

# Department of Communication & Journalism

## Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by department: October 24, 2025  
Approved by ArtSci Faculty Affairs: November 24, 2025  
Approved by university Faculty Affairs: November 26, 2025

### Table of Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Faculty Responsibilities 2
3. Areas of Faculty Performance 3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness 4
5. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 7
6. Promotion and Tenure 9
7. Annual Performance Review 11
8. Mid-Term Review 15
9. Post-Tenure Review 16
10. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status 18

### 1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Communication & Journalism is to provide research, teaching, and service to the campus, community, state, university, and discipline. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Communication and Journalism for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and/or 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. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general Unit guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with University requirements, policies, and guidelines. In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and policies, rules, and procedures of the College of Arts & Sciences, Texas A&M University, or Texas A&M University System, the College, University or System statement takes precedence.

### 2. Faculty Responsibilities

Responsibilities in the *Tenure Track* (*tenure-track and tenured; T/TT*) are Teaching (30%), with a 2-2 load, Research (50%), and Service (20%). The T/TT ranks are Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The ranks in the non-tenure *Academic Professional Track* (APT) are: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Assistant Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and Professor of the Practice. Responsibilities in the Lecturer ranks are Teaching (90%), with a 4-4 load, and Service (10%). Responsibilities for Instructional ranks and Professor of the Practice ranks

are Teaching (70%), with a 3-3 load, and Service (30%). Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may be added in with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. In such instances, percent effort in research, teaching, and/or service will be adjusted to account for amount of administrative effort added.

### **3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M1)**

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance including teaching, scholarship, service, and/or administration. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. With the approval of the college, the Department Head may modify an individual faculty member's effort allocation for a specified period of time. If the research and/or creative work area is reduced, it should not be below 25%, except for faculty members whose percent effort in administrative duties at the department, college, or the university level is 50% or above. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

#### **3.1 Teaching**

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to:

- Use teaching practices known to motivate and actively engage students in the learning process, employing both traditional and innovative methods to meet diverse learning needs and styles.
- Contribute to meaningful instruction and acquisition of knowledge for all students, ensuring content relevance and accessibility.
- Aim to continuously improve their teaching practices through reflection, feedback, and professional development opportunities.
- Ensure fair and rigorous assessment of coursework, maintaining high academic standards while applying consistent, transparent evaluation criteria, and providing constructive feedback to support student learning and development.
- Foster a positive, inclusive, and fair learning environment for students.
- Serve as a positive role model, mentor, and/or advisor, guiding students not only academically but also in their professional and personal growth.
- Utilize necessary technology effectively to enhance educational outcomes, integrating digital tools and resources that support teaching and learning.
- Support faculty peers by sharing best practices.

Evaluation of teaching requires a comprehensive approach that extends beyond simple quantitative metrics. Although student evaluations are an essential component, they alone do not suffice for a complete assessment. To evaluate teaching effectiveness, it is critical to incorporate various sources and methods, including self-evaluations, peer evaluations, direct feedback from students, and the observable impacts of teaching beyond the classroom. The comprehensive assessment of faculty teaching performance should encompass classroom instruction, course and curricular maintenance and development, student advising and mentoring, the broader impacts of educational activities on student trajectories, and faculty engagement in professional development activities. These diverse elements collectively provide a holistic view of a faculty member's contributions to the educational mission.

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

Research is central to the mission of the college, and effectiveness in scholarship and is required of all tenured or tenure-track faculty as well as other faculty tracks where research is required as part of annual assessment and promotion. Faculty members should be actively engaged in creating and supporting research that influences academic and/or nonacademic communities. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of research necessitates a nuanced approach, relying on diverse and potentially distinct sources of information, tailored to different scholarly emphases within a discipline. Although scholarship must meet standards of quality and rigor to be meritorious, and typically undergo peer review, the specific metrics for evaluating impact can vary significantly across sub-disciplines. For faculty members whose work primarily involves *journal publications*, effective evaluation might focus on the inclusion of their work in top-tier academic journals, which are often characterized by high-impact factors, publication by journals affiliated with prestigious professional associations, rigorous peer-review processes, and recognition by distinguished editorial boards. Metrics such as H-indexes and citation counts, as well as extramural funding can be important indicators of the influence and trajectory of this type of research, both within academic circles and beyond. For faculty whose scholarship emphasizes *book publications*, the evaluation criteria should consider the nature and prestige of the publisher, the scope and reach of the book distribution, reviews by respected scholars, invitations to speak at significant literary or academic events, and subsequent citations in academic works. For those focused on *engaged scholarship*, with significant community impacts, evaluation should extend to metrics that assess the level of influence and implementation of their research in real-world settings. This could include documented changes in community practices or policies directly attributed to the researcher's work, the development of training models or interventions, measurable social changes, and the dissemination of findings through public venues or media outlets that highlight the relevance and application of the research to broader societal issues.

In sum, the assessment of research effectiveness and excellence must be adaptable, reflecting the specific goals and impacts of diverse scholarly activities. It should encompass traditional academic metrics where applicable, but also consider evidence of broader, transformative impacts on communities and industries, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of a faculty member's contributions to both academic and public spheres.

