

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Department of English

Approved Department of English, November 13, 2020

Approved College of Liberal Arts March 15, 2021

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties August 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 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 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 English** 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.M1, 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.M2 - 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](#). Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1) associated with each title within their unit. Faculty ranks and tracks within the Department of English are as listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines: tenure-track assistant, associate, and full professors, who are responsible for research, teaching and service; non-tenure track instructional assistant, associate, and full professors, who are responsible for teaching and service; and non-tenure track lecturers, who are responsible for teaching.

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

3.1 Teaching

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are demonstrated teaching competence in three broad areas: classroom instruction, graduate and undergraduate mentoring, and course development. Instructional competence includes all activities associated with the fair and effective management of regularly scheduled, multi-student courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Mentoring involves participation on graduate committees as appropriate to rank and field and may also include directed readings at the graduate and undergraduate levels and the direction of significant undergraduate research projects. Course development entails the ongoing maintenance of syllabi in regularly scheduled courses, contributions to course offerings in the form of proposals for special topics courses at the undergraduate or graduate level or the creation of entirely new courses, and availability to teach a reasonable variety of courses at all levels over the course of a five-year period.

3.2 Scholarly or creative work

Tenure-stream faculty are expected to maintain an active scholarly or creative agenda. The desired profile for research demonstrates the creation and the completion of significant research projects which might 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. The department's benchmarks for "satisfactory/meets expectations" and "exemplary/exceeds expectations" in scholarly and creative activity are intended to encourage faculty to be consistently productive, to produce high quality work and to be ambitious in placing that work (whether authored or editorial in nature) with top peer-reviewed presses, in nationally and internationally prominent peer-reviewed journals, and in other high impact print and electronic venues including edited collections from prestigious presses. 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 Committee must show flexibility and discretion in evaluating the individual faculty member's scholarly and/or creative work over the five-year window. Evaluators need to consider not only the number and length of faculty publications, but also the visibility and impact of the work in the discipline. Visibility and impact are indicators of quality: visibility is an assumption about the prominence of the venue; impact requires more time to manifest itself in such things as book prizes and awards, invitations to give talks, reprints, frequency, and prominence of citations, etc. In practice, such flexibility in evaluating faculty research will necessitate a variety of judgment.

3.3. Service

Faculty service falls into three general categories: citizenship, impact, and visibility. The first is expected of all tenure-stream faculty members, with the second and third being more typical for senior faculty. Citizenship embraces the standard running of the department and 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, and the like. 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. 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.

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** for tenure-stream faculty include, but are not limited to:

Winning a teaching award recognized by the Faculty Senate or from a professionally recognized body external to the university, doing significant service on eight or more graduate or honors thesis committees (numbers are subject to change upon the advice of the Director of Graduate Studies in response to changing conditions such as enrollments), chairing three or more Ph.D. committees, or by demonstrating a consistent record of achievement with at least two of the following:

- an annual average score on university and/or departmental evaluations that is markedly higher than the departmental average
- evidence of frequent engagement in pedagogical training such as CTE or technology workshops
- evidence of significant technological innovation or of significant course development related to the implementation of technology
- evidence of substantial contributions to course development or creation
- significant course development that furthers University initiatives in service learning, study abroad, or diversity
- an internal or external grant or award for teaching or course development
- evidence of significant and sustained mentoring of individual students at the graduate or undergraduate levels.

Indicators of Excellence in Teaching for APT faculty include, but are not limited to:

Winning a teaching award recognized by the Faculty Senate or from a professionally recognized body external to the university, doing significant service on honors thesis committees, or by demonstrating a consistent record of achievement with one or more of the following:

- an annual average score on university and/or departmental evaluations that is markedly higher than the departmental average
- mentoring a cohort of graduate students in the preparation/teaching of a course
- mentoring a student in an Honors Program Teacher-Scholar Capstone
- frequent engagement in pedagogical training such as CTE or technology workshops
- significant technological innovation or significant course development related to the implementation of technology
- substantial contributions to course development or creation
- significant course development that furthers university initiatives in service learning, study abroad, or diversity
- a grant for teaching or course development
- significant and sustained mentoring of individual students at the graduate or undergraduate levels
- another activity or combination of activities demonstrating unusual initiative, commitment, or leadership in teaching.

