

# **Texas A&M School of Dentistry Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation**

## **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 4
  5. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure 6
  6. Annual Review 13
  7. Mid-Term Review 17
  8. Post-Tenure Review 19
  9. Emeritus 23
- Appendix I: School Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review  
Committee Bylaws 24
- Appendix II: Department Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review  
Committee 29

## 1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M School of Dentistry is to shape the future of dentistry by developing exemplary clinicians, educators, and scientists. We improve oral health by caring for the needs of a [REDACTED] community; seeking innovations in science, education, and health care delivery; and serving as leaders in health professions education.

### Our Vision

Following a century of excellence, the school will continue to be a leader in dental education by:

- Educating exemplary clinicians who deliver evidence-based care
- Fostering translational and clinical research to improve patient care and delivery
- Providing high quality service to students, patients, faculty, staff, alumni, and the public
- Increasing access to dental care through cultural competence, [REDACTED] and community-based care

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 School of Dentistry (school or SOD) 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. All aspects of assessment and associated documentation are handled through the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) This document describes the recommended procedures for each of the various faculty assessments and the responsibilities of the faculty, department heads, and school administration in carrying out these assessments, submitting, and retention of the resulting documentation. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the school of Dentistry; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general school 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>TITLE</b>	<b>LINK</b>
<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.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion - Appendix I</b>	<a href="https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines">https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines</a>
<b>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</b>	<a href="https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines">https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines</a>
<b>Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</b>	<a href="https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines">https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines</a>
<b>Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</b>	<a href="https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure">https://facultyaffairs.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.M1](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). Descriptions and categories of performance may be found in section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1. The School of Dentistry has a diverse faculty with a wide range of duties and responsibilities extending from those who focus primarily on research to those who focus on clinical and/or didactic instruction or some combination of research and training. All faculty strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty are expected to make contributions in all areas including scholarly activity, teaching, and service. Academic professional track (non-tenure track) faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in two of these three areas but are not excluded from making contributions in all areas. For academic professional (clinical and teaching) faculty, scholarly activity is expected if promotion is a goal. Adjunct faculty ranks denote non-compensated “volunteer/courtesy” faculty.

## 3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), 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, scholarly activity, and service** (*including patient care and administrative duties*). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the department head and dean. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

### 3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the school, 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 school’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.

Teaching activity includes diverse topics such as mastery of subject; appropriate instructional methods; effective planning and organization; rapport with students; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving; modeling professionalism; mentoring students; using appropriate methods of evaluation; providing adequate feedback to students; enthusiasm and energy; using new technology; developing new learning experiences, courses, programs, or curricula; developing unique methods to evaluate student learning, skills, and professionalism; developing methods to evaluate individual teaching, courses or curricula; training and mentoring students, postdoctoral fellows, colleagues, staff, or faculty in research, teaching, service, or clinical activities.

The extent to which a faculty member’s responsibilities contribute to teaching programs should be considered as well as service and performance of faculty as program, course, or module directors and as clinical group leader; and the overall amount of preclinical/clinical teaching responsibility, or research mentoring.

Outcomes include increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values in the students resulting from effective instruction. Evidence of quality and innovation may be deduced in a variety of ways including teaching portfolios, peer evaluation, student performance assessments, national board results, Western Regional Examining Board results, student ratings of classroom, clinical and didactic instruction, and student research publications and results.

### 3.2 Scholarly Activity:

Scholarship includes compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge; scholarly activity that supports teaching and professional service; and the generation of new knowledge through use of the scientific method.

NOTE: this section is mandatory for tenure track and research track faculty. For **academic professional (clinical and teaching) faculty**, scholarly activity is expected if promotion is a goal. Such faculty should discuss expectations with department heads and their research/scholarship activities should be reviewed. These activities can be related to any teaching activity, or to the improvement or understanding of the basis, translation, integration, or instruction of the treatment of dental, craniofacial, and related disorders.

Evidence of scholarship is diverse and includes: \*publication in refereed journals; \*acquisition of grant funds; presentation of research at other universities or major scientific meetings; reviewing grants for NIH, NSF, and other scientific organizations; manuscript review; supervision of theses or dissertation research; service on theses or dissertation committees; publication of research abstracts; and manuscripts submitted for publication; patents or commercialization of research \*publication of textbooks, book chapters, review articles, case reports, technical and clinical procedures, and instructional materials; the editorship of professional journals; integration and synthesis of clinical approaches to particular dental problems; publication, compilation, and comparison of teaching materials or curricula within a clinical or biomedical discipline; marketing of new methods and techniques in education, instrumentation and technology; and collaborative projects with other institutions.

\*Significant (depending on time assigned for this area) quality production in scholarship and research is essential for promotion on all faculty tracks, and for tenured faculty for success in post-tenure review. These and other activities must also lead to a regional or a national/international reputation to progress for various levels of promotion.

### 3.3 Service (includes Patient Care and Administration)

Service includes **institutional leadership and participation** at all levels by maintaining the operation and contributing to the growth of the institution through efforts aimed at enhancing programs and services; leadership in curriculum development, evaluation, and pedagogy; and technological innovations; and **professional service** through contributions to the maintenance and growth of the profession; and providing continuing education.