### 3.3 Service

Faculty members are expected to actively engage in service activities that contribute to the Department of Communication & Journalism (CMJR), the College of Arts & Sciences, and Texas A&M University. Such engagement is essential to fulfilling departmental performance expectations. Departmental citizenship is recognized as a cornerstone of effective service, essential to upholding the collaborative and supportive environment of the department. The criteria for assessing the effectiveness and excellence of service include: (1) departmental citizenship, demonstrating consistent and proactive participation in departmental activities and initiatives; (2) the impact of service activities, evaluating the tangible outcomes and benefits of these activities; and (3) active participation in initiatives that drive progress within the department, college, and university contexts. Contributions to the discipline and broader community are valued and considered within the overall service evaluation, but they do not replace the fundamental service obligations to the department, college, or university, unless specifically approved by the Department Head. Service that significantly advances knowledge or applies expertise to community issues may also be recognized as scholarly contributions, as detailed in Section 4.

## 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Communication & Journalism recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area and further elaboration can be found in Appendix A of the College of Arts & Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

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

- **Curricular Development:** Defined as the significant investment of time and expertise in creating new courses or making substantial revisions to existing courses that significantly change and improve learning objectives and outcomes, thereby enhancing the educational curriculum.
- **Course Development:** Defined as the introduction of new learning objectives, the integration of innovative teaching technologies, and/or the adoption of alternative assessment methods to enhance engagement or outcomes. Although an indicator of excellence, course development does not satisfy the department's criteria for "curricular development" when evaluating a faculty member's candidacy for promotion (See Section 5).
- **High-Quality Student Mentoring:** Involvement in and dedicated to guiding students in their academic, research, and career paths that yields measurable improvements in student achievement.
- **Excellent Student Performance:** Demonstrated by indicators such as student research success (e.g., conference presentations, publications, research awards) and notable achievements in job and internship placements facilitated by the instructor's active engagement.
- **Exemplary Instruction in Large Classes:** Mastery in teaching large classes (100 or more students), as evidenced by the successful incorporation of high-impact pedagogical practices and positive student evaluations.
- **Exemplary Instruction in Small Classes:** Mastery in teaching small classes through labor-intensive, high-impact learning exercises, fostering deep engagement and/or impacts beyond the classroom, leading to positive student evaluations.
- **Development of Service-Learning Initiatives:** Significant contributions to the design and implementation of service-learning projects that integrate academic learning with community service, enhancing students' academic and civic responsibilities.
- **Leadership in Study-Abroad Programs:** Developing and leading study-abroad programs that expand students' global perspectives and understanding through immersive learning experiences.
- **Enhancement of Student Professional Development:** Active involvement in programs like the University Honors program, significantly contributing to the professional growth and development of students.
- **Securing External Financial Support for Educational Opportunities:** Successfully obtaining external funding for teaching and learning projects, demonstrating a commitment to advancing educational excellence.
- **Recognition for Teaching Excellence:** Receipt of prestigious teaching awards at the college-level or university-wide, acknowledging outstanding instructional achievements.
- **Publication of Educational Materials:** Authoring textbooks or peer-reviewed instructional materials that contribute significantly to the field's pedagogical resources.
- **Dedication to Student Advancement:** Significant investment in writing detailed and persuasive letters of recommendation and actively supporting students' efforts to secure scholarships, internships, employment, and graduate placements.
- **Professional Development:** Active participation in and contribution to seminars, workshops, or conferences aimed at professional development, particularly those that focus on enhancing teaching skills at the college level. For non-research faculty, professional research publications, presentations, or other scholarly activities that align with their area of instructional expertise and contribute to their capacity to teach effectively may also serve as indicators of excellence in teaching in the form of professional development.
- **Application of Advanced Teaching Techniques:** Implementing innovative teaching techniques acquired through professional development activities to significantly improve instructional quality and student learning outcomes.

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

- **Course Management:**
  - **Course Maintenance:** Ensures that courses are accurate, organized, and regularly updated with current content and materials. Although an indicator of effective teaching, course maintenance does not satisfy

the department's criteria for “curricular development” when evaluating a faculty member’s performance (per Section 7.3.1; see Section 4.1).

- Administrative Compliance: Adheres to minimum syllabus requirements, college and university teaching policies, and state laws. Responsibilities include posting syllabi and CVs on HOWDY, conducting classes as scheduled, maintaining scheduled office hours, and ensuring responsive communication.
- Communication and Responsiveness:
  - Student Interaction: Responds promptly and professionally to student inquiries and concerns. This includes daily monitoring of TAMU email (Monday through Friday) and ensuring responses are provided to students and administrators within 48 hours, unless on approved leave or accommodation (via Workday, Concur, or with approval from the Department Head).
- Assessment and Evaluation:
  - Rigorous and Fair Grading: Implements a consistent and transparent grading system to ensure that grades and grade distributions are fair, unbiased, and reflect student performance based on established academic standards.
  - Grade Submission and Feedback: Ensures that midterm and final grades are submitted on time and provide clear feedback on students' performance. Feedback is designed to help students understand their academic standing and identify areas for improvement.
  - Evaluations: Achieves high student participation rates in course evaluations and uses insights from these evaluations to refine teaching practices and methodologies.

