

MAYS BUSINESS SCHOOL GUIDELINES

MAYS BUSINESS SCHOOL

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Originally Adopted November 13, 2020

Amended January 19, 2022

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties January 19, 2022

Revised June 7, 2022

Approved by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, June 8, 2022

Revised July 25, 2023

Approved by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, September 7, 2023

Contents

1. Introduction.....9

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 10

 2.1 Tenure-Accruing/Tenured Faculty Positions..... 10

 2.1.1 Instructor 10

 2.1.2 Assistant Professor 10

 2.1.3 Associate Professor..... 11

 2.1.4 Professor..... 11

 2.1.5 University Distinguished Professor 11

 2.2 Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Positions 12

 2.2.1 Assistant Lecturer 12

 2.2.2 Lecturer 12

 2.2.3 Senior Lecturer 12

 2.2.4 Principal Lecturer 12

 2.2.5 Clinical Assistant Professor 13

 2.2.6 Clinical Associate Professor 13

 2.2.7 Clinical Professor 14

 2.2.8 Assistant, Associate, and Professor of Practice..... 14

 2.2.9 Visiting Faculty 15

 2.2.10 Multi-Year Appointments 16

2.3	Endowed Position Appointment and Review Process.....	17
2.3.1	Faculty Endowments	17
2.3.1.1.	Endowed Chair	18
2.3.1.2	Endowed Professorship.....	18
2.3.1.3	Endowed Assistant and Associate Professorship	18
2.3.1.4	Endowed Lectureship.....	19
2.3.1.5	Selection.....	19
2.3.1.6	Appointment.....	19
2.3.1.7	Evaluation and Reappointment.....	20
2.3.1.8	Budgetary Guidelines.....	21
2.3.2	Administrative Endowments	23
2.3.2.1	Selection and Appointment	24
2.3.2.2	Evaluation and Reappointment.....	24
2.3.2.3	Budgetary Guidelines.....	25
2.3.3	Summer Support for Departing Faculty.....	25
2.4	ABD Faculty Appointment Process	25
3.	Areas of Faculty Performance	26
3.1	Teaching	28
3.2	Research and Publication.....	29
3.3	Service	29
4.	Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	30
4.1	Indicators of excellent performance in teaching	30
4.2	Indicators of effective performance in teaching	31
4.3	Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in teaching	32
4.4	Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in teaching	32
4.5	Indicators of excellent performance in research and publication.....	32
4.6	Indicators of effective performance in research and publication.....	33
4.7	Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in research and publication..	34
4.8	Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in research and publication.....	34
4.9	Indicators of excellent performance in service	35
4.10	Indicators of effective performance in service.....	35
4.11	Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in service.....	36
4.12	Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in service.....	36
5.	Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure.....	36

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty	36
5.1.1 Performance Expectations for Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion to an Associate Professor Position with Tenure	37
5.1.2 Performance Expectations for Associate Professors Seeking Promotion to a Professor Position.....	38
5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty	39
5.2.1 Lecturer Seeking a Promotion to Senior Lecturer.....	39
5.2.2 Senior Lecturer Seeking a Promotion to Principal Lecturer	40
5.2.3 Clinical Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of Practice Seeking a Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor or Associate Professor of Practice...	40
5.2.4 Clinical Associate Professor or Associate Professor of Practice Seeking Promotion to Clinical Professor or Professor of Practice.....	41
5.3 Promotion and/or Tenure Review Processes	42
5.3.1 Promotion and Tenure Review Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty.....	42
Initiating the Process	42
Role of the Candidate	42
Role of the Departmental Faculty	42
Role of the Department Head	44
Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee	44
Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair	45
Role of the Senior Associate Dean.....	46
Role of the Dean.....	46
5.3.2 Promotion Review Process for Academic Professional Track Faculty	47
Initiating the Process	47
Role of the Candidate	47
Role of Departmental Faculty.....	47
Role of the Department Head	49
Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee	49
Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair	50
Role of the Senior Associate Dean.....	50
Role of the Dean.....	51
5.3.3 Faculty Notification during Promotion and Tenure Processes	51
5.3.4 Time Table	52
6. Annual Review.....	53

6.1 Purpose	54
6.2 Focus.....	54
6.3 Time Period of the Annual Review	54
6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance	55
6.4.1. Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Teaching.....	55
6.4.2. Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Research and Publication.....	55
6.4.3 Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Service.....	56
6.5 Required Components	56
6.5.1 Faculty Member’s Report of Previous Activities.....	56
6.5.2 Written Document Describing the Department Head’s Evaluation	56
6.5.3 Meeting between the Department Head and the Faculty Member	57
6.5.4 Performance Assessment	57
6.6 Assessment Outcomes Requiring Action for Tenured Faculty Members	57
6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance	58
6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance	58
6.7 Time Line.....	58
6.8 Complaint Procedure for Failing to Follow Guidelines	59
7. Mid-Term Review	59
7.1 Purpose	59
7.2 Process	60
7.3 Feedback from the Mid-Term Review and Non-Renewal of Faculty Appointment	61
7.4 Non-reappointment of Untenured Assistant Professors at Other Times	63
7.5 Non-reappointment of Academic Professional Track faculty	64
8. Post-Tenure Review	65
8.1 Purpose	66
8.2 Periodic Peer Review Committee	66
8.3 Process	66
8.3.1. Process when Research Council Makes a Favorable Recommendation on the Appointment to an Endowed Position	66
8.3.3 Process in All other Cases.....	67
8.3.3 Submitting to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.....	68
8.4 Professional Development Review	69
8.5 The Professional Development Plan	70

8.5.1 Assessment.....	71
8.5.2 Completing the Professional Development Plan.....	71
8.6 Appeal.....	71
8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review.....	72
9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status.....	72
9.1 Process.....	72
9.2 Eligibility Criteria.....	73
9.3 Privileges.....	73
Appendix A: Transition to Retirement Program.....	75
A.1 Overview.....	75
A.2 Eligibility.....	75
A.3 Phased Transition Period.....	75
A.4 Modifying the Phased Transition Period.....	76
A.5 Percentage Effort and Workload.....	76
A.6 Compensation and Benefits.....	76
A.7 Other Considerations.....	77
A.8 Process for Requesting Transition to Retirement.....	77
A.9 Administrative Provisions.....	77
Application Form: Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program Proposal.....	79
Appendix B: Guidelines for Faculty Workload, Summer Support, Travel, Meals, External Employment, and Teaching in Excess of 100%.....	80
B.1 Workload Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty.....	80
B.1.1. Nominal Teaching Loads.....	80
B.1.2. Course Releases for Special Circumstances.....	80
B.1.3. Concentration of Teaching Loads.....	82
B.1.4. Course Buy-Out.....	82
B.1.5. Leave Without Pay.....	82
B.2 Workload Guidelines for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty.....	83
B.2.1. Nominal Teaching Loads.....	83
B.2.2. Course Releases for Special Circumstances.....	84
B.2.3. Concentration of Teaching Loads.....	85
B.2.4. Leave Without Pay.....	86
B.3 Guidelines for Summer Support, External Employment, and Teaching in Excess of 100%.....	86

B.3.1 Summer Salary Support for Research.....	86
B.3.2 Summer Salary Support for Administrative Appointments, Service, Outreach, and Special Projects.....	87
B.3.3 Summer Salary Support for Teaching.....	87
B.3.4 Maximum Compensation and Exceptions.....	88
B.3.5 Teaching in Excess of 100 percent	88
B.3.6 External Employment.....	89
B.3.7 Service to Non-Profit Organizations.....	89
B.3.7 Departing Faculty Members	90
B.4 Guidelines for Faculty Members who Travel Outside Brazos Valley.....	90
B.4.1 Business Travel.....	90
B.4.2 Faculty Development Leave Travel.....	90
B.4.3 Alternate Work Location Travel.....	91
B.4.4 Travel for the Purpose of External Employment	91
B.5. Guidelines for Business Meals and Personal Meals while Traveling.....	92
B.5.1 Business Meals	92
B.5.2 Personal Meals.....	92
Appendix C: Promotion and Tenure Dossier	93
C.1. Dossier Materials Submitted by the Candidate	93
Candidate’s Statement on Teaching, Research, and Service.....	93
Candidate’s Annotated Curriculum Vitae	93
Candidate External/Internal Reviewer Checklist.....	94
Teaching Portfolio.....	94
Research Portfolio	94
Service Portfolio.....	95
Other Materials	95
C.1.1. Exceptions for APT Faculty Members.....	96
C.1.2. Exceptions for Mid-Term Reviews.....	96
C.2. Dossier Materials Submitted by the Department and College	96
Summary Data Table.....	96
External Reviewer Letters	96
Department P&T Committee Report & Recommendation.....	98
Department Head Recommendation	103
School P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendation.....	103

Dean Recommendation	104
Other Materials and Documentation	104
Appendix D: Hiring Faculty with Tenure Review-upon-Hire and/or at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor	105
D.1. Regular Process	105
D.2. Expedited Tenure Review for the Rank of Professor	105
D.3. Contingencies in Offer Letters	105
Appendix E: University Distinguished Professor Nomination Guidelines.....	107
E.1. Eligibility Criteria	107
E.1.1 Scope of the Award.....	107
E.1.2. Eligibility	107
E.2 Nomination Process	110
E.2.1 Role of the Candidate.....	110
E.2.2 Role of the Department Head	111
E.2.3 Role of the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship	111
E.2.4 Role of Faculty UDP Review Committee	112
E.2.5 Role of the Senior Associate Dean.....	114
E.2.6 The Joint Roles of ADRS and Dean.....	115
E.3 Nomination Dossier	116
E.3.1. Materials Submitted by the Candidate	116
E.3.2 Materials Submitted by the Department Head.....	116
E.3.3 Materials Submitted by the Dean.....	116
Appendix F: Ethics and Professional Conduct.....	118
F.1. General Principles of Ethical and Professional Conduct.....	118
F.2. Due Process, Corrective Actions, and Remedies.....	119
Appendix G: Faculty Development Leave.....	122
G.1. Purpose.....	122
G.2. Process and Deadlines	122
G.3. Change in Venue, Purpose, or other Terms of the FDL	123
G.4. Budgetary Guidelines	123
G.5. Report of FDL Activities	124
G.6. Faculty who Previously Served in Administrative Positions.....	124
Appendix H: Periodic Evaluation of Centers and Institutes	125
H.1. General.....	125

H.2. Definitions.....	125
H.3. Centers and Institutes Covered.....	125
H.3.1. College Level.....	125
H.3.2. Department Level	126
H.4. Frequency and Criteria.....	126
H.5. Review Committee and Report	127
H.6. Director Appointments and Evaluations.....	127
H.6.1. Terms of Appointment.....	127
H.6.2. Selection Process	127
H.6.3. Performance Evaluations:	127
H.7. Continuation of the Center or Institute	127
Appendix I: Appointment of Assistant Department Heads.....	129
I.1 Authority	129
I.2 Compensation	129
I.3 Approvals	129
Appendix J: A-level Journals by Department	130
Appendix K: Guidelines Outlining Selection and Nomination Process for University and College Level Faculty Research Awards	131
Appendix L: Guidelines Outlining Selection and Nomination Process for University and College Level Faculty Teaching Awards.....	133
Appendix M: Guidelines Outlining Selection and Nomination Process for University and College Level Staff Awards	135
Appendix N: Adoption and Revision of Mays Guidelines	136
N.1. Adoption	136
N.2. Revisions.....	137
N.3. Technical Corrections.....	137

1. Introduction

With respect to a vision, Texas A&M University notes that it is “dedicated to the discovery, development, communication, and application of knowledge in a wide range of academic and professional fields. Its mission of providing the highest quality undergraduate and graduate programs is inseparable from its mission of developing new understandings through research and creativity.” Consistent with the focus of the university’s mission, Mays Business School’s *vision* is “To Advance the World’s Prosperity.” Supporting efforts to fulfill this vision are the School’s *mission*: to be a vibrant learning organization that creates impactful knowledge and develops transformational leaders. Appropriate evaluation and review guidelines and reward structures for faculty members to facilitate their pursuit of the School’s vision and mission are essential.

The mission of Texas A&M University and the vision and mission of Mays Business School are not static. It is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. However, it is necessary, desirable, and feasible to establish a general set of guidelines and criteria for the various faculty positions that are congruent with the mission and core values of Texas A&M University and with Mays Business School’s vision and mission.

The expectations of Mays Business School for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among research and publication, teaching, and service and that they achieve *excellence* and *effectiveness* while completing their work. The nature of scholarly innovation requires flexibility and freedom to pursue value-creating research, teaching, and service projects. Because of this, Mays does not use a single set of metrics to evaluate faculty performance.

In addition to detailing performance expectations and indicators of desired performances, this document serves as the basis for discussions between faculty members and their Department Heads regarding the setting of individual annual and long-term goals that best align with the mission Texas A&M University and the vision and mission of Mays Business School. (Herein, we use the term Department Head broadly to identify the leadership position with whom faculty members interact and to whom they report. Associate Deans, for example, report to the Dean while Department Heads report to the Senior Associate Dean. Thus, the term Department Head in this document references the leader with whom a faculty member has a direct reporting relationship.) Typically, the formal communication regarding a faculty member’s progress is a Department Head’s direct responsibility and includes written documentation that becomes a part of the faculty member’s personnel file.

This document articulates college-level guidelines the five academic departments housed in Mays Business School use for processes related to faculty members’ activities and contributions (e.g., annual performance reviews, promotion and tenure procedures, and Periodic and Post-Tenure review activities). In a few instances, there are slight

variances across departments with respect to implementing certain processes. We describe these variances in appropriate sections of this document.

We seek consistency between Mays' Guidelines and those of Texas A&M University and the Texas A&M University System. Thus, 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 positions take precedence.

We include nine appendices at the end of the document. Their content speaks to additional details regarding the policies and processes explained in the document itself:

- In Appendix A we provide guidelines for Mays faculty who are transitioning to retirement
- In Appendix B we provide guidelines for faculty workload, summer support, travel, meals, external employment, and teaching in excess of 100%
- In Appendix C we provide guidelines for promotion and tenure dossiers
- In Appendix D we provide guidelines for tenure review-upon-hire
- In Appendix E we provide guidelines for nominations for the University Distinguished Professor award
- In Appendix F we provide guidelines for ethical and professional conduct by Mays faculty and staff
- In Appendix G we provide guidelines for faculty development leave
- In Appendix H we provide guidelines for periodic evaluations of centers and institutes
- In Appendix I we detail the process for approving and amending this document.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definitions of faculty ranks and tracks are available from University [Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion—see section 1). At Mays, there are several categories of faculty with variant performance expectations.

2.1 Tenure-Accruing/Tenured Faculty Positions

2.1.1 Instructor

This is a tenure-track appointment that Mays uses for a person recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure-track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree prior to the beginning of the appointment. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title changes to Assistant Professor. We expect Instructors to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research, teaching, and service.

2.1.2 Assistant Professor

At a minimum, an Assistant Professor's performances should demonstrate *effectiveness* in teaching and *excellence* in terms of research and publication. The focus of service contributions, while normally limited, is on departmental and Mays academic needs. Further, Assistant Professors should display evidence of progress toward meeting the criteria and performance indicators Mays uses to evaluate candidates' request for promotion to an Associate Professor position with tenure.

2.1.3 Associate Professor

At a minimum, an Associate Professor's performance should demonstrate *effectiveness* in the three performance dimensions. In addition, the School expects demonstration of an *excellent* performance in either the research and publication or the teaching performance dimension. Typically, Associate Professors seek *excellence* in terms of research and publication. Although the three performance dimensions are part of the promotion process, research and publication commonly carries the largest weight in the promotion decision. Associate Professors, relative to Assistant Professors, should exhibit increased contributions in terms of service that result in an *effective* or an *excellent* rating in this performance area.

2.1.4 Professor

Professors should demonstrate leadership in pursuing *excellence* and gain national and international prominence because of their contributions. Professors may lead by (1) contributing to the body of knowledge through *excellence* in their research and publication contributions; (2) mentoring junior faculty; (3) excelling in teaching as shown by satisfying one or more of the criteria and performance indicators associated with *excellence* within this performance area; and (4) demonstrating *excellence* in their service activities. While there may be significant diversity in the nature of the contributions by Professors, there is continued expectation of examples of *excellence* in one or more of the three performance areas.

2.1.5 University Distinguished Professor

The title of University Distinguished Professor is not a Mays but a university title. This title represents the highest level of accomplishment for faculty. The Office of Faculty Affairs determines the eligibility criteria for this title on annual basis. According to the current criteria, "to be eligible for the title of University Distinguished Professor, the candidate will have made one or more original or transformational contributions that are widely recognized to have significantly advanced or redirected scholarship in the relevant field." The university defines *Transformational* as work that is "a substantial intellectual leap forward, rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge."

University policy indicates that faculty members receiving an appointment as a University Distinguished Professor in 2010 and in prior years hold this title as a *rank*.

For faculty members appointed as a University Distinguished Professor in 2011 and after, the designation is an *award* rather than a *rank*.

The process described in Appendix E is the one Mays uses to identify nominees for University Distinguished Professor awards.

2.2 Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Positions

2.2.1 Assistant Lecturer

This is an APT appointment for individuals we do not expect to fill a faculty position at Mays Business School for more than five years. Individuals holding these appointments focus on teaching, and are normally not eligible for faculty voting rights in the shared governance processes on campus.

2.2.2 Lecturer

This is an entry-level position for part- and full-time instructors who typically have the following profile:

- A graduate degree and/or commensurate experience
- Contributions to Mays relate primarily to the teaching performance area
- As determined by the Department Head, may also contribute non-substantially in areas such as service and engagement.

Excellent performance is necessary for promotion to a Senior Lecturer position.

2.2.3 Senior Lecturer

This is a position for individuals whose performance warrants promotion or who have extensive experience in the field of education when Mays hires them. Most individuals seeking promotion to this rank will have served at least five years at the rank of Lecturer. However, this is not a requirement. Promotion is granted based on professional accomplishments as opposed to longevity. Faculty members considered for the Senior Lecturer rank typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A graduate degree and/or commensurate experience
- A record of teaching that demonstrates *excellent* and *effective* performance on a consistent basis
- Contributions to Mays relate primarily to the teaching performance area
- As determined by the Department Head, may also contribute in areas such as service and engagement.

2.2.4 Principal Lecturer

This is a position for individuals whose performance warrants promotion or who have extensive experience in the field of education when Mays hires them. Most individuals seeking promotion to this rank will have served at least five years at the rank of Senior Lecturer. However, this is not a requirement. Promotion is granted based on professional accomplishments as opposed to longevity. Faculty members considered for Principal Lecturer typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A graduate degree and/or considerable work experience
- A record of teaching that demonstrates sustained *excellent* and *effective* performance over a period of at least ten years, on a consistent basis
- Significant contributions to Mays that relate primarily to the teaching performance area
- As determined by the Department Head, may also contribute in areas such as service and engagement.

2.2.5 Clinical Assistant Professor

This is an entry-level position for full time APT faculty members who typically have the following profile:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., PhD in a business discipline, JD for legal instruction, etc.), except for terminal degrees granted by for-profit institutions and by institutions that offer the terminal degree program on an open enrollment basis.
- Contributions to Mays that relate to the teaching performance area, while fulfilling service expectations
- With the approval of the Department Head, clinical faculty members may satisfy their service expectations through research publications in respected academic journals.

This faculty title may also be appropriate for individuals who have served at the rank of Assistant Professor at another institution. At an appropriate time, promotion is only for those with excellent records.

2.2.6 Clinical Associate Professor

Typically, individuals holding this faculty title served at least five years at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor. However, this is not a requirement. Promotion is granted based on professional accomplishments as opposed to longevity. This faculty title may also be appropriate for individuals who achieved the rank of Associate Professor at another institution. Clinical Associate Professors typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., PhD in a business discipline, JD for legal instruction, etc.), except for terminal degrees granted by for-profit institutions and by institutions that offer the terminal degree program on an open enrollment basis.

- A record of *excellence* in teaching or service
- Contributions to Mays that relate to the teaching performance area, while fulfilling service expectations
- With the approval of the Department Head, clinical faculty members may satisfy their service expectations through research publications in respected academic journals.
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of Mays beyond classroom instruction.

2.2.7 *Clinical Professor*

Typically, this is a position for individuals with at least five years of service at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor. However, this is not a requirement. Promotion is granted based on professional accomplishments as opposed to longevity. A Clinical Professor title may also be appropriate for individuals who achieved the rank of Professor at another institution. Clinical Professors typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., PhD in a business discipline, JD for legal instruction, etc.), except for terminal degrees granted by for-profit institutions and by institutions that offer the terminal degree program on an open enrollment basis.
- A record of *excellent* teaching or service performance over an extended amount of time
- Contributions to Mays that relate to the teaching performance area, while fulfilling service expectations
- With the approval of the Department Head, clinical faculty members may satisfy their service expectations through research publications in respected academic journals.
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of Mays beyond classroom instruction.