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching for APT and tenure-stream faculty include, but are not limited to:

A record of consistent, high-quality teaching as evidenced by

- coherent and comprehensive syllabi that reflect departmental course descriptions and university policies and require assessments and assignments appropriate to the level of the course
- adherence to university policies regarding the timely submission of syllabi, curriculum vitae, and grades
- availability to teach courses at all levels and within a range of subject areas as appropriate for rank and field
- an annual average ranking of “satisfactory” on university and departmental teaching evaluations
- active service on graduate committees and honors thesis committees as required by field and appropriate to rank.

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Scholarly or Creative Work for tenure-stream faculty include, but are not limited to:

- a substantial monograph published with a top-tier university press or in a prestigious book series
- a substantial creative work published with a top-tier university press, a highly regarded press specializing in creative writing, or an internationally prominent trade press
- a substantial critical edition with an introduction and scholarly apparatus published with a top-tier university press
- highly visible and substantial digital database, archive, or research tools whose creation involves serious intellectual work and is consistent with best practices in digital scholarship
- peer-reviewed and/or invited scholarly articles or creative work in highly selective and highly visible venues
- peer-reviewed and/or invited book chapters or creative work in edited volumes published by a top-tier university press, a highly regarded press specializing in creative writing, or an internationally prominent trade press
- a substantial edited book from a top-tier university press or highly regarded press specializing in creative writing or an internationally prominent trade press, or in a prestigious book series
- prestigious or highly prestigious external fellowships, residencies, and grants
- highly selective internal grants or awards
- other forms of recognition that demonstrate high quality, visibility and scholarly or creative impact, including invited creative readings, scholarly lectures, or keynotes at nationally or internationally prominent venues.

4.4 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Scholarly or Creative Work for tenure-stream faculty** include, but are not limited to:

A record of consistent, substantive, and significant peer-reviewed scholarly or creative work, as evidenced by achievements such as but not limited to the following unranked list:

- a substantial monograph published with a respected university or trade academic press, including scholarly work that is public facing
- a substantial creative work published with a respected university or trade academic press, or (for creative work) a respected press specializing in creative writing or with a nationally prominent trade press
- a substantial critical edition with an introduction and scholarly apparatus
- digital databases, archives, and research tools whose creation involves serious intellectual work and is consistent with best practices in digital scholarship
- a book manuscript under contract with a respected university or trade academic press, or (for creative work) a respected press specializing in creative writing, or a nationally prominent trade press
- peer-reviewed scholarly articles or creative work in good-quality venues
- book chapters or creative work in edited volumes
- a substantial edited book from a respected university or trade academic press or (for creative work) a respected press specializing in creative writing, or a nationally prominent trade press
- editing a scholarly or creative journal
- external fellowships, residencies, and grants
- invited work in prominent venues
- editing an issue of a scholarly or creative journal
- a textbook from a respected publisher of textbooks
- omnibus reviews or article-length reviews
- internal grants
- competitively selected presentations at national or international conferences

For APT faculty in the Department of English, scholarly and creative activity is not required, but (per the College's Academic Professional Track Faculty Guidelines) can be evaluated in the category of Enhancing Instructional Effectiveness.

4.5 Indicators of **Excellence in Service for tenure-stream faculty** include, but are not limited to one or more of the following:

- Unusually deep/extensive fulfillment of expectations for effective service or similar achievements.
- Evidence of good departmental citizenship as measured by fulfillment of expectations for effective service in combination with one or more of the following:
 - successful administrative leadership within or beyond the department.
 - evidence of national reputation such as elected or appointed office in a relevant professional organization, membership on (or chairship of) the organizing committee for a national or international conference, membership on an editorial board, editorship of a book series, or invited service on a national or international grant review committee.