4.3. Indicators of *Excellence in Scholarship* include, but are not limited to:

- Juried Excellence
  - Highly Productive, High-Impact Research Program: Demonstrated by publications in leading peer-reviewed journals, strong book presses, and refereed book chapters.
  - Securing Extramural Support: Successfully obtaining grant funding through rigorous peer review processes, both internal and external, demonstrating the recognized value and feasibility of the research.
- Public Impacts
  - Innovation Adoption: Community or professional adoption of innovations developed through scholarly engagement.
  - Policy Influence: Documentation of one’s scholarship influencing public policy or legislation.
  - Media Coverage: Evidence of media coverage or public dissemination that highlights the scholarship and its community relevance.
  - Educational Impact: Impacts on community education through workshops, training sessions, or public lectures that stem directly from scholarly work.
- Recognition and Awards
  - Significant Research Awards: Receipt of notable research awards such as a college or university research award (e.g., Rothrock), and major national or international research awards from professional associations like the International Communication Association, National Communication Association, and others.
  - Prestigious Fellowships: Achieving fellowships that are highly selective and bring broad recognition to the faculty and department.
- Leadership and Influence in Research
  - Keynote Addresses and Plenary Sessions: Delivering invited keynote addresses or participating in plenary sessions at national or international conferences.
  - Leadership Roles in Research Activities: Serving as Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PI on funded external grants from foundations or federal agencies such as the National Science Foundation.
- Scholarly Contributions and Community Engagement
  - Disciplinary Service as Scholarly Contribution: Engaging in activities that extend beyond routine academic duties, considered scholarly due to their significant impact on advancing the field. This

includes roles such as serving as an editor for top-tier journals, orchestrating major scholarly conferences with significant impacts, and participating on grant review panels for federal funding agencies.

- Community Service as Engaged Scholarship: Utilizing academic expertise to address community issues through activities that are directly connected to the researcher's scholarship, leading to significant outcomes such as the authorship of white papers or policy documents and spearheading research-driven projects that have a measurable social impact. These activities not only advance the community but also contribute to knowledge production, enhancing the impact of the department and university.

4.4. Indicators of *Effectiveness in Scholarship* include, but are not limited to:

- Publication and Presentation
  - Scholarly Publication: Publication in refereed journals or scholarly books and/or progress on forthcoming book projects.
  - Edited Volumes: Editing scholarly books that contribute to the field.
  - Conference Presentations: Presentations of papers at national and/or international meetings.
- Grant Acquisition
  - Grant Submission: Submission of proposals for internal and/or external funding.
  - Grant Support: Obtaining extramural support through internal or external mechanisms that may not involve rigorous peer-review processes but that support research productivity.
- Recognition and Awards
  - Receipt of awards or recognitions for scholarly impact and/or contributions to the field.
- Service to Scholarship
  - Scholarly Service Activities: Engaging in service activities that significantly support and advance the department, college, or discipline. These activities may include organizing conferences, serving on editorial boards, mentorship of graduate student publications (without authorship) or contributing to academic committees that play a crucial role in the scholastic enterprise, even if not directly linked to independent research output.

4.5. Indicators of *Excellence in Service* includes, but are not limited to:

- University Service. Significant direction of committees, strategic initiatives, and projects that further departmental, university/college, and disciplinary activities:
  - Departmental Leadership: Impact on accomplishing departmental goals and priorities through activities such as the completion of projects when chairing committees, chairing a search committee, sponsoring student organizations, and leading significant projects (e.g., leading Academic Program Review, organizing a conference).
  - College and/or University Leadership: Chairing College and/or University Committees (e.g., CLA Graduate Instructional Committee, Undergraduate Instructional Council) or leading strategic initiatives.
- Disciplinary Service: Forms of disciplinary service that support the daily functioning and governance of the discipline but do not qualify as scholarly contributions can count as excellence in service, assuming department criteria for meeting expectations in service to the department, college, and/or university are met (see Section 4.6). Forms of disciplinary service that might indicate excellence in service include peer reviewing journal articles or conference papers, serving on committees within professional associations, organizing or conference panels, and participating in award selection committees, serving as a high-level officer of a national/international communication or journalism association. Although crucial to the discipline's infrastructure, these activities are classified as routine service rather than scholarship.
- Community Service: Community service that supports the public good and aligns with faculty expertise can be an indicator of excellence in service, provided it meets established departmental criteria for service to the department, college, and/or university. This includes activities such as volunteering, public speaking, or participating in local organizations where faculty apply their recognized academic and professional expertise. To count as an indicator of excellence, such service should not only contribute significantly to the

community but also enhance the reputation of the university and/or discipline, reflecting the integration of academic skills in addressing broader societal issues.