2.2.8 *Assistant, Associate, and Professor of Practice*

The “Professor of Practice” faculty track is for individuals who do not hold a terminal degree but who have achieved distinguished careers in the private sector and/or government service.

Individuals in this faculty track concentrate on either the teaching or the service performance area. Usually, they hold a Master’s Degree in the area that relates to their teaching and service.

We use the rank of *Assistant Professor of Practice* for faculty with fewer than five years of experience in academia and who, at the time of hire, have approximately ten years of relevant distinguished careers in the private sector.

Typically, the rank of *Associate Professor of Practice* is for faculty with at least five years of academic experience and at least ten years of distinguished private-sector

service prior to joining academia, or for faculty who, at the time of hire, have approximately 15 years of relevant distinguished careers in the private sector.

The rank of *Professor of Practice* is for faculty usually with at least ten years of academic experience and at least ten years of distinguished private-sector service prior to joining academia or for faculty who, at the time of hire, have approximately 20 years of relevant distinguished careers in the private sector.

Faculty members serving in the “Professor of Practice” track contribute primarily to the teaching performance area, while fulfilling service expectations. With the approval of the Department Head, faculty members in this track may satisfy their service expectations through additional teaching or through intellectual contributions consistent with AACSB’s expectations for scholarly practitioners.

2.2.9 Visiting Faculty

Periodically, it may be desirable or necessary to employ faculty holding a terminal degree temporarily, on a visiting basis. These faculty members do not have a long-term commitment to Texas A&M University as an employee. In these instances, we hire the faculty member on the visiting faculty track.

Faculty who are appointed at less than 66% effort should be hired with the conscribed faculty title qualifier of “Visiting”. Visiting faculty titles normally are for cases where we do not expect the faculty appointment to extend beyond three years.

The following guidelines determine the rank within the visiting faculty track:

- A faculty member hired immediately after the completion of his or her terminal degree holds the rank of *Visiting Assistant Professor*.
- If a faculty member served in a tenured or tenure-track appointment at another AACSB-accredited school during the year immediately preceding their employment with Mays Business School, the rank will be the most recent rank at that other school, preceded by the word “visiting.”
- In all other cases, the Dean, Senior Associate Dean, and Department Head work collaboratively to identify the most appropriate rank for a visiting faculty appointment.

Faculty serving on the visiting faculty track are not eligible for promotion within that track. However, with appropriate approvals at all levels, the university may convert the appointment of a visiting faculty to a tenured/tenure-track appointment or to a clinical faculty appointment.

University rules requires the preservation of rank during the conversion process. For example, a faculty serving at the rank of *visiting assistant professor* may only convert to *clinical assistant professor* or to *assistant professor*. If promotion to the rank of “associate” is desirable once the faculty member converts to a new track, the promotion must follow the process detailed in this document pertaining to the particular track to which the faculty member converted. For example, if a *visiting assistant professor* converts to *assistant professor*, promotion to associate professor with tenure is a separate process that follows the requirements applicable to all other untenured assistant professors.

2.2.10 Multi-Year Appointments

Faculty members appointed to [Adjective] Professor, [Adjective] Associate Professor (except research, visiting, or adjunct), Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and those appointed to Senior or Principle Lecturer will have annual appointments for at least the first three years, but always receive 12 months notice if they are not to be reappointed. These appointments do not need to be full-time appointments, but intent to change the percent effort of the appointment should either be by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Department, or after 12 months notice to the faculty member. After the first three years and before the end of the sixth year of continuous appointment at one of these ranks, the faculty member should be considered for promotion. (Principle Lecturers can be promoted to *[Adjective] Associate Professor* if their appointment responsibilities are expanded beyond just the area of teaching) Failure to receive promotion does not affect reappointment consideration. At least once in every three years, faculty members in these position must be considered for promotion or they must provide a written waiver of such consideration to the Department Head. All faculty members in these titles should be considered for multi-year appointments after the first three years at TAMU, and rolling appointments can be used as desired. It is expected that those who have achieved the stature of *[Adjective] Professors* would have multi-year rolling appointments that are three to five years in length after their initial three years of TAMU service in this rank. It is also expected that faculty who have been in these titled position will have multi-year rolling appointments of three to five years after they have been at TAMU in one of these positions for ten years.

Faculty members appointed to [Adjective] Assistant Professor (except research, visiting, and adjunct), Assistant Professor of the Practice, and Lecturer will have annual or semester appointments for the first five years of service in the titled position. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget. Faculty members who have continuously been in one of these ranks for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven year period are entitled to 12 months notice if they will not be reappointed. Faculty members in these ranks should normally be considered for promotion from these ranks after five years, and after this at least once every three years unless they provide the Department Head with a written waiver. Failure to receive a promotion does not automatically affect

the reappointment to these ranks. Faculty in these ranks should be considered for multi-year appointments after these have served continuously in the position at TAMU for ten years.

Appointments of a duration greater than one year require the approval of the Department Head, Senior Associate Dean, and Dean. These appointments are reserved for APT faculty members who make extraordinary contributions to either the teaching or service/outreach mission of Mays Business School, and who perform at least at a satisfactory level across all other areas of performance.

APT faculty members with multi-year appointments remain subject to the annual review process outlined in Section 6 of this document. The dismissal of an APT faculty member prior to the expiration of the appointment must be based on good cause (Section 5.1 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

2.3 Endowed Position Appointment and Review Process

Mays offers two types of endowed positions: faculty endowments and administrative endowments. Faculty endowment positions are associated with a specific faculty member and recognize that individual's accomplishments in the performance dimensions relevant to the specific type of endowed position. The latter are associated with an administrative position and are awarded to the holder of that administrative position, but only for the duration of such administrative appointment.

2.3.1 Faculty Endowments

Mays supports highly productive faculty members through endowed chairs, professorships and lectureships. The stated priorities and restrictions associated with each endowed position inform selection decisions and budgetary decisions and processes. (Note: Research and publication *excellence* is the key selection criterion for virtually all endowed chairs, professorships, assistant and associate professorships in Mays. However, if *excellence* in the teaching performance area were the primary selection criterion for an endowed position, that criterion carries the greatest weight in the selection process.)

The Mays Research Council considers nominees and provides recommendations to the Senior Associate Dean and Dean, who in turn submits the recommendations through the Vice President for Faculty Affairs to the President who has final approval.

Members of the MRC serve three-year terms. A faculty member from each academic department serves as a member of the Council. Those eligible to serve are full professors in the department who hold an endowed chair. Faculty serving in administrative positions as Department Head, Associate Dean, or Dean are not eligible to serve. Faculty are eligible to serve more than one term, if approved by the Department Head, Senior Associate Dean, and Dean. The Dean appoints Council members upon acceptance of a recommendation from the Department Head and the Senior Associate Dean.

The Associate Dean of the Research and Scholarship shall serve as the chair and a non-voting member of the MRC.

2.3.1.1. Endowed Chair

An appointment to an endowed chair is one of the highest honors for a Mays faculty member. The highest level of performance, and national and international recognition of that performance, are inherent guidelines for appointing a faculty member to an endowed chair. Individuals appointed to endowed chairs satisfy the institutional expectation of unquestionable excellence in at least one of the three performance areas (research and publication, teaching, and service) as well as any specific criteria associated with a particular endowed position. Gift agreements with donors may specify the criteria for a position; however, in the absence of such specification and in general, research and publication are the primary decision criteria. The appointment to an endowed chair may recognize a current member of the faculty or it may be associated with recruiting a new faculty member. In all appointments, *excellence* is a product of several years of outstanding performance based on national and international standards.

2.3.1.2 Endowed Professorship

Individuals appointed to an endowed professorship receive a high honor in recognition of their consistent performance and their ability to continue demonstrating high productivity as a researcher or teacher. In addition to strong performances in the research and publication, teaching, and service performance areas, an individual appointed to a professorship also satisfies any unique criteria associated with a particular endowed position. Generally, research productivity takes precedence when selecting individuals to appoint to an endowed professorship. In exceptional cases, an individual who demonstrates ongoing effectiveness in research and outstanding teaching or service accomplishments (such as those who are recipients of teaching awards) may also be considered for appointment, or reappointment, to an endowed professorship. The appointment to an endowed professorship may recognize a current member of the faculty or may be associated with recruiting a new faculty member.

2.3.1.3 Endowed Assistant and Associate Professorship

An endowed assistant or associate professorship is generally to recognize and encourage a faculty member who has demonstrated superior performance in appropriate areas of expectations and who has displayed significant promise for future eminence in appropriate areas of performance. The institutional expectation of the promise of superior performance must be met, as well as any criteria stated in the donor document. Generally, research productivity takes precedence when selecting individuals to appoint to an endowed assistant or associate professorship. In exceptional cases, an individual who demonstrates ongoing effectiveness in research and outstanding teaching or service accomplishments (such as those who are recipients of teaching awards) may also be considered for appointment, or reappointment, to an endowed assistant or associate

professorship. The appointment to an endowed assistant or associate professorship may recognize a current member of the faculty or may be associated with recruiting a new faculty member.

2.3.1.4 Endowed Lectureship

An endowed lectureship is a general term describing endowed positions available to APT faculty. Individuals appointed to an endowed lectureship hold the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Executive Assistant Professor, Executive Associate Professor, Executive Professor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer. Some gift agreements may refer to such endowed position by different names, such as Clinical Professorship or Executive Professorship. In this document, we use the term Endowed Lectureship generically to include all endowed positions awarded to APT faculty members.

Those selected for appointment to an endowed lectureship have earned a rating of *excellent* in either teaching or service over an amount of time. For teaching *excellence*, in addition to classroom *excellence*, criteria for this position include contributions such as strong student mentoring, commitment to continuous pedagogical innovations and participation in curricula development. Criteria for *excellence* in service include excellence in program management, employer relations, and external development activities.

2.3.1.5 Selection

Department Heads begin by identifying faculty member prospects who, in their opinion, qualify for appointment to an endowed position, or faculty members who currently hold an endowed Professorship and are eligible for potential appointment to an endowed Chair. Department Heads are encouraged to consult with holders of endowed positions in their department before deciding which faculty members they will nominate. Subsequently, Department Heads prepare a nominations dossier that includes a current *CV* and a nomination letter addressed to the Dean. The nominations letter provides a list of accomplishments that warrant appointment to an endowed position at Mays. The material provided to form the dossier is to be consistent with how Mays measures excellence in terms of research, teaching, and service as specified in these Guidelines.

Department Heads submit the nominations dossier to the Mays Research Council through the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship. Resulting from the Council's deliberation is a recommendation regarding each candidate.

2.3.1.6 Appointment

Following the selection of a candidate for appointment to an endowed position (either a chair, a professorship, an assistant or associate professorship, or a lectureship) the MRC Chair prepares a letter to request appointment approval by the President through the

Senior Associate Dean, Dean and Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The nomination dossier accompanies the request for appointment approval of the candidates.

2.3.1.7 Evaluation and Reappointment

Every five years (or more often if a review cycle of fewer years is established at the time of initial appointment or a reappointment), the Mays Research Council evaluates the performance of an endowed chair or professorship holder, placing particular emphasis on the faculty accomplishments that occurred after the previous reappointment. This evaluation satisfies the requirement to conduct a Periodic Peer Review for tenured faculty members holding an endowed position. With the exception noted in the following paragraph, reappointment to an endowed position is likely if the results of an evaluation indicates that she or he is maintaining *excellence* in his or her work particularly with respect to research and publication for chairs and professorships and with respect to teaching or service for lectureship holders. Term lengths for endowed assistant and associate professorships, and fellowships should not exceed three (3) years. Endowed assistant and associate professors will cease to hold their current endowed positions upon promotion to the next rank. Under no circumstance should reappointments be made without undergoing the review process. To facilitate the review process, individuals prepare a summary of how their endowed position supported their work during the term of their appointment and the anticipated benefits of reappointment. The Department Head receives a copy of the summary each candidate for reappointment prepares.

In the case of tenured faculty members who are holders of endowed chairs or endowed professorships and who are serving, or have served, in administrative positions at Texas A&M University, the evaluation for reappointment will focus primarily on the faculty member's administrative accomplishments. This exception applies to faculty members who (1) are currently serving in an administrative position, or (2) have concluded their administrative appointment and have returned to the faculty after serving continuously in administrative positions for at least five years. This exception also covers the five-year period immediately after the faculty member concludes his or her administrative appointment and returns to the faculty. Administrative positions covered by this exception are those of Department Head, Associate Dean, Senior Associate Dean, Dean, Associate Provost, Provost, Associate Vice President, Vice President, or Executive Vice-President, regardless of the type of appointment (acting, interim, fixed-term, or indefinite-term). To benefit from this exception, a faculty member who returns to the faculty after serving five or more years in an eligible administrative position will normally seek renewal of a chair or a professorship for a term that concludes no later than five years after the faculty member returns to the faculty. For example, if an eligible faculty member concludes an administrative appointment and returns to the faculty on September 1, 2023 and the faculty member's endowed chair is scheduled for renewal on September 1, 2026, the faculty member may seek a two-year renewal under this exception until September 1, 2028. Subsequent renewals are subject to the regular criteria mentioned in the previous paragraph.

As part of the renewal process, Department Heads solicit those holding an endowed chair, professorship, assistant or associate professorship, or lectureship to prepare a dossier (including a current CV) that the candidate will submit to them. In preparing the dossier, the candidate should provide a detailed list of accomplishments that s/he has achieved during the period of time for which s/he has held an endowed position, with a particular emphasis on accomplishments that occurred after the previous reappointment. The material provided to form the dossier is to be consistent with how Mays measures excellence in terms of research, teaching, and service as specified in these Guidelines. Once prepared, the faculty member is to submit her/his dossier to the Department Head.

After receiving the dossier, the Department Head evaluates the submitted materials using the criteria shown in Section 2.3 of these Guidelines.

Following the evaluation, the Department Head prepares a letter recommending one of four options: (1) reappointment to the same type of endowed position for a full-term duration, (2) reappointment to the same type of endowed position for a limited-term duration, (3) reappointment to a different type of endowed position (i.e., chair instead of professorship or vice-versa), or (4) non-reappointment.

Following the evaluation, the Department Head provides a letter addressed to the dean recommending one of the four options. The Mays Research Council then receives materials the candidate develops and the Department Head's letter. Resulting from the Council's deliberation is a recommendation regarding each candidate. The Chair will prepare a memo to the President, through the Senior Associate Dean, Dean and Vice President for Faculty Affairs with the Council's recommendations. The candidate's dossier and Department Head's letter of recommendation will accompany this memo. If there is a need for a more detailed review process, in collaboration with the Department Head and with the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship (ADRS), the Senior Associate Dean manages the process. If the ADRS position is vacant, with the concurrence of the Dean, the Senior Associate Dean may appoint a senior chaired professor to perform the role of the ADRS during the review process.

2.3.1.8 Budgetary Guidelines

The original gift agreement and applicable University policies determine the allocation of income generated by chairs, professorships, and lectureships' endowments. Subject to availability of funds, income from the endowment may support activities of those holding an endowed position in the following manner:

- *Endowed chairs*: Two months of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year. Each endowed chair also receives an annual *faculty development account* (defined below). The amount of funding in the faculty development account is the same for all endowed chair holders at Mays. In consultation with Department Heads, the Senior Associate Dean determines the annual amount of a chairholder's faculty development account. If an individual wishes to carry forward unused spending account funds into subsequent periods,

he or she may request permission from the Senior Associate Dean through the Department Head to do so. Attention is given to thoughtful and justifiable reasons for carrying funds forward (e.g., if an individual plans to apply for a faculty development leave in the near future and anticipates unusually heavy travel expenses during that period). There are no circumstances though under which unused spending account funds are eligible for salary support. Annually, unused balances influence decisions about future allocations to an individual's spending account.

- *Endowed Professorships*: One month of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year. Each professorship also receives annual *faculty development account* (defined below). The amount of funding in the faculty development account is the same for all endowed professorship holders at Mays. In consultation with Department Heads, the Senior Associate Dean determines the annual amount of a professorship's faculty development account. The same considerations as described for those holding an endowed chair apply to unused balances for those holding an endowed professorship.
- *Endowed Assistant and Associate Professorships*: One month of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year. Each assistant and associate professorship also receives annual *faculty development account* (defined below). The amount of funding in the faculty development account is the same for all endowed assistant and associate professorship holders at Mays. In consultation with Department Heads, the Senior Associate Dean determines the annual amount of an assistant or associate professorship's faculty development account. The same considerations as described for those holding an endowed chair or professorship apply to unused balances for those holding an endowed assistant or associate professorship.
- *Endowed Lectureships*: Up to one month of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year. The Department Head determines the amount, if any, of the annual *faculty development account* (defined below) for holders of endowed lectureships. This amount may differ across endowed lectureship holders. The Department Head and Senior Associate Dean work collaboratively to determine the amount of summer salary support for each holder of an endowed lectureship.

If individual endowment accounts fail to generate earnings sufficient to provide this level of annual support, Department Heads may choose to provide supplemental funding from other sources. In the case of endowed chairs and professorships, if Department Heads want to provide this supplement but lack sufficient funds to do so, they may request supplemental funding from the Dean.

Faculty Development Accounts

A faculty development account is funded by revenue from endowed positions for purposes other than summer salary support, subject to the limits pertaining to each type of endowed position established by Mays Business School. The Dean or Department

Head may choose to supplement, from other sources, the revenue generated by each endowment, provided that the total revenue in each faculty development account does not exceed these limits. For example, if Mays determines that the annual level of a chairholder development account is \$10,000, and if the endowment only generates \$8,000 that particular year, the Dean may provide an additional \$2,000 contribution from other eligible revenue sources.

Generally, funds from faculty development accounts are intended for intellectual development. In the case of Chair, Professorship, Assistant or Associate Professorship holders, these funds typically support research activities that lead to publication of high-quality research, such as journal subscriptions, submission fees, conference attendance, data purchasing, human subject funding, software, computing equipment, books, and research assistants. In the case of Lectureship holders, these funds typically support teaching, service, or external outreach activities.

Funds from faculty development accounts associated with Chairs, Professorships, Assistant and Associate Professorships, and Lectureships may not be used to support external employment activities, or activities that earn compensation in excess of 100% FTE. For example, these funds may not be used for salary, textbook writing assistance, assistance for classes taught in excess of 100%, or assistance with external employment activities including expert witness engagements and service on governing boards of organizations outside Texas A&M University. These funds may also not be used to defray costs that are mostly personal in nature, such as commuting to Texas A&M or paying for internet access at home. Finally, all expenses paid from these funds must adhere to Texas A&M System Policy 21.03.03 pertaining to the disbursement of funds.

Unused funds from faculty development accounts do not roll over into a new fiscal year. With the approval of the Dean, exceptions may be made for faculty members who are expected to be on Faculty Development Leave during the subsequent fiscal year.

2.3.2 Administrative Endowments

Mays supports faculty members who are academic leaders at Texas A&M University through administrative endowed positions. These take the form of endowed chairs, professorships, and directorships. Unlike endowed positions that are associated with a faculty member, these positions are associated with a specific administrative title and are awarded to a faculty member only for the duration of his or her service in that particular administrative capacity. An appointment to an administrative endowed position ceases when the faculty member no longer serves in the underlying administrative capacity.

To be appointed to an administrative endowed position, the gift agreement must specify explicitly that proceeds from the endowed gift may be used to support an academic leadership position, or an administrative position, rather than a specific faculty member. It is not necessary for the gift agreement to confine the use of proceeds to administrative endowed positions (at the exclusion of a faculty endowed position), so long as the use of

funds for administrative positions is allowed, at the discretion of the Dean of Mays Business School.

A faculty member may cumulate an appointment to a faculty endowed position with an appointment to an administrative endowed position, so long as the faculty member meets the qualifications and requirements of each type of position. This guidance relates to administrative positions within Mays Business School (Dean, Associate Dean, Department Head, Program Director, or Center Director) or at Texas A&M University (President, Vice President, Assistant/Associate Vice President or Associate Provost) (acting and interim appointments excluded). The level of appointment (Chair, Professorship, or Directorship) should consider both the level of the administrative position as well as donor intent.

2.3.2.1 Selection and Appointment

Every faculty member appointed to an administrative position that is associated with an administrative endowment will be considered for appointment to that endowed position. The Dean of Mays Business School, at his or her discretion, initiates a request for appointment, which includes sufficient information and justification for review and evaluation by the university administration. For endowed positions pertaining to the Dean of Mays Business School, the request is initiated by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer of Texas A&M University.

2.3.2.2 Evaluation and Reappointment

With the exception noted in the subsequent paragraph, every five years (or more often if a review cycle of fewer years is established at the time of initial appointment or a reappointment), the Dean evaluates the performance of the holder of an endowed position. For endowed positions that are for the Dean, the Provost and Chief Academic Officer performs the evaluation. Typically, this evaluation is performed concurrently with the reappointment review conducted for the underlying administrative position. Reappointment to an administrative endowed position is likely if the faculty member is also reappointed to the underlying administrative position. For the purpose of SAP 12.01.99.M1.01 (Section 1.3), faculty members who participate in the review process for reappointment to the underlying administrative position shall constitute the review committee for reappointment to the administrative endowed position, and a favorable recommendation for reappointment to the administrative position shall be deemed a favorable recommendation for reappointment to the endowed administrative position.

