

# COSC Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by the Department: August 26, 2021

Approved by the College: December 10, 2021

## REQUIRED

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

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance 3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness 3-4
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure 4
6. Annual Review 4-9
7. Mid-Term Review 9-10
8. Post-Tenure Review 10-13

## 1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University **Department of Construction Science** is dedicated to education, discovery, development and application of knowledge in the field of construction while fulfilling the land grant mission of Texas A&M University and enhancing the economic development of the State of Texas. 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 Construction Science** for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

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

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

## 2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). The Department of Construction Science aligns all faculty ranks and tracks with University rules and guidelines. Upon future conflicts with University rules or guidelines, individual cases will be reviewed and a determination will be made by the Department and the College Human Resources/Business office. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of [UR 12.01.99.M2](#)) associated with each title within their unit.

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

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

### 3.1 Teaching

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance, productivity, and impact are: **1) Teaching performance as evidenced by student scores\***; **2) Development of pedagogical content\*\***; **3) Student mentoring and advising\*\*\***; **4) Major teaching grants and recognitions\*\*\*\***.

### 3.2 Research and/or scholarly activity

Research, scholarly activity or creative work is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in these areas is required of all tenure-track faculty. All tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge in the field through research, scholarly activity or creative work in one or multiple areas of scholarship, including discovery, creativity, application and teaching. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating performance, productivity, and impact in research and/or scholarly activity are: **1) Competitive contracts and grants<sup>†</sup>**; **2) Scholarly products and recognitions<sup>††</sup>**; **3) Advising graduate students on research<sup>†††</sup>**.

### 3.3 Service

Service is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to participate in regular, active, and constructive service to both the university and the profession/community. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance, productivity, and impact are: **1) Service to the profession or society<sup>§</sup>**; **2) Service to the university<sup>§</sup>**; **3) Service to the college<sup>§</sup>**; **4) Service to the department<sup>§</sup>**.

## 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

#### 4.1 Indicators of ***Excellence in Teaching***

For a candidate to be rated "Excellent", s/he must meet the "Excellent" mark in three (3) of the four (4) categories: **1) Teaching performance as evidenced by student scores; 2) Development of pedagogical content; 3) Student mentoring and advising; 4) Major teaching grants and recognitions.**

##### 4.1.1 Teaching performance as evidenced by student scores

Excellent – Meet at least two (2) of the following during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance: (i) teaching effectiveness score in the third quartile (75th percentile) of departmental scores (based on the level and size of the courses taught) for at least five (5) semesters (excluding summer semesters); (ii) highly positive and supportive written comments from students; (iii) excellent review results from the departmental teaching peer-review committee.

##### 4.1.2 Development of pedagogical content

Excellent – Meet one (1) of the following during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance: (i) development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials, and/or publication of instructional materials; (ii) multiple peer-reviewed publications with teaching focus in peer-reviewed journals and/or conference proceedings in; AND one (1) of the following (regardless of time accomplished): (iii) development of new educational programs, or making major revisions to existing programs; (iv) development of a new class, or major revision of an existing class.

##### 4.1.3 Student mentoring and advising

Excellent – Meet at least two (2) of the following during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance: (i) serve as chair of non-thesis M.S. committees; (ii) serve as member of thesis/dissertation committees; (iii) placement of graduate students or postdoctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions.

##### 4.1.4 Major teaching grants and recognitions

Excellent – Meet at least three (3) of the following during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance: (i) major internal (university, college, department) teaching award; (ii) major external (professional society) teaching award; (iii) invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence; (iv) significant external funding for teaching as PI; (v) competitive internal funding for teaching as PI.

#### 4.2 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching***

For a candidate to be rated "Effective", s/he must meet the "Effective" mark in two (2) of the four (4) categories:

**1) Teaching performance as evidenced by student evaluations; 2) Development of pedagogical content; 3) Student mentoring and advising; 4) Major teaching grants and recognitions.** Candidates who do not meet these requirements, will be considered as "Below Effective".