- Service Recognition: Earning a prestigious award for department, college, university, or disciplinary service or for community service that supports the public good and aligns with faculty expertise.

4.6. Indicators of *Effectiveness in Service* includes, but are not limited to:

- Departmental Citizenship: Active and responsible participation in departmental governance activities is a key indicator of effective service. For detailed expectations of departmental citizenship, refer to Section 6.4.
- Department, College and University Service: Conscientious participation in department, college or university service activities is essential for meeting department service expectations. Faculty are expected to engage in these activities when assigned by the Department Head, following discussion and mutual agreement on the appropriateness of the assignment, or when aligned with their interests and professional development goals. The focus should always be on making meaningful contributions to these initiatives.
- *Note on Disciplinary and Community Service*: Service to the discipline and community are valued as complementary activities that support overall faculty service but do not substitute for the expected effective service at the departmental, college, or university level. These activities can contribute to evaluations of service performance that "exceed expectations" or are considered "outstanding," provided that department service expectations are first met (see Section 6.3.2). When disciplinary and community service activities significantly advance knowledge or the enterprise of knowledge acquisition, they may also be recognized as scholarly contributions (per Section 4.3).

## 5. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

### 5.1 Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members in tenured and tenure-track positions are evaluated for promotion and tenure based on their accomplishments across three areas of responsibility —teaching, scholarship, and service. This evaluation emphasizes the quality, significance, and impact of their contributions, tailored to the proportional effort designated to each responsibility, as detailed in Section 2. For promotion and/or tenure, faculty must demonstrate not only meritorious accomplishments but also a high potential for continued excellence in their future academic endeavors. As faculty members advance from Assistant to Associate to Full Professor, the expectations for performance in these areas increase accordingly, emphasizing the need for continual growth and contribution at higher levels, as follows:

- 5.1.1. Assistant Professor: Assistant professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a pattern of excellence in research. Patterns of excellence in research are determined within the department and communicated annually to assistant professors through committee review (Section 5.3). Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and academic needs. It is also expected that assistant professors will show evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with an emphasis on developing a strong foundation in both teaching and research.
- 5.1.2. Associate Professor: Associate professors are expected to demonstrate sustained effectiveness in research and teaching, with evidence of continued growth and maturation in their academic careers. They should take on greater service roles compared to assistant professors, especially within the department, college, or university. Associate professors are also expected to attend and be actively involved in all Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings, as well as the review and recruitment of faculty into the tenure stream. Promotion to full professor requires a comprehensive assessment of performance across all three areas, focusing on expanded influence and leadership within their field.

- 5.1.3. Professor: Upon achieving the rank of Professor, faculty members are expected to demonstrate clear leadership in at least one area of their professional activities. This includes leading significant initiatives that exemplify excellence in service; pioneering new directions in teaching and instruction, especially in fostering student development; making innovative contributions to the body of knowledge in their field; and mentoring and supporting the development of junior faculty. Professors are expected to maintain sustained excellence in multiple areas of performance, showcasing the breadth and depth of their expertise and leadership within and beyond the university. Professors are also expected to attend and be actively involved in all Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings, as well as the review and recruitment of faculty into the tenure stream.

## 5.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty tracks in the department have three ranks: Assistant (e.g., Lecturer, Assistant Instructional Professor, Assistant Professor of Practice), Associate (e.g., Senior Lecturer, Associate Instructional Professor, Associate Professor of Practice), and Full (e.g., Principal Lecturer, Instructional Professor, Professor of the Practice). Evaluation criteria for these positions are aligned with the proportional effort designated to each responsibility—teaching, service, scholarship, and administrative duties—as detailed in Section 2. This proportional effort guides the evaluation process, ensuring that faculty are assessed more heavily in areas where they spend the majority of their time and effort. For promotion, faculty members must not only demonstrate meritorious achievements but also show a high potential for continued excellence in their designated responsibilities. As APT faculty progress from the rank of Assistant to Associate to Full, the expectations for performance in these areas increase accordingly, emphasizing the need for continual growth and contribution at higher levels, as follows:

### 5.2.1 Teaching

- Assistant Rank: APT faculty at this rank are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, with an emphasis on delivering high-quality instruction and developing effective course materials. Teaching should be informed by sound pedagogical practices, with evidence of responsiveness and continuous improvement based on student feedback and peer evaluation. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to teaching.
- Associate Rank: Faculty at this rank are expected to excel in teaching, showing a strong record of high-quality instruction. At this level, faculty should contribute to program excellence, mentor students, and demonstrate innovation in teaching practices. Excellence in teaching should be reflected in student outcomes and recognition through awards and/or formal acknowledgments, course and/or curricular development, and impacts beyond the classroom. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to teaching.
- Full Rank: Faculty at this rank are expected to demonstrate leadership in teaching, including the development of new courses, significant contributions to course and curricular development, and the mentoring of junior faculty in teaching. Faculty should be recognized for their pedagogical innovations and for making substantial contributions to the teaching mission of the department, college, and/or university. Their teaching should have a broad impact, evidenced by impacts beyond the classroom, awards, grants, and/or other forms of external recognition. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to teaching.