If the administrative position is outside Mays Business School, the Dean, in cooperation with appropriate university officials, will determine the most appropriate process to perform this evaluation.

2.3.2.3 Budgetary Guidelines

The original gift agreement and applicable University policies determine the allocation of income generated by chairs, professorships, and directorship endowments. Subject to availability of funds, and with the exception noted in the subsequent paragraph, income from the endowment may be used to cover the cost of the administrative stipend normally associated with the type of administrative position held by the holder of the endowed position. Income from the endowed position may also be used to cover business expenses that directly benefit the mission of the unit, center, or program that the holder of the endowed position leads.

Income from the endowment may not be used to support external employment activities, or activities that earn compensation in excess of 100% FTE. For example, these funds may not be used for textbook writing assistance, assistance for classes taught in excess of 100%, or assistance with external employment activities including expert witness engagements and service on governing boards of organizations outside Texas A&M University. These funds may also not be used to defray costs that are mostly personal in nature, such as commuting to Texas A&M or paying for internet access at home. Finally, all expenses paid from these funds must adhere to Texas A&M System Policy 21.03.03 pertaining to the disbursement of funds.

If individual endowment accounts fail to generate earnings sufficient to provide this level of annual support, the Dean (in consultation with the Department Head, where applicable) may choose to provide supplemental funding from other sources.

2.3.3 Summer Support for Departing Faculty

Income from the endowment may not be used to pay summer salary support to faculty members who are not expected to resume a full-time faculty appointment with Mays Business School during the subsequent academic year. Exceptions may be made for faculty members retiring from Mays Business School, subject to approval by the Dean.

2.4 ABD Faculty Appointment Process

When offered a tenure-track position as an Assistant Professor at Mays Business School, there is a clear expectation that an individual will complete the requirements for the terminal degree prior to the date when the appointment commences. If the individual completes the substantive requirements (i.e., defends her or his dissertation successfully) but not the administrative requirements (i.e., submission of final dissertation manuscript to receive the degree), for purposes of these guidelines, we consider the degree completed. However, we require a letter from the dissertation chair or comparable individual certifying this to be the case. Finally, in any event, we also require formal certification from the degree-granting institution when an individual receives the actual degree. The individual's department retains copies of all of these documents.

Failing to complete the degree (as defined above) by the date when appointment commences, results in the following options for an individual:

- The individual may remain in residence at her or his current institution and complete the degree. If a person does this, Mays will hold her or his position until January 15 of the following year. Assuming completion of all degree requirements by January 15, the individual may then join the Mays faculty under the terms of the original offer, including summer support.
- The individual may join the Mays faculty on the initial employment date at the rank of *Instructor*, without completing all degree requirements. This rank begins on the first day of employment and ends the last day of the month during which an individual completes all PhD degree requirements. The appointment converts to Assistant Professor on the first day of the following month. For example, a person who joins the faculty on September 1 and who completes all degree requirements by the end of December of a given year would hold the rank of Instructor for the months of September through December. This rank would convert to Assistant Professor on the first day of January of the following year. An individual's salary while serving as an Instructor is the amount specified in her or his signed offer letter.
- At Texas A&M University and at Mays Business School, the rank of Instructor is a tenure-track appointment. Thus, all time served at this rank counts toward an individual's probationary period with respect to the promotion and tenure process. Mays does not delay the timing of the mid-term review and the timing of the mandatory promotion and tenure review for individuals serving initially at the rank of Instructor rather than the rank of Assistant Professor.
- One academic year is the maximum amount of time an individual with an initial appointment as an Assistant Professor may serve at the rank of Instructor. At the conclusion of this one-year period, renewal of an Assistant Professor's appointment is not possible if the faculty member has not completed his or her doctoral degree requirements.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

At Mays Business School, faculty members' performance occurs in three major areas:

- (1) Creating and disseminating impactful knowledge via research and publication
- (2) Teaching
- (3) Service to the institution, the profession, and external constituencies

Thus, at Mays Business School, we base decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and merit compensation on a faculty member's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service. In assessing faculty performance, the School maintains a commitment to the position that the accumulation of activities alone does not constitute

desirable performance; indeed, Mays places high value on accomplishments that are of “high quality.” Mays Business School recognizes and defines four levels of performance in research and publication, teaching, and service:

- *Excellent performance*: a high level of performance that meets and exceeds norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *excellence*, as described in section 4 of this document
- *Effective performance*: performance that meets norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *effective* performance, as described in section 4 of this document
- *Needs-improvement performance*: performance that falls below norms and expectations of *effective* performance as reflected by substantive indicators of *needs improvement* performance, as described in section 4 of this document
- *Unsatisfactory performance*: performance that falls below norms and expectations of *excellent*, *effective*, and *needs improvement* performance as reflected by substantive indicators of *unsatisfactory* performance, as described in section 4 of this document

Mays Business School recognizes multiple indicators of various levels of performance and that performance indicators may vary over time for individuals at different career stages. In all instances, we determine a rating (e.g., “*excellent*” or “*effective*”) by measuring a faculty member’s performance against multiple indicators associated with a particular performance category.

Fifty percent for research and publication, 40 percent for teaching, and 10 percent for service are typical allocations of time among the three performance areas for tenure-track and tenured faculty members. Individual departments may choose to apply higher weights to research, particularly for assistant and associate professors. Generally, however, research weighs no more than 70 percent of the time allocation in the case of assistant professors and no more than 60 percent in the case of associate professors.

For APT faculty members, the allocation of individuals’ time toward teaching is greater. For clinical and executive faculty with significant service expectations, the allocation of time reflects more of a balance, potentially reaching 50 percent in each area. In general, time allocations for APT faculty members result from discussions between each individual and her or his Department Head.

As noted above however, the allocation of a faculty member’s time to the three areas may change across the course of a career. Such changes are products of discussions between the faculty member and her or his Department Head. Under no circumstance though can the time allocation drop to a weight of zero in any given performance area without the approval of the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean. The Dean evaluates such requests in accordance with University promotion and tenure guidelines.

Regardless of the percentages of a faculty member's allocation of time among the three performance areas, the desired outcome is that all faculty members perform at a level of *effective* or *excellent* in the three performance areas. The faculty member and her or his Department Head consult about proposed changes to a faculty member's allocation of time as well as the performance expectations associated with the changes. For annual performance review purposes, a reduction in a faculty member's involvement with one performance area (e.g., research/publication) means that she or he will have fewer contributions with respect to the indicators of *excellent* and/or *effective* performance for that particular area. However, reduced effort in a performance area should still result in at least *effective* performance in that area and should avoid performance that falls into either the *needs improvement* or the *unsatisfactory* category. Similarly, for annual performance review purposes, an increase in the percentage of time a faculty member allocates to a performance area (e.g., research and publication) should result in more substantive contributions/outcomes and/or quality relative to the indicators of *effective* and/or *excellent* research and publication performance.

Alternate work assignments (such as administrative/leadership responsibilities) may replace one or more performance areas in certain situations. Those holding the relevant administrative position review and approve, as appropriate, potential changes in terms of an alternate work assignment. For example, Department Heads and Center Directors seeking to reduce their performance expectations to a weight of zero in a category for a specified period consult with the Dean and the Senior Associate Dean. Associate Deans seeking to reduce their performance expectations to a weight of zero in a category for a specified period consult with the Dean. In all instances, the performance of a faculty member going to a weight of zero in a performance category for an agreed-upon period is evaluated in light of the performance expectations associated with the agreed-upon assigned duties (this would include administrative assignments) of their position.

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to reaching Mays Business School's vision and mission. In particular, developing and maintaining a vibrant learning organization is central to faculty members' commitment to be scholarly teachers. Mays requires at least *effective* teaching from all faculty members. For APT faculty, the School expects that they will achieve *excellence* with respect to their teaching-related efforts. In the case of APT faculty with an exceptional service record and with the approval of the faculty member's Department Head, *effectiveness* in teaching is sufficient for an amount of time, although *excellence* in teaching remains the long-term objective.

Mays Business School expects all faculty members to: (a) contribute to teaching and student development activities, (b) strive continuously to improve their scholarly teaching efforts and (c) promote and diversify the development of teaching programs in Mays. Specific indicators the School uses to assess a faculty member's contributions in terms of achieving teaching *excellence* and *effectiveness* appear in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of this document.

Criteria used to evaluate a faculty member's teaching performance include those of student learning, peer review results, student feedback, and involvement with programs to enhance pedagogy.

3.2 Research and Publication

Creating and disseminating impactful knowledge is central to the university's mission and Mays Business School's vision and mission. Publications in leading journals for each of the School's academic disciplines is central to valued performance for tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The School expects tenure-track and tenured faculty members to contribute to the creation of new knowledge through their research projects. Working actively with PhD students, serving as a member of editorial review boards, and engaging with colleagues collaboratively as a means of providing mutual support are additional activities demonstrating productivity related to the research and publication performance area. Pending discussions with their Department Head, APT faculty may also emphasize research and publication.

Mays uses a multi-faceted approach to assess faculty members' performance with respect to research and publication. (Specific indicators used to assess research and publication *excellence* and *effectiveness* appear in sections 4.5 and 4.6 of this document.) Mays does this in that no single performance indicator or a small set of indicators captures the complexity associated with creating new knowledge. Journal publications are a primary indicator of productivity and success with respect to this performance area. Publishing scholarly books, serving in editorial capacities for journals, presenting one's scholarship during national and international conferences, and maintaining an active commitment to and involvement with the School's PhD program are examples of additional measures used to assess faculty performance in terms of research and publication.

3.3 Service

Service is the third primary performance area in which all Mays faculty members contribute. Relative to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors allocate larger percentages of their time to service activities.

Additionally, Mays expects APT faculty serving on the clinical or executive faculty track to devote time to service. In some cases, APT faculty members have significant service expectations such as program management or external development and outreach. APT faculty members who choose to concentrate exclusively on teaching may do so by accepting a higher teaching load.

With the approval of the Department Head, APT faculty serving on a clinical faculty appointment may meet part of their service expectations through publications in respected academic journals, while APT faculty serving on an executive faculty appointment may meet part of their service expectations through intellectual contributions consistent with AACSB's scholarly practitioner classification.

Service contributions flow to the School and its units as a product of a commitment to shared governance. By serving, faculty members demonstrate their desire to influence the School’s vision, mission, and activities flowing from them.

Faculty service includes committee and task force work at the University and School levels as well as involvement with the building of programs. Disciplinary service includes a faculty member’s editorial contributions and involvement with local communities.

As with the other two performance areas, the School uses multiple criteria to assess service contributions. Active participation in committee and task force opportunities, positive orientations to accepting journal editorial responsibilities, and demonstration of being a “good corporate citizen” are examples of criteria for assessing faculty members’ service outcomes. Specific indicators of service *effectiveness* and *excellence* appear in Sections 4.9 and 4.10.

Next, in section 4, we provide indicators of research and publication, teaching and service performance in each of the four categories—*excellent*, *effective*, *needs improvement*, and *unsatisfactory*. Some indicators do not fall exclusively into a single performance area from among those of research and publication, teaching, and service. For instance, working successfully with PhD students has a relationship with research and publication and teaching. Similarly, participating in executive development programs has both teaching and service connotations. Mays remains committed to recognizing that completing some activities results in a faculty member contributing to more than a single performance area.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

As indicated previously, Mays Business School recognizes that there are multiple indicators of faculty performances to use to assess the quality of contributions with respect to research and publication, teaching, and service. Moreover, the performance indicators on which faculty members concentrate may vary across time and career stages.

Herein, we do not describe a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. Rather, we seek to identify accomplishments with a high probability of leading to positive career development as well as a high probability of earning favorable performance evaluations.

4.1 Indicators of excellent performance in teaching

These indicators include the following

- Selection for peer-reviewed University, Mays Business School, or professional society outstanding teaching awards (such as the Association of Former Students award)
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- Highly noteworthy teaching performance over a significant period as evidenced by outstanding student ratings, interviews with students and student leaders, or outstanding peer evaluations (including peer reviews of classroom instruction). We consider such evaluations in relation to course expectations (documented through course syllabi), grading practices in relation to comparable course levels/sections, and/or other factors
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials, including high-quality online (remote learning) courses
- High-quality contributions to high-priority instructional programs
- Publication of instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations) that are adopted widely
- Major contributions to developing new instructional programs
- Publications with a teaching focus in refereed journals
- Receiving significant peer-reviewed external funding to support developing innovative teaching activities and methods
- Preparing and/or coordinating successful new executive development programs.

4.2 Indicators of effective performance in teaching

These indicators include the following

- Selection for student awards for outstanding teaching
- Development of a new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses
- Evidence of high quality with respect to class preparation and in terms of student interaction(s)
- Supervision of independent student projects
- Effective coordination of multi-section courses
- Significant contributions to student development through advising and mentoring, including service as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor
- Participation in the Mays Business School/University Honors Program and/or programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Presentations in executive development programs
- Effective coaching of students for competitions and preparation of students for study abroad programs.
- Chair of and/or membership on PhD student committees

4.3 Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in teaching

These indicators include the following

- Demonstrating a minimal commitment to using effective classroom pedagogies
- Little evidence of efforts to facilitate student learning inside the classroom
- Student evaluations that are significantly below departmental expectations
- Student feedback expressing concern over an occasional lack of adequate classroom preparation
- Evidence suggesting a failure to update teaching materials regularly
- Declines in student demand for assigned classes
- Infrequent participation in faculty discussions regarding pedagogical enhancements.

4.4 Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in teaching

These indicators include the following

- Student evaluations that are significantly below the departmental average
- Consistent inputs to the Department Head (from students and/or peers) that the faculty member is ineffective in the classroom
- Failure to establish and/or meet office hours
- Consistent use of outdated materials in the classroom
- Student feedback indicating that the faculty member is unprepared for class consistently
- Failure to provide students with feedback on graded assignments in a timely manner
- Failure to maintain currency with discipline-specific teaching-related practices and knowledge
- Failure to demonstrate a concern about poor and/or declining classroom performances
- Being late for class repeatedly, dismissing class early, canceling classes without valid reasons, or otherwise failing to use class time effectively
- Frequent documented violations of classroom policies (Mays Business School and University).

4.5 Indicators of excellent performance in research and publication

These indicators include the following

- Publications in leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines
- Publication of acclaimed scholarly book(s)
- Publication of acclaimed practitioner book(s)

- Frequent citation of publications
- Editorship of a highly regarded scholarly book
- Associate editorship or section editorship of a major journal(s)
- Receipt of a major fellowship, research, or publication award(s)
- Membership on the editorial board of a major journal(s)
- Receipt of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research
- Membership on review panel(s) for national or international research organization(s)
- Invitation to present a showcase or a keynote paper or to deliver an address at a significant international and/or national conference(s)
- Invitation(s) to present research at peer and/or aspirant schools
- Chair of PhD student committees that lead to top-tier journal publications and/or student placements at peer and/or aspirant schools
- Other clear and demonstrable contributions to PhD student development
- Frequent media citations of published work
- Consistent involvement in interdisciplinary and/or multidisciplinary, internationalization and diversity efforts and/or research projects
- Frequent media citations of published scholarship.

4.6 Indicators of effective performance in research and publication

These indicators include the following

- Publication in respected refereed journals in appropriate disciplines
- Publication in non-refereed journals that are recognized widely and valued
- Publication of a respected scholarly book(s)
- Publication of a respected practitioner book(s)
- Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs
- Citation of publications
- Frequent presentation of papers at national or international conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines
- Publication of a chapter(s) in a scholarly book(s)
- Refereed publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings
- Editorship of a respected, refereed journal(s)
- Associate editorship or section editorship of a respected, refereed journal(s)
- Membership on an editorial board of a respected, refereed journal(s)
- Well-documented contribution(s) (i.e., mentorship) to others' research
- Significant self-development activities such as a faculty development leave
- Evaluation of promotion and tenure cases at respected (peer and aspirant) universities
- Media citations of published scholarship

- Involvement in interdisciplinary and/or multidisciplinary, internationalization and diversity efforts and/or research projects.

4.7 Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in research and publication

These indicators include the following

- Publication in refereed journals in appropriate disciplines with minimal peer recognition, provided that such journals are recognized by the Social Sciences Citation Index and/or by the Science Citation Index
- Publication of a scholarly book or a book chapter with minimal peer recognition
- Publication of a practitioner book with minimal recognition by practitioners
- Limited citation of publications
- Few research presentations at national and international conferences and meetings
- Research presentations at regional conferences and meetings only
- Minimal involvement with a department’s PhD program
- Ad hoc reviewer for journals and regional meetings
- Minimal research collaborations with colleagues within and outside Mays Business School
- Minimal participation in departmental research seminars.

4.8 Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in research and publication

These indicators include the following

- Publication in non-refereed journals lacking widespread recognition
- Publications in refereed journals that do not appear in the Social Sciences Citation Index or the Science Citation Index
- Failure to maintain currency with the discipline’s knowledge
- Failure to initiate new working papers of any type over a three-year or longer period
- Very few citations of published works
- Infrequent or inconsistent involvement with research seminars presented by internal or external scholars
- Infrequent or inconsistent involvement with ad hoc reviewing for any type of journal or academic conference over a three-year or longer period
- Failure to support a department’s research mission.

Mays Business School encourages its faculty to demonstrate research leadership and as opportunities become available, to collaborate with others in the process of doing so. Occasional single-authored works and/or a balance of authoring order on publications in disciplines where the order of authorship conveys information regarding relative contribution are examples of demonstrating this type of leadership.

Service

4.9 Indicators of excellent performance in service

These indicators include the following

- Officer in a national/international professional organization(s)
- Program chair or a similar position for a national/international meeting(s)
- Administrative leadership role within Mays Business School and/or the University
- Officer in the Faculty Senate
- Chair of a major university committee or task force
- Demonstrated leadership in significant departmental, Mays Business School, University, or system administrative or service roles
- Service on a major governmental commission task force or board
- Attraction of significant external financial support in the form of development gifts.
- External activities that result in improved employment opportunities for Mays students.
- Editorship of a major journal(s)
- Frequent evaluations of promotion and tenure cases for peer and/or aspirant schools
-

4.10 Indicators of effective performance in service

These indicators include the following

- Committee chair of a national/international professional organization(s)
- Officer in a regional or state professional organization(s)
- Program chair or a similar position for a regional and/or state professional organizational meeting(s)
- Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Service on University, Mays Business School, and departmental committees and task forces
- Contribution to external development efforts
- Advisor to a student organization
- Engagement with administrative roles within the department
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups performed on a *pro-bono* basis or in exchange for a nominal honorarium
- Service as a consultant to business organizations and/or governmental agencies

- Evidence of professional service to the local community and/or to the public at large that is commensurate with the faculty member's responsibilities to Mays Business School
- Self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals and/or national and international associations

4.11 Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in service

These indicators include the following

- Lack of reasonably active participation in Mays Business School and University-wide committees and task forces
- Infrequent participation with national and regional academic associations
- Infrequent demonstration of informal leadership roles within a department, Mays Business School, and the University
- Infrequent acceptances of opportunities to mentor students and/or junior faculty
- Infrequent participation with school-wide events (e.g., faculty/staff meetings, events to honor faculty and staff colleagues)
- Irregular involvement with faculty recruiting processes.

4.12 Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in service

These indicators include the following

- No active participation in Mays Business School and University-wide committees and task forces
- No involvement with national or regional academic associations
- Failure to participate appropriately in departmental activities such as faculty meetings and faculty/staff events
- Consistent declines of opportunities for involvement with student activities and/or organizations
- Consistent failure to participate with school-wide events including faculty/staff meetings
- Failure to be an active participant with faculty recruiting processes
Conduct detrimental to the department or Mays Business School's reputation and/or work climate.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Mays Business School evaluates faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure in terms of their performance in the areas of research and publication, teaching, and

service. Assessments of faculty members' performances focus on the *quality*, *significance*, and *impact* of their work. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, those seeking promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate high potential for continuing *effectiveness* at a minimum with the hope that future performances will show *excellence*.

5.1.1 Performance Expectations for Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion to an Associate Professor Position with Tenure

At a minimum, Assistant Professors must demonstrate *effectiveness* in teaching and *excellence* with respect to research and publication. Departmental and college academic needs are the focus of an Assistant Professor's limited service contributions. Evaluation of a request for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure includes an assessment of the three performance areas, with research and publication carrying the heaviest weight. The minimum requirements for Mays include the following:

- An overall exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University
- Pattern over time of an *effective* performance in service
- Pattern over time of an *effective* performance in teaching
- Pattern over time of an *excellent* performance in research and publication
- High potential for continued *excellence* in research and publication and hopefully in terms of teaching and service as well

Time Frame

Typically, decisions regarding promotion to an Associate Professor position and the granting of tenure occur simultaneously. An explanation of the probationary period for an Assistant Professor appears in the initial offer of employment. The maximum probationary period for tenure is seven years, with up to three years credit given for tenure track experience at another university.