Evidence of service includes membership on committees or other assignments within the school, health science center, and the University; leadership roles in curriculum reform, development, and implementation; contribution to faculty governance; participation in institutional, departmental, or program strategic planning; participation in student recruitment activities; development or participation in minority student programs; participation in faculty recruitment; conducting faculty development programs; providing in-service seminars, continuing education, and training; participation in quality control; participation in assessment programs; and coordinating educational displays in and outside of school; appointment as a section or symposium chairperson; membership in and contribution to professional organizations; consultant to professional journals as a manuscript referee, reviewer, etc.; consultant to accrediting and other educational review boards; presentation of continuing education programs; and invited presentations at academic institutions and professional groups.

Note: service of about 10% effort is required of all full-time faculty. This effort will vary from a lesser amount for junior faculty to a greater amount for senior faculty depending on teaching, research, and clinical commitments.

## **4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The School of Dentistry 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. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

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

Course load, syllabus, assignments, examinations, grading methods, structured classroom observation (peer evaluation of teaching) continuous course and teaching improvement  
Direction of graduate students, direction of undergraduate researchers, direction of postdoctoral scholars, other mentoring activities  
Curriculum and course development, substantial revision of existing courses, textbooks, and other instructional materials  
Participation in student professional development programs  
Participation in honors programs  
Continuous Improvement of Other Contributions  
Scholarly approaches to teaching

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

Standardized chronological table/peer review of student evaluation data  
Continuous improvement of factors identified in student evaluations  
Peer review of teaching  
Awards of Recognition for Distinguished Teaching  
Outcomes of board exams  
Trainee accomplishments  
Solicited involvement in educational organizations

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

Quality and quantity of publications, review of selected publications/work expected, scholarship of teaching and learning  
Funding consistency and trajectory, granting agencies, variety of funding sources  
Contribution to societal need, appropriate dissemination of results, collaboration, degree of risk/reward

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

Upward trajectory for research progress, invitations, honors, awards, overall research, or scholarship  
Field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship  
Election to scientific societies or academies

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

Formal and informal departmental service roles  
School roles  
University roles  
Professional organization  
Editor, reviewer, or judge  
Community, state, national, international recognition

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

Leadership roles  
Service awards  
Solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations  
Invited presentations  
Requests for external evaluations of promotion and tenure candidates for other universities

## 5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

The school follows the *Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* (published annually) for tenure-track and faculty seeking promotion with continued tenure. The OAA directs, administers, and supervises the candidate, departmental, and school-level process. Each year updated templates are provided to candidates and departments with specific instructions from the *VPFA P&T Guidelines* for each template. All documents are reviewed and submitted by the OAA.

The department head or direct supervisors should identify candidates for elective promotion (and possible early tenure) by the end of January of each calendar year. Candidates themselves may also propose going up for promotion following consultation with and approval from the department head. The OAA will announce the option for elective promotion each February to all faculty. Tenure-track assistant professors will have been informed previously that they are due for mandatory tenure review and that will again be confirmed. Once candidates are identified, department heads and approved candidates will inform the OAA, who will provide each potential candidate and department with a copy of the current tenure and promotion procedures and guidelines of the School of Dentistry and of the University (also available from the Faculty Affairs website: [facultyaffairs.tamu.edu](http://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu)) and initiate guidance for the process.

### 5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty (see UR 12.01.99.M1 section 4.4.3.)

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. Evaluation criteria for academic professional track faculty will follow the standards outlined in section 5.3 as designated for each rank and for their assigned areas of performance. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. University mandates also require awarding appropriate credit to faculty who actively work toward achieving the University's goals in three major areas: (1) supporting multidisciplinary collaborations; (2) enhancing [REDACTED] experiences at the department, school, and/or university levels; and (3) requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance. Documentation of excellence will be provided by department and school peer review. The criteria for the School of Dentistry is as follows:

#### 5.1.1 Assistant Professor:

This rank indicates a relative novice stature in academia, but with credentials evidencing both an expertise in the field, and a commitment to significantly contribute to the areas required by their appointment of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service.

#### 5.1.2 Associate Professor:

##### Teaching (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Is effective as a teacher and mentor as evidenced by mastery of both content and method and documented by student and faculty evaluation
2. Is responsible for design, organization, coordination, and evaluation of a course, or a series of lectures, and/or for curricular improvements.
3. Is recognized as an exemplary scientist or clinician whose teaching activities can be documented as providing a positive role model for students.
4. Is effective as a supervising professor for post-doctoral/advanced education students.

5. Demonstrates innovation in teaching methods and production of texts, educational software, etc. and the production of new knowledge through research in the teaching content area.
6. Participates in student guidance and counseling.
7. Responsible for the development of continuing education or other professional programs or is an invited speaker.

#### Scholarly Activity (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Demonstrates initiative, independence, and sustained scholarly activity in research.
2. Publishes research findings and scholarly papers in refereed professional journals or books. (It is recognized that publications/grants may be co-authored.) Obtains patents.
3. Presents research and scholarly findings at professional meetings.
4. Obtains funding for research or other scholarly activities.
5. Serves on thesis or dissertation committees or other research review boards.

#### Service (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Provides administrative responsibility for a service or specific area of patient care or teaching for which peer recognition can be documented.
2. Chairs or serves on committees within the department, school, University, and/or affiliated institutions.
3. Provides consultation to other departments or schools within the University and to local, state, regional, or national organizations of institutions that seek to benefit from the candidate's experience.
4. Conducts ad hoc review of manuscripts and grants; serves on extramural grant review committees or editorial boards of scientific or professional journals.
5. Performs a key administrative role in patient care, research, or teaching activities within a department.
6. Provides service as a health educator for the community.
7. Maintains active membership and participates in key organizations of the individual's discipline.

