

Department of English

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Updated: Summer 2024

Revised: October 2024

Approved College of Arts & Sciences: November 2025

Approved University Faculty Affairs: November 24, 2025

1. Introduction	4
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	4
3. Expectations for Areas of Responsibility	5
3.1 Teaching	5
3.2 Scholarly or creative work	5
3.3. Service	6
4. Scale and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Performance	6
4.1 Rating Scale for Annual Reviews	7
4.2 Sources for Evaluating Performance	7
5. Annual Review	8
5.1 Purpose	8
5.2 Focus	9
5.3 Time Period of Review	9
5.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance	9
5.5 Required Components for Annual Review	10
5.6 Promotion Progress Review	11
5.7 Assessment Outcomes that Require Action	12
5.8 Timeline	13
5.9 Complaint Procedure	13
6. Midterm Review for Untenured Assistant Professors	14
6.1 Purpose	14
6.2 Process	14
6.3 Feedback from midterm review	15
7. Department-Level Process for Promotion and Tenure Review	15
7.1 Purpose	15
7.2 Focus	16
7.3 Time Period of Review	16
7.4 Time Considerations	17
7.5 Other Special Considerations	19
7.5.1 Reviewing Faculty with Budgeted Joint Appointments	19

7.6 Department-Level Requirements for Candidate's Promotion Dossier	20
7.7 Department Review Process	20
8. Departmental Criteria for Promotion and Tenure Review	23
8.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	23
8.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty	26
9. Post-Tenure Review	29
9.1 Purpose	29
9.2 Peer Review Committee	29
9.3 Process	29
9.4 Periodic Peer Review for Tenured Faculty with Budgeted Joint Appointments	30
9.5 Department Responsibility to Submit Information on Tenured Faculty	30
9.6 Professional Development Review	31
9.8 The Professional Development Plan	32
9.9 Appeal Process (Post-Tenure Review and Professional Development Review)	32
9.10 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review	33
10. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status	33
11. Contact Office	33
Appendix A: Departmental Benchmarks for Review	
Appendix B: Sample Indicators for Faculty Performance	
Appendix C: Departmental Guidelines for Preparing Research, Teaching, and Service Reports for Midterm, Tenure, and/or Promotion	
Appendix D: Standard Department Timeline for Midterm Reviews and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of English is to publish nationally and internationally recognized scholarly and creative work within our discipline and in related interdisciplinary fields; create and teach innovative and effective undergraduate and graduate classes; and practice constructive citizenship through service to the Department, University, and profession. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members are essential to support this mission. 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 the stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of English for its faculty are to achieve effectiveness and excellence across their teaching, research, and service. The department acknowledges that the nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, making the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance unattainable ([University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)). Nonetheless, this document articulates department 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:

[12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure](#)

[12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion](#)

[12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review](#)

[University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines \(updated annually\)](#)

[College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation](#)

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 Faculty Title Guidelines](#). Department of English faculty titles and the responsibilities are as listed and described in the [College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines](#):

Tenure Track Titles (responsible for research, teaching, and service)	Academic Professional Track Titles: Instructional (responsible for teaching and	Academic Professional Track Titles: Lecturer (responsible for teaching)
--	---	---

	service)	
Assistantw`11 Professor	Instructional Assistant Professor	Lecturer
Associate Professor	Instructional Associate Professor	Senior Lecturer
Professor	Instructional Professor	Principal Lecturer

3. Expectations for Areas of Responsibility

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in their assigned categories of performance: scholarly/ creative work; teaching; and service. Descriptions of expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below; university criteria can be found in [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). 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 department and all faculty are required to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. The baseline criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are demonstrated teaching competence in three broad areas, as appropriate to title:

1. classroom instruction: all activities associated with the fair and professional management of regularly scheduled, multi-student courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels
2. graduate mentoring: participation on graduate committees as appropriate to rank and field
3. course maintenance: the ongoing development of syllabi in regularly scheduled courses; availability to teach a reasonable variety of courses at all levels over the course of a five-year period.

Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion (see Appendices A and B below for departmental benchmarks and indicators for faculty annual performance review; see also appendix B.1 in the [College guidelines](#)).

3.2 Scholarly or creative work

Tenure-stream faculty are expected to maintain an active scholarly or creative agenda. The baseline departmental expectations for research follow from disciplinary norms and focus on substantial research projects which culminate in a monograph, scholarly edition, digital project, or a thematically coherent set of essays, published in well-regarded print or electronic peer-reviewed venues. Faculty are encouraged to be consistently productive, to produce high quality work, and to be ambitious in placing that work with top peer-reviewed presses, in nationally and

internationally prominent peer-reviewed journals, edited collections from prestigious presses, and in other high impact print and electronic venues. Similar expectations govern productivity, quality, and placement of creative work in highly regarded, nationally or internationally visible venues with clearly articulated and selective review processes comparable to those of peer-reviewed scholarly presses and journals. Given the widely varied research profiles of department faculty, the Department Head and Evaluation Advisory Committee must show flexibility and discretion in evaluating the individual faculty member's scholarly and/or creative work over the five--year window.

See Appendices A and B for specific departmental review benchmarks and indicators for faculty performance review.