Under extenuating circumstances, the probationary period may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the Department Head, Dean, and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. However, it is rare for the University to grant such an extension in the year of mandatory consideration for tenure. The University's guidelines specify the special and unique circumstances for considering an extension of the probationary period.

In general, Assistant Professors should expect to complete their full probationary period at their entry rank. (The actual review and decision process, of course, begins the preceding year.) If an individual's record of accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of the rank of Associate Professor, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion and tenure prior to the end of the probationary period. This

includes individuals who served in a tenure-track or visiting faculty position at another institution for an amount of time prior to joining Mays, and who have not claimed credit towards tenure at Texas A&M for time served at such other institution. A request for early promotion is simultaneously a request for early granting of tenure, and vice versa. An individual contemplating asking for early consideration should consult with her or his Department Head, senior members of the departmental faculty, with the Senior Associate Dean and with the Dean before making a formal request for consideration.

5.1.2 Performance Expectations for Associate Professors Seeking Promotion to a Professor Position

At a minimum, Associate Professors should produce an *effective* performance in terms of research and publication, teaching, and service. Additionally, Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor should demonstrate *excellence* in research and publication. Relative to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors seeking promotion should exhibit increased contributions in terms of service. An assessment of the three performance areas is foundational to the promotion decision; commonly, research and publication carry the heaviest weight in the decision. In terms of research and publication, Mays expects that Associate Professors will continue producing research at a rate that is close to commensurate with the productivity research and publication productivity required for an Assistant Professor to receive a promotion to an Associate Professor position. The minimum requirements for Mays Business School include the following:

- An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in his or her field
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of an *excellent* performance in terms of research and publication
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of an *effective* performance in teaching
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of an *effective* performance in service

Time Frame

Promotion to Professor is a product of cumulative contributions, with special attention given to accomplishments since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Consistent with University guidelines, Mays does not have a “time in grade” expectation for an Associate Professor seeking a promotion to Professor. Section 3.1 of the *Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles* notes the following:

Tenured faculty at the Associate Professor level may request that they receive consideration for promotion. There is no requirement that this

consideration for promotion occur within a specified timeframe. Normal time in these ranks is determined by not only the ability to contribute significantly and continuously in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, but by a period of service long enough to mount substantive evidence that their work in these areas is having an important impact locally and where applicable, nationally and internationally.

Experience at Mays suggests that typically, but not always, Associate Professors require five years of service in rank to compile a record necessary for promotion to Professor. Because of the expectations associated with a request by an Associate Professor to receive consideration for promotion to Professor, an individual should consult with her or his Department Head, senior members of the departmental faculty, and the Office of the Dean before making a formal request for consideration. Doing this allows a faculty member to become aware of the degree of support among colleagues and administrative leaders with respect to a potential candidacy for promotion to the rank of Professor.

If the candidate for promotion to Professor also serves as the Head of the Department, the Dean selects either the Senior Associate Dean or the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship to fulfill the role of the Department Head in the review process.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

As with tenure-track and tenured faculty members, evaluations of requests from APT faculty for a promotion involve an analysis of an individual's contributions with respect to agreed-upon performance expectations. For promotion, APT faculty members must demonstrate a high potential for continued *excellence* in the performance area on which they concentrate (teaching or service). As a criterion, the potential for continued *excellence* is in addition to the expectation that their performance prior to seeking a promotion also is *excellent*. At Mays Business School, most APT faculty concentrate their efforts in the teaching performance area, with service or research and publication being a secondary area of activity. However, with approval from their Department Heads, some APT faculty concentrate their efforts on service, with teaching or research and publication being a secondary area of activity.

5.2.1 Lecturer Seeking a Promotion to Senior Lecturer

At a minimum, Lecturers are to be *effective* in teaching. Assessment of both performance areas, with teaching performance carrying the heaviest weight, is the source of a decision to promote an individual to a Senior Lecturer position. The minimum requirements for promotion to Senior Lecturer position in Mays Business School include the following:

- Pattern over time of *excellence* in their main area of activity (either teaching or service)
- Pattern over time of *effective* performance in the other area of activity

- Potential for continued *excellence* in the main area of activity and *effective* performance in the secondary area
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University

Lecturers typically serve at least five years in rank before seeking promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. If an individual's record of accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of the rank of Senior Lecturer, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion prior to five years in rank. Normally, only full-time Lecturers are eligible for promotion consideration.

5.2.2 Senior Lecturer Seeking a Promotion to Principal Lecturer

At a minimum, Senior Lecturers are to be *effective* in teaching and render service contributions related to departmental and college academic needs. Assessment of both performance areas, with teaching performance carrying the heaviest weight, is the source of a decision to promote an individual to a Principal Lecturer position. The minimum requirements for promotion to Principal Lecturer position in Mays Business School include the following:

- Pattern over time of *excellence* in their main area of activity (either teaching or service)
- Pattern over time of *effective* performance in the other area of activity
- Potential for continued *excellence* in the main area of activity and *effective* performance in the secondary area
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University

Senior Lecturers typically serve at least five years in rank before seeking promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer. If an individual's record of accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of the rank of Principal Lecturer, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion prior to five years in rank.

5.2.3 Clinical Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of Practice Seeking a Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor or Associate Professor of Practice

At a minimum, Clinical Assistant Professors and Assistant Professors of Practice should deliver *effective* performance(s) in teaching and either service *or* research on a consistent basis. Because all clinical and the majority of executive faculty have minimum service obligations, individuals interested in pursuing research and publication should discuss a proposed research agenda with their Department Head to determine their appropriate assignments. In addition, a strong case for promotion requires *excellence* in either teaching *or* service. The minimum requirements for promotion to Clinical Associate

Professor or Associate Professor of Practice in Mays Business School include the following:

- Pattern over time of *excellence* in either teaching *or* service
- Pattern over time of an *effective* performance in service *and/or* research and publication
- Potential for continued *excellence* in teaching *or* service and *effective* performance(s) in teaching, service *and/or* research and publication
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University

Clinical Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of Practice typically serve at least five years in rank before seeking promotion. If an individual's record of accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or Associate Professor of Practice, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion prior to five years in rank. An individual who compiles an unusually strong and exceptional record of accomplishment may request early consideration. Normally, only full-time clinical or executive faculty are eligible for promotion consideration.

5.2.4 Clinical Associate Professor or Associate Professor of Practice Seeking Promotion to Clinical Professor or Professor of Practice

At a minimum, Clinical Associate Professors and Associate Professors of Practice should deliver effective performance(s) on both teaching and service dimensions on a consistent basis. Because all clinical faculty and the majority of executive faculty have a minimum service obligation, individuals interested in pursuing research and publication should discuss a proposed research and publication agenda with their Department Head to determine their appropriate assignments. In addition, a strong case for promotion requires *excellence* in either teaching *or* service. Clinical Associate Professors and Associate Professors of Practice generally serve at least five years in this rank prior to seeking promotion to the Clinical Professor or Professor of Practice rank. The minimum requirements for promotion to Clinical Professor or Professor of Practice at Mays Business School include the following:

- Pattern over time of *excellence* in teaching
- Pattern over time of *effective* performance in service *and/or* research and publication
- Potential for continued *excellence* in teaching and *effective* performance in service *and/or* research and publication
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University

Clinical Associate Professors and Associate Professors of Practice typically serve at least five years in rank before seeking promotion. If an individual's record of

accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of a rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor of Practice, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion prior to five years in rank. Normally, only fulltime clinical and executive faculty are eligible for promotion consideration.

5.3 Promotion and/or Tenure Review Processes

Transparency and consistency describe the processes Mays uses when completing promotion and/or tenure reviews. This is the case for tenure-track, tenured, and APT faculty.

5.3.1 Promotion and Tenure Review Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Initiating the Process

Department Heads initiate the process for individuals desiring consideration for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor by soliciting self-nominations. In the case of the mandatory year of consideration for an untenured/tenure-track faculty member, no nomination is necessary. A request for early promotion to Associate Professor indicates a simultaneous request for early tenure. After discussing the promotion and tenure process and clarifying expectations with the Department Head, an individual wishing to have her or his case heard prepares a dossier according to Mays and University requirements. Individuals in their mandatory year for promotion and tenure consideration must also prepare a dossier. Because the University changes its requirements for preparing dossiers from time to time, individuals participating in promotion and tenure processes bear responsibility for ensuring that they follow the most current University guidelines.

Role of the Candidate

As noted, the candidate has the primary responsibility to prepare the basic information and data for her or his dossier in accordance with Mays and University requirements. As part of the dossier, the candidate is to supply in concise form a statement of his or her goals, philosophies, strategies, and emphases in carrying out his or her professional responsibilities in research and publication, teaching, and service and other accomplishments that are relevant to the position.

Role of the Departmental Faculty

Departmental faculty review is the first internal step in the process of evaluating candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The departmental tenure and promotion committee(s) meets the following requirements:

- For faculty pursuing promotion to an Associate Professor position with tenure, all tenured Associate Professors and Professors in a department comprise the departmental promotion and tenure committee

- All faculty members at the rank of Professor in a department comprise the departmental promotion and tenure committee for candidates for promotion to Professor in that department
- Confidentiality is the foundation for conducting deliberations
- Committee recommendations are advisory in nature
- Voting members of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee (we describe this committee's composition below in this section) may not vote on promotion and tenure cases at the departmental level nor participate in the departmental deliberations.
- The committee is required to hold a meeting (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of each candidate; two thirds of the voting members of the committee constitute a quorum
- The Department Head schedules this meeting with sufficient advance notice to ensure that all voting members are available to attend
- Voting faculty members must attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote
- The committee must have at least five voting members; if an insufficient number of faculty members qualify to serve on the committee, the departmental P&T committee will be augmented using the process described below, until the committee includes five voting members:
 - First, the departmental representative of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee will vote at the department level rather than at the college level;
 - Second, if additional voting members are needed, the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship becomes a voting member of the departmental P&T committee;
 - Third, if additional voting members are still needed, the Chair of the Departmental P&T committee (or another senior committee member designated by the Department Head) nominates at least two faculty members from other departments at Mays, whose research areas are close to that of the faculty member(s) who is (are) being evaluated that particular year; subsequently, Mays Research Council considers the nominations and makes a recommendation to the Dean, whose decision is final.
- Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote. However, within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting, these individuals may write a separate letter, addressed to the Department Head, containing their personal recommendation; the letter may inform the decision of the Department Head but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

The departmental review process normally includes a faculty peer review of classroom teaching and instructional materials. For Assistant Professors, this review takes place during the third year at that rank as part of the mid-term review. If any concerns surface during the mid-term review, another review occurs during the fourth year. For Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor, the review may occur early in the year of consideration.

In some departments, a senior faculty member serves as coordinator of the review process. The coordinator is responsible for recording in writing the departmental tenure and promotion committee's recommendation. In other departments, the Department Head appoints a senior faculty member to serve as chair of the departmental P&T committee for a pre-determined amount of time.

A secret ballot reflects the committee's recommendation. Ballot formats include paper and ballot box, or an online voting or survey platform where each committee member receives a unique, anonymous link to cast a vote. If an online platform is the choice, the administrator of the voting process ensures that no committee member may vote more than once and that the vote of each committee member remains secret to all parties involved in the process. For example, if Qualtrics is the voting method in use, ballot secrecy happens by choosing the following settings for a survey: "by invitation only" and "anonymous."

All members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee know the identity of the coordinator serving as the letter writer (or of the committee chair, as applicable). The letter writer takes appropriate steps to ensure that she or he conveys the richness of discussion accurately, including positive and negative points. Following submission to the Department Head, she or he adds the written document to the candidate's dossier.

To review promotion and tenure cases of tenure-track or tenured faculty located in a non-departmental unit, the Senior Associate Dean appoints an ad-hoc committee to serve in lieu of the departmental review committee. The ad-hoc committee consists of five full-time tenured faculty members at Mays Business School, all of whom hold faculty ranks higher than the candidate.

Role of the Department Head

The Department Head is responsible for obtaining outside letters and responding to candidates' questions as they develop their dossiers. Department heads should not attend the evaluation meetings and in no case should voice their opinion about the candidate to the committee or members of the committee.

After receiving the departmental faculty recommendation, the Department Head prepares a letter to present and explain her or his independent recommendation regarding the candidate to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation differs from the departmental committee's recommendation, he or she explains the reasons for the difference when writing a letter.

The Senior Associate Dean performs the role of the Department Head for candidates located in a non-departmental unit or when the candidate for promotion serves as a Department Head.

Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Mays (college-wide) promotion and tenure committee has seven voting members—one elected (full) professor from each academic department, two at-large members appointed by the Dean (both serving at the rank of full professor), and one *ex officio* (non-voting) member appointed by the Dean as well. The *ex officio* member serves as the committee's chair. Tenured Professors, with the exception of Mays and university administrators (Department Head and above), are eligible for election or appointment to the Mays promotion and tenure committee. All tenured faculty members holding academic rank within a particular department are eligible to vote for that department's representative. Typically, Mays promotion and tenure committee members serve three-year staggered terms. The Mays promotion and tenure committee reviews all promotion and tenure cases and transmits, in writing, its recommendations and votes to the Dean. The committee also reviews mid-term review cases.

The committee is required to hold one or more meetings (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of each candidate. The committee chair, as well as six of the seven voting members of the committee constitute a quorum. The Senior Associate Dean schedules this meeting with sufficient advance notice to ensure that all voting members are available to attend.

Voting faculty members are required to attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote. Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote. However, but within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting, these individuals may write a separate letter, addressed to the Dean and submitted through the Senior Associate Dean, containing their personal recommendation. The letter may inform the decision of the Dean but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

As is the case with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, we use a secret ballot to reflect the committee's recommendation. The voting process is similar to that used in departmental promotion and tenure committees, described earlier in this section.

Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair

The chair of the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee serves as an *ex officio* (non-voting) member. Appointed by the Dean, the chair normally serves a three-year term. The chair facilitates, moderates, and coordinates the process. Active participation by the chair in the substantive discussions about the promotion and tenure decision for each candidate does not occur. Based on the voting members' views (including minority perspectives) and votes, committee members draft letters describing their recommendations. The chair and the committee agree upon the approach for writing letters. Typically, the chair will delegate to different committee members the writing of the first draft of the letter for each candidate. However, the chair has the final responsibility of ensuring that each letter represents the committee's views, deliberations, votes, and recommendation. All voting committee members sign each letter. The chair submits the committee's letters to the Dean for her or his analysis.

Role of the Senior Associate Dean

The Senior Associate Dean ensures that the promotion and tenure process follows the appropriate departmental, college and university guidelines.

The Senior Associate Dean also ensures that the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee members receive the dossiers for all promotion and tenure candidates and that the committee completes its review process within the required amount of time as stipulated by the University. The Senior Associate Dean also ensures that timely elections (by faculty vote) to the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee occur.

The Senior Associate Dean is available, at the discretion of each department faculty, to attend the departmental review process to capture the richness of the discussion regarding each promotion and tenure candidate. This participation may consist of attendance throughout the peer review process or a briefing by the departmental faculty involved in the review process at the conclusion of the departmental evaluations.

To understand the richness of discussion and the outcomes from the deliberations, the Senior Associate Dean may attend the Mays tenure and promotion committee meeting unless in a written request to the Senior Associate Dean, a majority of the voting members of that committee asks that the Senior Associate Dean refrains from doing so. If the Senior Associate Dean attends the meeting, he or she is encouraged to serve as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if individuals present inaccurate statements, the Senior Associate Dean shares information to assist in clarifying or presenting the facts. However, the Senior Associate Dean abstains from efforts to influence the thinking or voting of the faculty. For instance, the Senior Associate Dean avoids championing or advocating for a positive or negative outcome. The Senior Associate Dean has no vote in the Mays tenure and promotion committee.

The Dean may, at his or her discretion, appoint an individual other than the Senior Associate Dean to represent the Office of the Dean during these deliberations provided that the individual is a full, tenured professor at Mays Business School.

Role of the Dean

After the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee completes its deliberations, the Dean receives the candidate's dossier, which at this point includes the following:

- All materials created and/or obtained for inclusion in the dossier
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the departmental committee (with its vote)
- Written recommendation from the Department Head
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee (with its vote)

The Dean prepares her or his own independent summary assessment of a candidate. If the Dean's assessment differs from the Department Head's assessment and recommendation, he or she will inform the Department Head of the reasons for those differences; in turn, the Department Head will inform the departmental promotion and tenure committee of the Dean's decision and the reasons for it. The departmental review committee then has an opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials are a part of the candidate's dossier, including relevant arguments supporting the candidate's case. Identifying germane new evidence or new and different arguments might lead to submission of a newly organized case for reconsideration at the school level.

If the Dean recommends against tenure and/or promotion and that recommendation differs from the Department Head's recommendation, the Dean informs the Department Head and the candidate of the reasons for the recommendation. The faculty member then has an opportunity to offer a stronger case for promotion and tenure or for a promotion only in the instance of an Associate Professor seeking a promotion to Professor. The Dean and the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee review this case prior to forwarding a final recommendation to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

5.3.2 Promotion Review Process for Academic Professional Track Faculty

Initiating the Process

By soliciting self-nominations, Department Heads initiate the process for individuals desiring consideration for promotion to Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, Associate Professor of Practice, Clinical Professor, or Professor of Practice. After discussing the process and clarifying expectations with the Department Head, an individual desiring to be a candidate for promotion prepares a dossier according to Mays and University requirements. When preparing their dossier, APT faculty seeking promotion typically focus on performance indicators related to teaching and service (and, in some cases, research and publication as substitute for service). Individuals seeking promotion bear responsibility for ensuring that they follow the most current University and Mays Business School guidelines.

Role of the Candidate

As noted, the candidate bears the primary responsibility to prepare the basic information required for her or his dossier in accordance with Mays and University guidelines. As one part of the dossier, the candidate supplies, in concise form, a statement of his or her goals, philosophies, strategies, and emphases in carrying out his or her professional responsibilities in teaching, service and other accomplishments relevant to the position.

Role of Departmental Faculty

Departmental faculty review is the first step in the process of evaluating requests from APT faculty for promotion. The departmental review committee meets the following criteria:

- All full-time faculty members in the department serving at a rank higher than that of the candidate comprise the departmental promotion review committee for APT faculty members (Appendix C, Section 11 contains all promotion and tenure committee structures)
- Absolute confidentiality accompanies the review committee's deliberations
- Committee recommendations are advisory in nature
- The committee must hold a meeting (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of each candidate. Two thirds of the voting members of the committee constitute a quorum
- The Department Head schedules this meeting with sufficient advance notice to ensure that all voting members are available to attend
- Voting faculty members must attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote
- The committee must have at least five voting members; if an insufficient number of faculty members qualify to serve on the committee, the departmental P&T committee will be augmented in the order described below, until the committee includes five voting members:
 - First, the departmental representative of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee votes at the department level rather than at the college level;
 - Second, the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship becomes a voting member of the departmental P&T committee;
 - Third, the Chair of the Departmental P&T committee (or another senior committee member designated by the Department Head) nominates at least two faculty members from other departments at Mays, whose area of expertise in teaching and service are close to that of the faculty member(s) who is (are) being evaluated during that particular year; subsequently, Mays Research Council considers the nominations and makes a recommendation to the Dean, whose decision is final.
- Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote. However, within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting these individuals may write a separate letter addressed to the Department Head containing their personal recommendation; the letter may inform the decision of the Department Head but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

In some departments, a senior faculty member serves as coordinator of the review process. The coordinator is responsible for recording in writing the departmental tenure and promotion committee's recommendation. In other departments, the Department Head appoints a senior faculty member to serve as chair of the departmental P&T committee for a pre-determined amount of time.

A secret ballot reflects the committee's recommendation. Ballot formats include paper and ballot box, or an online voting or survey platform where each committee member receives a unique, anonymous link to cast a vote. If an online platform is the choice, the administrator of the voting process ensures that no committee member may vote more than once and that the vote of each committee member remains secret to all parties

involved in the process. For example, if Qualtrics is the voting method in use, ballot secrecy happens by choosing the following settings for a survey “by invitation only” and “anonymous.”

All members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee know the identity of the coordinator serving as the letter writer (or of the committee chair, as applicable). The letter writer takes appropriate steps to ensure that she or he conveys the richness of discussion accurately, including positive and negative points. Following submission to the Department Head, she or he adds the written document to the candidate’s dossier.

To review promotion cases of APT faculty located in a non-departmental unit, the Senior Associate Dean appoints an ad-hoc committee to serve in lieu of the departmental review committee. The ad-hoc committee consists of five full-time faculty, with representation from at least two APT faculty of ranks higher than the candidate.