#### 5.1.3 Professor:

#### Teaching (Associate to Professor)

1. Sustained and outstanding performance of the examples cited for the Associate Professor level.
2. Leadership through design, organization, coordination, and evaluation of a course or courses (undergraduate, graduate, or continuing education); administrative responsibility at the school or department level for curriculum; supervision of staff teaching within a course, department/division, or school.
3. Invitations as visiting professor at other institutions.
4. Responsibility for student mentoring, guidance, and counseling as well as consultation to student organizations and groups within and outside the school.
5. Sustained recognition as an exemplary scientist, teacher, mentor, or clinician whose activities can be

documented as providing a positive role model for students.

6. Publication of educational works and new content area knowledge in relevant journals or books.

#### Scholarly Activity (Associate to Professor)

1. Is senior or responsible author of papers published in refereed professional journals or other media. (It is recognized that publications/grants may be co-authored.)

2. Published research forms an important body of work that is nationally or internationally recognized.

3. Receives funding as a principal investigator for research and/or serves an essential role as a coinvestigator in collaborative research.

4. Invitations to participate at national or international professional or scientific meetings.

5. Invitations to preside over sessions at national or international professional or scientific meetings.

6. Recognition for excellence in research by professional or scientific institutions or organizations.

7. Serves as chair of thesis or dissertation committees.

#### Service (Associate to Professor)

1. Appointment to responsible positions within the institution or its affiliates. (chairs a committee, department; membership on major decision-making school/University committees)

2. Recognition as an authority by other schools and departments within the University and by local, state, regional, or national organizations or institutions.

3. Senior administrative responsibility for a service or specific area of patient care or clinical teaching.

4. Consultant to, or serves on, government review committees, study sections, or other national review panels.

5. Serves as an officer or committee chair in professional or scientific organizations.

6. Serves on editorial boards of professional scientific journals

7. Election to responsible positions on civic boards or organizations concerned with health care issues at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels.

The school follows the *TAMU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* (published annually) with the OAA directing, administering, and supervising the candidate, departmental, and school-level process.

#### 5.2. Tenure Review upon Hire

Candidates for faculty positions whose initial appointment to the Texas A&M University faculty is at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for **Tenure Review Upon Hire**. It is important to note that tenure is obtained only by the affirmative action of the Board of Regents. The process for **Tenure Review Upon Hire** will be the same as the annual tenure review described in the *Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs Promotion & Tenure Guidelines*: (<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure>) with the only exception that it can be submitted out of cycle. Required documents are to be submitted with the Hire ID in the Faculty

Affairs Portal.

In exceptional cases (full professors with tenure from peer or aspirant institutions, national academy members, Nobel, or Wolf Prize winners) candidates for tenured faculty positions are eligible for an expedited tenure review.

The process for **Expedited Tenure Review** will be the same as described in the *Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs Promotion & Tenure Guidelines* with the following exceptions:

- A minimum of 3 arms-length letters in addition to reference letters received as part of the hiring package. We recommend that names of 3 arm's-length external reviewers be requested when candidates are selected for on campus visit.
- If the faculty member is a National Academy Member, only three arms-length letters from the candidate's list is required. This will eliminate the worry that a school/department is notifying the community at large that a candidate is considering moving to another institution.
- Individual reports on teaching, research, and service reports are not needed if the department committee summary report addresses teaching, research, and service.
- In cases of time pressure, the review by P&T committees can be conducted electronically. However, P&T committees must make every effort to meet and discuss the expedited tenure case under review.

### 5.3 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional (non-tenure) Track (see UR 12.01.99.M1 section 4.4.4.)

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional (non-tenure), part-time, and volunteer tracks faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. There are three categories for APT faculty: Instructional, Clinical or Research faculty. Faculty with "Instructional" in their title will be evaluated on the quality and impact of their didactic teaching. Faculty with "Clinical" in their title will be evaluated on the quality and impact of their clinical teaching. Faculty with "Research" in their title will be evaluated on the quality and impact of their scholarly activities. In all APT categories, if promotion is a goal, contribution in all areas is expected. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for academic professional track faculty.

The school follows the *Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* (published annually) **in so far as it addresses academic professional (non-tenure) track promotion** with the OAA supervising and submitting all documents for the candidate, departmental, and school-level process. Faculty at the school on the academic professional track are promoted primarily based on their contributions to the educational program or research program and their institutional and professional service. For promotion on the APT clinical/teaching track, scholarly productivity is also expected but is not the focus of this track. For promotion on the APT research track, teaching activity is expected but is not the focus of this track. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. The following school-specific guidelines are:

- A minimum of three evaluations from external reviewers is required, and the letters should strongly address the performance and impact of the candidate's academic activities.
- The external reviewers may be non-tenured at the rank of Associate Professor (for promotion to Associate Professor rank) or Professor (for promotion at all ranks).

Academic professional track promotion criteria and process applies to part-time and volunteer faculty. Below are evaluation criteria for academic professional track faculty as designated for each rank and for their assigned areas of performance. Below are examples of evidence that can be used to support promotion.

5.3.1 Academic Professional Track Assistant Professor: <https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/>

This rank indicates a relative novice stature in academia, but with credentials evidencing both an expertise in the field, and a commitment to significantly contribute to the areas required by their appointment of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service.

### 5.3.2 Academic Professional Track Associate Professor:

Evidence of emerging reputation at the regional and state level.