##### 4.2.1 Teaching performance as evidenced by student evaluations

Effective – Meet at least one (1) of the following during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance: (i) positive and supportive written comments from students; (ii) positive review results from the departmental teaching peer-review committee.

##### 4.2.2 Development of pedagogical content

Effective – Meet one (1) of the following during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance: (i) development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials, and/or publication of instructional materials; (ii) peer-reviewed publication(s) with teaching focus in

peer-reviewed journals and/or conference proceedings in; OR meet one (1) of the following (regardless of time accomplished): (iii) development of new educational programs, or making major revisions to existing programs; (iv) development of a new class, or major revision of an existing class.

**4.2.3 Student mentoring and advising**

Effective – Meet at least one (1) of the following during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance: (i) serve as chair of non-thesis M.S. committees; (ii) serve as member of thesis/dissertation committees; (iii) placement of graduate students or postdoctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions.

**4.2.4 Major teaching grants and recognition**

Effective – Meet at least two (2) of the following during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance: (i) major internal (university, college, department) teaching award; (ii) major external (professional society) teaching award; and (iii) invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence; (iv) significant external funding for teaching as Co-PI; (v) competitive internal funding for teaching as Co-PI; (vi) non-competitive internal teaching grants as PI.

**4.3 Indicators of *Excellence in Research and Scholarly Activity***

For a candidate to be rated "Excellent", s/he must meet the "Excellent" mark in all three (3) categories: **1) Competitive contracts and grants; 2) Scholarly products and recognitions; 3) Advising graduate students on research.**

**4.3.1 Competitive contracts and grants**

Excellence – strong evidence of sustained effort and proven potential for continuous growth with external funding. Internal funding is considered primarily as a means to bring larger external grants and contracts.

**4.3.2 Scholarly products and recognitions**

Excellence – sustained and consistent record of scholarly products and recognitions. Examples include: (i) peer-reviewed publications in highly respected journals or highly competitive conferences in the candidate's field of research; (ii) invention disclosure, patent applications, and patents; (iii) major research awards or field medals; (iv) invited research talks; (v) creation of new commercial entities or organizations that will incubate, develop, and deploy technologies resulting from research or transfer results from research into existing commercial entities; (vi) meaningful contributions to science and technology policy debate, development, and deployment. The quality of these products must be commensurate with the candidate's field of research, and comparable to what is expected in peer programs.

**4.3.3 Advising graduate students on research**

Excellence – substantial success with graduate student mentoring, with an emphasis on completion of doctoral students.

**4.4 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Research and Scholarly Activity***

For a candidate to be rated "Effective", s/he must meet at minimum the "Effective" mark in all three categories: **1) Competitive contracts and grants; 2) Scholarly products and recognitions; 3) Advising graduate students on research.** Candidates who do not meet these requirements, will be considered as "Below Effective".

**4.4.1 Competitive contracts and grants**

Effective – evidence of sustained effort and potential for growth with funding to build a research program during the term being evaluated. The Department's expectation is that the candidate should demonstrate their ability to bring funding as an independent investigator, or as a collaborator (Co-PI or key personnel) with clearly defined contribution.

#### 4.4.2 **Scholarly products and recognitions**

Effective – evidence of sustained efforts to generate scholarly products as a major contributor during the term being evaluated. The Department's expectation is that the candidate should demonstrate evidence of multiple scholarly products.

#### 4.4.3 **Advising graduate students on research**

Effective – evidence of the candidate's ability to mentor graduate students. The Department's expectation is that the candidate should demonstrate evidence of successful mentoring of at least one graduate student per year.

### 4.5 Indicators of *Excellence in Service*

For a candidate to be rated "Excellent", s/he must meet the "Excellent" mark in category (1), and at least one (1) of the remaining three (3) categories. Categories are: **1) Service to the profession or society; 2) Service to the university; 3) Service to the college; 4) Service to the department.**

#### 4.5.1 **Service to the profession or society**

Excellence – strong evidence of sustained and impactful service during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance. Examples include: (i) officer in a national or international professional organization; (ii) serve on a major governmental commission, task force, or board; (iii) chair or similar position in a program accreditation team or academic program review (APR), or national or international conference; (iv) editor of a major journal; (v) chair committee in a national or international professional organization; (vi) major contribution to the industry or society.