Role of the Department Head

The Department Head is responsible for obtaining outside letters and responding to candidates' questions as they develop their dossiers. Department heads should not attend the evaluation meetings and in no case should voice their opinion about the candidate to the committee or members of the committee.

After receiving the departmental faculty recommendation, the Department Head prepares a letter to present and explain her or his independent recommendation regarding the candidate to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation differs from the departmental committee’s recommendation, he or she explains the reasons for the difference when writing a letter.

The Senior Associate Dean performs the role of the department head for candidates located in a non-departmental unit.

Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Mays (college-wide) promotion and tenure committee has seven voting members—one elected (full) professor from each academic department, two at-large members appointed by the Dean, and one *ex officio* (non-voting) member appointed by the Dean as well. The *ex officio* member serves as the committee’s chair. Tenured Professors, with the exception of Mays and university administrators (Department Head and above), are eligible for election or appointment to the Mays promotion and tenure committee. All tenured faculty members holding academic rank within a particular department are eligible to vote for that department's representative. Typically, Mays promotion and tenure committee members serve three-year staggered terms. The Mays promotion and tenure committee reviews all promotion cases and transmits, in writing, its votes and recommendations to the Dean.

The committee must hold a meeting (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of each candidate. The committee chair, as well as six of the seven voting members of the committee constitute a quorum. The Senior Associate Dean schedules this meeting with sufficient advance notice to ensure that all voting members are available to attend.

Voting faculty members must attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote. Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote; however, within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting, these individuals may write a separate letter, addressed to the Dean, containing their personal recommendation. The letter may inform the decision of the Dean but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

As is the case with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, a secret ballot will reflect the committee's recommendation. The voting process will be similar to that used in departmental promotion and tenure committees, described earlier in this section.

Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair

The chair of the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee serves as an *ex officio* (non-voting) member. Appointed by the Dean, the chair normally serves a three-year term. The chair facilitates, moderates, and coordinates the process. Active participation by the chair in the substantive discussions about the promotion and tenure decision for each candidate does not occur. Based on the voting members' views (including minority perspectives) and votes, committee members draft letters describing their recommendations. Typically, the chair will delegate to different committee members the writing of the first draft of the letter for each candidate. However, the chair has the final responsibility of ensuring that each letter represents the committee's views, deliberations, votes, and recommendation. All voting committee members sign each letter. The chair submits the committee's letters to the Dean for her or his analysis.

Role of the Senior Associate Dean

The Senior Associate Dean ensures that the promotion process follows the appropriate departmental, college and university guidelines.

The Senior Associate Dean also ensures that the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee members receive the dossiers for all promotion candidates and that the committee completes its review process within the required amount of time as stipulated by the University. The Senior Associate Dean also ensures that timely elections (by faculty vote) to the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee occur.

The Senior Associate Dean is available, at the discretion of each department faculty, to attend the departmental review process to capture the richness of the discussion regarding each promotion candidate. This participation may consist of attendance

throughout the peer review process or a briefing by the departmental faculty involved in the review process at the conclusion of the departmental evaluations.

To understand the richness of discussion and the outcomes from the deliberations, the Senior Associate Dean may attend the Mays tenure and promotion committee meeting unless in a written request to the Senior Associate Dean, a majority of the voting members of that committee asks that the Senior Associate Dean from doing so. If the Senior Associate Dean attends the meeting, he or she is encouraged to serve as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if individuals present inaccurate statements, the Senior Associate Dean shares information to assist in clarifying or presenting the facts. However, the Senior Associate Dean abstains from efforts to influence the thinking or voting of the faculty. For instance, the Senior Associate Dean avoids championing or advocating for a positive or negative outcome. The Senior Associate Dean has no vote in the Mays tenure and promotion committee.

The Dean may, at his or her discretion, appoint an individual other than the Senior Associate Dean to represent the Office of the Dean during these deliberations provided that the individual is a full, tenured professor at Mays Business School.

Role of the Dean

After the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee completes its deliberations, the Dean receives the candidate's dossier, which at this point includes the following:

- All materials created and/or obtained for inclusion in the dossier
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the departmental committee (with its vote)
- Written recommendation from the Department Head
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee (with its vote)

The Dean prepares her or his own independent summary assessment of a candidate. If the Dean's assessment differs from the Department Head's assessment and recommendation, he or she will inform the Department Head of the reasons for those differences; in turn, the Department Head will inform the departmental promotion and tenure committee of the Dean's decision and the reasons for it. The departmental review committee then has an opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials are a part of the candidate's dossier, including relevant arguments supporting the candidate's case. Identifying germane new evidence or new and different arguments might lead to submission of a newly organized case for reconsideration at the school level.

If the Dean recommends against promotion and that recommendation differs from the Department Head's recommendation, the Dean informs the Department Head and the candidate of the reasons for the recommendation.

5.3.3 Faculty Notification during Promotion and Tenure Processes

A faculty member learns of the recommendation for or against promotion at each level of review. The University requires that the Department Head handle all such communications. At Mays Business School, the Dean may also choose to communicate with the candidate, in addition to the official communication from the Department Head.

In the event of a negative decision, the faculty member is entitled, upon request, to a written statement of the reasons contributing to that decision. The Department Head provides a statement of reasons to the faculty member after the Board of Regents or Chancellor have ruled on the University's promotion and tenure or promotion-only recommendations.

If a non-tenured faculty member alleges that the decision to deny tenure results from a violation of academic freedom, a violation of civil rights, or any other form of illegal discrimination, the faculty member may appeal the decision with the President of Texas A&M University within twenty (20) business days of receiving the formal tenure decision. (University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Sections 9.2 and 9.3).

A faculty member receives written notice of the official decision regarding a promotion decision as soon as possible after the Chancellor or the Board of Regents have acted on the President's recommendations.

At any point in the process, a candidate may elect to withdraw from further promotion consideration by submitting a written request.

5.3.4 Time Table

On an annual basis, the University's timetable specifies the specific dates for the promotion and tenure process. The approximate timetable is as follows:

- May—Dossiers due for cases requiring external review letters
- June-August—Preparation of dossier, receipt of external reviews
- August—Dossiers due for cases that do not require external review letters
- August-September—Departmental reviews
- September—Departmental recommendations to the Dean
- October—Mays Promotion and Tenure committee completes its evaluations
- October-November—Mays Promotion and Tenure committee submits its recommendations to the Dean
- December—Dean submits recommendations to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.
- January-April—The university completes the review process. Tenure cases are forwarded to the Board of Regents for a final decision. The President makes the final decision for promotion-only cases.
- September 1—Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.

To meet this timetable, departments complete their review processes and the faculty dossiers by the first week of September. Obtaining external letters often requires considerable time and effort; accordingly, requesting these letters in June or before is appropriate.

Faculty members who seek promotion (other than those who are subject to mandatory review) are required to notify their Department Head no later than the second Monday in May. Those who are subject to mandatory review follow the deadlines communicated by their Department Head.

6. Annual Review

Mays Business School conducts annual performance reviews in a manner consistent with Section 2.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1. All faculty members, regardless of rank, receive an annual evaluation of their performance. Faculty members receive the results of the annual review from their Department Head in a written format. To coincide with the University's deadlines for such activities, this annual review occurs in the spring of each academic year.

There are occasions, however, when assessing an individual's overall record occurs at another time. Mid-term reviews and promotion and/or tenure reviews, which take place in the fall, are the most obvious situations when this occurs. When reviewed in this manner, it is appropriate for the annual review process to reference the outcome of this earlier review.

Department Heads complete annual performance reviews. In some cases, Department Heads will choose to solicit input from other members of the Mays or departmental faculty who have direct interactions with the faculty member regarding her or his teaching, research, or service activities. In all cases, each faculty member receives a single performance review from the Department Head, which addresses all areas of responsibility.

To inform the annual evaluation process, the Department Head requests information annually from each faculty member in his or her department pertaining to faculty performance activities and indicators for the preceding year (the Professional Activities and Accomplishments Report, or PAAR). All faculty use a common reporting routine (such as Digital Measures or Faculty 180, as directed by the Senior Associate Dean). Department Heads have the discretion to request additional performance-related information for their own use.

All tenured faculty in each of the School's five academic departments evaluate and provide feedback on the performance of untenured Assistant Professors. The emphasis of this evaluation is the progress an individual is making regarding earning a promotion to an Associate Professor position with tenure. All Professors evaluate and provide feedback on the performance of Associate Professors particularly with respect to their progress toward earning a promotion to Professor. Some departments may choose to

conduct annual peer-review meetings for this purpose. Department Heads may participate fully during such peer-review meetings.

Department Heads evaluate the performance of Professors and that of APT faculty. Department Heads may delegate the performance evaluation of APT faculty to a senior APT faculty member who serves as Assistant or Associate Department Head.

6.1 Purpose

The purposes of the annual performance review include the following:

- Creating a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations
- Providing evaluative feedback regarding how well the individual is performing currently relative to the norms and expectations for her or his faculty position
- Providing developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved
- Providing feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process varies by academic rank and a faculty member's career stage 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 a positive promotion and tenure decision. For APT faculty, the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable (see section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1—University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion—for additional details).

Regardless of academic rank, the annual review will focus only on those dimensions of performance that are relevant to the specific rank of the faculty member being evaluated. For example, a faculty member serving at the rank of lecturer will not be evaluated on research or scholarly activities, nor will the lack of such scholarly activities be viewed as a negative factor in the evaluation process. At the beginning of each academic year, department heads will establish clear expectations with each faculty member about the exact dimensions of performance that are applicable to their particular situation. Subsequently, the annual review will evaluate the faculty member's progress towards meeting these expectations.

6.3 Time Period of the Annual Review

At Mays Business School, annual performance reviews focus on a previous twelve months of activities, from March 1 in year Y-1 to February 28/29 in year Y. In the case of research activities, the reviews focus on a rolling 36-month window, from March 1 in

year Y-3 to February 28/29 in year Y. For example, during calendar year 2023, faculty members will report professional activities performed between March 1, 2022 and February 28, 2023, with the exception of research activities, which will be reported over a three-year window from March 1, 2020 to February 28, 2023. The following calendar year, in 2024, faculty members will report professional activities performed between March 1, 2023 and February 29, 2024, while the three-year research window is rolled forward by one year, from March 1, 2021 to February 29, 2024. Departments may change this evaluation period after consultation with the Senior Associate Dean.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

As noted in Section 3 above, Mays Business School uses the criteria of *excellent*, *effective*, *needs improvement*, and *unsatisfactory* to assess faculty members' performances annually. The indicators for each of these performance categories appear in section 3 above. We remind all faculty members that these performance indicators appear in this document, the Mays Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation and Appointments.

6.4.1. Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Teaching

- *Excellent*—a high level of performance in terms of teaching that meets or exceeds departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *excellence*
- *Effective*—performance in terms of teaching that meets the departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *effective* performance
- *Needs improvement*—performance in terms of teaching that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent* and *effective* performances as reflected by substantive indicators of *needs improvement* performance
- *Unsatisfactory*—performance in terms of teaching that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent*, *effective*, and *needs improvement* performance as reflected by substantive indicators of *unsatisfactory* performance.

6.4.2. Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Research and Publication

- *Excellent*—a high level of performance in terms of research and publication that meets or exceeds departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *excellence*
- *Effective*—performance in terms of research and publication that meets the departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *effective* performance
- *Needs improvement*—performance in terms of research and publication that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent* and *effective* performances as reflected by substantive indicators of *needs improvement* performance

- *Unsatisfactory*—performance in terms of research and publication that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent*, *effective*, and *needs improvement* performance as reflected by substantive indicators of *unsatisfactory* performance.

6.4.3 Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Service

- *Excellent*—a high level of performance in terms of service that meets or exceeds departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *excellence*
- *Effective*—performance in terms of service that meets the departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *effective* performance
- *Needs improvement*—performance in terms of service that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent* and *effective* performances as reflected by substantive indicators of *needs improvement* performance
- *Unsatisfactory*—performance in terms of service that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent*, *effective*, and *needs improvement* as reflected by substantive indicators of *unsatisfactory* performance.

6.5 Required Components

Consistent with section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1, the Mays annual performance review includes several components. The components used are consistent with section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1.

6.5.1 Faculty Member's Report of Previous Activities

Faculty annual reviews are completed through Interfolio Faculty 180. The exact form of the report faculty members complete to describe the activities they completed during an annual performance evaluation period may vary slightly across the five departments in Mays Business School. In all cases though, the form in use has the following characteristics:

- The report focuses on the previous annual review period as specified by the faculty member's department (see section 6.3 above for details)
- The report allows the faculty member to discuss current and longer-term projects and their status. The faculty member provides these descriptions with respect to teaching, research and publication, and service
- Faculty members describe their short- and long-term performance goals as they relate to teaching, research and publication, and service.

6.5.2 Written Document Describing the Department Head's Evaluation

The Department Head prepares a written evaluation to describe her or his assessment of the faculty member's annual performance. Part of the written document addresses

performance expectations for the faculty member with respect to teaching, research and publication, and service for the upcoming academic year. If the Department Heads had delegated the evaluation to others (such as to a senior APT faculty member or to tenured faculty members), the Department Head must still prepare a written evaluation letter; however, the performance assessment prepared by the delegate informs the Department Head's evaluation.

The faculty member receives a copy of the written document. The faculty member signs the document to acknowledge receipt of it. Once signed, the Department Head adds the document to the faculty member's personnel file. If a faculty member chooses not to sign the written document to acknowledge receipt of the document, the Department Head notes this in the faculty member's personnel file. Faculty members have the right to provide written comments regarding the document they receive from the Department Head; these comments become part of their personnel file.

No faculty member may receive an overall *excellent* or *effective* performance rating if she or he failed to comply with all required System and University training programs during the performance evaluation year (see System Regulation 33.05.02—Required Employee Training). In instances where a faculty member received notification of a mandatory training program requirement near the end of the annual performance evaluation period, she or he has 30 days to complete the requirement. To verify compliance with the System and the University's training programs, faculty members during the annual review process acknowledge that they have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

6.5.3 Meeting between the Department Head and the Faculty Member

Annually, there is an opportunity for a faculty member to visit with her or his Department Head to discuss the results of her or his annual performance review and performance-related expectations for the next academic year. In some instances, a faculty member and her or his Department Head may agree to meet more frequently. This meeting is mandatory in all cases where the faculty member's performance is rated below "effective." In such cases the Department Head will discuss specific expectations for performance improvement and a timeline thereon.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment

In assessing a faculty member's annual performance, the weights allocated to teaching, research and publication and service are consistent with the expectations associated with her or his appointment, the results of previous annual reviews, and with the faculty member's overall contributions to the department's and Mays Business School's strategic plans, her or his department's strategic plan, and the University's mission.

6.6 Assessment Outcomes Requiring Action for Tenured Faculty Members

As per University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 concerned with Post-Tenure Review, the following annual performance evaluation and Periodic Peer Review ratings require additional action.

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

Being evaluated as *unsatisfactory* in any single category—research and publication, teaching, or service or in any other assigned responsibility (e.g., administration)—or as *needs improvement* in any two categories yields an overall rating of *unsatisfactory* for a tenured member of the faculty.

An annual review resulting in an overall *unsatisfactory* rating expresses in writing the basis for the rating in accordance with the specified performance indicators. The Dean and Senior Associate Dean receive a copy of each report specifying an *unsatisfactory* rating for a faculty member.

A written improvement plan accompanies each report the Dean and Senior Associate Dean receive in which faculty members earned an *unsatisfactory* performance review. The plan is a product of collaborative work between a faculty member and her or his Department Head. The plan specifies actions the faculty member will take to bring about near-term improvements in her or his performance. If deemed necessary, because of an *unsatisfactory* annual performance evaluation, the Department Head may request that the faculty member undergo a Periodic Peer Review. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall rating of *unsatisfactory* for three consecutive annual performance reviews or who receives an *unsatisfactory* rating during a Periodic Peer Review is subject to a Professional Development Review (see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01—Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

When a tenured faculty member receives a *needs improvement* rating in any single area of faculty performance (teaching, research and publication, and service) during the annual evaluation process or during a Periodic Peer Review, she or he must work with her or his Department Head immediately to develop a plan for near-term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In research and publication, three years may be required for the faculty member to complete the plan successfully. The rating of *needs improvement* can remain as *needs improvement* as long as the faculty member is meeting predetermined milestones in the improvement plan. If the faculty member is not satisfying the approved milestones, her or his rating converts to *unsatisfactory*. When a faculty member completes all milestones of an agreed-upon improvement plan, her or his performance rating converts to *effective*.

6.7 Time Line

The annual review process concludes prior to the beginning of the annual budgeting process. This sequencing allows Department Heads to assess faculty members’

performances when considering merit increases (if any merit increases are available). This is important in that a stipulation from the Office of Faculty Affairs requires the completion of all annual reviews before recommending merit increases (if any). On an annual basis, June 30 is the last day to complete annual reviews.

6.8 Complaint Procedure for Failing to Follow Guidelines

A faculty member who believes that her or his annual review *process* lacks compliance with college and departmental procedures, or in the absence of access to published guidelines, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the Dean of Mays Business School through the Senior Associate Dean (with a copy of the letter going to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs). The Dean reviews the complaint and reaches a decision about its merits. A faculty member may appeal the Dean's decision to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. University guidelines (see section 2.4.3.6 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1) indicate that there is no formal appeal or grievance regarding the *substance* of an annual review.

7. Mid-Term Review

In addition to the annual performance review, at the end of a tenure-accruing Assistant Professor's third year as a member of the Mays faculty, he or she receives a more detailed and comprehensive review, also known at Mays as the "third-year review." This review is in accordance with Section 4.5.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). Comprehensive in nature, this review is mandatory for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period of five years or more.

7.1 Purpose

The purpose of a mid-term review is to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid mid-point of their probationary period. This review familiarizes the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensures that she or he understands the expectations of those entities with ultimate responsibility for the tenure and promotion decision. This review also ensures that the faculty member has a clear understanding of her or his status and progress.

The mid-term review mimics the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however, the Department Head may solicit internal letters of recommendation rather than external letters of recommendation.

As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review includes review by the department's promotion and tenure committee, the Department Head, the Mays P&T committee, and the Dean. The Dean may delegate the evaluation of mid-term performance to the Senior Associate Dean.

This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research and publication, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

According to university rules, the mid-term review may replace the annual faculty performance review. However, Mays Business School requires that a faculty member receive an annual review even during the year when she or he participates in the mid-term review.

7.2 Process

The Mid-Term review focuses on:

- The individual's teaching performance during the first three years of employment
- The individual's research and publication performance during the first three years of employment
- The individual's service performance during the first three years of employment
- Providing an explicit statement of whether the individual is *on, above, or below trajectory* for a positive promotion and tenure decision at the appropriate time
- Providing an explicit statement of what area(s) of performance with respect to research and publication, teaching, and service, if any, is/are of concern.

The individual faculty member is responsible for assembling a dossier of materials related to her or his teaching, research and publication, and service contributions for review. To the extent possible, this dossier should mirror those required for the promotion and tenure process (with the exception of outside letters).

The mid-term review process calls for the tenured department faculty and the Department Head to first review the individual's dossier. A coordinator of the tenured faculty (or the chair of the departmental promotion and tenure committee, if applicable) and the Department Head prepare separate feedback memoranda. These memoranda address the five points above describing the purpose of the mid-term review.

University rules provide some flexibility regarding the timing of the mid-term review. The mid-term review may take place between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year and December of the target year. For example, for a faculty member hired in calendar year 2020, the target year of the mid-term review is 2023. The review can take place any time after March 2023 with the end of December 2023 being the deadline for completion (See the following table.)

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
--------------	--------------------------------	---

Calendar Year 2020	7 years	Mar – Dec 2023 (due before December 2023 of AY 2023-2024)
-----------------------	---------	---

At Mays business school, the mid-term review follows the same calendar as that used for promotion and tenure cases. The review process begins during May of the academic year prior to the target academic year and concludes in December of the target year. Specifically:

- May-June—Department Heads notify candidates subject to the mid-term review of the requirement to prepare their dossiers
- June-August—Preparation of dossier
- August-September—Departmental reviews
- September—Departmental recommendations to the Dean
- October—Mays Promotion and Tenure committee completes its evaluations
- October-November—Mays Promotion and Tenure committee submits its recommendations to the Dean
- December—Dean prepares her or his independent evaluation. The Dean may delegate this task to the Senior Associate Dean.

7.3 Feedback from the Mid-Term Review and Non-Renewal of Faculty Appointment

The Department Head is responsible for meeting with the mid-term review candidate to discuss his or her feedback as well as the feedback from faculty in her or his department. The Department Head places her or his memorandum as well as the one the departmental faculty prepared into an individual’s dossier. The Department Head then transmits the dossier to the Mays promotion and tenure committee. The Mays promotion and tenure committee conducts its own review and adds its letter to the faculty member’s dossier.

