an advisory rating to the department head for each faculty member on their research/scholarship, teaching, and service over the previous year as *Meritorious*, *Satisfactory*, *Needs Improvement*, or *Unsatisfactory* based on established evaluation criteria (examples listed below) and in accord with departmental standards. In addition, the ARC provides an advisory overall rating to the department head that is based on the individual criteria ratings. The department head will consider the advice of the ARC and determine the final criteria and overall ratings. The department head ratings will be provided in an evaluation report to the faculty member. This report will include a statement on expectations for the next year in research, teaching, service. The faculty member indicates receipt of the evaluation report by signing a copy of the document, and is given the opportunity to provide written comments for their personnel file if they so choose. If a faculty member declines to acknowledge receipt of the report, that will be noted in the file. All faculty members will have an opportunity, if desired, to meet with the department

head to discuss the written review and expectations. For faculty members who receive a *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* rating in any single category, or an overall *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* rating, the department head will consult with the faculty member to formulate a timely improvement plan with milestones. An overall *Unsatisfactory* rating is reported to the Dean of the College of Science, along with a written plan, developed by the faculty member and Department Head for near-term improvement.

**Complaint Procedures:** A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the stated guidelines, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the College of Science, and with a copy to the dean of faculties. The dean of the College of Science will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the College of Science may be appealed to the dean of faculties.

Timeline:

In January of each calendar year, the department head will request the following from each faculty member:

1. A completed annual report form
2. A current curriculum vitae
3. Course syllabi and exams
4. Rationale for any changes to the standard research/scholarship, teaching, and service load that were not granted prior approval
5. Copies of any supplemental research, teaching and/or service reports the faculty member chooses to submit

**Other responsibilities of the ARC:** The ARC also serves as the preliminary tenure and promotion committee for the Department of Biology. They help assemble the candidate's dossier, including external review letters, provide an initial summary of the candidate's credentials in all relevant areas, and write up a summary of the committee-of-the-whole discussion and vote. In addition, the ARC makes recommendations for faculty award nominations to the department Awards Committee.

**6.3 Period of Evaluation:** The period of evaluation is a calendar year, although plans for and progress on multiyear projects may be considered. The annual review will be performed the spring semester following the year to be evaluated. The reports are due on February 1 of each year. The ARC will evaluate the annual reports in February and March, and then provide their recommendations to the department head in April. The department head will review the recommendations of the ARC, determine the ratings in each criteria area and the overall rating, and provide a written report of the evaluation to the faculty member by July 1.

#### **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 as one of five categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement," "Satisfactory," and "Meritorious." Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

The criteria listed below are common, established measures of faculty effectiveness, and while it is expected that faculty will meet some of the metrics for a given performance ranking, the metrics should not be treated as a checklist. Furthermore, accounting for differing paths of career development, it is expected that flexibility of performance criteria should accrue with seniority. Taking such flexibility in consideration, the ARC and department head will evaluate the strengths of a faculty member's research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in their totality, and accounting for the contribution of a faculty member toward accomplishing the university's overall mission, when evaluating performance.

##### **6.4.1 Teaching**

Teaching excellence is a goal of the Department of Biology. According to the College of Science guidelines, the ARC will review teaching performance indicators from the table provided on the annual report Form. This table includes semester, course number, number of students in the course, mean course GPA, mean

overall student evaluation rating, and the percentages of D, F, Q grades. Unsatisfactory teaching is contrary to our mission and a serious violation of the public trust. An unsatisfactory rating in teaching will necessitate a comprehensive review of teaching. The head, in consultation with the faculty member, will appoint a teaching review committee consisting of three faculty members. This committee will review the faculty member's syllabi, exams, course notes, student evaluations, mean course GPA, the percentages of D, F, and Q grades, and classroom performance, as well as any additional materials provided by the faculty member. The faculty member and the teaching review committee will develop a written plan for near-term improvement.