#### Teaching (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Is effective as a teacher and mentor as evidenced by mastery of both content and method and documented by student and faculty evaluation.
2. Is responsible for design, organization, coordination, and evaluation of a course, or a series of lectures, and/or for curricular improvements.
3. Is recognized as an exemplary scientist or clinician whose teaching activities can be documented as providing a positive role model for students.
4. Is effective as a supervising professor for post-doctoral/advanced education students.
5. Demonstrates innovation in teaching methods and production of texts, educational software, etc. and the production of new knowledge through research in the teaching content area.
6. Participates in student guidance and counseling.
7. Responsible for the development of continuing education or other professional programs or is an invited speaker.

#### Scholarly Activity (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Participation in creative scholarly activity/ research.
2. Publishes research findings and scholarly papers in refereed professional journals or books. (It is recognized that publications/grants may be co-authored.)
3. Obtains patents.
4. Presents at professional meetings (Local, State, National, International) .
5. Obtains funding for research or other scholarly activities.
6. Serves on thesis or dissertation committees or other research review boards.

#### Service (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Provides administrative responsibility for a service or specific area of patient care or teaching for which peer recognition can be documented.
2. Chairs or serves on committees within the department, school, University, and/or affiliated institutions.
3. Provides consultation to other departments or schools within the University and to local, state, regional, or national organizations of institutions that seek to benefit from the candidate's experience.
4. Conducts ad hoc review of manuscripts and grants; serves on extramural grant review committees or editorial boards of scientific or professional journals.
5. Performs a key role in patient care, research, or teaching activities within a department.
6. Provides service as a health educator for the community.
7. Maintains active membership and participates in key organizations of the individual's discipline.

### 5.3.3 Academic Professional Track Professor:

Evidence of an emerging national reputation.

### Teaching (Associate to Professor)

Sustained and outstanding performance of the examples cited for the Associate Professor level.

Leadership through design, organization, coordination, and evaluation of a course or courses (undergraduate, graduate, or continuing education); administrative responsibility at the school or department level for curriculum; supervision of staff teaching within a course, department/division, or school.

Invitations as visiting professor at other institutions.

Responsibility for student mentoring, guidance, and counseling as well as consultation to student organizations and groups within and outside the school.

Sustained recognition as an exemplary scientist, teacher, mentor, or clinician whose activities can be documented as providing a positive role model for students.

Publication of educational works and new content area knowledge in relevant journals or books.

### Scholarly Activity (Associate to Professor)

Is senior or responsible author of papers published in refereed professional journals or other media. (It is recognized that publications/grants may be co-authored.)

Published research forms an important body of work that is nationally or internationally recognized.

Receives funding as a principal investigator for research and/or serves an essential role as a coinvestigator in collaborative research.

Invitations to participate at national or international professional or scientific meetings.

Invitations to preside over sessions at national or international professional or scientific meetings.

Recognition for excellence in research by professional or scientific institutions or organizations.

Serves as chair of thesis or dissertation committees.

### Service (Associate to Professor)

Appointment to responsible positions within the institution or its affiliates (chairs a committee, department; membership on major decision-making school/University committees).

Recognition as an authority by other schools and departments within the University and by local, state, regional, or national organizations or institutions.

Senior administrative responsibility for a service or specific area of patient care or clinical teaching.

Consultant to, or serves on, government review committees, study sections, or other national review panels.

Serves as an officer or committee chair in professional or scientific organizations.

8. Serves on editorial boards of professional scientific journals

9. Election to responsible positions on civic boards or organizations concerned with health care issues at

the local, state, regional, national, or international levels.

The school follows the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually) with the OAA directing, administering, and supervising the candidate, departmental, and school-level process.

#### 5.4 Other Considerations for Evaluating Faculty

Exceptions (from UR Section 4.4.1.4): “Exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure and promotion may sometimes be warranted. Examples would include (a) gifted and productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b) exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the University is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding, but whose teaching and research are only acceptable. Few faculty will possess qualities such as these, but those who do deserve recognition and advancement.”

Outside Professional Experience: It is important the School of Dentistry faculty be aware of the current state of professional practice and research. Continued interaction with the private practice community, academic and research community (nationally and internationally) is essential to a faculty member’s maintaining professional currency. Mechanisms for achieving this continuing development may include limited private practice opportunities; continuing education courses; faculty development leave at institutes, other universities, within industry, or government laboratories; consulting activities, activities in professional societies, and accreditation agencies.

#### 5.5. Appointments for Academic Professional (non-Tenure) Track Faculty

Requirements for appointment at the Associate Professor or Professor rank

- 1) The candidate’s curriculum vitae (CV) with teaching/course evaluations (5 yrs. if possible).
- 2) External letters of evaluation (3 minimum).
- 3) A letter of recommendation from the department head that includes the expected contribution of the faculty member to the school.
- 4) A letter of review from the school APT Committee.
- 5) A letter of recommendation from the associate dean for academic affairs to the school dean with approval by the dean.

To expedite the review process, all required documents must be submitted electronically to the school Office of Academic Affairs who will distribute all the materials accordingly for review/approval.

Appointment of full-time faculty at the rank of Lecturer, or academic professional (Clinical, Instructional, or Research) Assistant Professor can be made at the department level with approval of the dean. Appointment of part-time or non-compensated (Adjunct) Assistant Professor-rank faculty can also be made at the department level with approval of the dean.

Joint part-time faculty appointments to the rank of (modifier) Assistant Professor, (modifier) Associate Professor or (modifier) Professor does not require School APT Review Committee review since faculty with primary appointments in other components or schools at TAMU or other institutions have previously been reviewed by internal review committees in their primary components or schools. Upon request from the faculty, the department head should write a memo requesting permission from the Dean for matching rank at the School of Dentistry, with a copy sent to the associate dean for academic affairs. Faculty without another faculty appointment wishing to be promoted to a higher academic rank must follow the same procedure delineated for Academic Professional (non-Tenure) Track faculty for review by the School APT Committee.