### 5.2.2 Service

- Assistant Rank: APT faculty at this rank are expected to engage in routine service activities primarily within the department. This includes participation in departmental meetings, committees, and activities that support the department's operations. Service contributions should focus on meeting the basic needs of the department and supporting academic and student-focused initiatives, appropriate to the percent effort assigned to service. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to service.

- Associate Rank: Faculty at this rank are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in service by contributing more significantly to the department, college, and university. Faculty should begin to show evidence of broader impact through their service activities. For APT faculty with service responsibilities greater than 10% effort, this includes taking on leadership roles within departmental committees, participating in college or university-level service, and/or contributing to professional service in their discipline. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to service.
- Full Rank: Faculty at this level are expected to demonstrate a sustained record of contributions impacting the department, college, university, and potentially the discipline. For APT faculty with greater than 10% service responsibilities, this includes chairing important committees, leading strategic initiatives, and contributing to the governance and/or direction of the academic unit. The level of leadership expected aligns with the percent effort assigned to service. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to service.

### 5.2.3 Research

- Assistant Rank: APT faculty with research in the title are expected to contribute to a program of research, scholarly, or creative work. This contribution may involve supporting principal investigators and assisting in research activities, with outputs such as publications, presentations, or creative works validated by peer review. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to research.
- Associate Rank: APT faculty with research in the title are expected to have a demonstrated record of contributing to excellence in research, scholarly, or creative work. Although they may not independently lead research programs, their contributions should support sustained productivity and the influence of a research program within the department. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to research.
- Full Rank: APT faculty with research in the title are expected to demonstrate leadership in supporting research, scholarly, or creative work. This includes a sustained record of playing critical roles in supporting high-impact publications or creative works that contribute significantly to the advancement of the field. Research faculty at this level might also lead major research initiatives or support projects recognized at a national or international level. Expectations are aligned with the percent effort assigned to research.

## 6. Promotion and Tenure

### 6.1 Tenure and Promotion Processes

#### 6.1.1 Committee Composition

- Tenure and/or Promotion Committees shall include all faculty members who are eligible to serve, as defined by the University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. Specifically, only tenured TAMU faculty may vote on cases involving the awarding of tenure or a promotion to a candidate who already holds tenure. To vote on a promotion case, a faculty member must hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being sought by the candidate.
- Full participation in discussion and voting is expected of all eligible faculty in every candidate's promotion and/or tenure case (See Section 4.6, Departmental Citizenship).

#### 6.1.2 Promotion Review of Tenure-Accruing Appointments

- The P&T Committee Chair and Department Head will meet with the candidate to identify external letter-writers that the candidate wishes to have included (and excluded). The P&T Committee Chair will then work with the committee to generate a separate list of external letter-writers not on either of these lists. From the two inclusion lists, the committee will make recommendations to the Head on the external letters to solicit. The Head and/or P&T Committee Chair will then contact letter-writers to solicit reviews.

- The members of the P&T Committee shall study all relevant documents as submitted by the candidate under review, including the candidate's research, teaching and service impact statement; a current annotated CV; evidence of research performance, teaching quality, and service contributions; the external letters; and other documents required by university and college guidelines and that the candidate may deem relevant.
- The P&T Committee Chair will assign a subcommittee of three members to report on the candidate's research, teaching, and service performance. To the extent possible, the member drafting the research report will be in the candidate's research division, with relevant expertise.
- The full committee will meet to discuss the draft subcommittee research, teaching, and service reports, to suggest edits and discuss candidates and their dossier. The committee chair will take notes to assist in the preparation of a summary of discussion. All members are expected to attend in person and be actively involved in all Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings, except when absent with a documented and justified absence (e.g., professional travel, illness, faculty development leave) or when recused due to a documented conflict of interest (e.g., relative of candidate, graduate adviser of candidate).
- The chair of the review P&T Committee will combine material from the subcommittee reports, notes on the committee discussion, and results of the committee vote to write the overall evaluation report, consistent with university guidelines. A draft will be circulated for comment to the committee for discussion and to address any comments/concerns, after which a final version will be circulated for all members to sign, in accordance with University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion.
- Each member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will vote on whether promotion and/or tenure are recommended, via an online ballot made available to all committee members for a period not less than 24 hours. Members absent during the voting period will contact the P&T Committee Chair to arrange for access to the ballot in advance or coordinate another time or method to vote. Unless recused for a conflict of interest, members absent from one or more full committee meetings will have access to the full dossier and will vote, after reviewing relevant online promotion and tenure materials.
- The evaluation of the Department Head, along with P&T Committee's report, and the promotion dossier are then submitted for review by the College of Arts & Sciences.