#### 4.5.2 **Service to the university**

Excellence – strong evidence of sustained and impactful service during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance. Examples include: (i) administrative leadership role in the university; (ii) officer/chair/member in the Faculty Senate; (iii) chair of major standing or ad-hoc university committee or task force.

#### 4.5.3 **Service to the college**

Excellence – strong evidence of sustained and impactful service during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance. For example, administrative leadership role in the college during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance.

#### 4.5.4 **Service to the department**

Excellence – strong evidence of sustained and impactful service during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance. Examples include: (i) administrative leadership role in the department; (ii) advisor to student organizations.

### 4.6 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Service*

For a candidate to be rated "Effective", s/he must meet the "Effective" mark in two (2) of the four (4) categories. Categories are: **1) Service to the profession or society; 2) Service to the university; 3) Service to the college; 4) Service to the department.**

#### 4.6.1 **Service to the profession or society**

Effective – evidence of impactful service during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance. Examples include: (i) officer in a regional/state professional organization; (ii) member of review panel of a major research organization (e.g., NSF, NIH, NCHRP); (iii) service to the local community and public at large; (iv) reviewer for major peer-reviewed journals and/or conference proceedings; (v) member of a program accreditation team or academic program review (APR), or scientific/technical committee of a major international conference; (vi) member on the editorial board of a major journal; (vii) impactful contribution to the industry or society.



#### 4.6.2 **Service to the university**

Effective – evidence of impactful service during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance. Examples include: (i) administrative leadership role in the university; (ii) officer/chair/member in the Faculty Senate; (iii) chair/member of major standing or ad-hoc university committee or task force.

#### 4.6.3 **Service to the college**

Effective – evidence of impactful service during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance. For example, member of a major college committee or task force during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance.

#### 4.6.4 **Service to the department**

Effective – evidence of impactful service during the term being evaluated, or an equivalent level of performance. Examples include: (i) administrative leadership role in the department; (ii) advisor to student organizations; (iii) member of major department committee or task force.

### 5. **Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure**

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

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

##### 5.1.1 **Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:**

In order to be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates are expected to meet the following ratings: 1) Research – Excellent; 2) Teaching – Effective; 3) Service – Effective.

5.1.1.1 In addition, for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates are expected to meet the following criteria in these categories of Research:

**Competitive contracts and grants:** A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate evidence of his or her capability to win and lead competitive external contracts/grants as a primary investigator (PI for a significant project, or Co-PI for an impactful grant with clearly defined contribution), to secure a sufficient amount of funding to support graduate student equivalents (see notes), and to build and sustain an independent research program during the term being evaluated.

**Scholarly products and recognitions:** A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate evidence of producing scholarly product(s) as a major contributor during the term being evaluated, and a considerable level of recognition in their field.

**Advising graduate students on research:** A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate evidence of successful mentoring of at least two graduate student equivalents (see notes) during the term being evaluated.

##### 5.1.2 **Associate Professor to Full Professor:**

In order to be promoted from Associate Professor to Full Professor, candidates are expected to meet the following ratings: 1) Research – Excellent; 2) Teaching and Service – One excellent and one effective in either category.

5.1.2.1 In addition, for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, candidates are expected to meet the following criteria in these categories of Research:

**Competitive contracts and grants:** A candidate for promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate his or her capability to continuously win and lead competitive external contracts/grants as a primary

investigator, and/or lead successful efforts to bring impactful collaborative contracts/grant(s), to secure a sufficient amount of funding to support multiple graduate student equivalents (see notes), and to lead an independent and/or collaborative research program during the term being evaluated.

**Scholarly products and recognitions:** A candidate for promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate strong evidence of a significant number of scholarly products as a major contributor during the term being evaluated, and national/international recognition in their field.

**Advising graduate students on research:** A candidate for promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate evidence of successful mentoring of multiple graduate student equivalents (see notes) during the term being evaluated.