## 5.6 Promotion and Tenure Process

The probationary period for a faculty member is seven years of full-time service, beginning with appointment to a tenure-eligible rank. Under extenuating circumstances, the probationary period at Texas A&M University may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the department head, dean, and the Vice-President for Faculty Affairs. The probationary period may include (12.01.99.M1 *University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion*, page 12 of 28) appropriate full-time service at other institutions of higher education. If a faculty member has served a term of probationary service at one or more institutions, the probationary period at Texas A&M University may be for fewer than seven years. In such cases, however, the person's total probationary period in the academic profession may be extended beyond seven years.

Promotion with continued tenure and academic professional (non-tenure) track faculty promotion is elective and application must come after consultation with the department head.

The Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee shall consist of eleven (11) members with a balance of representation for clinical and basic sciences. Members are selected by the Committee on Committees or appointed by the Dean on a rotating basis for 3-year terms. The Dean appoints five members and the Committee on Committees appoints six members. During even numbered years, the Dean appoints members prior to the Committee on Committees' appointments. Only associate professors and professors will serve with associate professor membership limited to three or fewer. At least six full professors with tenure must serve on the committee.

The APT Committee will meet as needed to evaluate dossiers of appointment candidates, and at least annually to evaluate dossiers of promotion and tenure, mid-term tenure, and post-tenure review candidates. A quorum will consist of six members. Motions will be approved by a simple majority of the members present. In the event of a tie vote, the APT Committee will discuss the candidate again and revote or may reconvene at a later date.

## 6 Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion*). All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or academic professional track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible. All aspects of assessment and associated documentation are handled through the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA). The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads to assess faculty performance when determining merit payments and/or merit salary increases. The Vice-President for Faculty Affairs *Guidelines for Annual & Mid-term Reviews* states, "These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year." At the school, annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year, and the review process must be completed by **March 31** of each year.

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.M1](#) *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 for academic professional (non-tenure) track faculty, tenure-track promotion with tenure, and promotion with continued tenure as relevant.
  - See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). 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.M1](#) (*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion*).

### 6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year. An expanded period of one year may be applied to newly hired faculty but should only include independent research and publications.

### 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 four categories: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Satisfactory", "Excellent". Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

#### 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.
- Excellent – 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. This may also include national or international recognition as educators through leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

#### 6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Scholarly Activity** 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.
- Excellent– strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, citations, funding, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, invited presentations, 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 school and an absence of extra school 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.
- Excellent – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local and national 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, and would be recognized by receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement.

### 6.5 Required Components

The annual review must contain the components below in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

#### 6.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities (Self-evaluation).

Before the end of the calendar year, the OAA will inform department heads that they must request that all faculty submit a completed *Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation Report*. The current process for this report will be made available to the department heads by the OAA for distribution to their faculty. The report may consist of either an online form, a Word or other type of digital document that can be filled in and submitted electronically according to the departmental requirements or directly to the OAA.

#### 6.5.2 Annual Evaluation Review Report by Department Head (or program director or supervisor)

The department head, director, or supervisor will fill out an evaluation for the previous year in the annual review document as instructed by the OAA. Moreover, this annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service (*includes patient care and administrative duties*) and any longer-term goals. This annual review should include an informed judgment 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 sign with initials. Likewise, the faculty member must certify their attentiveness to safety and compliance. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be signed and dated by each faculty member on their *Annual Evaluation Review Report*:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.
- I will, on a continuing and timely basis, address any safety deficiencies, report any and all safety concerns to the department head, and demonstrate compliance with safety standards as defined by the Environmental Health and Safety Department.

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

The department head, director, or supervisor meets with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year and any long-term goals. 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. The department will furnish a copy to the faculty member and retain a copy in their department personnel files. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member

On or before **March 31** of each year signed originals of reviews and for faculty and any related documents should be forwarded to the OAA where they will be saved electronically and filed in each member's faculty file. Department heads must also provide email confirmation that certifies that all faculty (tenured, tenure track, and academic professional track) have completed a self-evaluation, been reviewed, received feedback, and signed a copy of their written review. The department heads should specifically indicate any tenure track faculty member who is not progressing satisfactorily toward an affirmative tenure decision, Also reported are any unsatisfactory ratings, or more than one “Needs Improvement” ratings.

#### 6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, scholarly activity, and service (*includes patient care and administrative duties*) 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, school, 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, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care, etc.), 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 school established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean through the OAA as outlined in 6.5.3. The report to the OAA 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 for submission to the OAA by a **May 1** deadline. 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 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Vice President for Faculty Affairs *for Annual & Mid-term Reviews* states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.” The OAA requires that all department annual evaluation processes be completed by **March 31** 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 school, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the school with a copy to the Office of the Vice-President for Faculty Affairs. The dean of the school will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the school may be appealed to the Vice-President for Faculty Affairs. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#).

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.M1](#)

## 6. **Mid-Term Review**

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#) (*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 seven years), be conducted (normally by the end 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. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the department P&T committee, department head, the school P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a mid-term (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

## 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 by the end of 2022 (AY 2022-2023))

The OAA will provide early notice with instructions in the fall of the preceding year to each department and mid-term tenure review candidate followed by a formal memo from the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA) after the first of the year. Department heads should meet with mid-term review candidates in the early part of the calendar year to discuss the mid-term review process using information received from the OAA.