Indicators of **Excellence in Service for APT faculty (Instructional track)** include, but are not limited to one or more of the following:

- Service in an administrative position (either as interim or full appointment).
- Service in an unusually high-visibility or high-impact role for a significant purpose (e.g., the Dean's Advisory Committee) or event (e.g., organizing a conference, conducting an internal review) either for the college or the university
- Service as a departmental section coordinator (e.g., Creative Writing Coordinator)
- Organization of a special activity, such as a brown-bag series, guest lecturer, or other event enriching the life of the department, university, or profession
- Membership on a hiring committee

- Service in a committee leadership role
- Membership on an organizing or steering committee for a professional organization, external conference, etc.
- Reviewing a manuscript or other potential contribution for a scholarly, instructional, or creative venue
- Service on MA/Ph.D. committees
- Another activity or combination of activities demonstrating unusual initiative, commitment, or leadership (to be described in the Annual Checklist narrative statement).

4.6 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Service for tenure-stream faculty*** include, but are not limited to:

A record of consistent good citizenship within and beyond the department, including service to the profession at large, appropriate to rank and length of service and as evidenced by factors such as:

- Membership (need not be concurrent) on at least two standing or ad hoc departmental committees (e.g., EC, USC, GSC, Tenure and Promotion, Strategic Planning, Diversity, search committees), or on one departmental committee and one committee beyond the department level, such as a college or university committee (e.g., Faculty Senate, Liberal Arts Council, Writing Center Course Advisory Committee).
- A record of consistent participation in ad hoc departmental service opportunities such as presentations at brown-bags, the shepherding of visitors, coordination of guest speakers for departmental or interdisciplinary working groups, mentoring, assisting with graduate student placement efforts, and the like. Some of these endeavors (such as mentoring first-time teachers) clearly take more time and energy than others, and the evaluation committee is urged to consider the amount of effort on display as a factor when determining whether service expectations have been met or exceeded.
- Service to the profession as measured by at least five instances over the five-year period of some combination of any of the following: a book review in a quality peer-reviewed venue, a report for a professional journal/publisher/grants agency, an invited tenure or midterm faculty review, invited service as the external member on a thesis/dissertation committee for another university, assembling (and perhaps also chairing) a panel at a national or international conference, membership on the organizing committee for a local or regional conference.

Indicators of Effectiveness in service for APT faculty (Instructional track) include, but are not limited to:

A record of consistent good citizenship within and beyond the department, including possible service to the profession at large, appropriate to rank and length of service and as evidenced by factors such as:

- Membership on a department standing committee (e.g., the Executive Committee, the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the Diversity Committee) or a special-purpose or ad hoc committee
- Participation in ad hoc departmental service opportunities such as presentations at brown bags, the shepherding of visitors, coordination of guest speakers for departmental or interdisciplinary working groups, mentoring, and the like.
- Serving as sponsor of a student organization
- Membership on a permanent college or university committee (e.g., the APTF Subcommittee for the Faculty Senate) or on a special-purpose or ad hoc committee of the college or university

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, patient care, 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:

- 5.1.1 Assistant Professor: Assistant professors are evaluated based on their progress towards a tenurable record in scholarly or creative activity, teaching and service, as outlined in 5.1.2.
- 5.1.2 Associate Professor: In order to be considered for promotion and tenure in the Department of English, faculty members must demonstrably meet departmental standards of excellence in three categories: 1) published scholarly or creative work, 2) teaching, and 3) service.

The department expects all faculty members to be active in pursuing a scholarly or creative agenda that leads to the regular publication of work in professionally recognized outlets as appropriate by sub-field. Scholarly and creative productivity is not judged by quantity alone, but, above all, takes into account the quality of work published as determined by such measures as refereed vs. non-refereed journals and presses, professional standing of journals and presses, invited (potentially non-refereed) submissions from particularly prestigious journals and presses, reviews, awards, external grants, competitive residencies, invited readings and talks, 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, such as Film Studies and Digital Humanities. Substantial, high-impact scholarly or creative works (including refereed books, edited collections, scholarly articles, book chapters, and creative projects) are often the most highly valued because they reflect the most serious investment of scholarly research and creativity. Collaborative work in any format can represent 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. For Digital humanities projects, the quality of the faculty member's scholarly contribution (and of the project itself) rests upon indicators of impact such as external grant funding, the publication of peer-reviewed scholarship based upon the digital project, reviews, or citations of the project, invited presentations, or other professional recognition.