3.3. Service

Faculty service falls into three general categories:

1. Citizenship: this category is the baseline expected of all department faculty members. It is characterized by activities such as regular attendance at departmental meetings, membership on departmental committees, casting departmental ballots as eligible, volunteering for appropriate ad hoc activities
2. Impact: includes higher-profile department, college, or university service including but not limited to active mentoring of junior and new faculty, chairing a departmental committee, serving on or chairing a TAMU committee beyond department level, or filling a TAMU administrative role within or beyond the department level
3. Visibility: refers to extra-University professional service including but not limited to organizing a conference or academic event; serving on an editorial board or program advisory board beyond TAMU; holding office in a professional organization; serving as a tenure or promotion reviewer for another institution; serving as an invited peer reviewer for a journal, book publisher, or grant-giving organization.

See Appendices A and B for specific departmental review benchmarks and indicators for faculty performance review.

4. Scale and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Performance

While evaluating faculty performance across individual areas of responsibility does not operate via a specific formula, it does make use of the following tools:

1. A rating scale for evaluating faculty performance (section 4.1)
2. A set of departmental benchmarks (Appendix A), derived from disciplinary norms and the college's guiding criteria (see [the College Faculty Evaluation Guidelines](#)).
3. A list of indicators of faculty performance (Appendix B).

4.1 Rating Scale for Annual Reviews

Following the Department of Arts and Sciences' guidelines, the Department of English uses a five-point scale for evaluating faculty performance:

- Unsatisfactory
- Needs Improvement
- Meets Expectations
- Exceeds Expectations
- Outstanding

More detail on these ratings can be found in section 5.4.

4.2 Sources for Evaluating Performance

4.2.1 Sources for Evaluating Teaching

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself to solely quantitative measurement or the use of a single-source of information. To better protect against potential bias and ensure a more holistic review of a faculty member's teaching performance, multiple sources of information are required by the department to be considered at annual, midterm, tenure, and promotion review:

1. Faculty descriptions of their teaching contributions. These descriptions include information on new and revised courses, high impact learning experiences, mentoring of students, professional development related to teaching, etc.
2. Student feedback regarding their learning experience as judged by student end of course evaluations.

For promotions reviews, the department also requires two peer-evaluations of teaching (one at midterm).

4.2.2 Sources for Evaluating Research or Creative Work

The evaluation of research or creative work requires multiple sources of information for review. In the Department of English, these include: lists of work published or to be published (mandatory for tenured and tenure-track faculty); external presentations; grants; honors, awards, and professional recognition; evidence of visibility and impact; other accomplishments. See Appendix B for further indicators of research or creative work.

4.2.3 Sources for Evaluating Service

While service is an integral component of faculty responsibilities, it can often be the most difficult area of faculty responsibility to document. At annual review, the faculty member's review materials and CV will be the principal source of information; additionally, at mid-term, tenure, and other promotion reviews, service will be documented in the impact statement and in any support letters or emails documenting department/ college/ university/ disciplinary/ community service that the candidate includes. See Appendix B for further indicators of service.

5. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with [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 their 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 ([University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion](#)). 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.

5.1 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.
- 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 create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

5.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title, rank, and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review, per [University Rule 12.01.99.M2 \(University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion\)](#).

- 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, the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards promotion, as applicable.

5.3 Time Period of Review

While the focus of the annual review will pay most attention to faculty performance of assigned duties over the calendar year under review, the Department of English uses a five-year evaluative window in all three categories (teaching, research, service).

5.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 3) will be rated according to the following five categories, taking into account faculty title and stage of career:

- Unsatisfactory: Performance that falls below the norms in the evaluation area according to title. No evidence of meeting departmental criteria.
- Needs Improvement: Performance that falls below the norms of *meets expectations* in the evaluation area according to title. There is minimal evidence of meeting departmental criteria.
- Meets Expectations: Performance that demonstrates effectiveness in the evaluation area according to title. There is sufficient evidence of meeting departmental criteria.
- Exceeds Expectations: Performance that meets and surpasses effectiveness in the evaluation area according to title. In addition to evidence of effectiveness, there is strong evidence of excellence in the evaluation area.
- Outstanding: Performance that is exceptional, significantly surpassing department expectations for the assigned area. There should be exceptionally strong evidence of excellence according to departmental criteria.

For more detailed information on potential indicators of these evaluation categories according to each area of faculty workload, see Appendix B.

5.5 Required Components for Annual Review

5.5.1 Annual Report of Faculty Member Activities

The English department, in accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M1, \(University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion\)](#), requires each faculty member to submit an annual report of their activities in their assigned performance areas. In the Department of English, these reports must include:

- the Faculty 180 Faculty Performance Evaluation Review (FPER) for the appropriate *calendar* year,
- a current and annually-updated CV,
- syllabi and AEFIS course evaluations for courses taught in the past calendar year,
- completed table with AEFIS course evaluation scores,
- the Annual Evaluation Workload Checklist,

- the non-evaluation form

All forms to be completed are stored on the departmental intranet.

5.5.2 The Department's Evaluation Process

Peer review is conducted by the department's Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC), which consists of four tenured faculty members and one APT faculty member.¹ The APT faculty member participates in the work of the committee only for the evaluation of APT faculty. The Associate Head and Directors are not eligible to serve; the Department Head does not serve on the committee but attends the meetings. Members are appointed by the Head in consultation with the Executive Committee and serve staggered two-year terms. The Head appoints the chair of the committee. The committee reviews the Annual Checklists of all faculty who are not on the committee, evaluating each individual's performance in the categories of scholarly and creative activity, teaching, and service, as appropriate to their track, rank, and assigned departmental duties. The committee provides its evaluation recommendations to the Head. The committee may also provide recommendations to the Awards Committee for faculty to be nominated for College and University awards.