The Office of the Dean receives the dossier with the results of the Mays promotion and tenure committee’s deliberations included. The Dean and/or Senior Associate Dean meet with each individual. During this meeting, they provide their own feedback and answer questions/address concerns or issues she or he may surface. The Dean (or the Senior Associate Dean) prepares a summary memorandum of this meeting and shares it with the Department Head after placing it into the individual’s dossier.

The Department Head and the Senior Associate Dean meet to review the outcome of the mid-term review. If the results of the mid-term review indicate a lack of sufficient progress by a tenure-track faculty member toward earning a promotion to an Associate Professor position with tenure, not renewing the individual’s annual contract may be an appropriate decision.

At Mays Business School, the Department Head makes a non-renewal decision regarding a tenure-track assistant professor. The Department Head makes this decision with the advice and consent of the tenured faculty in that department and with the approval of the Dean and Senior Associate Dean.

A non-renewal decision about a tenure-track assistant professor must meet the “adequate consideration” standard explained below. This is a higher standard than the “at will” default standard in Texas labor laws.

Section 5.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 stipulates that “a decision not to renew the tenure-track appointment of a non-tenured faculty member ... shall be based upon *adequate consideration* of the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.”

Section 4.5.2 of the same rule defines “adequate consideration” as follows:

Adequate consideration of a promotion or tenure case consists of a conscientious review, which seeks out and considers all available evidence bearing on the relevant performance of the faculty member, and assumes that the various academic units follow their approved procedural guidelines during the promotion or tenure review process. Adequate deliberation over the evidence in light of relevant standards and exclusive of improper standards is the basis of such consideration. An improper standard is any criterion not related to the professional performance of the faculty member. The evaluation of a promotion or tenure case should constitute a bona fide exercise of professional academic judgment.

At Mays Business School, “adequate consideration” follows this process:

1. The Dean (or Senior Associate Dean as applicable), at the conclusion of the mid-term review process, determines that the candidate’s progress towards promotion and tenure is *below trajectory*; and
2. Following the Dean’s determination, a majority of tenured faculty in the department recommend non-renewal by secret ballot; and
3. The Head of the Department considers the recommendation of the tenured faculty.

If, following the above-mentioned process, the Department Head decides against renewing the appointment of an untenured, tenure-track assistant professor, she or he drafts a memorandum addressed to the faculty member, routed through the Senior Associate Dean and Dean. The memorandum informs the candidate of the decision and explains how adequate consideration of the faculty member’s performance is the basis for the decision. The candidate must receive such memorandum prior to May 31 of the academic year during which the mid-term review took place.

A tenure-track assistant professor who receives a non-renewal notice at the outcome of the mid-term review remains employed by her or his department on a full-time basis during the subsequent academic year. Her or his employment with the university and Mays Business School terminates on May 31 of the academic year that immediately follows the non-renewal decision.

A successful outcome of the mid-term review process does not guarantee any particular outcome for the mandatory (tenure) review process.

7.4 Non-reappointment of Untenured Assistant Professors at Other Times

The period prior to or immediately following the outcome of the mid-term review provides an opportunity for the Dean, Senior Associate Dean, Department Head, and tenured faculty to evaluate the performance of assistant professors when considering renewal of their faculty appointments.

A non-reappointment decision regarding a tenure-track assistant professor may also occur outside the mid-term review process. Because assistant professors receive annual renewals of their appointment, a non-renewal decision may take place at any other time. However, the standard of “adequate consideration” continues to apply. When a non-renewal decision occurs for an untenured assistant professor at a time other than that of the mid-term review, Department Heads meet the standard of “adequate consideration” as follows:

1. Department Heads assemble and provide to the Senior Associate Dean significant evidence of major performance deficiencies, which, in the opinion of the Department Head result in a very low likelihood of a successful promotion and tenure decision. Documentation of these deficiencies is in the form of annual review letters, written reprimands, or other evidence that is acceptable to the Senior Associate Dean. Example of such deficiencies include pervasive and repeated insubordination and unsatisfactory evaluations; and
2. Department Heads obtain, by secret ballot, a vote of the majority of the tenured faculty in the department in favor of non-renewal. The tenured faculty must have access to the evidence mentioned in the previous paragraph and must be given ample opportunity to deliberate before the vote takes place; and
3. Department Heads seek the approval of the Senior Associate Dean and Dean before making the non-renewal decision.

Due to the absence of a peer-review process at the college level, Mays reserves non-renewal decisions outside the mid-term review process for the most serious, egregious cases when continuation of the faculty member’s appointment is clearly detrimental to the vision and mission of Mays Business School.

Decisions to renew a candidate’s appointment in any particular year, or over a period of time, do not guarantee any particular outcome for the mid-term review process or for the mandatory (tenure) review process.

If a non-tenured faculty member alleges that the non-reappointment decision results from a violation of academic freedom, a violation of civil rights, or any other form of illegal discrimination, the faculty member may appeal the decision with the President of Texas A&M University within twenty (20) business days of receiving the formal non-reappointment decision. (University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Sections 9.2 and 9.3).

7.5 Non-reappointment of Academic Professional Track faculty

Renewal of appointments for APT faculty members is “At Will,” both in the case of annual appointments and in the case of multi-year appointments. “At Will” means that the Department Head, with the Senior Associate Dean’s approval, may decide to not renew the appointment for any reason or for no particular reason, provided that a decision to not renew a faculty member’s appointment has no coverage by a statutory exception or by a common law exception.

(Exceptions to “At Will” are available on the website of the Texas Workforce Commission at https://www.twc.texas.gov/news/efte/wrongful_discharge.html.)

APT faculty members who do not receive a renewal of their appointment receive notification of their non-renewal decision in writing within a “reasonable time” from when the department has decided against renewal, except when University Rule 12.01.99.M1 requires one-year advance notice.

APT faculty members are entitled to receive one-year advance notice as indicated in the table below.

Rank	Faculty members entitled to receive one-year advance notice of non-renewal	
	Years of Full-Time Service	
	Fewer than five	Five or more
Adjunct Assistant Professor	No	No
Adjunct Associate Professor	No	No
Adjunct Professor	No	No
Visiting Assistant Professor	No	No
Visiting Associate Professor	No	No
Visiting Professor	No	No
Assistant Lecturer	No	No

Lecturer	No	Yes
Senior Lecturer	Yes	Yes
Principal Lecturer	Yes	Yes
Clinical Assistant Professor	No	Yes
Clinical Associate Professor	Yes	Yes
Clinical Professor	Yes	Yes
Assistant Professor of Practice	No	Yes
Associate Professor of Practice	Yes	Yes
Professor of Practice	Yes	Yes

A major programmatic revision or a budgetary cutback are the basis for exceptions to the one-year advance notice requirement. The Department Head submits such requests, with appropriate documentation, through the Senior Associate Dean, Dean, and Vice President for Faculty Affairs to the President of Texas A&M University for approval.

An APT faculty member who does not receive a renewal may present a grievance in person to the Dean. The Dean considers the grievance and renders a decision, which is final.

8. Post-Tenure Review

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once every year but no less often than once every six years after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at an institution. The evaluation considers the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research and publication, scholarship, or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities. This evaluation includes peer review of the faculty member.

This comprehensive evaluation is one part of the Periodic Review and the Post-Tenure Review process. For tenured faculty members, the Post-Tenure Review seeks to promote continued academic professional development. The review also enables a faculty member who has fallen below performance expectations and norms for her or his academic rank to pursue a peer-coordinated development plan. Resulting from effective implementation of this plan are improvements by an individual with respect to her or his performance in one or more of the three performance areas—teaching, research and publication, and service. Post-Tenure Review has two components:

- (1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6 above) conducted by a faculty member's Department Head (or another person responsible for completing an annual review of the faculty member's performance)
- (2) Period Peer Review by a committee of peers (see section 8.2 below)

8.1 Purpose

The purposes of the Periodic Peer Review are to:

- Assess whether an individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member holding a particular rank
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development
- Assist faculty members in efforts to enhance their professional skills and goals
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

8.2 Periodic Peer Review Committee

The following guidelines describe the formation of the committee in charge of evaluating Associate Professors and Professors for the purpose of the Periodic Peer Review:

- For Associate Professors and Professors who hold an endowed position (a chair or a professorship), *and who are reappointed to an endowed position*, the Periodic Peer Review committee is the Mays Research Council. The Periodic Peer Review occurs concurrently with the review the Research Council conducts to appoint (or reappoint) an individual to an endowed position.
- For Associate Professors and Professors *not holding an endowed chair or professorship*, or for *those who do not receive a reappointment to an endowed position*, those holding the rank of Professor in a faculty member's department form the Periodic Peer Review committee. This committee formation process applies when the faculty member's Department Head is not a member of the committee and when at least three faculty members are eligible to serve (that is, the department has at least three eligible Professors). If less than three faculty members are eligible to serve, the Dean appoints Professors from other departments to serve on the Periodic Peer Review committee so that a minimum of three Professors comprise the committee. For any faculty members of the same rank in the same department undergoing review in the same year, the committee members must be the same.

8.3 Process

8.3.1. Process when Research Council Makes a Favorable Recommendation on the Appointment to an Endowed Position

For Associate Professors and Professors for whom the Research Council recommends, by majority vote, in favor of reappointment to an endowed position, the periodic review

concludes with the submission of such recommendation to the Senior Associate Dean. At that time, Mays concludes that the faculty member has had an effective performance in all areas of activity for the purpose of the Periodic Peer Review.

Appointments to a different type of endowed positions also satisfy the requirements of the Periodic Peer Review. These include faculty members serving previously in an endowed professorship position who receive an appointment to an endowed chair, or those previously serving in an endowed chair position who are appointed to an endowed professorship.

However, if the Research Council, by majority vote, recommends against reappointment to any endowed position of any type, Mays convenes a Periodic Peer Review committee to review the case, as explained in sub-section 8.3.2.

8.3.3 Process in All other Cases.

In all other cases, the Periodic Peer Review follows the process outlined in this Sub-Section. This includes cases where the Mays Research Council reviews an individual's performance and recommends against reappointment to an endowed position and cases where a stand-alone Periodic Peer Review committee at the department level reviews the faculty member.

Additionally, an individual experiencing a Periodic Peer Review prepares a one-page document describing the allocations of her or his time among research and publication, teaching, and service during the relevant six-year period with respect to these three performance areas.

8.3.2.1 Materials Submitted

The materials submitted are comprehensive in nature. Because of this, they typically provide information and data that inform the conduct of a Periodic Peer Review. However, faculty members and administrators may use additional materials when they deem them helpful. A faculty member's assigned duties are the basis for completing a Periodic Peer Review. Members of committees evaluate a faculty member's performance to determine if it meets the expectations of a tenured member of the department's faculty.

8.3.2.2 Materials Reviewed

The Periodic Peer Review committee reviews materials submitted by the individual experiencing such a review and then prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The committee provides an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings are identical to those used for Annual Performance Reviews (*excellent, effective, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory*).

8.3.2.3 Effective Performance

If the Periodic Peer Review committee assesses a faculty member's performance to be *effective*, she or he will experience another review after six years as specified by School and University guidelines. However, receiving three consecutive ratings of *unsatisfactory* during Annual Performance Reviews completed by a faculty member's Department Head triggers a Periodic Peer Review.

8.3.2.4 Unsatisfactory Performance

For a tenured Associate Professor and for a tenured Professor, a finding of *unsatisfactory* performance in any performance area during a Periodic Peer Review process shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria featured in these guidelines. An *unsatisfactory* Periodic Peer Review triggers a Professional Development Review (see section 8.4 below).

8.3.2.5 Needs Improvement Performance in Two Categories

For a tenured Associate Professor and for a tenured Professor, a finding of *needs improvement* in any two of the three performance areas during a Periodic Peer Review process shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria featured in these guidelines. A finding of *needs improvement* in any two of the three performance areas triggers a Professional Development Review.

8.3.2.6 Needs Improvement Performance in a Single Category

For a tenured Associate Professor and for a tenured Professor, a finding of *needs improvement* in a single category during a Periodic Peer Review requires a specific, written explanation of the identified deficiencies. This explanation informs the immediate development of a near-term improvement plan. The faculty member and her or his Department Head collaborate to develop the improvement plan.

8.3.2.7 Tenured Faculty with Joint Appointments

For a tenured Associate Professor and for a tenured Professor with budgeted joint appointments, University and School guidelines of the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (that is, where her or his Ad Loc resides) determines the conduct of the Period Peer Review, unless the faculty member requests a review by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department, the Department Head shares the report with her or his counterpart in the secondary unit.

8.3.3 Submitting to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs

No later than May 31 of a year, each Department Head provides a list of faculty members undergoing a Periodic Peer Review during the current academic year to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, through the Senior Associate Dean and Dean. Also

provided to these parties are the outcomes of the reviews completed and the dates of the last Periodic Peer Review the faculty members experienced. The Department Head places these documents into a faculty member's personnel file.

8.4 Professional Development Review

A Professional Development Review takes place when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall *unsatisfactory* annual review ratings or an *unsatisfactory* Periodic Peer Review, or upon a faculty member's request. The Department Head informs the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review and of the nature and procedures of the review. When substantive mitigating circumstances exist (e.g., illness), a Department Head, with the consent of the Senior Associate Dean, may recommend that the faculty member be exempt from a Professional Development Review during that academic year. The Dean has final approval of such a recommendation. If the results of the Professional Development Review identify substantial or chronic deficiencies with respect to a faculty member's performance, the review committee describes the deficiencies in writing. The faculty member, Department Head, Senior Associate Dean and Dean receive a copy of the written report. The faculty member, review committee, and Department Head then work together to prepare a Professional Development Plan that the Dean finds acceptable.

The purposes of a Professional Development Review are to: (1) identify and acknowledge officially substantial or chronic deficiencies in performance, (2) develop a specific Professional Development Plan by which to remedy deficiencies, and (3) monitor progress toward taking the actions specified in the Professional Development Plan.

An ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee) conducts the Professional Development Review, unless the faculty member requests that the Department Head conduct it. The Dean appoints the three-member ad hoc faculty review committee in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean, the Department Head and faculty member for whom a review is to take place. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities, as directed by the Dean in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean.

Individuals holding the rank of Professor form the three-person ad hoc review committee. The Dean consults with the faculty member who is to receive a review and her or his Department Head to identify the Professors in the relevant department with interests and experiences aligned most closely with those of the faculty member scheduled for a review.

The faculty member scheduled for a review prepares 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 that a Professional Development Review is to occur. The dossier includes all materials submitted by the faculty member. Although review dossiers will differ, at a minimum, each dossier includes a copy of the faculty

member's current *Curriculum Vitae*, a teaching portfolio, and a statement detailing current research, scholarship, or creative work.

The Department Head adds to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials the Department Head adds 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 Professional Development Review process.

The Professional Development Review occurs in a timely fashion (normally less than three months after the faculty member under review submits the initial dossier). The Professional Development Review results in one of three possible outcomes:

- The results of the report identify no deficiencies. The committee informs the faculty member, Department Head, the Senior Associate Dean, and Dean in writing about this outcome. The committee's report suspends the outcome described in the prior annual review.
- The committee finds some deficiencies, but concludes that they are not substantial or chronic. The review committee details the deficiencies in writing and provides a copy of that document to the faculty member, the Department Head, the Senior Associate Dean, and the Dean.
- The committee finds substantial or chronic deficiencies when completing its work. The review committee details the deficiencies in writing and provides a copy of that document to the faculty member, Department Head, the Senior Associate Dean, and Dean. The faculty member, review committee, Department Head and Senior Associate Dean then collaborate to develop a Professional Development Plan that the Dean accepts.

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan indicates the remedies for specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental or college-wide performance criteria and indicators). The Professional Development Plan grows out of a collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the Department Head, the Senior Associate Dean, and the Dean. The plan should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and Mays Business School. A faculty member participates in forming a Professional Development Plan. A faculty member has an obligation to be a part of efforts to develop a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement it.

Individual circumstances dictate the development of individual Professional Development Plans. In all instances though, a plan: (1) identifies specific deficiencies requiring attention; (2) defines specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the

deficiencies; (3) outlines activities to undertake to achieve desired outcomes; (4) sets timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving outcomes; (5) indicates the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan; and (6) identifies institutional resources needed to support the plan.

8.5.1 Assessment

The faculty member and Department Head meet annually to review her or his progress toward remedying deficiencies. The review committee, the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean receive annual progress reports from Department Heads. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular performance evaluation process (e.g., Annual Performance Reviews) may draw from the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals of her or his Professional Development Plan.

8.5.2 Completing the Professional Development Plan

When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the Professional Development Plan, the Department Head prepares and sends a final report to the faculty member, the Senior Associate Dean, and Dean. Completing the Professional Development Plan successfully is the positive outcome all parties seek through this process. Re-engaging a faculty member's talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community.

If after consulting with the review committee the Department Head, Senior Associate Dean and Dean agree that the faculty member failed to meet the Professional Development Plan's goals and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may begin under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

8.6 Appeal

If at any point during the process a faculty member believes that unfair use of post-tenure review provisions occurs, she or he may file a grievance under the provisions of University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01 "Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights."

If the faculty member wishes to challenge the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to a specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, she or he can appeal to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. After consulting with the faculty member, Department Head, and Dean, the decision of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs regarding the committee's composition is final.

If a faculty member wants to challenge the validity of the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, she or he may appeal the finding to the Dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final.

If the faculty member, Department Head, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan that is acceptable to the Dean, mediation directed by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs is the path through which a plan takes shape.

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 her or his Department Head.

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 ten years must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he or she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than ten years, may also be considered." Faculty titles eligible for emeritus status include Professor, Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice, Associate Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Associate Professor of Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor of Practice, Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Lecturer.

9.1 Process

The process for emeritus appointment begins *after* the candidate separates from the university.

- Each candidate for emeritus status submits a comprehensive *Curriculum Vita* to her or his Department Head
- All faculty members eligible, those holding tenured positions, receive and evaluate the candidate's *Curriculum Vitae*
- Eligible faculty vote "yes," "no," or "abstain" regarding an individual's candidacy for a position of emeritus faculty
- The Department Head prepares a memorandum stating her or his recommendation, the manner in which the faculty member performed in the areas of research and publication, teaching, and service that merits emeritus status and indicates if the individual retired in good status; the Department Head routes the memorandum, along with the candidate's *Curriculum Vitae*, to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs through the Senior Associate Dean and Dean
- The Senior Associate Dean and Dean review the Department Head's recommendation, and forward the Dean's recommendation to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

For candidates who are not attached to an academic department, the Senior Associate Dean, in consultation with the heads of the academic departments, appoints an ad-hoc committee of at least five members to review the Curriculum Vitae and to vote on the individual's candidacy for emeritus faculty.

The emeritus designation may be requested to be added to an administrative title (Dean, Provost, Vice President, Vice Provost or Associate Provost) when a faculty member either leaves the administrative position and returns to his/her full-time faculty position or leaves the university. The Provost and Chief Academic Officer initiates nominations for emeritus designation for a Dean, Vice President, Vice Provost or Associate Provost; the President receives these requests. The President initiates nominations for emeritus designation for a Provost and Chief Academic Officer. Recommendations from the President go to the Chancellor, who makes recommendations to the Board of Regents for their confirmation.

9.2 Eligibility Criteria

Faculty members are eligible for the emeritus designation if they have made a positive contribution to the mission of the university and have retired from the university in good standing. Good standing means that the faculty member demonstrated conduct "in a manner consistent with the code of ethical conduct in accordance with System Policy 07.01, Ethics, throughout the individual's employment."

The Senior Associate Dean, with the concurrence of the Dean, determines if the faculty member was in "good standing" at the time of separation from the university. The tenured faculty and Department Head jointly determine if the faculty member made a positive contribution to the mission of the university and to Mays' vision and mission. Meeting the above-mentioned standards is sufficient for the emeritus designation.

9.3 Privileges

Emeritus faculty are encouraged to continue their participation in the many varied activities associated with campus life and, consistent with established policies, to avail themselves of University facilities.

With appropriate approval, emeritus personnel can receive invitations to participate in graduate faculty activities and to accept appointment on graduate committees.

Emeritus faculty may retain access to their Mays email account and may remain listed in the Mays directory. Emeritus faculty must notify their Department Head of their preferences as soon as possible following approval of the emeritus title.

Emeritus faculty may request office space through the Department Head. The Department Head, in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean, is responsible for determining whether appropriate space is available and for assessing the extent to which the emeritus faculty member contributes directly to department's mission and goals.

Office space granted to emeritus faculty may be different from prior assigned space. The Dean, in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean is the final authority for initial and subsequent office assignments to emeritus faculty. Therefore, Department Heads should address requests for space allocation to the Senior Associate Dean and provide a brief justification for the request. Department Heads may elect to require brief reports of activities from emeritus faculty annually in preparation for seeking approval for office space.

Appendix A: Transition to Retirement Program

A.1 Overview

The Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program (TRP) offers eligible faculty members the opportunity to make a staged transition from full-time faculty status to retirement. The TRP allows faculty members to retain tenure and some benefits while decreasing responsibilities and commitments according to a predetermined schedule. The application form appears at the end of this appendix.

