

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Department of Economics

Approved by the Department of Economics, September 29, 2021

Approved by the College of Liberal Arts, September 30, 2021

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties September 30, 2021

REQUIRED

- Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.
 - For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to [University Rule 12.01.99.M1.](#)
- Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:
 - Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit
The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.
 - Dean of Faculties

Table of Contents

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

8. Post-Tenure Review 10-13

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Economics is to achieve excellence in research, teaching, and service. Excellence in research means attaining national and international recognition, as evidenced by, for example, national rankings, high quality published scholarly research, citations, external funding, and awards and honors. Excellence in teaching means offering to all students the opportunity to realize their full potential for learning. Excellence in service means providing a high level of professional expertise and experience not only to the Department and professional organizations but also to the University and the public. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Economics for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. ([UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2](#)) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.01.99.M1- University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure

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](#). Faculty ranks and tracks within the Department of Economics are as listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. .

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; research and scholarly activity; and service to the University and the profession. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Teaching

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are: a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of the chosen field of specialization; care in planning, organization, and presentation of course material; willingness to advise and direct students (e.g. through senior honors theses, directing dissertations, and participating on dissertation committees); willingness to mentor graduate students in the department; and specific indicators described in section 4.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work: All faculty are expected to contribute to the development of the discipline or multidisciplinary areas through research and publication. Quality and quantity of research output will be considered. Both the advancement of knowledge and its professional dissemination are crucial. Research competence must be demonstrated by publication of original research in leading professional journals. The quantity of publications is an important criteria. In the final analysis, the quality and impact of these publications carries the greatest weight. Factors that will be strongly considered include whether the candidate has contributed to flagship or leading scholarly journals, demonstrated a strong prospect for continuing research productivity, and received external research grants.

3.3 Service: All faculty, with the exception of faculty with "lecturer" in their title, are expected to contribute service activities that promote the department's mission, recognizing that service can take multiple forms including service to the department, College, University and/or profession. Evidence of service to the University and College includes but is not limited to: active participation in University and College wide councils, multidisciplinary areas, boards, and committees. Evidence of service to the department includes: participation in departmental committees, student committees, departmental student activities, mentoring other faculty, and other administrative service.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide

representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

- 4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to: Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; Outstanding direction of graduate research or creativity activity that is validated by peers and communicated; Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teaching award; Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award; Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence; Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials; Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum; Chair of doctoral research committees; Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects; Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence; Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students; Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions; Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program).
- 4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to: Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes; Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes; Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes; Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses; Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects; Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation; Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research; Active member of graduate student advisory committees; Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments; Effectively coordinating a multi-section course; Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness; Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
- 4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to: Publication in leading refereed journals; Receiving major fellowship or research award; Frequent citation of publications; Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s); Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings; Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research; Publication with teaching focus in leading refereed journals.
- 4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to: Publication of scholarly book(s); Publication in refereed journals; Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book; Editing a scholarly book; Publication in non-refereed but widely recognized journals; Publication with teaching focus in refereed journals; Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines; Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness; Receiving of a competitive basis internal funding for research; Invited research seminars at other recognized departments; Active department research seminar participant.
- 4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to: Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal; Being an officer in a national or international professional organization; Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization; Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board; Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting; Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University; Serving in a high standing service role for the department; Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate; Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee; Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
- 4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to: Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organization; Being a committee chair in national or international professional organization; Being an officer in regional or state professional organization; Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting; Serving as an

active member of the Faculty Senate; Serving on University, college, and department committees and tasks forces; Serving as consultant; Being an advisor to student organizations; Serving in administrative roles within the department; Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large; Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness; Mentoring of junior faculty; Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

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

- 5.1.1 Assistant Professor: [The key criteria for evaluating Assistant Professors are described in section 3.1-3.3 above, and criteria for promotion to Associate Professor are described in 5.1.2 below. For making appointments at the Assistant Professor level, the department evaluates potential in Teaching, Research, and Service. In Teaching, evidence of highly quality teaching is weighted in forming a judgment on the potential candidate. In Research, a candidate should demonstrate evidence of research potential, of a caliber likely to lead to publications and grants. Evidence of substantial support from the letters of recommendation are weighed in forming a judgment on the potential candidate. In Service, a candidate should show promise to contribute to a dimension of the department's mission using criteria in section 3.3]
- 5.1.2 Associate Professor: [*In Teaching, for promotion to Associate Professor, the department expects the effective delivery of instruction at both the undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate level, using the criteria for teaching in section 3.1. In Research, for promotion and tenure to Associate Professor, evidence must be presented that the candidate is emerging to have a national reputation as a scholar. We consider various indicators in judging promotion and tenure cases. Among them are quality and quantity of publications, quality of journals in which publications have appeared, external letters of evaluation, records of grants awarded, citations, and the quantity and quality of work in progress. Metrics of impact may include but are not limited to the quality of journal placements and citations in highly regarded journals. The substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship will continue needs to be established for all promotions. The dossier must demonstrate that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the Department. Internal cases for promotion to a higher rank and external hires at that rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Internal cases should also be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired, controlling for rank and stage of career. Tenure and promotion to the Associate Professor rank requires a research program culminating as a series of articles published (or in press) in major economics journals. The Department (and the College) encourages work based on the Ph.D. dissertation, but expects in addition a research program beyond the dissertation. Factors that will be strongly considered include whether the candidate has contributed to flagship or leading scholarly journals, demonstrated a strong prospect for continuing research productivity, and received external research grants. *Achieving excellence in a multidisciplinary area— such as teaching a multidisciplinary course or major research contribution to a grant or multidisciplinary journal publication – will be appropriately rewarded. In Service, for promotion and tenure to the Associate Professor rank, faculty are expected to show evidence of service in a dimension that promotes the department's mission using criteria described in section 3.1.]**
- 5.1.3 Professor: [Promotion to Professor requires evidence in Teaching, Research and Service using criteria in section 3. *In Teaching, the department expects the effective delivery of instruction and advising at both*

the undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate level, using the criteria for teaching in section 3.1. In Research, promotion to Professor requires a substantial research program culminating in publication in the discipline's major journals, the significance of which will be evaluated in light of its demonstrable impact on the discipline through citations and external letters. Factors that will be strongly considered include whether the candidate has contributed to flagship or leading scholarly journals, demonstrated a strong prospect for continuing research productivity, and received external research grants. Metrics of impact may include but are not limited to citations in highly regarded journals, appointments in editorial and professional positions, and indicators of broader societal impact of research. In Service, promotion to Professor requires evidence of service in multiple dimensions that promote the department's mission using criteria described in section 3.1.]

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

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

Promotion reviews for APT faculty will be conducted according to the criteria listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

5.3 Process The Department Head shall prepare a dossier to be transmitted to the College for each candidate undergoing formal college-level review. Preparation of the dossier and the evaluation process shall follow processes and guidelines of the College of Liberal Arts.

5.3.1 Preparation of Candidate's File:

The dossier must include all materials specified in the College and University guidelines. The process of obtaining external letters also follows those guidelines. A draft of research, teaching, service, and summary reports prepared by the Evaluation Subcommittee should be placed in the promotion and tenure file at least one week prior to the Committee Meeting. Once the candidate's promotion and tenure file has been assembled, the Department Head will inform all members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the candidate if material is added to the file prior to the Promotion and Tenure Committee's meeting to vote on the case. This material may include additional information about publications, teaching activities, service activities, or additional memoranda clarifying material in the file. Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are expected to keep confidential all comments in the Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting regarding the candidate and other elements of the case.

5.3.2 Committee Structure:

The Promotion and Tenure Committee for mid-term reviews and for tenure and promotion decisions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor shall consist of all department faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor with tenure. For tenure decisions regarding Associate Professors and Professors, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of the tenured faculty at or above the ranks of the individual being reviewed. For promotion decisions from Associate Professor to Professor, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all faculty at the rank of Professor.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for the preparation of four reports: a summary report, and one each in the areas of research, teaching and service. These reports are to be prepared consistent with the procedures and evaluation criteria.

The Department Head will appoint an Evaluation Subcommittee for each type of personnel decision (e.g., mid-term review, promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, and promotion to Professor with tenure as appropriate). This subcommittee shall prepare reports for review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Evaluation Subcommittee may revise these reports consistent with the Faculty's vote and incorporating comments from the Faculty. Evaluation Subcommittee members shall sign the final version of their reports as preparers of the report.

5.3.3 Promotion and Tenure Committee Meeting:

The Department Head shall call a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The chair of the Evaluation Subcommittee shall chair the meeting, and the Evaluation Subcommittee shall report to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall evaluate each candidate based on his/her research, teaching, and service record. After deliberation and vote, the Evaluation Subcommittee shall prepare an evaluation report consistent with the Promotion and Tenure Committee's deliberations and vote.

5.3.4 Department Head Report:

As specified in the College and University guidelines, the Department Head shall prepare a report for the Dean which includes:

- A report of the vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- An independent personal recommendation regarding the candidate.

The Department Head is also responsible for transmitting the complete dossier as described above to the Dean's office. If the Department Head's decision on mid-term or promotion and tenure cases is contrary to that of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, then, prior to transmittal of a recommendation to the Dean, the consultative faculty must be notified and may be convened for further consultation. The Department Head shall inform candidates of decisions made at each step in the review process.

5.3.5 Midterm-Reviews:

In consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Head will provide all mid-term review candidates with a written performance report upon completion of the college-level review. This report should mention observed strengths and weaknesses and indicate areas of performance where improvement is expected. The report should contain enough detail that will help the candidate demonstrate appropriate accomplishment at the next formal college-level review. The candidate should meet as warranted, individually or together, with the Department Head, the Chair of the Evaluation Subcommittee, and other regular economics faculty members to evaluate progress.

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 non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.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 and/or 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 Process

The Department Head shall conduct an annual review of each faculty member. Merit reviews shall consider research, teaching, and service activities (multidisciplinary as well as disciplinary) for the previous three years based on information supplied by the faculty member and data generated by the Department Head. Salary recommendations shall be based on criteria consistent with those relevant to the tenure and promotion of tenure-track faculty and to the continuation of non-tenure track faculty.