#### 6.1.3 Annual P&T Committee Review of Tenure-Accruing Appointments

- In accordance with the College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and University SAP 12.01.99.M1, the department conducts a mandatory comprehensive midterm review for untenured assistant professors, typically in or before the third year of their tenure track. This review assesses their progress toward tenure (see Section 8).
- In addition to the midterm and mandatory promotion and tenure reviews at the end of the probationary period, and the annual reviews overseen by the Department Head, the Promotion and Tenure Committee conducts annual reviews of non-tenured faculty in tenure-line appointments. These reviews occur in the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the probationary period and aim to assess progress toward tenure and promotion by identifying strengths and areas for improvement in research, teaching, and service.
- The P&T Committee Chair oversees these reviews, requesting that the faculty member submit a written impact statement, teaching evaluation data, peer observations, and any relevant publications or manuscript reviews. The Committee then reviews these materials to determine if the candidate is making sufficient progress toward promotion and tenure.
- Based on the committee's assessment, a recommendation to terminate the candidate's appointment can be made at the end of any annual review period. A negative third-year review could result in a one-year terminal contract (see Section 8).
- The P&T Committee Chair drafts a letter outlining the committee's feedback and decision, which is then reviewed and ratified by the committee members. This letter, along with the Department Head's memo responding to the P&T Committee Report, is sent to the candidate by May 1. A meeting with the Department Head and P&T Chair follows to discuss the reports and provide further recommendations by May 15.

- Faculty members confirm receipt of all evaluations and meetings by signing the relevant documents and may add written comments if desired.

#### 6.1.4 Non-Mandatory Review for Promotion in Tenured/Tenure-Accruing Appointments

- Prior to the mandatory review for promotion and tenure, typically in the sixth year of their tenure track, tenure-track faculty may seek an earlier review for promotion with tenure. Further, faculty with tenure may seek non-mandatory promotion in rank (e.g., promotion from Associate Professor to Professor). Processes for non-mandatory promotion review of T/TT faculty follow those described in Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2.
- Faculty wishing to seek nonmandatory promotion may do so under the advisement of the Department Head and the P&T Committee Chair. Prior to this, the faculty member can request a review of a promotion dossier for an advisory vote on the appropriateness of promoting.
- The decision to seek nonmandatory promotion is ultimately the candidate's to make. Approval from the Department Head or department committee is not required for a tenure-track faculty member to initiate a nonmandatory promotion review.
- If a faculty member wishes to seek nonmandatory promotion review in the following promotion cycle, they should write an email to the Department Head and P&T Committee Chair by **October 1** of the academic year for a promotion case that would be submitted the following fall, indicating their desire to be considered for a promotion in rank.

#### 6.1.5 Promotion Review of Academic Professional Track Faculty Appointments

- Processes for promotion review of APT faculty follow those of promotion and tenure review of tenure-track faculty, as described in Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2, with review limited to the performance areas relevant to a given position, as described in Section 2.
- To demonstrate that they meet the criteria for promotion to the next rank, faculty members in APT positions will often be considered for promotion after five years; however, time in rank is never a sufficient criterion for promotion. There is no required time in rank for promotion consideration unless specified in the offer letter. Faculty wishing to seek promotion should do so under the advisement of the Department Head and the P&T Committee Chair. At any point, an APT faculty member can request a review of a promotion dossier for an advisory vote on the appropriateness of promoting. The advisory vote is not binding, and faculty may elect to seek promotion regardless of the outcome of the advisory vote.
- The decision to seek promotion is ultimately the candidate's to make. Promotion review is not mandatory and approval from the Department Head or department committee is not required for an APT faculty member to initiate a promotion review.
- If a faculty member wishes to seek promotion in the following promotion cycle, they should write an email to the Department Head and P&T Committee Chair by **October 1** of the academic year for a promotion case that would be submitted the following fall, indicating their desire to be considered for a promotion in rank.

## 6.2 Alignment of Department Review with Institutional Standards and Guidelines

CMJR's review committees evaluate candidates based on indicators of excellence and effectiveness for scholarship, teaching, and/or service, applying evaluative criteria appropriate for track and rank, as outlined in Sections 3 and 4.

Texas A&M University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure list additional evidence of contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service, which the department committee may consider when viewed as relevant to evaluating tenure and/or promotion cases. Further, the College of Arts & Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation details criteria for promotion and tenure, which guide promotion and tenure committees' reviews and deliberations (See Section 3, Section 4, Appendix A). Specifically, department committees will evaluate: (a) teaching performance based on evidence of high-quality teaching, professional development, curriculum development, and impact beyond the classroom; (b) scholarly performance based on evidence of scholarly independence, intellectual leadership, scholarly impact, and a positive trajectory; and (c) service performance based on evidence of institutional engagement,

academic leadership, professional mentoring and/or public engagement and outreach, and commitment to the discipline. Sufficiency of faculty candidacy in relation to these criteria will be evaluated by the committee based on the college-level guidelines that are specific to each candidate's track and prospective rank (per Section 9).

Upon completing deliberations, the committee's report will articulate how department-level guidelines were applied within the framework of college and university guidelines, ensuring clarity in how department review of candidates aligns with college and institutional standards and guidelines.

## **7. Annual Performance Review**

Annual reviews of performance are conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). All faculty members, regardless of their tenure status, are required to undergo an annual written evaluation. The responsibility for conducting these reviews lies with department heads, unit directors, or supervisors.