Following submission of the materials to the OAA by the candidate, the Department Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee will review each case and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the OAA who will then provide the report to the department head. Separate evaluation of each area (research, teaching, and service) as well as an overall assessment must be provided. The committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the candidate but rather they must provide an argument as to why the candidate is or is not on track for tenure and indicate the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments. The committee must also discuss what the candidate can do to improve performance during the remainder of the probationary period.

Regarding scholarly activity, the committee must specifically describe the expertise of the candidate and the uniqueness and significance of their scholarly contribution. The committee must consider the circumstances of each candidate regarding the nature and proportion of their individual assignments in teaching, research, and service. The OAA will determine the due date for submission of the committee report.

Upon review of the candidate's mid-term review dossier, the department APT committee report, the department head-writes a preliminary report regarding the candidate's performance in all areas of review. This report must include arguments as to why the candidate is or is not on track for tenure and what the candidate can do to improve performance during the remainder of the tenure probationary period. The department head must specifically describe the scholarly expertise of the candidate and the uniqueness and significance of their scholarly contribution. This report must be signed by the department head and submitted to the OAA by the specified due date.

The School of Dentistry APT Committee will then review the dossier and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the OAA. Separate evaluation of each area (research, teaching, and service) as well as an overall assessment must be provided. The committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the candidate but rather they must provide an argument as to why the candidate is or is not on track for tenure and indicate the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments. The committee must also discuss what the candidate can do to improve performance during the remainder of the tenure probationary period. Regarding scholarly activity, the committee must specifically describe the expertise of the candidate and the uniqueness and significance of their scholarly contribution. The committee must consider the circumstances of each candidate regarding the nature and proportion of their individual assignments in teaching, research, and service.

#### Required Documentation

To conduct the review, the following items must be provided by the candidate to the OAA at the end of the spring semester (exact date will be provided):

- A cumulative three-page statement (maximum) on the faculty member's accomplishments, goals, and philosophies in teaching, research, and service
- A course evaluation summary (form available through the OAA)
- An up-to-date comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV)
- Copies of two of the faculty member's most significant papers published while at Texas A&M University

The OAA provides annual performance evaluations by the department head.

#### 7.3 Feedback from mid-term review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through mid-term review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the ADAA, department head (and supervisor/unit director if appropriate), departmental faculty, and school APT committee. The ADAA and the department head will meet with the candidate to discuss all recommendations and the overall outcome of the mid-tenure review. Department heads, with the input of the ADAA, will then prepare a final report/memo for the candidate, which will receive final review and approval from the dean of the school, before dissemination to the candidate. Candidates will acknowledge receipt of their evaluation by signing the document. The signed copy is sent to the OAA, where it will be retained.

#### 10. **Post-Tenure Review**

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (*Post-Tenure Review*), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member

who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

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

### 8.1 Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is contributing 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 Post-Tenure Review Committee

At the School of Dentistry, this committee is the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee. The structure and procedures of the School APT Committee are described in the bylaws of the Committee, which are attached to this document as an appendix (Appendix I) and are available on the school's website.

### 8.3 Process

#### 8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by the Post-tenure Review Committee:

- *Statement of Teaching, Research, and Service*
- *Curriculum Vitae*
- *Course Evaluation Summary*
- *PDF File of Publications*
- *Department Head Evaluations*
- *Teaching, Research, and Service Support Materials*

8.3.2 The Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the school 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 post-tenure review again in six years or fewer, as determined by school 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 category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Periodic 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>1</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>**, the OAA will provide to the dean and the Office of the Vice-President for Faculty Affairs, the list of those faculty who underwent Post-Tenure Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee’s (School APT Committee) written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be filed in the Office of Academic Affairs.

### 8.3 Professional Development Review

A Professional Development Review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Post-Tenure Review 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, director, or supervisor and approval of the ADAA and 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” acceptable to the ADAA and 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 ADAA/dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, schools, or universities.

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 Development 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

---

<sup>1</sup> It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

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 ADAA/ 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 ADAA/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 ADAA and dean.

#### 8.4 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 school guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, director, or supervisor and the ADAA/dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the school. 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)

#### 8.5 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 Vice-President for Faculty Affairs and the Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the ADAA/dean, the decision of the VPFA 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 ADAA and 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 ADAA/dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the VPFA and Associate Provost (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

#### 8.6 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

## 8. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

[University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) states the following: Every individual who, at the time of retirement 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.

After the nominee's CV is reviewed by all departmental full-time faculty, a committee of three faculty members appointed by the department head will create and submit the documentation representing the consensus of the department faculty. The OAA facilitates the departmental and school emeritus nomination process and submits the final approved documents to the Faculty Affairs Office. See the Faculty Affairs website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

Departments-will work with the OAA to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

**Appendix I:** *School of Dentistry Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Review Committee Bylaws*

**Appendix II:** *Department Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion (APT) Review Committee*

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

---

### Contact Office

---

Texas A&M School of Dentistry, Office of Academic Affairs, 214-828-8207 (*no general email available*)

## APPENDIX I

**Bylaws**  
**Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review Committee**

**Article 1 – Name and Purpose**

*Section A.*

These bylaws conform to the *Texas A&M School of Dentistry Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation* covering annual performance evaluation, mid-term tenure review, appointment at rank, tenure upon hire, promotion of faculty with or without tenure, and post-tenure review. Variance with that document will be resolved in favor of that document.

*Section B.*

The official name of this body shall be the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review Committee (hereinafter referred to as the APT Committee or Committee).