Given the variety of scholarly and creative activity conducted within English, there is no single template for a successful tenure candidacy. A monograph or substantial creative work or its equivalent, such as a major digital project, a cohesive series of scholarly articles or a series of shorter creative works, combined with evidence of a clear agenda for future productivity, are the requisite criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor. In English, first books are often an extensive revision of the dissertation. Candidates may also present a coherent body of publications or a significant digital or creative project that demonstrates a level of scholarly or creative engagement and potential disciplinary importance equivalent to a scholarly monograph. All scholarly work presented for consideration will be evaluated for potential impact on the discipline by colleagues and also by specialists outside the department chosen by the head and tenure committee in consultation with the candidate. Evidence of a promising scholarly or creative 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, and other significant recognitions that suggest a sustainable line of inquiry.

The department expects every faculty member to teach at a consistently meritorious level. The successful candidate for promotion to associate or full professor will present clear evidence of constructive engagement with students. Such evidence may include course syllabi, peer observations, written statements from undergraduate and graduate students, course evaluations, 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 trainings or enrichment opportunities. For assistant professors, the College of Liberal Arts requires written peer teaching reviews at least twice in the year leading up to the midterm review and at least twice in the year leading up to the tenure and promotion review. Consequently, the tenure and promotion portfolio should include letters from four tenured colleagues, two of those letters dated within the last calendar year. In addition, candidates for

promotion to associate professor are advised to invite tenured colleagues to visit the class informally in the first year and to make an effort to get a reasonable rate of completion on student evaluations.

The department expects every member to participate constructively in the life of the department. Such participation 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.

- 5.1.3 Professor: Candidates for promotion to professor should have achieved a level of accomplishment in these areas beyond the criteria presented for promotion to associate professor. 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.

For promotion to full professor, the College of Liberal Arts requires that teaching report include peer observations by at least two full professors, either in the semester in which the case is considered or in the prior year. 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.

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

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 of English will conduct promotion, or tenure and promotion, reviews following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation; practices specific to the department are explained in sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2.

5.3.1 Tenure and Promotion Committees

The Head consults with candidates for tenure and promotion and, with the advice and consent of the tenure-stream members of the Executive Committee (or, when candidates for promotion are APT faculty, the advice and consent of faculty members of the Executive Committee), establishes a Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee—or, when tenure is not at issue, a Promotion Advisory Committee—for each candidate. 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 type of appointment, and to produce an official report representing the evaluation of the candidate's case by those faculty eligible to vote on it. A (Tenure and) Promotion Advisory Committee consists of a chair, who produces the summary of faculty discussion and voting on the candidate's case, and two other committee members, who produce reports on the areas of faculty performance that pertain to the candidate's type of appointment. All committee members will be at or above the candidate's target rank.

The Head, in consultation with the Advisory Committee chair, solicits external reviewers based on the lists provided by the candidate and committee. The Advisory Committee chair advises the candidate and coordinates the committee's activities, with primary responsibility for external letters (including 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. 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 insure equitable treatment across the cohort.

5.3.2 Tenure and Promotion Procedures

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 reports on the relevant areas of faculty performance. Eligibility for review and voting is determined as follows:

- For tenure: all tenured faculty.
- For promotion to Professor: all Professors.
- For promotion to Associate Professor: all Professors and Associate Professors.
- For promotion to Instructional Professor: all Professors and Instructional Professors.
- For promotion to Instructional Associate Professor: all Professors, Associate Professors, Instructional Professors, and Instructional Associate Professors.
- For promotion to Senior Lecturer: all Professors, Associate Professors, Instructional Professors, Instructional Associate Professors, and Senior Lecturers.