For faculty with budgeted joint appointments, it is imperative that the relevant department heads, unit directors, or supervisors collaborate as stipulated in Section 3.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1. The aim is to ensure comprehensive and accurate evaluations, ideally culminating in a single annual review letter that addresses all areas of the faculty member's responsibilities.

Faculty members with administrative roles, such as associate deans, department heads, or unit directors, will be reviewed by their immediate supervisor. Additionally, for those holding administrative roles that include faculty responsibilities like teaching and/or research, the Department Head will provide necessary performance feedback to the immediate supervisor to be included in the overall evaluation. This approach ensures that each faculty member receives a holistic review that encompasses all aspects of their professional responsibilities.

### **7.1 Purpose**

Annual reviews serve distinct purposes from the feedback provided on progress towards promotion and tenure, detailed in Section 5.3.3. Focused on assessing immediate past performance and identifying potential areas for development within the current role, the objectives of annual reviews include:

- **Evaluative Feedback:** To provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and standards for their specific faculty role. This includes assessing how well the faculty member meets the department's requirements in teaching, research, service, and/or administration.
- **Developmental Feedback:** To offer developmental suggestions on how the faculty member can enhance and improve their contributions across all areas of their professional responsibilities.
- **Merit Compensation Basis:** To establish a well-reasoned basis for merit compensation recommendations.

### **7.2 Annual Review Processes**

- The annual review of faculty members is conducted under the responsibility of the Department Head, who may assign one or more faculty members to provide independent advisory ratings. Annual reviews take place between February and April, with faculty required to submit their annual reports by February 15. Written evaluations are communicated to faculty members by May 31.
- Each faculty member is required to submit an updated curriculum vitae and a Faculty Performance Evaluation Report. This report should comply with all reporting requirements set by the University and College Guidelines. The Department Head may also request additional materials, such as narratives and data aggregation tables, provided they align with University and College guidelines.

- The review will assess faculty performance over three years for scholarship and over the past year for teaching and service. However, an "unsatisfactory" rating in teaching and service, like in research, will be based on a three-year evaluation (see Section 7.3).
- The primary goals of the annual review are to clarify institutional and individual objectives, evaluate the faculty member's contributions towards achieving these goals, and support the faculty member's professional development. This assessment will highlight strengths and areas for improvement in research, teaching, and service.
- A faculty member's overall evaluation encompasses up to four areas: research, teaching, service, and administration. These areas are weighted according to the percent effort outlined in the faculty member's position responsibilities (per Section 3.0).
- Upon request by either the Department Head or the faculty member, a personal conference will be scheduled to discuss the evaluation.
- Faculty members must acknowledge receipt of their evaluation by signing the copy that will be filed in their personnel records. Faculty may also submit written responses to their evaluation, which will be included in their file.

### 7.3 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

Department-level annual review of performance incorporates five rating categories: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Meets Expectations", "Exceeds Expectations", and "Outstanding," based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence over the review window. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

#### 7.3.1 Performance Rating Criteria for Teaching:

- Unsatisfactory: Performance that falls significantly below the norms and expectations for the "Needs Improvement" category or meets "Needs Improvement" for the second time within a three-year period.
- Needs Improvement: Performance that falls below the norms and expectations for "Meets Expectations," as outlined in Section 4.2. Expectations are adjusted based on the faculty member's rank and stage of career.
- Meets Expectations: A rating of "Meets Expectations" is awarded to faculty members who meet basic classroom teaching expectations, as defined in Section 4.2.
- Exceeds Expectations: A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" is granted to faculty who not only meet basic teaching expectations but also display two or more of the indicators of excellence listed in Section 4.1, or who makes a significant contribution through any single indicator.
- Outstanding: A rating of "Outstanding" is given to faculty who meet basic teaching expectations and either make a significant contribution in one of the following areas: curricular development, high-quality student mentoring, leadership in study abroad programs, securing external grant support, or receiving prestigious awards as detailed in Section 4.1; or exhibit three or more indicators of excellence listed in Section 4.1.

#### 7.3.2 Performance Rating Criteria for Scholarship:

- Unsatisfactory: Performance that falls significantly below the norms and expectations for the "Needs Improvement" category or meets "Needs Improvement" for the second time within a three-year period.
- Needs Improvement: Performance that falls below the norms and expectations for "Meets Expectations," as outlined in Section 4.3. Expectations are adjusted based on the faculty member's rank and stage of career.
- Meets Expectations: A rating of "Meets Expectations" is awarded to faculty members who meet basic scholastic expectations, as demonstrated by meeting at least one of the indicators in Section 4.3.
- Exceeds Expectations: A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" is granted to faculty who not only meet basic scholastic expectations but also demonstrate one or two of the indicators of excellence listed in Section 4.3.
- Outstanding: A rating of "Outstanding" is given to faculty who demonstrate three or more of the indicators of excellence listed in Section 4.3 or makes significant impact through any single indicator.