While the EAC's recommendations for annual review are advisory to the Head, the Head's annual evaluation letter will report the EAC's ratings in each of the three performance areas (teaching, research, and service) and provide a rationale for any instance in which the Head's rating differs from that of the EAC or if the EAC's rating was split.

5.5.2.1 Periodic Peer Review Component of the Annual Review Process

For those tenured faculty identified for Periodic Peer Review, the tenured members of the committee also constitute the Periodic Peer Review committee, subject to the conditions and allowances specified below in section 8.

5.5.3 Department Head's Written Evaluation and Report

The department head will write an evaluation letter for the year for the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the letter 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 evaluation document will be noted in the file. This letter and any related documents will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. This letter shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, scholarly and/or creative work, and service and should include an informed judgment by the department head of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

5.5.4 Compliance Review

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

¹ The APT faculty representative can hold either a lecturer or instructional title; they must, however, be past the first promotion level.

days to complete the requirement. All faculty must certify that they are up to date on TrainTraQ training on their submitted non-evaluative form.

Annual review of faculty performance for teaching must also consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member complies with all policies, rules, and deadlines associated with teaching. The college recommends that the annual evaluation rating accurately reflect situations where a faculty member is out of compliance with the policies listed below for teaching.

- Course Syllabi and CV must be posted no later than seven days after the first class day as stated in [Texas Education Code 51.974](#).
- All required midterm grades and final grades, including the grades for graduating seniors, must be submitted on time.
- All attendance certifications (e.g., First Day of Attendance Certification) must be submitted accurately and on time.

5.5.5 Meeting between the Department Head and Faculty Member.

The department head will provide an opportunity for faculty members to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. This meeting is only required for all assistant professors and any faculty member who received “needs improvement” in one of their evaluative categories or an unsatisfactory overall evaluation.

5.6 Promotion Progress Review

5.6.1 Feedback on Progress towards Tenure for Untenured Tenure-Track Professors

Tenured members of the department (the department’s tenure and promotion voting faculty) must participate in an annual review of untenured assistant professors (and untenured associate professors, as applicable). Using annual review materials, this review must provide a candid assessment of whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards tenure and promotion (relative to their year on the tenure clock), and to provide constructive feedback on ways to strengthen their overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The feedback is reported to the department head. The feedback includes a vote, conducted via electronic anonymous ballot, of all eligible faculty (see section 7.3.2.1 for eligibility criteria) on whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress, as well as a vote on whether the faculty member’s appointment as a tenure track faculty member should be continued. The department head should independently review all annual review materials and provide a written memo to the faculty member (incorporating feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process). A copy of the department head’s written evaluation of a faculty member must be submitted to the college (to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs).

5.6.2 Optional Feedback on Progress towards Promotion for Promotion-Eligible Faculty

Promotion eligible faculty should understand that having a series of positive annual reviews is not the best indicator of whether somebody is ready to come up for promotion. In other words, a

faculty member can be doing very good work and meet or exceed expectations during annual reviews, but not yet have a record that merits promotion. For that reason, tenured associate professors and academic professional track faculty who are not at the highest rank have the *option* of requesting *informal* feedback on their progress towards promotion.

In October of each academic year, the department head will send out a call for tenured associate professors who wish to be considered for promotion to full professor to submit material for review by the full professors. The full professors will provide feedback on the nominee's promotion progress. Similarly, in February of each academic year, the same process will happen for academic professional-track faculty who wish to be considered for promotion to senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructional associate professor, or instructional professor, depending on their current title and eligibility.

In accordance with university guidelines, a faculty member may opt to come up for a non-mandatory promotion at any time. In other words, there is no requirement that a faculty member undergo the optional promotion progress review. Similarly, there is no requirement that a faculty member must receive a successful outcome from a promotion progress review prior to coming up for promotion (though it would be inadvisable for a candidate to fully ignore advice from the department committee).

5.7 Assessment Outcomes that Require Action

Per [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

5.7.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Appendix A). 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 for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)) 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 shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#).

5.7.2 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 8), they must

work with the department head immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching or service, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. For research, 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.

5.8 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling the department head to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The University’s [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.”

5.9 Complaint Procedure

A faculty member who believes that their annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college, with a copy to the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. 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 Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. [See University SAP 12.01.99.M1.](#)

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. [See University SAP 12.01.99.M1.](#)

6. Midterm Review for Untenured Assistant Professors

In accordance with [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 the end of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

6.1 Purpose

The Department of English will conduct the midterm review following the procedure described in [the College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation](#).

- 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's tenure and promotion committee, department head, the Dean's Advisory Committee for Tenure Track Faculty, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, scholarly or creative work, and service to date, as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review takes the place of the annual faculty performance 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.

6.2 Process

In the Department of English, the mid-term review process begins at the beginning of the fall semester of the third year with the establishment of the midterm advisory committee (a subcommittee of the full department tenure and promotion committee), consisting of a chair, one committee member to draft the research section of the department report, and one committee member to draft the teaching and service sections of the department report. The committee will work with the candidate through the fall semester to draft and revise an impact statement and assemble the required materials in Interfolio. The statement and materials should mimic those required at tenure (outlined in section 7.1.1 below; see [the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines](#) for college requirements for the midterm dossier).

Committee members are expected to work with the candidate to draft the impact statement and select appropriate supporting materials over the fall semester and into the spring semester. Final drafts of the candidate's statement and all supporting material, as well as final drafts of the committee's reports should be complete by the middle of February and uploaded to Interfolio; they will then be made available to the full voting faculty.