#### NOTES:

##### Teaching and Pedagogical Activities:

###### \* *Teaching performance:*

- *Departmental averages in teaching effectiveness may be further broken down into three tiers for fair comparison: (a) lower-level undergraduate courses, (b) upper-level undergraduate courses, and (c) graduate-level courses.*
- *In evaluating candidate's teaching performance, the P&T Committee may also review grades distribution, course content, and other supplementary materials. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient supporting evidence, as needed.*

###### \*\* *Development of pedagogical content:*

- *Examples of instructional materials include widely adopted or acclaimed textbooks, workbooks, and online tools and games.*
- *Examples of existing programs include major degree programs, minors, and tracks.*
- *The candidate's role and contribution to each publication must be properly documented. In general, serving as first co-author, second co-author (with student as first author), or corresponding author are indicators of major roles in a published paper. However, these examples are not meant to be exclusive.*
- *Publications counted toward research performance cannot be counted toward teaching performance, and vice versa (see "Research and Scholarly Activities").*
- *The candidate's role and contribution to each indicator listed above must be properly documented. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly establish a case for their contribution in each criterion.*

###### \*\*\* *Student mentoring and advising:*

- *It is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate impact, relevance, and significance of identified mentoring and advising activities.*

###### \*\*\*\* *Major teaching grants and recognitions:*

- *For the purpose of this criterion, multiple occurrences of the same item (e.g., multiple teaching awards) can be counted separately toward the minimum criteria for excellence and effectiveness.*
- *Examples of teaching invitation include courses, training workshops, and invited guest lectures from other institutions. Conference presentations (whether peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed) cannot be counted toward meeting this criterion.*
- *The candidate's role and contribution to each indicator listed above must be properly documented. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly establish a case for their contribution in each criterion.*
- *Funding and grants counted toward research performance cannot be counted toward teaching performance, and vice versa (see "Research and Scholarly Activities").*
- *The candidate's role and contribution to each indicator listed above must be properly documented. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly establish a case for their contribution in each criterion.*

##### Research and Scholarly Activities:

† *Competitive contracts and grants:*



- For the purpose of this criterion, only "competitive" contracts and grants are to be considered. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient supporting evidence, as needed.
- For consistency purposes, the TAMU internal contracts and grants system ("Maestro") will be used to calculate the portion of funds attributed directly to the candidate.
- Funding and grants counted toward teaching performance cannot be counted toward research performance, and vice versa (see "Teaching and Pedagogical Activities").

†† Scholarly products and recognition:

- The candidate's role and contribution to each publication must be properly documented. In general, serving as first co-author, second co-author (with student as first author), or corresponding author are indicators of major roles in a published paper. However, these examples are not meant to be exclusive, and it is the candidate's responsibility to clearly establish a case for their role, and to demonstrate meaningful contributions to producing each paper/publication.
- It is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient evidence regarding the reputation of a journal that their research appeared. Some indicators may include impact factor information obtained directly from the journal, acceptance rate, review process, average number of reviewers, etc.
- Each peer-reviewed book chapter or monograph is recognized as a scholarly product.
- A scholarly book published by a major publisher is recognized as a significant product. However, the candidate must provide evidence such as publisher's reputation, number of copies, adoption rate, etc. in order to demonstrate impact.
- Publication of conference proceedings as the editor does not count as book publication, but it is recognized as a scholarly product.
- Publications counted toward teaching performance cannot be counted toward research performance, and vice versa (see "Teaching and Pedagogical Activities").
- Both U.S. and international patents (with sufficient documentation are accepted). Provisional patents must be accompanied by evidence of the candidate's plan to file for a permanent patent before the expiration of the provisional period.
- Regardless of the level (university, regional, national, international), for a research award or field medal to be considered as a major recognition, the candidate is responsible to demonstrate, with facts and evidence, the level of competition and the importance of such recognition in their field of research.
- For a research talk to be considered "invited", the candidate must show evidence that their expenses (full or partial) were covered by the inviting body/organizer. Examples may include: conference registration fees, travel and accommodation expenses, honorarium, etc. A good example for this may be a conference keynote speech. In most cases, a job interview does not qualify for an invited talk. In any case, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide proper evidence in order for it to count.
- As a general rule, when counting the number of citations, self-citations are excluded. Potential sources for documenting citations include Google Scholar, Scopus, Orcid, Web of Science, and Citeseer.
- It is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient evidence regarding the significance in terms of the number of citations. For example, the average number of citations of several notable peers in the candidate's research field may be used as a guiding indicator.