A.2 Eligibility

A full-time faculty member is eligible to apply for the TRP if at the time of proposed entry into the program the individual:

- Holds tenure at Texas A&M University
- Has completed at least ten years of full-time employment at Texas A&M University
- Earned a performance evaluation of *effective* or better in the categories of teaching, research and publication, and service during the most recent academic year
- Holds an Ad Loc position in Mays Business School
- Receives 100% of her or his pay from Mays Business School.

A.3 Phased Transition Period

By participating in the TRP, eligible faculty members elect to reduce their percentage of effort for a defined phased transition period (normally up to a maximum of three years). Using then current Mays criteria and guidelines, departments continue evaluating the performance of those pursuing the transition program. Typically, the expectation is that a person involved with the TRP will concentrate on teaching during the transition period. These individuals must earn a minimum rating of *effective* (and hopefully *excellent*) during the transition period when concentrating on teaching to retain program eligibility. Failure to earn at least an *effective* rating in teaching for those concentrating on that performance area results in possible discontinuance of the transitioning program.

A desire to concentrate on research and publication during the transition process is possible. A request to emphasize research and publication while transitioning to retirement must receive Department Head approval and subsequently, approval by the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean. Faculty members concentrating on research and publication during the transition program must earn a minimal rating of *effective* (and hopefully *excellent*) regarding research and publication to maintain program eligibility. Failure to earn at least an *effective* rating in research and publication for those concentrating on this performance area results in possible discontinuance of the program.

Participating faculty members retain their tenure and faculty title (e.g., Professor, Associate Professor) during the phased transition period. At the end of the phased

transition period, participating faculty members relinquish tenure and separate from employment by retiring. Faculty members agree to relinquish tenure and separate employment at the date mutually agreed upon before the phased transition period begins; this agreement is irrevocable (subject to conditions detailed in Section A.4).

A.4 Modifying the Phased Transition Period

During the phased transition period, a participating faculty member may petition for an extension or other modification(s). A participating faculty member may also choose to resign before the end of the predetermined phased transition period. No approval is required; but to allow an affected department time needed to adjust its plans regarding teaching in particular, a program participant should inform her or his Department Head of her or his intention at least one semester in advance.

A.5 Percentage Effort and Workload

During the phased transition period, a participating faculty member receives an appointment at no more than 75% effort (75% FTE) or less. Workload and compensation during the phased transition period is determined in advance as part of the written agreement. It is important to note that any reduction in FTE below 75% but higher than or equal to 50% results in a reduction in the employer's state group insurance premium (SGIP). Any reduction below 50% FTE results in employee ineligibility for tenure and for SGIP coverage.

Workload and compensation may be constant over the course of the transition period or may vary by a predetermined amount during the period of the transition. For example, an individual may propose to be at 75% FTE in the first year, 50% FTE in the second year, and 25% FTE in the third year. University policies regarding SGIP coverage should inform an individual's decisions regarding variances in work percentages across time.

Workload and compensation may be constant within a given year or workload and compensation may be unbalanced. For example, if a participating faculty member has a 50% appointment the appointment may be 50% over the full nine-month academic year or it could be at a rate of 100% effort for four and one-half months and zero percent effort for the remaining four and one-half months.

In all cases the distribution of courses taught during an individual's participation in the TRP may not have a negative effect on a department's academic programs.

A.6 Compensation and Benefits

Participating faculty members receive compensation according to their percentage of effort during the phased separation period (e.g., at 50% of their nine-month base salary if effort is 50% for the full nine-month period). Participation in TRP has implications for both benefit coverage and benefit costs. Accordingly, we encourage faculty members

considering participation in the TRP to consult the Texas A&M Division of Human Resources and Organizational Effectiveness for guidance on benefits both during the TRP and after separation.

A.7 Other Considerations

If an individual teaches in a Mays-sponsored program for additional compensation (e.g., CED, EMBA, PMBA, etc.) during the TRP, the compensation for such teaching is at the then contemporaneous standard pay rate offered to faculty who teach in these programs.

If at the time of entry into the TRP a faculty member holds an endowed position, she or he typically resigns it at the beginning of the agreed-upon transition period. This allows allocation of an endowed position to another Mays colleague working on a full-time basis. However, a faculty member may consult with the Senior Associate Dean and Dean regarding the possibility of retaining some portion of her or his endowed position. The Dean's decision regarding this possibility is final. If desired, an individual entering into a phased transition period may request appointment as an Emeritus Professorship Holder or as an Emeritus Chair Holder. The Dean has final approval regarding such requests. An individual relinquishing an endowed position when entering the transition program may request some research support by visiting with her or his Department Head. If supportive, but if the department lacks funds, the Department Head may submit a request for financial support to the Senior Associate Dean and Dean, who has final approval authority.

A.8 Process for Requesting Transition to Retirement

Eligible faculty members interested in participating in the TRP submit an application to the Dean through their Department Head and the Senior Associate Dean.

Applications must specify:

- the proposed date of entry into the TRP
- the proposed duration of the TRP, and
- the proposed workload and responsibilities during the TRP

For eligible faculty members with joint appointments all relevant unit heads must approve the proposal.

Once a TRP proposal receives approval, the Dean's office prepares, and the Dean signs, a formal Separation Agreement (the Agreement), which includes the participant's signature as well.

A.9 Administrative Provisions

The School may amend the TRP or terminate it if changes in funding, system policy or regulation, University rules, or other unforeseen circumstances require such actions.

***Application Form:
Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program Proposal***

Name _____

Title _____

Department _____

Proposed Start Date of Phased Transition Period _____

Proposed Date of Retirement from TAMU _____

Proposed workload and duties during phased transition period. Describe teaching expectations, research and publication commitments, and service obligations. Include additional pages if necessary:

I am applying for the Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program.

Signature of Faculty Member

Date

Approval:

The faculty member meets the eligibility criteria of the Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program. The proposed workload and duties meet the needs of the department.

Department Head Signature

Printed Name

Date

Senior Associate Dean Signature

Printed Name

Date

Dean Signature

Printed Name

Date

Appendix B: Guidelines for Faculty Workload, Summer Support, Travel, Meals, External Employment, and Teaching in Excess of 100%

B.1 Workload Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

In general, the norm is for Mays faculty members to be involved with teaching activities during each academic year. In this section, we describe the guidelines used to determine workloads for members of the Mays Business School faculty.

B.1.1. Nominal Teaching Loads

The following policies and guidelines inform teaching loads for Mays Business School tenured and tenure-track faculty without administrative appointments.

Three Courses per Year

An annual load of three courses per year applies in the following instances when a faculty member maintains an *effective* performance in teaching and service:

- Tenure-track assistant professors, during their first three years of employment with Mays Business School
- Faculty who have maintained for many years and continue to maintain an *excellent* research and publication record resulting in high levels of national and international visibility, as determined by the head of the department
- Faculty holding an endowed chair.

Four Courses per Year

An annual load of four courses is modal for faculty members who do not meet one of the three criteria mention above but who demonstrate on-going *effectiveness* in research and publication in combination with on-going *effectiveness* in teaching and service.

Five Courses per Year

An annual load of five courses is modal for faculty members whose performance in research and publication *needs improvement* and who demonstrate ongoing *effectiveness* in teaching and service.

Six Courses per Year

For faculty members who receive one or more ratings of *unsatisfactory* in research and publication during the most recent three years, an annual teaching load of six courses is the norm, provided that the faculty member demonstrates ongoing effectiveness in teaching and service.

B.1.2. Course Releases for Special Circumstances

B.1.2.1. Exceptional Teaching and Service

In addition to evaluating performance in the area of research and publication, Department Heads take into account other considerations such as the nature and scope of a faculty member's teaching and service contributions to the profession and/or the institution. In light of special teaching situations (such as individuals teaching large sections, remote learning courses through on-line delivery mechanisms, and/or other especially time-demanding classes) and/or special service situations (such as chairing a major university committee, providing *excellent* service to an inordinately large number of committees, or directing a high-impact educational program), adjustments to these workloads are possible in the form of one or two course releases per year. Any such adjustment applies only as long as the special circumstances exist.

B.1.2.2. Teaching in the Full-Time MBA Program

Faculty members who regularly teach two sections per year in the full-time MBA program receive a course release of one course section every two years and those who regularly teach one sections per year in the full-time MBA program receive a course release of one course section every four years.

B.1.2.3. One-time Course release for Assistant Professors

In exceptional cases, Department Heads may grant a one-time course release of one course section in an academic year to faculty members serving at the rank of assistant professors for competitive market reasons. Such an exemption is also possible when Mays requests an assistant professor to teach a new course that requires significant preparation. Department Heads may offer this course release only once during the period of time when the faculty member serves at the rank of Assistant Professor. The Senior Associate Dean approves these requests.

B.1.2.4. Teaching Large Sections

Faculty members who teach two large sections each semester will obtain one course release per semester. Typically, but not always, large sections are offered in courses that are part of the Common Body of Knowledge (CBK) or part of the Business Minor. The definition of a large section is the prerogative of the Dean, in consultation with the head of the department where the course is offered.

B.1.2.5. Coordinating Large Sections

Faculty members who coordinate CBK classes across multiple sections may obtain additional course release of up to one section per semester, as determined by the head of the department, provided that such coordination efforts are not included in the faculty member's service expectations.

B.1.2.6. Dean Approval Required for all other Cases

With the two exceptions noted above (teaching in the full-time MBA program and one-time course releases for assistant professors), teaching loads of less than three courses for tenured and tenure-track faculty members require approval from the Senior Associate Dean and Dean. In addition, the Dean and the Senior Associate Dean must also approve course releases in excess of two course sections per academic year.

The Senior Associate Dean and Dean also approve course loads higher than six courses a year for tenured and tenure track faculty. In rare instances, a tenured faculty member may choose to meet their service expectations through additional teaching.

B.1.3. Concentration of Teaching Loads

Without adverse effect on academic programs, a faculty member may request an unbalanced teaching load to block time for other professional activities. For instance, an individual with a three-course load may request that she or he teach the three courses in either a fall or a spring semester, allowing an individual to concentrate on research projects during the non-teaching semester.

If approved, the semester in which he or she lacks a teaching assignment does not allow a faculty member to conclude that she or he is on “paid leave” in any sense of this word.

During a non-teaching semester, a faculty member maintains an active presence in the department and continues fulfilling her or his service commitments. If a faculty member expects to be away from campus and outside the Bryan/College Station area for any meaningful amount of time during a non-teaching semester, she or he must complete an Alternative Work Location (AWL) form, unless the absence is related to approved business travel.

AWL requests require approval from the Department Head, Senior Associate Dean, Dean, and the appropriate university official in charge of personnel matters for faculty. Due to international taxation issues, Mays does not approve AWL requests for locations outside the United States. Mays considers exceptions to this policy; but only in rare and exceptional cases of *force majeure* and with the approval of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer. Approved AWL requests occur when absence from the campus yields benefits for Mays and when such absence permits continuing fulfillment of an individual’s assigned duties.

B.1.4. Course Buy-Out

Faculty who wish to “buy out” of one or more courses with a research grant during the academic year can do so with her or his Department Head’s approval. Mays reduces the nine-month base salary by 1/6 for each course the faculty member buys out.

B.1.5. Leave Without Pay

Faculty members who wish to take time off for personal reasons for a period ranging from 30 days to one academic year may request a Leave of Absence Without Pay through appropriate university channels.

B.2 Workload Guidelines for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

At Mays, most APT faculty choose teaching as the focus of their work, with research *or* service being a second performance area in which they contribute. Department Heads consult with APT faculty members to determine if research and publication *or* service will be their secondary area of emphasis.

With the approval of their Department Head, other APT faculty choose service as the focus of their work, with teaching being a second performance area in which they contribute.

B.2.1. Nominal Teaching Loads

Below, we list the nominal teaching loads for APT Faculty employed on a full-time basis in Mays Business School.

Clinical faculty:	six courses per academic year with normal service expectations, similar to those of tenured faculty
Executive faculty:	six courses per academic year with normal service expectations, similar to those of tenured faculty
	seven courses per academic year with a reduced level of service expectations
	eight courses per academic year with a minimal level of service expectations
Lecturer faculty:	eight courses per academic year and a minimal level of service expectations
	seven courses per academic year with a reduced level of service expectations
	six courses per academic year with normal service expectations, similar to those of tenured faculty
Visiting faculty:	two to eight courses per academic year depending upon the extent to which research, particularly high-impact research, is an expectation of the position. Mays expects visiting faculty with significant research expectations to have a nominal teaching load of two to four courses per year while those with significant

teaching and service expectations to have a nominal teaching load of five or six courses per year. Visiting faculty without any research or service expectations normally have a teaching load of eight courses per year.

Department Heads, in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean, are expected to establish standards for each of the three levels of service mentioned in these guidelines (normal, reduced, and minimal service expectations) and to communicate these standards to faculty members in their departments.

For APT faculty appointed on a part-time basis, Mays reduces the nominal teaching load in proportion to the percentage FTE appointment. When the reduction results in a fractional number of courses, Department Heads consult with the Senior Associate Dean about the appropriate teaching load.

Department Heads determine the nominal teaching loads of APT faculty taking into account the appropriate mix of teaching and service contributed by each faculty member.

B.2.2. Course Releases for Special Circumstances

B.2.2.1. Exceptional Teaching and Service

Department Heads take into account other considerations such as the nature and scope of a faculty member's teaching and service contributions to the profession and/or the institution. Special teaching and/or service situations may result in adjustments to a faculty member's teaching load. Delivering remote learning courses through on-line delivery mechanisms and other time-demanding classes are examples that might result in a reduced teaching load. Chairing a major university committee, providing *excellent* service to a large number of university and/or Mays committees and directing high-impact educational programs are examples of service responsibilities that might result in a reduced teaching load. Any such adjustment applies only as long as the special circumstances exist. Department Heads may choose to offer additional compensation rather than a teaching load reduction for some of these activities.

B.2.2.2. Teaching in the Full-Time MBA Program

Faculty members who regularly teach two sections per year in the full-time MBA program receive a course release of one course section every two years and those who regularly teach one sections per year in the full-time MBA program receive a course release of one course section every four years.

B.2.2.3. Research and Intellectual Contributions

With the approval of the Department Head and Senior Associate Dean, clinical faculty members who regularly publish their research in respected academic journals may receive course releases. Similarly, executive faculty members with ongoing intellectual

contributions that meet the AACSB scholarly practitioner standard may receive course releases.

B.2.2.4. Teaching Large Sections

Faculty members who teach two large sections each semester will obtain one course release per semester. Typically, but not always, large sections are associated with classes that are part of the Common Body of Knowledge (CBK) or part of the Business Minor program. The Dean determines the definition of a large section, in consultation with the head of the department where the class is offered.

B.2.2.5. Coordinating Large Sections

Faculty members who coordinate CBK classes across multiple sections may obtain additional course release of up to one section per semester, as determined by the head of the department, provided that such coordination efforts are not included in the faculty member's service expectations.

B.2.2.6. Dean Approval Required for all other Cases

Teaching loads of less than four courses per year for APT faculty members requires approval from the Senior Associate Dean.

B.2.3. Concentration of Teaching Loads

Without adverse effect on academic programs, an APT faculty member may request an unbalanced teaching load to block time for other professional activities. For instance, an APT faculty member with a teaching load of eight courses per year may request to teach five courses in the fall semester and three courses in the spring semester. This request might occur if the APT faculty member is serving on a University committee that has a heavier workload in fall terms compared to spring terms. The Department Head accommodates such requests if she or he concludes that accepting them supports the faculty member's efforts and does not harm the department's teaching mission.

If an APT faculty member obtains approval to concentrate his or her teaching load in a single semester, the semester in which he or she lacks a teaching assignment does not allow a faculty member to conclude that she or he is on "paid leave" in any sense of this word.

During a non-teaching semester, a faculty member maintains an active presence in the department and continues fulfilling her or his service commitments. If a faculty member expects to be away from campus and outside the Bryan/College Station area for any meaningful amount of time during a non-teaching semester, she or he must complete an Alternative Work Location (AWL) form, unless the absence is related to approved business travel.

B.2.4. Leave Without Pay

Faculty members who wish to take time off for personal reasons for a period ranging from 30 days to one academic year may request a Leave of Absence Without Pay through appropriate university channels.

B.3 Guidelines for Summer Support, External Employment, and Teaching in Excess of 100%

Subject to budget availability and continued excellence in the performance of assigned faculty responsibilities, faculty members at Mays Business School may earn summer salary support, as well as compensation for teaching in excess of 100%, as detailed in this Section.

B.3.1 Summer Salary Support for Research

The following guidelines are intended to positively encourage ongoing research productivity to ensure that our research culture moves Mays Business School toward our vision of national preeminence. Subject to budget availability and continued excellence in the performance of assigned faculty responsibilities, faculty members at Mays Business School may earn summer salary support for research, as detailed in this Section.

A tenure-track assistant professor who does not hold any endowed position typically earns two months of summer salary support for the first three years of employment, as specified in the offer letter. Tenure-track assistant professors will remain on a 3-course load with two months of summer research support until they are reviewed for promotion and tenure, conditional on a positive third-year review.

A tenured associate or full professor without an endowed position who publishes at least two peer-reviewed studies in A-level journals over the most recent 5-year window will maintain a 3-course teaching load and two months of summer research support.¹ A-level journals are defined to include each department's A-level journal list plus any other journal that is an A-level journal in another business field or base discipline (e.g., *American Economic Review*). See Appendix A for a list of A-level journals. A faculty member who does not publish at least two peer-reviewed studies in A-level journals over the most recent 5-year window may experience an increase in teaching load and a reduction in summer research support. In these situations, the Department Head will consult with the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, the Senior Associate Dean, and the Dean regarding changes to the faculty member's teaching load and summer research support.

A tenured faculty member who is the holder of an endowed professorship may use the income from the endowed professorship to receive up to one month of summer salary support for the duration of the appointment to the endowed professorship. A tenured associate or full professor with an endowed professorship who publishes at least two

peer-reviewed studies in A-level journals over the most recent 5- year window will maintain a 3-course teaching load and receive a second month of summer research support. A faculty member who does not publish at least two peer-reviewed studies in A-level journals over the most recent 5-year window may experience an increase in teaching load and may forfeit a second month of summer research support. In these situations, the Department Head will consult with the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, the Senior Associate Dean, and the Dean regarding changes to the faculty member's teaching load and summer research support.

A tenured faculty member who is the holder of an endowed chair may use the income from the endowed chair to receive up to two months of summer research support and will maintain a 3-course teaching load for the duration of the appointment to the endowed chair.

A faculty member who currently serves in a leadership role within Mays Business School and/or the University (e.g., Department Head, Associate Dean), or who serves as editor-in-chief or senior editor at an A-level journal, will not be subject to the same research productivity threshold. For summer salary support for administrative appointments see section **B.3.2.** of the *Mays Guidelines for Faculty Appointments and Evaluations*.

1 Although we use a three-year publication window in our annual performance review reports (i.e., to help with the determination of merit raises), for the purposes of determining adjustments to teaching loads and summer research support and given the dynamics at our top journals, we will use a 5-year window.

B.3.2 Summer Salary Support for Administrative Appointments, Service, Outreach, and Special Projects.

With the approval of the Department Head and subject to excellent performance in faculty duties, faculty members may earn up to one month of summer salary support for serving in the administrative capacity of program director.

With the approval of the Department Head, faculty members may also earn up to one month (and, in exceptional cases, up to two months) of summer salary support for the purpose of performing service, outreach, or other administrative duties that significantly advance the mission of Mays Business School, provided that clear indicators exist to assess the quality of the faculty member's contributions to Mays' mission.

B.3.3 Summer Salary Support for Teaching

Faculty members who teach during the summer are typically compensated with a fixed amount of pay per course section that is consistent with the practice of each specific department. Summer teaching may also be compensated through an extension of the faculty member's appointment beyond the nine-month academic year. However, these

cases are exceptional and reserved for faculty members who serve in program director capacities and whose summer teaching is an integral part of the program's educational curriculum.

B.3.4 Maximum Compensation and Exceptions

With the exception of administrative stipends, and with the exception of teaching in excess of 100%, a faculty member may not receive more than twelve months of pay during a fiscal year.

Administrative stipends are normally reserved for faculty members who serve as Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, Department Head, Associate Department Head, Assistant Department Head, and PhD Program Coordinator. The Dean may approve exceptions to this policy. Administrative stipends require approval from the Dean and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

B.3.5 Teaching in Excess of 100 percent

Teaching in excess of 100 percent is defined as teaching a number of course sections (or non-credit courses) that is higher than what is specified in the faculty member's appointment letter for the current fiscal year. Teaching in excess of 100 percent may not interfere with the faculty member's normal duties and responsibilities. Teaching in excess of 100 percent may be compensated, at the discretion of the department head, through an extension of the faculty member's appointment into the summer months (provided such extension does not result in a compensation that is superior to twelve months of salary) or through a request for supplemental compensation "in excess of 100%."