**Indicators of meritorious performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
2. Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials
3. Obtaining extramural funding for curricular enhancement
4. Selection for a university, college, or professional society outstanding teacher award
5. Authoring of textbooks or other instructional materials
6. Outstanding teaching evaluations (> 4.0 based on a 1-5 point scale) from students, while maintaining rigor.
4. Significant improvements in the percentages of D, F, Q rates that are standard for the level of course (e.g. <20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and <10% for 300 and 400 level courses)

**Indicators of satisfactory performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. The presentation of accurate, up-to-date, well-organized information and concepts
2. Receiving acceptable (>2.5 based on a 1-5 point scale) teaching evaluations from students, while maintaining rigor
3. Percentages of D, F, Q rates that are standard for the level of course (e.g. <20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and <10% for 300 and 400 level courses).
4. Satisfactory resolution of student complaints
5. Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
6. Satisfactory progress to degree of graduate students
7. Service as a member of graduate student advisory committees
8. Coordination of multisection courses
9. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness

**Indicators of needs improvement in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Significantly negative teaching evaluations (<2.5 based on a 1-5 point scale) from students
2. Percentages of D, F, Q rates that are significantly lower than the standard for the level of course (e.g. >20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and >10% for 300 and 400 level courses)
3. Regular and unresolved student complaints
4. Presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information
5. Not meeting deadlines for graduate student committee meetings and preliminary exams

**Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in teaching in the previous Annual Review
2. Less than 30% teaching load over a calendar year
3. Neglecting to meet formal teaching responsibilities

**6.4.2 Research and Scholarship.** The generation of new knowledge through research is the hallmark of a world-class university and an integral part of the Department of Biology.

**Indicators of meritorious performance in research and scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Publication in top tier journals in your field ( $\geq 2$ /year)

2. Leadership in obtaining funding for large scale or multiple-investigator projects
3. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
4. Member of review panel for national research organization
5. Invited plenary speaker at national and international meetings
6. Receiving a major fellowship or research award
7. Publication and funding resulting from collaborations in other fields
8. Licensing patents

**Indicators of satisfactory performance in research and scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Regular publication ( $\geq 1$ /year) of research as corresponding author in peer reviewed journals
2. Successful pursuit of extramural research support as PI/coPI
3. Presentation of research at national and/or international meetings
4. Publication of a scholarly book, or a chapter in a scholarly book
5. Publication in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings
6. Significant self-development activities, such as faculty development leave
7. Applying for, receiving, and/or licensing patents

**Indicators of needs improvement in research and scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Lack of publication in peer reviewed journals
2. Continued inability to obtain extramural research support, and/or unwillingness to submit applications
3. The absence of other scholarly activity

**Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in research/scholarship, include, but are not limited to:**

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in research and scholarship in the previous Annual Review
2. 0% research/scholarship activity over an academic year

**6.4.3 Academic Citizenship and Service.** Service to the department, college, university, and the scientific community at large is recognized an essential component of good academic citizenship.

**Indicators of meritorious performance in service include, but are not limited to:**

1. Officer in a national professional organization
2. Service on a major governmental commission, task force or board
3. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
4. Member of review panel for a national research organization
5. Program chair, or similar chair, for a national or international meeting
6. Officer in Faculty Senate, CPI, or other elected university committee.
7. Committee chair of national professional organization
8. Chair of major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee

**Indicators of satisfactory performance in service include, but are not limited to:**

1. Regular attendance and participation in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty chalk talks.
2. Service on departmental, college, or university committees
3. Officer in regional, state, and/or national professional organization
4. Program or committee chair for regional or state meeting
5. Reviewer for refereed journals, and/or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations
6. Service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies
7. Advisor to student organizations
8. Directing consulting, continuing education, and/or outreach activities
9. Contributions to diversity and/or internationalization/globalization

**Indicators of needs improvement in service include but are not limited to:**



1. Failure to regularly participate in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty chalk talks
2. Refusal to serve, or to be nominated to serve, on departmental, college, or university committees
3. Unwillingness or inability to contribute to the mission of committees the faculty member serves on

**Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in service include but are not limited to:**

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in service in the previous Annual Review
2. Less than 10% service load over a calendar year

## **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 members report of previous activities**

The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, 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, and faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

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, 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, 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 \_\_\_\_\_.

### **6.5.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member**

In the Department of Biology, pre-tenure faculty members must meet with the department head to discuss the annual review. Other faculty members may request a meeting with the department head to discuss the annual review. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

### **6.5.4 Performance Assessment**

In assessing performance, the standard weights given to research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service, are 60%, 30%, and 10%, respectively, for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Deviations

from these percentages must be negotiated with the department head and confirmed by the dean. In all cases, these 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, or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

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

### **6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance**

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

## **6.7 Time-Line**

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

## **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**

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.

- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's P&T committee, department head/ director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

## 7.2 Process

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

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

**Dossiers for the mid-term review.** The Department of Biology considers mid-term reviews are a very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty. These early reviews are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews are thoughtful and careful. Faculty members must be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period. Candidates' dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for tenure and promotion, except that external letters are not required. Additionally, work under review or in progress is of special importance in mid-term evaluations. The curriculum vitae must clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications.

Mid-term college-level reviews require copies of all annual review evaluations and letters be sent by the Department Head to the candidate. The mid-term dossier also includes separate reports on teaching, research, and service, and a summary report, written by the department's review committee. The teaching documentation contains evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the educational mission of the department and an evaluation of teaching quality. Reports on peer review or classroom visitations may be included and a summary of numerical teaching evaluations from individual courses is required. The recommendation letter from the Department Head indicates his/her overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

## 7.3 Feedback from midterm review

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

## 8. Post-Tenure Review

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

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

### 8.1 Purpose

The purpose of post-tenure review is to promote continued academic professional development, and to insure tenured faculty in the department maintain a satisfactory or better level of performance and productivity. Post-tenure review also enables a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of performance and productivity.

### 8.2 Peer review committee

The Annual Review Committee, which is composed of the associate head of operations (*ex-officio* and voting member) and 6 tenured faculty elected by the department, with no fewer than 3 Full Professors, also serves as the Department of Biology's Post-Tenure Review Committee. Members may review only colleagues at their rank or lower.

### 8.3 Process

In addition to the required annual review, every tenured faculty member will undergo post-tenure review every three years following the granting of tenure, or following an academic promotion. The post-tenure review will evaluate the faculty member's scholarly productivity in teaching, research and academic citizenship and service in accordance with the criteria for categories of performance as defined in departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and shall be reported as either meritorious, satisfactory, unsatisfactory or needs improvement. This review shall be used to determine the merit of the faculty member's performance and accomplishments over the preceding three-year period. A post-tenure review resulting in an overall unsatisfactory performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria described in the departmental guidelines. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean of Science accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement.

A faculty member can be exempted from post-tenure review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist.

**8.3.1** Materials to be reviewed by the Post-tenure Review Committee will, at a minimum, include the curriculum vita, teaching evaluations, annual reports and associated evaluations, and all documentation typically required by the department for annual reviews.

**8.3.2** The Post-tenure 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 must be consistent with annual evaluations.

**8.3.3** If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be reviewed again in three years.

**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 post-tenure 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. If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head will share the report with the other department head of the secondary unit.

**8.3.8** By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>, each unit will provide to the Dean of Science and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent post-tenure review, the outcome of those reviews, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The post-tenure 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” post-tenure 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. 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 dean will meet with the department head and the faculty member to determine the membership of the professional development review committee. The committee will consist of three faculty members at rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. Membership on the review committee will depend on the specific responsibilities and assignments of the faculty member under review.

**8.4.2.2** Once charged, the Department of Biology requires that the ad hoc professional development review committee meet and evaluate all of the materials described in Section 8.4.3 below and any other documentation provided by the department head.

**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 post-tenure 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 in [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

**8.4.5.3** If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, then 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 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)) 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 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 department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of, and in consultation with, the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the professional development plan see Section 9 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

## **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/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a professional development plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

### **8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review**

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

### **8.8 Flexibility**

Flexibility should accrue with seniority. Flexible guidelines are appropriate during post-tenure review. This faculty evaluation process should assess the contribution of a faculty member toward carrying out the university's overall missions. Thus, determination of what constitutes a satisfactory evaluation in all categories of research, teaching and academic citizenship and service should be guided by flexible criteria. The criteria described in the department guidelines for post-tenure review should take such flexibility into consideration.

## **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. In general, faculty members seeking emeritus status in the Department of Biology should retire or otherwise leave the university in good standing, receive a positive recommendation by vote of the faculty, and indicate a desire to continue contributing to the mission of the department.