### 7.3.3 Performance Rating Criteria for Service:

- Unsatisfactory: Performance that falls significantly below the norms and expectations for the "Needs Improvement" category or meets "Needs Improvement" for the second time within a three-year period.
- Needs Improvement: Performance that falls below expectations for "Meets Expectations" for departmental citizenship or service to the department, college, or university, as outlined in Section 4.6. Expectations are adjusted based on the faculty member's rank and stage of career.
- Meets Expectations: A rating of "Meets Expectations" is awarded to faculty members who meet service expectations for department citizenship and service to the department, college, and/or university, as described in Section 4.6.
- Exceeds Expectations: A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" is granted to faculty who not only meet basic service expectations but also demonstrate one of the indicators of excellence listed in Section 4.5.
- Outstanding: A rating of "Outstanding" is given to faculty who not only meet basic service expectations demonstrate two or more of the indicators of excellence listed in Section 4.5 or makes significant impact through any single indicator.

### 7.3.4 Overall Performance

Overall performance will be computed as a weighted based on proportional effort to each responsibility—teaching, service, scholarship, and/or administrative duties—as detailed in Section 2. Per system regulation, no faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating (i.e., rating of Meets Expectations or above) if they have not complied with all required Texas A&M University System and Texas A&M University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 – Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. All faculty must certify that they are up to date on trainings.

## 7.4 Department Head Report.

The Department Head will prepare an annual report for each faculty member, presented as a memorandum that evaluates performance across each area of responsibility. Faculty members must acknowledge receipt of this report by signing the document. They may also submit written comments, which will be included in their personnel file. Refusal to sign will be noted in the personnel file. This memorandum, along with the annual review and any related documents, will be stored in the faculty member's personnel file. The Department Head may also meet with the faculty member to discuss the review and set expectations for the forthcoming year. Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed, either at the request of the Department Head or the faculty member.

## 7.5 Assessment outcomes that require action

The following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

### 7.5.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with CMJR 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, unit director,

or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the Department Head, unit 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.

#### 7.5.2 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, unit 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. Each unsatisfactory review will be reported to the Dean. The report to the Dean will be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and Department Head. If deemed necessary, the Department Head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” of the faculty member.

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

A faculty member who believes their annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences. The Dean of the college or their designate will review and decide on the merits of the complaint.

### 8. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.4.2.) University policies, 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.

#### 8.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by CMJR’s P&T committee, Department Head, 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.

## 8.2 Process

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

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2020	7 years	Mar – Dec 2023 (due before December 2023 of AY 2023-2024)

## 8.3 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.

The Department of Communication will conduct the midterm review following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

## 9. Post-Tenure Review

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution. The evaluation should be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research, scholarship, or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities, and must include peer review of the faculty member.

### 9.1 Peer-Review Criteria

Judgments of satisfactory performance in research, teaching, and service by the peer-review committee will be based on the indicators that a faculty member has met expectations during the review period, as previously listed in in Sections 4 and 7.

### 9.2 Peer Review Committee

A three-person Peer Review Committee will be established. The Department Head will appoint one member of the Peer Review Committee. The faculty member undergoing peer review will select one member of the committee. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will head the committee. The membership of the Peer Review Committee will be drawn from full professors that are members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty who are undergoing review cannot serve on a peer review committee while they are under review. In special circumstances such as joint appointments, one committee member may be from outside the department.

### 9.3 Process

The candidate will submit a current CV to be reviewed by their committee. The candidate may also provide, and the committee may request, a written statement that is three pages or less and single-spaced, and any additional material that might inform a peer evaluation of research, teaching, and/or service performance, based on the evaluative criteria listed previously, in Sections 4 and 6.

### 9.4 Outcome

At the conclusion of peer review, the Department Head will communicate in writing to the candidate the committee's rating of their performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service as well as provide an overall rating of your performance. The rating categories used will be "Satisfactory," "Needs Improvement," and "Unsatisfactory."

### 9.5 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review or upon request of the faculty member. The Department Head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the Department Head or supervisor and approval of the Dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. 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/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" acceptable to the Dean.

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

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

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

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

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

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

9.6.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, Department Head, and Dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,

9.6.2 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.

9.6.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, Department Head, and Dean. The faculty member, review committee, and Department Head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 5) acceptable to the Dean.

## 9.6 The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan will indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the unit guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the Department Head or supervisor and the Dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

## 9.7 Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure review are being unfairly applied, wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee, or wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of university processes for faculty grievance and appeal.

## 9.8 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.

## 10. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

Faculty who, at the time of separation, hold a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University will be considered for emeritus status, following university policies and procedures, unless the faculty members requests in writing that they not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty may also be considered, if and as allowed by university policies and procedures. A nominee recommended by the Department of Communication and Journalism, at a minimum, should be in good standing.

---

### Contact Office

---

Department of Communication and Journalism, Office of Department Head, hblanton@tamu.edu

Approved by department: October 24, 2025

Approved by ArtSci Faculty Affairs: November 24, 2025

Approved by university Faculty Affairs: November 26, 2025