The full tenure and promotion committee of the department will follow the same meeting and voting process as for tenure (outlined in section 7.3.2 below).

6.3 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. The department head will meet with the candidate and provide written and formative feedback (included in the annual review letter) on progress towards tenure and promotion, summarizing and synthesizing feedback from the department's tenure and promotion committee, the dean, and the department head's informed assessment.

7. Department-Level Process for Promotion and Tenure Review

7.1 Purpose

The purpose of the department-level promotion and tenure review is to:

- recognize the growing expertise and contributions of faculty in the Department of English.
- provide an objective evaluation of a faculty member's record of accomplishments based on departmental and disciplinary benchmarks and norms. For tenure track faculty, the evaluation will include external letters of evaluation focusing on research and/or creative work.
- assess the quality, significance, and impact of a faculty member's work, as well as the potential for continued excellence.
- determine whether a faculty member's performance in all assigned areas of responsibility merits promotion to the next rank within the career track corresponding to their job title (i.e., promotion from tenure track assistant professor to associate professor (with tenure), promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, promotion from instructional associate professor to instructional professor).

7.2 Focus

The focus of the promotion review process will vary by track and the desired rank for promotion. The "promotion" (from a lower rank to a higher rank within a job title track) is distinct from "reclassification" (from one job title track to another job title track). Promotion is based on an assessment that a faculty member's achievements and accomplishments meet the expectations of the higher rank and requires multiple levels of review (as indicated in this document). Reclassification is reserved for exceptional circumstances and is outside the scope of this document.

When evaluating performance for promotion, the weights given to teaching, research and/or creative work, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual faculty member's appointment, the annual review, and the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department, college, and university.

7.3 Time Period of Review

The promotion process is on a similar timeline for all promotions, regardless of job title (with the exception of Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH) reviews). The overall timeline is set by the Office for the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, with college-level deadlines set by the College of Arts and Sciences.

In the spring of each year, the College of Arts and Sciences will release the timeline for review and submission of promotion materials to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for

the following academic year. See Appendix D for the standard department deadlines/ timelines. This includes the deadline for departments to submit a candidate's dossier materials for external review and the deadline for departments to submit the candidate's dossier (including departmental reports) to the college. The department solicits external review letters (for tenure track promotion cases) early in the spring semester, and conducts department level reviews in the early fall. The college level review process takes place in October and November, and the college submits promotion cases to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs in December. The university-level review of promotion cases takes place in January. Promotion and tenure decisions are reviewed by the University President (for all cases) and the Board of Regents (in the case of tenure cases only) in the spring. Promotion and tenure decisions become effective on September 1st of each year.

7.3.1 Mandatory Promotion Reviews

The department head identifies mandatory candidates for promotion and tenure in the fall semester of the year before they go up for review. Faculty with mandatory promotion reviews will be informed of the timeline for their review, and asked to confirm that they intend to submit the documentation for promotion and tenure.

7.3.2 Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH)

Faculty who are hired at Texas A&M University at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH). Note that tenure is obtained only by a positive recommendation by the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the University President. The review and submission process for TRUH is out-of-cycle for all TRUH candidates. The process may be expedited for TRUH candidates who are professors at aspirant peer institutions and/or professors who are members of the National Academy of Sciences. [The University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure](#) include information on external review letter requirements for TRUH cases.

7.4 Time Considerations

7.4.1 Tenure-Track Assistant Professors

Assistant professors have a mandatory review date for tenure set at the time of hire. The "standard" tenure clock at Texas A&M University involves a 7-year probationary period, with a "mandatory" tenure review that starts at the end of the 5th year and takes place during the 6th year. Some faculty may be hired with a shorter tenure clock, particularly if they have years of experience in a tenure track position at a peer university.

7.4.1.1 "Early" Tenure Reviews

Candidates may opt to undergo review prior to their mandatory year (i.e., early tenure review), as long as they have completed the midterm review. Candidates considering this option are strongly encouraged to speak to their mentors and department head prior to indicating a desire to come up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year.

7.4.1.2 Tenure Clock Extensions

Candidates may request an extension to the probationary period in accordance with [the University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure; Candidate Process Section](#). Requests for tenure clock extension are submitted by the faculty member, and approved by the department head, the Dean, and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Candidates who receive tenure clock extensions are held to the same standard as all other candidates. In other words, they should not be expected to have a stronger record due to a clock extension. Candidates who receive tenure clock extensions may later decide against using the clock extensions (as long as they inform their department head in the spring semester before coming up for tenure).

7.4.1.3 “Credit” for Accomplishments Prior to Employment on the Tenure Track at TAMU

In the College of Arts and Sciences, department- and college-level reviews for promotion (with tenure) factor in the candidate’s entire record of accomplishment (inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to their appointment on the tenure track at Texas A&M). For a successful promotion case, there needs to be evidence that there is both a continuous and a positive research and/or creative trajectory.

7.4.2 Tenured Faculty

Candidates who are tenured do not have a mandatory time to undergo review to professor. Faculty may choose to become a candidate for promotion at any time. They need to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service, with national and/or international recognition. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in Section 5.6, and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors in order to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.4.2.1 “Credit” for Accomplishments Prior to Tenure

In the College of Arts and Sciences, department and college-level reviews for promotion to professor factor in the candidate’s entire record of accomplishment (inclusive of research and/or creative activities completed prior to obtaining tenure at Texas A&M or elsewhere). For this second promotion, productivity and trajectory continue to be important guiding criteria, while scholarly impact and independence and intellectual leadership increase in relative importance. In other words, candidates for professor must be able to demonstrate that they have continued to be productive (with a positive trajectory) since obtaining tenure. In addition, there must be increasing evidence that their work is innovative and impactful, and that they have become an intellectual leader in their chosen area of specialty.