††† Advising graduate students on research:

- To calculate the graduate student equivalent, each M.S. student is counted as 1/2 and each Ph.D. student is counted as 1.
- Co-chairing a M.S. thesis will count as 1/2 of a M.S. student.
- Chairing an undergraduate honors thesis is equivalent to chairing 1 M.S. thesis.
- Until the department secures an independent Ph.D. degree program, the requirement of chairing at least one (1) graduate student at the Ph.D. level may be waived.
- Until the department secures an independent Ph.D. degree program, co-chairing a Ph.D. dissertation with chairs from other departments will count as 1 full Ph.D. student. Upon launching the department's independent Ph.D. program, this provision will phase out, and co-chairing a Ph.D. dissertation with chairs from other departments will count as 1/2 of a student.

- *Serving as a member on a thesis or dissertation committee does not count toward this criterion, but such activity can be used as evidence to demonstrate the candidate's excellence or effectiveness in student mentoring (see "Teaching and Pedagogical Activities").*
- *Chairing or serving as a member on a non-thesis M.S. committee does not count toward this criterion, but such activity can be used to demonstrate the candidate's excellence or effectiveness in student mentoring (see "Teaching and Pedagogical Activities").*

**Service:**

<sup>§</sup> *Service to the profession or society, university, college, and department:*

*It is the candidate's responsibility to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate impact, relevance, and significance of identified service activities.*

**5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track (APT) 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/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

The following table outlines impact and performance expectations for promotion of APT faculty:

<b>Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty</b>				
<b><i>Promotion From</i></b>	<b><i>Promotion To</i></b>	<b><i>Teaching</i></b>	<b><i>Research</i></b>	<b><i>Service</i></b>
Assistant Inst. Professor	Associate Inst. Professor	Excellent	Effective	Effective
Associate Inst. Professor	Full Inst. Professor	Excellent	One Excellent out of the two	
Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Excellent	N/A	N/A

**5.3 P&T Process**

**5.3.1 Deadlines and Review**

**5.3.1.1 Annual Review Packet**

Promotion and Tenure reviews conducted by the Department of Construction Science will follow the official schedules and calendars published by the Dean of Faculties and by the College of Architecture at Texas A&M University.

Toward the end of each calendar year, and no later than January 20 of the following year, the Department Head will initiate the annual review process by requesting that all faculty complete their Annual Review Packet and submit them to the Department Head by a specified date, said date being no later than January 31. The annual review will cover the period from January 1 to December 31 of the previous year. Faculty should follow the format presented in the Department's Annual Review Packet. Faculty members are encouraged to review the indicators of excellence and effectiveness in teaching, research and engagement activities so that they will include data necessary for a comprehensive review of their annual activities. At the initiation of the annual review process, the Department Head and the Chair of the P&T Committee will encourage tenure-track faculty to meet with their mentors regarding the preparation and submission of their Annual Review Packet.

**5.3.1.2 Tenured Faculty, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers**

The Promotion and Tenure Committee in the Department of Construction Science is composed of five tenured faculty members from the Department: three (3) of whom are elected by a majority vote of the faculty in the Department, and two (2) of whom are appointed by the Department Head. This committee is responsible to handle all promotion and tenure cases in the Department, except from Promotion Reviews for Full Professor, which is limited to Full Professors with Tenure only.

After receiving the Annual Review Packet for tenured faculty, senior lecturers, and lecturers the Department Head will meet with each faculty member to review the submitted materials. During the review with each faculty member it may be necessary to supplement and clarify information provided in the Annual Review Packet. It is also critical that the prospectus be reviewed and clarified if necessary. The prospectus should be challenging, yet achievable, and there should be measurable goals.