6.2.1 Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty are appointed on a year-to-year probationary basis. The Department Head, in consultation with the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee, shall conduct annual reviews of all tenure-track faculty members. For tenure-track faculty, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of tenured Associate Professors and Professors.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall vote on progress toward tenure and on contract renewal. If the Department Head's decision on contract renewal is contrary to that of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, then, prior to transmittal of a recommendation to the Dean, the Executive Committee and the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be notified.

Candidates should be informed, as soon as possible after the meeting, of the faculty vote and the Department Head's recommendation. A written evaluation by the Department Head summarizing the committee evaluation shall be given to the candidate as soon as possible, but usually no later than 30 days after the faculty meeting.

The annual review of tenure-track faculty aims to gauge and monitor the candidate's progress through the probationary period. The relevant criteria are those applicable to the eventual granting of promotion and tenure.

6.2.2 Associate Professors

Associate Professors are reviewed annually with regards to their progress towards promotion by the Department Head. As part of the annual review, the Department Head provides a performance rating in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service. The rating will be in accordance with the criteria described in the Department Annual Review of Faculty Guidelines document.

The Full Professor members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet each spring to discuss each Associate Professor's case. This discussion will be a critical input in the written progress report prepared by the Department Head.

6.2.3 Full Professors

Full professors are reviewed annually by the Department Head. As part of the annual review, the Department Head provides a performance rating in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service. The rating will be in accordance with the criteria described in the Department Annual Review of Faculty Guidelines documents.

6.3 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).

6.4 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year but may also include an expanded three-year window for the review period. ~~Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.~~

6.5 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

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

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Does Not Meet Expectations – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Meets Expectations – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Meets/Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Exceeds Expectations – those receiving the Exceeds Expectations would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** instructor in the classroom and advisor of undergraduate and/or graduate students, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.

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

6.5.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Research/Scholarly Activity** are

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Does Not Meet Expectations – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Meets Expectations – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Meets/Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Exceeds Expectations – those receiving the Exceeds Expectations rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4.
- Does Not Meet Expectations – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Meets Expectations – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Meets/Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.

- Exceeds Expectations – those receiving the Exceeds Expectations rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member, as measured by the Criteria in section 3 and Indicators in section 4. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.

6.6 Required Components

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

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

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

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

Examples of possible content for the report are:

- Research papers published and/or accepted for publication
- Research papers submitted for publication
- Research papers written during immediate previous calendar year
- Conference, Keynote, and External Workshop Presentations
- Research awards and honors
- Grants in place, applied for, and/or received during the previous calendar year
- Classes taught and new courses developed
- Textbooks and pedagogical methods produced
- Teaching awards and honors
- Service via editorial, refereeing, and panel review
- Professional Service responsibilities
- Committee Service to Department, College, or University
- Department workshops attended
- Texas A&M conferences organized
- Mentoring to other faculty members
- Service awards and honors
- Engagement with media or to community
- Accomplishments in Internationalization or Diversity
- Interdisciplinary research, teaching, or service

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

- ### 6.6.2 A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations.

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, ~~patient care~~, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

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

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

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

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

6.6.4 Performance Assessment.

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

6.7 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:

6.7.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

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

professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.7.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member does not meet the minimum standard for a satisfactory rating (i.e., is rated as Unsatisfactory in the annual review criteria of section 6.4) in any of the three performance areas, then the faculty member will receive a Needs Improvement rating in that area. 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.

6.8 Time-Line

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

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

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

7. **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 five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.

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

7.2 Process

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

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

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty. The Department of Economics will conduct the midterm review following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

8. Post-Tenure Review¹

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.).

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

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Peer Review Committee

A committee comprised of three Full Professors will constitute the Periodic Peer Review Committee. The Three Full Professors on the committee will be elected at large by the tenured faculty. In any given year, those Full Professors who are undergoing peer review will not be eligible to be elected to the committee, but all Full Professors will be eligible to vote on the composition of the committee.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

The Department Head will provide committee members with the annual review materials turned in by faculty members to be reviewed, along with annual review forms from the previous five years. Faculty members undergoing review may include materials in addition to those called for in the regular annual review process.

8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will produce a written report to the Department Head rating the faculty member's performance in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service. The rating will be in accordance with the criteria described in the Department Annual review. Ratings will reflect the majority opinion of the Committee, except in the case of an "Unsatisfactory rating". A finding of "unsatisfactory" requires unanimous agreement by the Periodic Peer Review Committee.

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

8.3.4 A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.5 A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.6 A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be

reviewed by both units.² 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 31st**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

8.4 Professional Development Review

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

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

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

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

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

8.4.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written

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

response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

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

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

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

8.6 Appeal

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

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. **Granting Faculty Emeritus Status**

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

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

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

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

Appendix

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

Contact Office

Department of Economics Office of LASB 200, e-mail spuller@tamu.edu