7.4.3 Academic Professional Track

Candidates on academic professional tracks do not have a mandatory time to undergo review for promotion. Candidates need to demonstrate sustained excellence in their assigned areas of responsibilities, as defined in their letter of appointment. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in

Section 5.6, and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.5 Other Special Considerations

7.5.1 Reviewing Faculty with Budgeted Joint Appointments

Reviews of faculty with funded joint appointments will follow guidance in the [University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion](#). Such faculty will be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by both units in accordance with guidelines from both units. Both units should collaborate on the selection of external reviewers.

7.5.2 Reviewing Faculty Transitioning to the College from University Libraries

Faculty members who transitioned from University Libraries into the College of Arts and Sciences will be evaluated based on expectations outlined in departmental and college guidelines. However, candidates who originally had appointments in the University Libraries may have unique records of accomplishments that draw on their areas of expertise. Faculty who have moved from University Libraries have the option to include an annual statement summarizing library and information discipline- related work with their other annual evaluation materials. As appropriate, annual appointment letters should indicate any ways in which their assigned areas of responsibility differ from the departmental norm. For example, if part of their teaching responsibilities include providing instruction to students on how to conduct library-based research, this should be described in the appointment letter. Similarly, if part of their service responsibilities may include providing guidance to faculty on data management, the use of altmetrics, then this should be indicated in the appointment letter. Promotion reviews would then factor in the information that is provided in the annual appointment letters. When selecting external review letter writers for faculty transitioning from university libraries, it is acceptable to include letters from tenured faculty librarians at other universities (assuming all university criteria for the selection of external review letters are met).

7.5.3 Reviewing Faculty Appointed at the Higher Education Center at McAllen

Faculty at the Higher Education Center at McAllen (HECM) will be reviewed by the P&T committee of their academic department at the College Station campus. Candidates from HECM should not be disadvantaged in the review process by unique contextual factors that are beyond their control (e.g., lower enrollments, fewer service opportunities, less support resources for teaching, etc.) As appropriate, departments guidelines must specify how faculty members at McAllen will be evaluated.

7.5.4 Reviewing Faculty Whose Records Qualify as Exceptions to Normal Requirements

In accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure, or more commonly promotion to professor, may sometimes be warranted. Examples 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. In all cases, performance in the other two dimensions must be at least acceptable. Few faculty members will possess qualities such as these, but those who do, deserve recognition and advancement. In those rare circumstances, it is expected that there will be ample evidence demonstrating the required excellence in one area to warrant such exceptions.

7.6 Department-Level Requirements for Candidate's Promotion Dossier

The department requires the same documents that the college requires for the candidate's promotion dossier. These requirements can be found in the [College Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation](#).

7.7 Department Review Process

The Department of English will conduct promotion, or tenure and promotion, reviews following the procedure described in the College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation; practices specific to the department are explained in sections 7.7.1 and 7.7.2.

7.7.1 Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees

The Head consults with candidates for tenure and promotion and establishes a Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee—or, when tenure is not at issue, a Promotion Advisory Committee—for each candidate. These committees are approved by faculty members of the Executive committee as appropriate to the promotion being sought. The role of the committee is to assist the candidate in preparing materials, to draft reports on the areas of faculty performance (scholarly and creative activity, teaching, and service) that pertain to the candidate's title, and to produce an official report representing the evaluation of the candidate's case by those faculty eligible to vote on it. The Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee drafts the department report summary report, with separate sections focused on each of the assigned areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). See Appendix C for departmental guidelines and expectations for this report. All committee members will be at or above the candidate's target rank and title. In years when multiple candidates within the same track seek promotion to the same rank, the Head, in consultation with the Executive Committee, may appoint a single Advisory Committee chair to ensure equitable treatment across the cohort.

For tenure and promotion cases, the head, in consultation with the Advisory Committee chair, solicits external reviewers based on lists provided by the candidate and the committee. The Advisory Committee chair advises the candidate and coordinates the committee's activities, with primary responsibility for advising the candidate on prospective external reviewers and coordinating the committee's list of prospective reviewers, reviewing the candidate's and the committee's draft documents, and conducting the committee's work in accordance with Department, College, and University policies.

7.7.2 Tenure and Promotion Meeting and Voting Procedures

7.7.2.1 Voting Faculty

The (Tenure and) Promotion Advisory Committee chair makes available to eligible faculty, for review and eventual voting, the candidate's materials and the committee's draft report on the relevant areas of faculty performance. Eligibility for review and voting is determined as follows:

- For tenure: all tenured faculty
 - In rare cases where a faculty member is hired at the rank of Professor without tenure, the voting faculty consists only of tenured full Professors. The same is true for cases of tenure review upon hire for candidates hired at the rank of Professor.
- For promotion to Professor: all Professors
- For promotion to Associate Professor: all Professors and Associate Professors
- For promotion to Instructional Professor: all Professors, Instructional Professors, and Principal Lecturers
- For promotion to Instructional Associate Professor: all Professors, Associate Professors, Instructional Professors, Instructional Associate Professors, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers
- For promotion to Principal Lecturer: all Professors, Instructional Professors, and Principal Lecturers.
- For promotion to Senior Lecturer: all Professors, Associate Professors, Instructional Professors, Instructional Associate Professors, Principal Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers.