After receiving the Annual Review Packet for tenure-track faculty members, the Department Head will provide a copy to the Department P&T Committee. The P&T Committee will meet with each faculty member to review the submitted materials. During the review with each faculty member it may be necessary to supplement and clarify information provided in the Annual Review Packet. It is also critical that the prospectus be reviewed and clarified if necessary. The prospectus should be challenging, yet achievable, and there should be measurable goals. At the conclusion of the review, the P&T Committee will prepare a written evaluation report for the Department Head. In preparation of the report the committee will consider prior annual reviews, their meeting with the faculty member and the current Annual Review Packet. This report will include two votes by the P&T committee regarding 1) whether the tenure-track faculty member should be continued for an additional year and 2) whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

The P&T Committee will submit their evaluation reports and the faculty member's final Annual Review Packet to the Department Head by March 31.

## **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).

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, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.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 that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member's performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

### **6.1 Purpose**

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

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

## 6.2 Focus

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

## 6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year (one-year period)

## 6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on at least three categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Meets expectations/Satisfactory," "Exceeds Expectations." A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Satisfactory", "Exemplary", and "Most Meritorious" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 6.5 Required Components

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

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

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

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

**Examples of possible content for the report are:**

- ***Courses taught and SCHs/WSCHs***
- ***Service to department committees, College committees, University committees***

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/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

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

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

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

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



#### 6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

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

#### 6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

##### 6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, 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."

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

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

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

## 7. Mid-Term Review

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

### 7.1 Purpose

- 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)

### 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<sup>1</sup>**

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

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, 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

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

### 8.2 Peer Review Committee

All areas of evaluation for the promotion of candidates follow the P&T guidelines of the College of Architecture, Texas A&M University. The Dept. P&T committee has a sub-committee (Peer Review) for teaching that evaluates candidate's submission of teaching excellence. The P&T Peer Review committee represents all faculty rankings. Both professional and instructional ranking compose the committee. A checklist has been developed from the College of Architecture P&T guidelines. The checklist helps both the candidate as well as the committee to be objective in the review for promotion. The Peer Review Committee teaching sub-committee reports their evaluation to the Dept. P&T committee.

The committee chair for P&T and subcommittee chair for teaching are appointed by the Department chair. The committee P&T serve a minimum three years, and the teaching subcommittee members are selected by the subcommittee chair for teaching. The teaching subcommittee has members that represent each faculty rank. The committee is composed of members who have served for past years as well as having a new member each year. All submissions in the areas of research, teaching and service are reviewed by the committee, and committee recommendations are submitted to the Department Head. The teaching committee does not vote on the candidate's promotion, but they submit all documents and recommendations to the P&T committee.

### 8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- **Example 1**
  - Research
    - External grants

---

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

- Internal grants
- Publications
- Books
- Technical reports
- Conference publications
- Research presentations/workshops

- **Example 2**

- Teaching
  - Teaching load and classes
  - Teaching materials
    - Syllabus
    - Student's learning objectives
    - Classroom performance
    - New courses
    - Evaluation by the students
    - Teaching award
    - Samples of student work that supports the student learning outcomes
    - Outstanding direction of graduate student's research
    - Innovative pedagogical methods of teaching
    - External funding for teaching
    - Invitation to teach domestic or international
    - Placement of graduate students in scholarly or professional positions

- **Example 3**

- Service
  - Peer reviewer
  - Conferences presentations
  - Professional memberships
  - Committee memberships
    - University
    - Department
    - Community

8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

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

- 8.3.4 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.6. A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.<sup>2</sup> If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.8 **By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

#### 8.4 Professional Development Review

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

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.

---

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

When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what “consultation” means.

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

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

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

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

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term

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

## 8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

## 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/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

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

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

#### 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](#)).

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

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

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

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

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

## Appendix

*Units may choose to annotate the revisions to previous versions of their evaluation guidelines*

---

### Contact Office

---

Department of Construction Science