Each candidate's materials are normally made available for two weeks. 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 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 Dean of Faculties' Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, all eligible faculty, including the candidate's advisory committee meet to discuss each candidate's areas of performance. The meeting may be held in person or virtually. Prior to the meeting, eligible faculty must review each candidate's materials (confirmed by signing the log sheet). 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.

After the meeting, the advisory committee chairs will compile the list of eligible faculty who attended and are eligible to vote. Faculty must have been present for the majority of the discussion, and (to vote on promotions for APT faculty) must have been present for the entire discussion of teaching, and (to vote on promotions for tenure-stream faculty) must be present for the full discussion of research and teaching. Faculty will have 48 hours (two business days) to vote; voting will take place either by paper ballots or virtually. In accordance with College policy, voting is anonymous, and faculty may not submit comments regarding the cases along with their votes.

After the meeting, each candidate's advisory committee drafts a summary of the discussion. The eligible faculty, defined as all who attended the meeting and voted on the candidate(s), review and approve the draft summary.

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

6.2.1 The English department requires each faculty member to complete an annual checklist upon which the annual evaluation is based.

6.2.2 The department's evaluation process includes peer review by the department's Evaluation Advisory Committee, which consists of four tenured faculty members and one APT faculty member. The APT faculty member participates in the work of the committee only for the evaluation of APT faculty. The Head, Associate Head, and Directors are not eligible to serve. 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 his or her track, rank, and assigned departmental duties. The committee provides its evaluation recommendations to the Head. The committee may also provide to the Awards Committee recommendations for faculty to be nominated for College and University awards. The chair normally serves as a liaison to the Awards Committee.

6.2.3 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 in the Department's faculty-approved Periodic Peer Review policy document.

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.M2](#) (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 window, e.g., three years, for the review period. The expanded review window of the Department of English is five years.

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.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may need improvement in the quality and effectiveness of course materials, present an

inconsistent record of compliance with university and departmental policy, or in other respects fall short of the department's indicators for satisfactory performance.

- Satisfactory/Meets Expectations – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and student accomplishments, and the quality and effectiveness of course materials. Faculty who meets expectations in teaching present an overall record consistent with the department's indicators for high-quality teaching.
- Exemplary/Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom educators as evidenced by peer review, student evaluations, the quality and effectiveness of course materials, effective mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students, grants, awards, and student accomplishments, and are likely to also demonstrate two or more of the department's indicators of excellence in teaching, such as significant, ongoing pedagogical training and contributions to course development.
- Most Meritorious/Significantly Exceeds Expectations – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, solicited involvement in educational organizations, and contributions to disciplinary pedagogy.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**.

6.5.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Scholarly and Creative Work** are

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in scholarly or creative activity.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in scholarly or creative activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of scholarly or creative impact and will not have met the department's expectations for published scholarly or creative work within the five-year evaluation window.
- Satisfactory/Meets Expectations – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by a record of publication that meets the department's benchmarks (as indicated below) within the five-year evaluation window, supplemented by other indicators of continuing scholarly or creative productivity (such as additional work under submission, grants, and presentations), and any relevant indicators of impact (such as citations, reviews, or other examples of recognition within the discipline). Following norms at peer and aspirational peer institutions, the benchmark for satisfactory performance in English is three substantial, well-placed peer-reviewed articles or the equivalent within the five-year evaluation window, as part of a profile of ongoing scholarly and creative activity as described in the department's indicators of effectiveness. Each faculty member's record is to be evaluated in relation to normative criteria in the discipline, including number, length, venue, visibility, and impact of publications. It should not be assumed that a higher number of publications is automatically superior to three high-visibility, high-impact placements or that any three articles necessarily meet this standard. The benchmark for satisfactory performance in creative writing is one or a combination of the following, to be evaluated in relation to length, venue, visibility, and impact: fifteen or more poems; 4-6 stories; a novella; a play performed in a respected venue; a screenplay optioned by a studio; 4-6 creative non-fiction essays in respected venues.