Each candidate's materials are normally made available for a minimum of two weeks in advance of the full voting faculty meeting. Additions, such as external letters that arrive after the candidate's materials have been provided to the faculty, will be made available when they are received. The department head is not a member of the voting faculty (their vote is advisory to the department head).

7.7.2.2 Meeting of Voting Faculty

The full (Tenure and) Promotion committee consists of all faculty eligible to review and vote on each candidate, including members of each candidate's Advisory Committee. Per [the University's Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion](#), all eligible faculty, including the candidate's advisory committee, meet in-person to discuss each candidate's areas of performance. Prior to the meeting, eligible faculty must review each candidate's materials (confirmed by online signature of a signature log, such as AdobeSign). Any significant concerns about the candidate's materials or missing materials should be raised to the advisory chair in advance of

the tenure and promotion meeting, allowing time for the materials to be corrected/uploaded or for the advisory chair to check with the head or the college about procedure.

Eligible faculty who cannot attend the meeting for compelling professional, medical, or other documented reasons for which they would normally request leave or business travel approval must inform the head of the conflict, submit a business travel or leave request, review the candidate's materials, sign the log sheet, and vote prior to the meeting. Requests for early voting and notification of recusals must be conveyed to the head 24 hours prior to the meeting. This meeting is an opportunity for voting faculty to suggest edits to the promotion report (these edits should indicate whether they reflect the majority of the conversation or a limited viewpoint), provide any additional detail for the report, and obtain any further information/ clarification they need in order to vote on the candidate's tenure and/or promotion. The Associate Head will chair this meeting, reaching out to the Department Head if there are any procedural issues.

7.7.2.3 Voting Procedures

After the meeting, the advisory committee chairs will compile the list of eligible faculty who attended and are eligible to vote on whether or not the candidate meets the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty must have been present for the majority of the discussion. To vote on promotions for APT faculty, they must have been present for the entire discussion of teaching; to vote on promotions for tenure-stream faculty, they must be present for the full discussion of research and teaching. Faculty will have two business days to vote after the meeting; voting will take place via online ballots. In accordance with College policy, voting is anonymous and faculty may not submit comments regarding the cases along with their votes.

Once the voting on the candidate's case has been completed, the advisory committee chair will update and finalize the department report. This will then be made available to all faculty who attended the meeting and voted on the candidate(s) to review and approve the finalized summary (via online signature such as AdobeSign).

7.7.2.4 The Department Head's Recommendation

The department head letter must provide an independent review of the candidate's teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. The head's letter should provide a basis for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The head's letter should also provide relevant contextual information for understanding the case. This might include disciplinary and departmental norms regarding authorship, publication venues, citations, grants, teaching assignments, student evaluations of teaching, undergraduate and graduate student mentoring, service assignments (relative to job title and rank). The head's letter should address P&T committee reports that need clarification (e.g., low rate of participation, discrepancies between votes and assessment, unclear evaluative statements). The head's letter should also address any special considerations, including but not limited to unresolved issues with the candidate's professional conduct that resulted in documented sanctions, and restrictions or other personnel actions. If the department head's recommendation is contrary to the departmental committee's recommendation, the head should clearly explain the basis for their recommendation.

8. Departmental Criteria for Promotion and Tenure Review

8.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, scholarly/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 are as follows:

8.1.1 Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure)

8.1.1.1 Teaching

The college outlines the following guiding criteria for all promotions (see [appendix A in the College guidelines](#)): **quality of teaching** (required); **professional development**; **curricular development**; **impact beyond the classroom**.

The department expects every faculty member to demonstrate a high quality of teaching. However, successful candidates for promotion to associate professor should also demonstrate evidence of professional development, curricular development, and/or impact beyond the classroom (See Appendix B for indicators).

Potential evidence of teaching effectiveness may include (unless otherwise marked, this is neither an exhaustive list nor a checklist of required items):

- course syllabi (required),
- peer observations (required),²
- course evaluations (required),
- written statements from undergraduate and graduate students,
- contributions to the curriculum through course and program development,
- direction of graduate theses and dissertations,
- participation on graduate committees,
- direction of undergraduate honors projects, internships, and research opportunities,
- publications related to pedagogy,
- course development grants, and documented participation in departmentally-approved training or enrichment opportunities.

² Two peer-evaluations via observation of teaching by a colleague at the university who holds a title that is at least the rank for which the candidate is seeking promotion; the department policy for teaching observations is that they should be conducted by tenured faculty. Individuals who conduct these peer observations should provide documentation summarizing their review of the observation to the candidate and ideally discuss the observation with the candidate. The departmental P&T committee must include summaries of the two peer observations in the teaching evaluation section of the P&T committee report. If a candidate has received more than two peer observations of teaching prior to promotion, the candidate may choose which two peer observations the P&T committee should summarize in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

The College of Arts and Sciences requires one written peer teaching reviews in advance of midterm review and two total leading up to the tenure and promotion review.

8.1.1.2 Scholarly or Creative Work

The college outlines the following “Level One” guiding criteria for all first-level promotions (see [appendix A in the College guidelines](#)): **productivity; independence and intellectual leadership; scholarly impact; positive trajectory.**

The department expects all faculty members to demonstrate a **productive** scholarly or creative agenda that leads to the regular publication of work in professionally recognized outlets as appropriate by sub-field. Given the variety of scholarly and creative activity conducted within English, there is no single template for a successful tenure candidacy. However, the requisite criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor consist of one of the following, combined with evidence of a clear agenda for future productivity:

- a monograph or substantial creative work
- a major digital project,
- a cohesive series of scholarly articles or a series of shorter creative works comparable in length or scope to a monograph,

In English, first books are often an extensive revision of the dissertation. All scholarly work presented for consideration will be evaluated for **independence and intellectual leadership** in the discipline by colleagues and specialists outside the department chosen by the head and tenure sub-committee in consultation with the candidate.