*Section C.*

The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) administers the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) process. This includes establishing the APT schedule, annually notifying faculty, department heads, mid-term, mandatory, and post-tenure review candidates of the schedule and requirements for APT, obtaining required mandatory documentation from the candidates, and scheduling meetings.

The APT Committee is charged by the Texas A&M School of Dentistry (TAMSOD) Dean to make recommendations regarding appointments, mid-term tenure review, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure review. The APT Committee makes recommendations to the Dean regarding these charges.

*Section D.*

The charges and duties of the APT Committee shall be to:

- Receive faculty dossiers and recommendations from the Office of Academic Affairs for appointment, mid-term tenure review, promotion tenure, and post-tenure review.
- Conscientiously review recommendations submitted in accordance with the Texas A&M University guidelines for appointment, mid-term tenure review, promotion and/or tenure, and post tenure review.

- Make recommendations regarding appointment, mid-term tenure review, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure review to the administration.
- Maintain strict confidentiality throughout the review period.
- Continually assess the strengths and weaknesses of the review process and endeavor to improve it.
- Continually review the established and implemented policies on appointment, mid-term tenure review, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure review.
- Recommend to the faculty and administration any recognized need for revision of the policies on appointment, mid-term tenure review, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure review.
- Inform the faculty through the OAA of the mechanics of the review process, and any changes therein, on a regular annual basis.
- Encourage department heads through the OAA to maintain communications with their faculty regarding criteria for review and review deadlines.
- Be available to general faculty for discussion of the appointment, mid-term tenure review, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure review processes.

## **Article 2 – Membership**

### *Section A. – Composition and Selection Process*

The APT Committee shall consist of eleven (11) members with a balance of representation for clinical and basic sciences. Members are selected by the Committee on Committees or appointed by the Dean on a rotating basis for 3-year terms.

The Dean appoints five members, and the Committee on Committees appoints six members. During even numbered years, the Dean appoints members prior to the Committee on Committees' appointments. Only associate professors and professors will serve with associate professor membership limited to three or fewer. At least six full professors with tenure must serve on the committee.

Faculty members in administrative positions (Associate Dean or higher) are ineligible for membership on the APT Committee.

The Dean or Committee on Committees must do replacement of committee members prior to the end of the academic year. Members may serve two full consecutive terms. One academic year off the Committee is required before consideration for membership again.

### *Section B. – Replacement of Members*

The Dean may replace members who are unable to attend the annual meetings, with assistance from the Committee on Committees.

The Dean will replace members who leave the APT Committee before ending their term, with assistance from the Committee on Committees.

### **Article 3 – Officers**

#### *Section A.*

The sole officer will be the Committee Chair. The elected Chair must be a tenured professor and have served on the Committee as a member for a minimum of one year of their current term.

#### *Section B.*

On or before the initial meeting of the year, the APT Committee, led by the previous Chair or the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA), will nominate and elect by secret ballot a Committee Chair who will serve for one academic year. Duties of the Chair shall include:

- presiding at the meetings of the APT Committee
- ensuring timely distribution of meeting minutes and submitting an Annual Report to the Dean and OAA
- submitting final Committee recommendation letters to the OAA regarding yearly appointment, mid-term tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review candidates.

### **Article 4 – Meetings**

#### *Section A.*

The APT Committee will meet as needed to evaluate dossiers of appointment candidates, and at least annually to evaluate dossiers of promotion and tenure, mid-term tenure, and post-tenure review candidates. A quorum will consist of six eligible members for each case. Motions will be approved by a simple majority of the members present. In the event of a tie vote, the APT Committee will discuss the candidate again and revote or may reconvene later.

#### *Section B.*

Additional meetings may be called by the Chair provided that at least three (3) working days' notice is given before the meeting, unless a minimum of 6 members agrees to meet on a shorter notice, and no members object to the meeting. For regular annual meetings, the Chair should inform the members of the date and time in advance so that members may withdraw from the committee if they are unable to participate.

### *Section C.*

The agenda for all meetings will be set by the Chair and may include items submitted by the Office of Academic Affairs or members.

### *Section D.*

The annual meeting for School APT review may be scheduled for a partial or entire day or more depending on the agenda unless a majority of the members present vote to reschedule or postpone a particular meeting or part of a meeting.

### *Section E. - Procedures*

It is the responsibility of each Committee member to be familiar with the policies regulating appointments, promotion and tenure, and mid-term tenure and post-tenure review and to have reviewed each candidate's complete dossier prior to the meetings.

Candidate's dossiers will be reviewed electronically or in the TAMSOD Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure share drive. Only Committee members and Academic Affairs staff will normally have access unless approved by the ADAA.

Each Committee member is responsible for shredding any printed documents or forwarding them to the Office of Academic Affairs for shredding.

Tenure candidates are assigned a primary and secondary reviewer who will present a candidate summary to the full Committee. Non-tenure promotion, post-tenure, and mid-term tenure review candidates are assigned a primary reviewer who will present the candidate summary to the full committee. The Chair or OAA may make exceptions to this procedure.

The primary reviewer prepares the APT Committee's written draft, which the Chair may edit. All voting members must approve the resulting document. If a member(s) of the committee dissent from the majority vote, that member or members must still approve the final written draft, which may include details of the dissenting opinion if the dissenting member or members agree to break the confidentiality of the vote by conferring with the reviewer who is preparing the document and/or the committee chair.

### *Section F. – Voting*

A motion with a second is required to act on any candidate.