- Exemplary/Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity work within the five-year evaluation window. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. The benchmark for exemplary performance in English is demonstrated by accomplishment significantly surpassing the benchmark for effectiveness, as described in the department’s indicators of excellence, taking into account number, length, venue, visibility and impact of published scholarly and creative work and achievement in additional areas such as internal and external funding, invited presentations, and internal and external awards.
- Most Meritorious/Significantly Exceeds Expectations – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member within the five-year evaluation window. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies. Faculty who receive this rating will surpass the department’s benchmark for exemplary performance in one or more areas, with demonstrable impact upon the field such as publications in nationally or internationally prestigious venues; substantial internal and external funding; highly competitive internal or external awards; invited presentations at nationally or internationally prestigious venues; and other strong evidence of impact. It should be understood that some subfields offer greater opportunities for recognition than others; similarly, the visibility and impact of faculty at this level may be demonstrated through citations, reviews, and similar metrics such as page views, downloads, and other alternative indicators of impact, but significant achievement in the humanities is not always reflected through these means.

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service within the five-year evaluation window.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service within the five-year evaluation window. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Satisfactory/meets expectations – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service within the five-year evaluation window. Those in this category will be involved in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and consistent with department expectations for citizenship, impact, and visibility. They often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment. Prior to mid-term review, untenured faculty are encouraged to participate in service while focusing primarily upon establishing their research and teaching profiles.
- Exemplary/exceeds expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service consistent with department expectations within the five-year evaluation window. Faculty in this category will demonstrate exemplary citizenship by successfully engaging in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent (highly visible, impactful) national level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- Most Meritorious/Significantly exceeds expectations – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member within the five-year evaluation window. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

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, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of possible content for the report to reflect a five-year window are:

- .
- Scholarly and creative activity: lists of work published or to be published; external presentations; grants; honors, awards, and professional recognition; evidence of visibility and impact; other accomplishments; 250-word commentary. This portion of the report is optional for APT faculty.
- Teaching: lists of courses taught, service on PhD and MA committees, and supervision of directed studies and honors projects; professional development in teaching; teaching-related grants; honors, awards, and professional recognition for teaching; other instructional activities and accomplishments; 150-word commentary
- Service: lists of structured and ad hoc service roles within the department; service with high impact within TAMU; service with high visibility outside of TAMU; honors, awards, and professional recognition for service; other service contributions or achievements; 150-word commentary.
- Other honors, awards, and professional recognition: list of any recognition not already provided elsewhere in the report
- Statement of compliance with University Requirements for Employment (training and safety)

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...), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.7.2 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 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 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The 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 English will conduct the midterm review following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

8. **Post-Tenure Review**¹

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

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

8.1 Purpose

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

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 Peer Review Committee

As indicated in section 3.2.5 of 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 6.2.2) will conduct Periodic Peer Review (PPR) as part of the EAC's normal evaluation process.

While the EAC's recommendations for annual review are advisory to the Head, the Head's annual evaluation letter will report the EAC's majority rating (or reports a split rating) 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.

8.2 Process

8.2.1 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. A "satisfactory" overall evaluation is defined as one in which a faculty member meets expectations in at least two of the three areas (research, teaching and service). In keeping with SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, a "needs improvement" rating in a single area cannot result in an unsatisfactory overall evaluation.

8.2.2 If a faculty member receives three consecutive overall "unsatisfactory" evaluation, they no longer meet the threshold identified in 8.2.1, and are subject to Professional Review per section 4 of 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.

8.3 Outcome

8.3.1 Following their normal practice, the EAC will review the activity report submitted for annual evaluation and provide the Head with an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities which will form the basis for the overall evaluation of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" conveyed in the Head's annual evaluation letter. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and will be consistent with annual evaluations.

- 8.1.1 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.
- 8.1.2 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

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

the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work

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

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

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

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4,

8.4.5.3 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 English, Administration Office, e-mail lchoyt@tamu.edu

Approved Department of English, November 13, 2020

Approved College of Liberal Arts March 15, 2021

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