Scholarly and creative productivity is not judged by quantity alone, but, above all, takes into account the **scholarly impact** of published work as determined by such measures as the following:

- refereed vs. non-refereed journals and presses,
- professional standing of journals and presses,
- invited (potentially non-refereed) submissions from particularly prestigious journals and presses,
- the publication of peer-reviewed scholarship based upon the candidate’s digital project, reviews or citations of the project,
- awards, external grants, competitive residencies,
- invited presentations and readings
- citations and other evidence of impact on one or more scholarly and/or creative subfields within English studies as well as closely related interdisciplinary or multi-media fields.

While disciplinary norms in English tend to prioritize single-authored work, collaborative work in any format also represents an equally serious scholarly investment. In evaluating collaborative work, the department will take into account the nature of the faculty member’s contribution as well as the work’s quality and impact.

Evidence of a **positive trajectory** include:

- acceptance in prominent venues of articles, book chapters, and other forms of creative work or scholarship drawn from new research,
- significant external grants or fellowships for work in progress,
- other significant recognitions that suggest a sustainable line of inquiry.

8.1.1.3 Service

The college outlines the following “Level One” guiding criteria for all first-level promotions (see [appendix A in the College guidelines](#)): **institutional engagement (required); academic leadership; professional mentoring; commitment to the discipline; public engagement and outreach.**

The department expects every member to participate constructively in the life of the department. Such **institutional engagement** is normally demonstrated by regular attendance at meetings, constructive participation in decision-making and other aspects of the functioning of the department, advising of students (as distinct from teaching), constructive collegueship (i.e., mentoring or assistance of others in fulfilling their duties and maturing as scholars), and service on elected and/or appointed committees. It may also be demonstrated by service on the Faculty Senate or on College or University committees and service to the profession (such as reviewing papers for journals, chairing sessions at conferences, or serving as an officer of a professional society), although service of this kind does not replace participation in the life of the department.

8.1.2 Promotion to Professor:

Candidates for promotion to professor should have achieved a level of accomplishment in research, teaching, and service beyond the criteria presented for promotion to associate professor. The categories of College guiding criteria remain the same as outlined in section 5.1.1. above (see [appendix A in the College guidelines](#) for examples of “Level Two” criteria for research and service for second-level promotions).

8.1.2.1 Teaching

In addition to the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, candidates for promotion to full demonstrate continued growth in scholarly or creative work, teaching, and service. The ideal candidate will also demonstrate outstanding teaching through leadership in the development of programs and curricula and student achievements, as well as in their commitment to graduate teaching and mentoring graduate students.

8.1.2.2 Research

Successful candidates for promotion to full professor will provide evidence of a scholarly or creative agenda with national and/or international reach and significance. The candidate’s entire body of scholarship, rather than the total productivity since tenure, should demonstrate high quality and impact on the field, as well as evidence of a promising trajectory. These criteria may be met by an additional published book, major digital or creative project or equivalent and related publications in prominent venues. The case for impact may also include awards, external grants, fellowships, and residencies for completed work or work in progress, invitations

to publish work in prestigious venues, citations of published work in peer-reviewed scholarship, service on national or international grant funding panels, and other significant recognitions of scholarly and creative work that suggest a sustainable and significant line of scholarly inquiry or creative endeavor.

8.1.2.3 Service

Candidates for promotion to full professor should demonstrate significant service, both at the departmental level and at the university or disciplinary level.

8.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. 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 Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines](#).

8.2.1 Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To meet expectations for promotion to senior lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to senior lecturer requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and demonstrated impact of the accomplishments within the university. Candidates seeking promotion to senior lecturer must have an established record of **high-quality teaching** and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation and student evaluation of teaching. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in **professional development** activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate they have contributed to the **development of curriculum** in their department, as appropriate for the department, and may demonstrate **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students, though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title. Candidates may also have service and/or research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities, but these are not required for promotion within the lecturer track. Suggested indicators demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in Appendix B.

8.2.2 Promotion to Principal Lecturer

To meet expectations for promotion to principal lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to principal lecturer requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership, particularly as it relates to teaching, within the university or have some teaching related achievements beyond the university. Candidates seeking promotion to principal lecturer must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching and have an established record of **high-quality teaching**, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Contributions in the

areas of **professional development** are required and should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to senior lecturer. For promotion to principal lecturer, candidates must have some achievements that demonstrate **impact beyond the classroom**. Achievements in **curricular development** are not generally required for this track, though may be appropriate in some circumstances. Candidates may also have service and/or research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities, but these are not required for promotion within the lecturer track. Suggested indicators demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in Appendix B.

8.2.3 Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to instructional associate professor, a candidate must demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to instructional associate professor requires demonstrated impact within the university in their assigned areas of responsibility. The evaluation for promotion must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letters. Suggested indicators demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching and service are given in Appendix B.

8.2.3.1 Teaching

Candidates seeking promotion to instructional associate professor must have an established record of **high-quality teaching** and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes. Candidates must provide evidence that they have engaged in **professional development** activities for teaching and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. Candidates may also demonstrate that they have contributed to the **development of curriculum** and may have achievements that demonstrate an **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students, though these can be optional criteria for promotion to this title.