Seconded motions are open to discussion.

Once all discussion is complete, members cast a secret written ballot.

Motions require a simple majority to pass. In the event of a tie vote, the APT Committee will discuss the candidate again and revote or may reconvene later.

It is preferred that members be present to vote, but email documentation of the member's vote is acceptable. Membership in the APT Committee is a serious responsibility, and if members are aware that they are unable to participate, they should withdraw from the committee at a date as early as possible so that a replacement may be found.

Members with a rank of Associate Professor do not vote on recommendations for Professor. Members on a non-tenure track will not vote on tenure track candidates.

Members from a departmental committee who previously voted on a candidate must recuse themselves from voting but are available to the APT Committee if needed for clarification.

The academic rank of Associate Professor and the granting of tenure must be achieved simultaneously within a seven-year probationary period for all initial tenure-track promotions. *Tenure Review Upon Hire* (Associate or Professor) or *Expedited Tenure Review* (tenured Professors) may be considered. If tenure is not granted, the appointment letter must state when a candidate may go forward for tenure consideration.

#### *Section G. – Mid-Term Tenure and Post-Tenure Review*

The APT Committee will participate in the school's mid-term tenure and post-tenure review processes. The Committee will determine whether the faculty member warrants a rating of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of the academic areas and professional and institutional service for the period of review. The APT Committee will make an independent judgment although the recommendations of the department APT committee (mid-term tenure review only) and the department head should be considered as relevant information. Mid-term tenure and post-tenure review should appraise the candidates' capacity for continued sustained productivity and quality.

If a deficiency or deficiencies are noted, they will be acted upon as outlined in the *Texas A&M School of Dentistry Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation*.

#### **Article 5 – Amendment Procedures**

Any articles of these operating procedures may be added, deleted, or amended by a majority vote of at least two-thirds of the membership of the APT Committee and recommended for approval by the dean.

## Appendix II

### 1. Department Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion (APT) Review Committees

#### a. Selection and Structure

Department APT committees shall consist of five faculty members of the School of Dentistry, who have already achieved the rank or higher of the candidate up for promotion. Tenured faculty may serve on committees for faculty on academic professional track lines, but not vice versa. Faculty on department committees may be from other departments in the SOD if faculty, who meet the above requirements, are not available in the candidate's department. In all cases, committees will be appointed by the department head. The department head shall also appoint the chair of the committee. In some cases, multiple committees may be appointed by a department head depending on whether there are multiple types of promotion among two or more candidates requiring different committee compositions. In the case of budgeted joint appointments, both departments must conduct a full review. In cases where faculty are paid by administrative units within the School but have significant teaching, research, and/or service commitments, promotion is possible but will be conducted through the faculty member's ad loc'd academic department.

#### b. Operation of the Department APT Committee

The department APT committee shall perform (1) mid-term reviews for tenure-track faculty members, and (2) all other reviews related to promotion and/or tenure for tenure-track and academic professional-track department faculty. Prospective faculty members who are being hired with tenure upon hire must also be reviewed by this committee. If, because of an annual performance review, a tenure-track faculty member is recommended by the department head for non-reappointment prior to their mandatory tenure review, he or she must be reviewed by the committee and the results of this review must be submitted through the department head to the ADAA with the recommendation for non-reappointment.

As outlined in the *TAMU Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* the department APT committee is charged with:

- Review and evaluation of the candidate's dossier.
- Preparing separate written peer reviews on each candidate's teaching, research, and service. The authorship of these documents should be clearly delineated, and all authors should sign.
- Preparing a complete overall report and recommendation explaining the committee's vote and reasoning for their recommendation, and in the case of mid-term tenure review, an overview of the candidate's progress and impact as it relates to their suitability for eventual tenure and/or promotion. This document is to be signed by all committee members.

No individuals other than the committee members shall be present during the committee's final deliberations, nor shall they be present during voting. Since the committee is viewed as advisory to both the department head and the dean, its vote should be independent of any action by the

department head. Hence, the department head should not be present during committee discussions or voting.

A secret ballot should be used to record the committee's vote that will be reported by the committee chair to the department head and the OAA. The votes should be counted, and the results should be announced to the committee immediately. All committee members should be present although absentee ballots may be used at the discretion of the committee chair. Committee members may not abstain from voting.

c. Department APT Committee Report – Further Considerations

The department APT committee report should address the areas of teaching, research, and service. The report should also include information regarding the faculty member's contributions to multidisciplinary collaborations, technology commercialization, and [REDACTED] related experiences at the department, university, and/or school levels. The committee must summarize its conclusions concerning each candidate with sufficient information for the department head, school administration, and university administration to understand the reasoning behind their recorded vote. A mixed vote would require further explanation of both the candidate's demonstrated abilities, and the committee's concerns.

Other considerations for the department committee report are:

- Authorship of the final report is to be made clear and the report is to be *signed/approved by all committee members*.
- University guidelines recommend that this statement: *"The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the APT committee,"* appear at the end of each report.
- *Authorship protocol* must be addressed by the department committee or by the department head, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members contribute for listing as a coauthor.
- *Quality and impact*. Department committees and department heads should be mindful of the multiple audiences who review the APT files and need to address "quality and impact" factors within their specific disciplines. Assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field. Some example areas: the importance of an award or citation; service and/or election to a professional organization; why published conference papers may be more significant than journal publications.
- *Acronyms* should be defined at first use, i.e., International Association for Dental Research (IADR). Again, assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field.
- *Identification of Courses*. If reference is made to a course, use the complete title of the course and its number in the initial reference.