8.2.3.2 Service

Candidates seeking promotion to instructional associate professor must have a meritorious record of service. As service is the second assigned area of responsibility for academic professional-track faculty in the Department of English, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for **institutional engagement**, and at least one of the other four guiding criteria: **academic leadership**, **commitment to the discipline**, **professional mentoring**, and/or **public engagement and outreach**. Candidates may also have research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

8.2.4 Promotion to Instructional Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to instructional professor, a candidate should demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to instructional professor requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership within the university or have some professional achievements related to their areas of responsibilities beyond the university. The evaluation for promotion to instructional professor must be in accordance with the level of effort

in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letter. Suggested indicators demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching and service are given in Appendix B.

8.2.4.1 Teaching

Candidates seeking promotion to instructional professor must demonstrate a genuine commitment to undergraduate teaching and have an established record of **high-quality teaching**, and provide evidence of effective instruction through peer evaluation and student evaluation of teaching. Candidates must also provide evidence that they have significant contributions in **professional development** activities for teaching, and that they utilize these activities to improve their instructional effectiveness and quality of teaching. The professional development activities should be more substantial than what was achieved for promotion to instructional associate professor. Candidates for promotion to instructional professor may also be leading professional development activities related to teaching. For promotion to instructional professor, candidates must have some meritorious achievements that demonstrate either **impact beyond the classroom** to undergraduate students or **curricular development**. Suggested indicators demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching are given in Appendix B.

8.2.4.2 Service

Candidates must have a meritorious record of service. As service is the second assigned area of responsibility for academic professional-track faculty in the Department of English, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for **institutional engagement**, and at least two of the other four guiding criteria for service: **academic leadership**, **commitment to the discipline**, **professional mentoring** and/or **public engagement and outreach**. Candidates may also have research and/or creative work contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

9. Post-Tenure Review

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

There are two different levels of post-tenure review:

1. Annual performance reviews conducted by the department head or supervisor responsible for conducting a faculty member's annual performance evaluation. (See Section 5 of these guidelines).
2. Periodic peer review by a committee (as described in this section).

9.1 Purpose

Post-tenure review applies to all tenured faculty members and is intended to:

- 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.
- 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.

9.2 Peer Review Committee

As indicated in [Texas A&M SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, Post-Tenure Review](#), peer review may be incorporated into the annual review process. Therefore, the four tenured members of the department's Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC, discussed in section 5.5.2 above) will conduct Periodic Peer Review (PPR) as part of the EAC's normal evaluation process.

9.3 Process

9.3.1 Materials

Materials to be reviewed by the peer review committee:

1. Updated CV (submitted with annual review materials)
2. Annual review report for the last three years.

Since our annual evaluation process already incorporates a five-year window, three consecutive satisfactory annual evaluations will satisfy the requirement of assessing whether an individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member and will thus constitute a satisfactory periodic peer review.

9.3.2 Responsibility of Peer Review Committee

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

8.3.3 Process for Each Rating of Review

9.3.3.1 Satisfactory

If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to periodic peer review again in six years or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, whichever is earlier.

9.3.3.2 Unsatisfactory

If a faculty member receives three consecutive overall "unsatisfactory" evaluations, they no longer meet the threshold identified in 8.3.3.1, and are subject to Professional Development Review per [Texas A&M SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, Post Tenure Review](#). Faculty who receive one or two "unsatisfactory" evaluations will be required to form a Near-Term Improvement plan and will

not be rated “Unsatisfactory” for the purposes of Post Tenure Review as long as they are making progress towards completing the requirements of the plan.

9.4 Periodic Peer Review for Tenured Faculty with Budgeted Joint Appointments

Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

9.5 Department Responsibility to Submit Information on Tenured Faculty

By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the dean and the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review that year, the outcome of the review, and faculty members who will undergo periodic peer review the next year. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation (conveyed in the faculty member’s annual review letter) and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

9.6 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 6.), an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 8.3.3.2.) or upon request of the faculty member. The department head will inform the faculty member that they are 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 when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For university guidelines on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#).

9.7.1 Objectives for Professional Development Review

The objectives of Professional Development Review are to:

- identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance;
- develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and
- monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

9.7.2 Ad Hoc Review Committee

The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be

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

9.7.3 Faculty's Review Dossier

The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements they deem 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

1. current curriculum vitae,
2. a teaching portfolio,
3. a statement summarizing current scholarly or creative work,
4. A statement summarizing current service work.

9.7.4 Department Head's Review/ Addition to Dossier

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

9.7.5 Professional Development Review Timeline

The Professional Development Review will be conducted 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:

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;
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 5.7.2;
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 8.8) acceptable to the dean.

9.8 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 collaboratively among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, and the dean and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The faculty

member is obligated 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 [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#)

9.9 Appeal Process (Post-Tenure Review and Professional Development Review)

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 \(Procedures for Appeal of Faculty Complaints and Appeal of Dismissals and Sanctions for Misconduct or Serious Misconduct\)](#).

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 Provost of Faculty Affairs. After consultation with the faculty member, department head, and the dean, the decision of the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs on the committee composition is final (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 ([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 Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs ([University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

9.10 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 ([University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

10. 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 they not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

See [University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) for the procedure for applying for emeritus status.

11. Contact Office

Department of English,
TAMU 4227
College Station, TX
77843-4227