Transparency and Equity in Access to Supplemental Compensation Opportunities

- Departmental leadership shall establish a process to share supplemental compensation opportunities with all eligible faculty
 - Eligibility is based on domain expertise
 - Eligibility is based on existing workload
- The common supplemental compensation opportunities shall be standardized for rates of pay or ranges that allow for variation based on levels of qualification.
- Care shall be taken to ensure all qualified faculty meet teaching load expectations before providing supplemental compensation opportunities for a teaching need.

The head of the unit where the course is offered initiates the request for teaching in excess of 100%. If the faculty member is housed in a different unit, the request is first routed through the head of that unit. Where applicable, the request is also routed through the appropriate associate dean..

The head of the unit where the faculty member is housed provides the following information with each request for teaching in excess of 100%:

- A description of the faculty member's teaching load and other faculty duties that constitute 100% of his or her faculty appointment for the relevant fiscal year;
- Evidence that the faculty member has taught, or is scheduled to teach, the number of course sections specified in the appointment letter (discrepancies between assigned teaching and actual teaching will be explained in detail);
- A cumulative count of past teaching efforts in excess of 100%, beginning with September 1 of fiscal year during which the request is made.

Faculty members who seek to teach in excess of 100 percent recognize that their main responsibilities are to their regular, full-time faculty duties. They, therefore, give due regard to these responsibilities when determining the amount and character of work done in excess of 100 percent.

B.3.6 External Employment

External employment is defined as dependent or independent personal services an individual renders to an entity outside Texas A&M University in exchange for compensation. External employment also includes pro-bono activities (including services rendered to non-profit entities) but only when such pro-bono activities are related to the faculty member's professional responsibilities.

External employment includes activities that lead to business income opportunities with the exception of those related to passive business income. For example, the purchase of a publicly traded stock is an activity related to passive income and is not considered external employment. In contrast, active participation of the faculty member with a business in which he or she has financial interest is considered external employment.

Faculty members who seek external employment recognize that their paramount responsibilities are to the university rather than to these external entities. They, therefore, must give due regard to these responsibilities when determining the amount and character of work done outside of the university.

Faculty members must always obtain appropriate approvals prior to engaging in external employment.

B.3.7 Service to Non-Profit Organizations

Faculty members who provide service to, or have a controlling interest in, a non-profit organization whose mission is related to that of Texas A&M University must seek permission to engage in such activity through the external employment process.

In some cases, it will be necessary for the non-profit organization to seek an affiliation agreement with Mays Business School. Faculty members who preform services to non-profit organizations are expected to consult with the Senior Associate Dean to determine if this situation applies to them.

B.3.7 Departing Faculty Members

With the exception of summer support for teaching, faculty members will generally not earn summer support if they do not plan to return to Mays Business School as a full-time faculty member during the subsequent academic year. The Dean may authorize exceptions to this rule, particularly in the case of faculty members who retire from Mays Business School.

B.4 Guidelines for Faculty Members who Travel Outside Brazos Valley

For the purpose of this Section, we define Brazos Valley as the geographical region that includes the counties of Brazos, Burleson, Leon, Robertson, Washington, Grimes, and Madison within the State of Texas.

B.4.1 Business Travel

A faculty member who travels to a location outside Brazos Valley is considered in business travel status when the faculty member's presence at such a remote location is primarily for the benefit of the university. Examples include travel to attend a conference, visiting a donor or employer, or working with a co-author.

The supervisor of each faculty member approves business travel requests before the beginning of travel. In general, business travel is limited to a duration not to exceed three weeks. The Dean may approve exceptions to the three-week limit for business travel.

In the case of faculty members who travel to international locations under the terms of the university policy on International Temporary Work Location, the university, with the concurrence of the Dean, may extend the business travel period up to 60 days.

A faculty member who travels for business may be reimbursed for transportation, lodging, meals and incidental expenses, in accordance with the policies of Texas A&M University, subject to budget availability in the faculty member's professional development account, and provided that such expenses are not reimbursed by other entities. Faculty members who do not have a defined professional development account will discuss reimbursement limits with their department head prior to making travel arrangements. Faculty members who make travel arrangements before securing proper funding through the normal channels may be responsible for paying for some or all travel expenses from personal funds.

B.4.2 Faculty Development Leave Travel

A faculty member who travels to a remote location under the terms of an approved Faculty Development Leave (FDL) is considered in FDL travel status when the faculty member's presence at such remote location fulfills the terms of the approved FDL.

Examples include travel to a host university for one semester to engage with other scholars to complete research projects.

A faculty member who travels for FDL purposes may be reimbursed for transportation and lodging only, in accordance with the policies of Texas A&M University and subject to budget availability in the faculty member's professional development account, and provided that such expenses are not reimbursed by other entities. Transportation will be reimbursed for only one round-trip travel between the faculty member's residence and the FDL location, even if the faculty member makes multiple trips between these two locations. Lodging expenses will generally be capped at 50% of the daily lodging allowance established by the General Services Administration, by the US Department of State, or by such federal agency that has jurisdiction over the particular travel area.

A faculty member who takes a short-term business trip while on FDL will be reimbursed for direct expenses associated with such short-term business travel as indicated in Section B.4.1.

A faculty member who travels for personal reasons while on FDL will not be reimbursed for any direct expenses associated with such personal travel.

B.4.3 Alternate Work Location Travel

A faculty member who lives in, or travels to, a remote location outside Brazos Valley for a personal reason is considered in Alternate Work Location (AWL) status. The university approves all individual requests for faculty members who live or travel outside Brazos Valley.

A faculty member who travels between Brazos Valley and the Alternate Work Location may not be reimbursed for any travel-related expenses.

A faculty member who lives outside Brazos Valley under the terms of an approved AWL may be reimbursed for expenses related to business or FDL travel, but only when such travel (a) originates in Brazos Valley or at the alternate work location, and (b) is to a destination that is neither in Brazos Valley nor in the geographical vicinity of the Alternate Work Location.

B.4.4 Travel for the Purpose of External Employment

A faculty member who travels to a remote location outside Brazos Valley, or outside an approved Alternate Work Location, for the purpose of external employment is considered in personal travel status.

Mays does not reimburse travel expenses related to personal travel.

Faculty members who travel for external employment purposes obtain approval of their external employment engagement prior to travel.

B.5. Guidelines for Business Meals and Personal Meals while Traveling

B.5.1 Business Meals

Business meals and related events are an important aspect of activities faculty and staff undertake to discharge their duties. Recruiting, hosting donors and potential donors, hosting student events, and holding parties to honor high-quality work provided by Mays' faculty and staff are examples of business meals and related events that the school supports. As a general guideline, Mays' personnel involved with these events should be constrained to those whose participation clearly supports the business-related purpose of the event. This policy establishes general principles that should guide expenditures and reimbursements.

With this policy, the Dean will periodically provide a cost boundary regarding business meals and business-related events (to include food, alcohol, gratuity, and tax—as applicable) when hosting events. In particular, this guideline applies when recruiting faculty, dining with scholars who deliver research seminars, and hosting dinners to honor faculty and staff for their high-quality work. Requests for exceptions to this policy should route through the head of the department prior to the event occurring. The Dean, and the Senior Associate Dean are always available for consultation regarding requests falling outside the general parameter described herein.

B.5.2 Personal Meals

A personal meal is any meal that does not qualify as a business meal. Faculty members will receive reimbursement for personal meals only when they are in business travel status (defined in Section B.4.1 above) and only when such travel involves one or more nights away from the faculty member's residence.

Faculty members will claim a reasonable amount of reimbursement for personal meals. In all cases, the university does not reimburse alcohol consumed with personal meals.

Appendix C: Promotion and Tenure Dossier

Candidates for promotion and/or promotion with tenure assume the lead role in preparing a dossier for various parties' review. At various stages in the review process, those responsible for individual stages of the process add appropriate materials to the dossier in Interfolio. The University may alter its format and content expectations for dossiers annually. Currently, the University is using Interfolio as the platform through which promotion and/or promotion and tenure packages reach the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

The dossier description that follows is relatively general in nature. Awareness of annual University requirements rests with individual candidates and reviewers (relative to their respective roles).

C.1. Dossier Materials Submitted by the Candidate

The sections of the dossier listed below are those that Mays expects the candidate to prepare and submit to the department for review. Currently, the candidate submits these materials through Interfolio by using the sections in the "Candidate Packet" portion of the Interfolio dossier.

Candidate's Statement on Teaching, Research, and Service

The candidate provides, in concise form (a maximum of three pages, single spaced), a statement describing his or her goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out her or his professional responsibilities with respect to teaching, research and publication, service and other relevant activities, if any. This statement provides a context for review of the file at each level; however, the statement is not for the candidate to make an argument for promotion or tenure.

The candidate's acknowledgment of the contents of the promotion and tenure dossier as submitted to the departmental review committee (not including outside letters) appears under the first section of the Interfolio dossier.

Candidate's Annotated Curriculum Vitae

A candidate's *Curriculum Vitae* should be concise and current when submitted for consideration.

Refereed publications appear separately from publications (or other creative works) that were not refereed. Complete documentation for each citation, including date of publication and inclusive page numbers, appears on the candidate's *Curriculum Vitae*.

Also presented separately are "in press" manuscripts (that is, those accepted but not published). The candidate includes the acceptance document (letter or email) in this section. Manuscripts under review appear in a separately captioned list. Where relevant

as evidence of research and publication performance, a candidate notes the amount of funded research as well as her or his role in the projects (for example, principal investigator, co-principal investigator, etc.).

Candidates must use the vita template provided by Faculty Affairs. Candidates should not alter the order or structure of items in the template. The template includes an annotation to specify authorship protocols within the discipline regarding order of authorship and contributions if not lead author. The grants section of the template should be used as is, without alteration and including all the indicated information. The template includes a 200-word biography of the candidate, which will be published in the recognition booklet featuring newly promoted and/or tenured faculty.

Candidates will be asked as part of submission to verify that the contents of their dossier are current and correct.

Candidate External/Internal Reviewer Checklist

The candidate submits a form, available from the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, disclosing the names of the external/internal reviewers she or he recommends to the department and the names of any potential reviewers on the “do not contact list.” In addition, the candidate certifies that the external reviewers he or she selected satisfy the University’s criteria and conditions.

Teaching Portfolio

To facilitate the evaluation of teaching, the candidate prepares and submits the following materials and items for review by the departmental promotion and tenure committee:

- Summary of teaching assignments and evaluations over the last five years
- Summary of graduate student committees and chairperson roles over the last five years
- Materials documenting instructional innovation(s)
- Listing of teaching awards
- Any other materials relevant to the performance indicators appearing in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Mays Guidelines for Faculty Appointments and Evaluations concerned with *excellence* and *effectiveness* in teaching.

Research Portfolio

For the evaluation of research performance, the candidate prepares and submits materials such as the following:

- List of publications with complete citations (including data of publications and inclusive page numbers) organized as:
 - Refereed journal articles
 - Books or chapters of books

- Proceedings and presentations
- Other, including non-refereed journals
- Work in progress
- Manuscripts accepted for publication but not published appear as “in press” entries; a received acceptance letter or email is included
- Submitted but unaccepted items/manuscripts appear in a separately captioned list
- Summary of reviewing and/or editorial activities
- List of research grant(s) and contract(s) funded and report(s) to sponsor(s)
- Other materials relevant to the indicators appearing in sections 4.5 and 4.6 in the document mentioned above concerning *excellence* and *effectiveness* in research and publication
- Reprints (copies) of three of the most significant publications.

Service Portfolio

To facilitate the evaluation of service, the candidate prepares and submits the following materials and items for review by the departmental promotion and tenure committee:

Evidence of *excellent* or *effective* performance in service engagements such as

- Officer, committee chair, or program chair in a professional organization(s)
- Program chair or a similar position for a national/international meeting(s)
- Administrative leadership role within Mays Business School and/or the University
- Officer or member of the Faculty Senate
- Chair or member of a major university, school, or departmental committee or task force
- Significant departmental, Mays Business School, University, or system administrative or service roles
- Service on a major governmental commission task force or board
- Attraction of significant external financial support or other contributions to external development efforts
- External activities that result in improved employment opportunities for Mays Students
- Advisor to a student organization
- Performance of administrative tasks within the department
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups performed on a *pro-bono* basis or in exchange of a nominal honorarium
- Service as a consultant to business organizations and/or governmental agencies
- Professional service to the local community and/or to the public at large that is commensurate with the faculty member’s responsibilities to Mays Business School
- Self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

Other Materials

This section of the dossier is for materials deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere. This might include unsolicited letters from students, peers or collaborators that were not part of a structured evaluation process or letters from TAMU faculty members. Annual performance evaluations by a candidate's Department Head and results from the mid-term review report may also appear in this section.

C.1.1. Exceptions for APT Faculty Members

Promotion decisions regarding APT faculty members do not require external review letters. Accordingly, APT candidates for promotion do not complete the *Candidate External/Internal Reviewer Checklist* section of the candidate dossier.

Moreover, APT candidates for promotion typically do not complete the *Research Portfolio* section. However, Clinical faculty members for whom research and publication is an expectation do complete that section. Even though these candidates complete the *Research Portfolio* section, they remain exempt from completing the *Candidate External/Internal Reviewer Checklist*.

C.1.2. Exceptions for Mid-Term Reviews

Mid-term reviews of assistant professors do not require external review letters. However, internal review letters may be included if requested by the Department Head. Accordingly, assistant professor candidates for mid-term reviews do not complete the *Candidate External/Internal Reviewer Checklist* section of the candidate dossier.

C.2. Dossier Materials Submitted by the Department and College

The sections of the dossier listed below are those that the department and college complete according to University guidelines. Currently, these sections fall within the "Internal Sections" category in Interfolio.

Summary Data Table

The Faculty Affairs Administrator generates a summary data table for each dossier, using the format prescribed by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The cover provides basic personnel data about the candidate.

External Reviewer Letters

External review letters are an essential component of the tenure and promotion review process for tenured, tenure-track, and research faculty. The purpose of external review letters is to provide an independent evaluation of the candidate's scholarly reputation and achievements in the discipline. Each dossier for tenure and promotion, tenure only, promotion to full professor and promotion for Research faculty is required to include a minimum of five (5) arm's length letters, although seven (7) is preferred. The

department should set a timeline for requests and reminders about letters to ensure that the minimum number of letters is obtained for review of the candidate.

The university does not require outside letters for academic professional track appointments (except for research track). However, departments and/or colleges/schools may require external letters in their units for some titles and not others, based on assigned responsibilities, expectations, and criteria. Internal evaluation letters can also be required by units for academic professional track faculty, and should convey an evaluative professional assessment of the impact demonstrated in the candidate dossier. Members of the P&T committee should not provide or be asked to provide internal evaluation letters. In units where letters are required or if faculty members choose to upload letters, they should be included in the “other materials” section and a reviewer chart should also be included.

Both the candidate and the department will generate lists of potential external reviewers. Candidates should NOT contact potential external reviewers themselves to inquire about their willingness to write a letter. From the candidate and department reviewer lists, a group of at least seven are selected and contacted by the Department Head or by the Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (when applicable) if the Department Head chooses to delegate this role to the Chair.

The department is responsible for ensuring receipt of least five letters. Thus, the person responsible for requesting and tracking the external reviewer letters (Department Head or Chair of the Departmental P&T Committee) follows up as needed to verify receipt and acknowledgment of the letters as well as acting on them the required timeline.

The selection of external reviewers follows the most current guidelines published by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

Department Heads take care in selecting external letter writers to ensure that:

1. They are persons whose objectivity is unquestionable – that is, no co-authors, longtime friends, former students, or former mentors (unless the department has more than the minimum five letters on hand)
2. They meet the requirements published by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.
3. The candidate did not identify any of the external letter writers as unacceptable.

The unit will verify that the external reviewers meet requirements using the External Reviewer Chart.

The recommendation is that each department solicit an equal number of letters for all candidates, and about equal numbers from the candidate and department list, but at least three must come from the department recommended reviewers.

The expectation is that departmental promotion and tenure committee, the Department Head, and the Dean will address negative comments appearing in outside letters as well as positive comments where the ultimate recommendation is negative. These comments inform the understanding of those who are part of the review process and provide them with additional information required to reach a decision.

External Reviewer Solicitation

Letters are solicited through Interfolio using the University Standard External Review template. College/schools will have the option to modify the solicitation letter based on the need of their discipline, but must obtain approval from the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs prior to making any changes. Department Heads who seek to solicit such modifications must seek permission and route their request through the Senior Associate Dean. Units can send a preliminary message to the potential reviewers to notify them of the upcoming request through Interfolio, but should not provide the candidate's dossier information as part of this message. Units will be asked to provide a short biography for each reviewer, highlighting specific qualifications and credentials, as part of the External Reviewer Chart.

External Review Chart

Information for all external reviewers contacted must be submitted as an excel file in the External Reviewer Chart. In this chart, the unit indicates which reviewers were suggested by the candidate and which by the unit, the reason for declination if known, a justification for the reviewer's qualifications if relevant, and a biography for the reviewer. The department head and dean should review this information during their evaluation and request that the department committee recruit additional letters if 1) the minimum number of five has not been reached, 2) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are not at peer institutions or programs, 3) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are not arms length from the candidate, or 4) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are associate professors on dossiers undergoing review for promotion to full. Files that reach Faculty Affairs that do not meet these requirements for external reviewer letters will be returned to the department to request additional letters.

Department P&T Committee Report & Recommendation

This section includes the eligibility for sitting on a departmental P&T committee, and the complete departmental report and recommendation.

In each department at Mays, the Departmental P&T committee includes all full-time faculty members serving at superior rank to that of the candidate receiving consideration for a promotion (or for promotion and tenure).

The chart below defines "superior rank" and guides eligibility for membership on the Departmental P&T committee.

Rank of faculty member being reviewed	Tenured faculty rank?	Rank eligible for tenure?	Superior ranks for the purpose of serving in the Departmental P&T committee
Professor	Yes		N/A
Associate Professor	Yes		Professor
Assistant Professor	No	Yes	Associate Professor, Professor
Clinical Professor	No	No	N/A
Clinical Associate Professor	No	No	Clinical Professor, Professor
Clinical Assistant Professor	No	No	Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Associate Professor, Professor
Professor of Practice	No	No	N/A
Associate Professor of Practice	No	No	Professor of Practice, Professor
Assistant Professor of Practice	No	No	Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice, Associate Professor, Professor
Principal Lecturer	No	No	N/A
Senior Lecturer	No	No	Principal Lecturer, Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice, Professor
Lecturer	No	No	Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice, Associate Professor, Professor

A comprehensive evaluation should be carried out for all areas of responsibility for the candidate. The department P&T committee prepares a summary report with separate sections focused on each of the candidate's assigned areas, which can include teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities. For Academic Professional Track faculty, the report should focus on their areas of responsibility; if a candidate has contributed beyond those assigned areas, this can be noted in the summary of the discussion. The report also includes a section to summarize the discussion of the committee about the candidate's overall dossier. Each section of this report must be written by a member of the P&T committee who is eligible to vote. Each section of this report should be prepared by a different committee member (e.g., one member prepares the teaching sections; one member prepares the research activity section). Authorship of each report section should be made clear by listing the names of the individual(s).

The departmental evaluation of teaching includes one or more of the following items, as appropriate:

- Peer evaluation of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods to determine levels of scope, rigor and quality of the candidate's course offerings
- Comments from peers regarding a candidate's student ratings. Also prepared are summaries of the student evaluations, a longitudinal perspective regarding a candidate's teaching performance, and an analysis of numerical data within the context of departmental standards and norms. This document contains a listing by academic year of the courses taught. In brief, a complete chronological summary of student ratings of an individual's teaching over a five-year period (as applicable) appears in tabular form. However, the basis of evaluations of an individual's teaching performance includes more than student ratings
- Peer evaluation of development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses
- Peer evaluation of special efforts the candidate made to improve her or his teaching or to develop new teaching materials
- Peer evaluation of publications with a teaching focus in refereed journals, including journals dedicated to education in the faculty member's discipline
- Documentation and evaluation of participation in honors programs and development of honors courses (if any participation)
- List of awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, with explanation as appropriate.
- List of external invited presentations describing and discussing teaching innovations
- List of competitive, refereed, externally funded grants for projects with a strong teaching focus
- Evaluations by former students or exiting students, if gathered in an unbiased way
- Evaluation of publication of instructional materials, including textbooks
- Other evidence of teaching quality as deemed important by the department and as evaluated by peers
- Peer evaluation of the candidate's performance in classroom teaching situations. This evaluation includes mention of the methods and frequency of observation as well as criteria for assessment of performance. If a department engages in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of a candidate's service to develop her or his teaching ability, these evaluations are natural additions to the

dossier. Faculty engaged in the review of classroom instruction are to be familiar with the process of effective observation of instruction. The Center for Teaching Excellence is a resource for information on the effective observation of classroom instruction.

At a minimum, a table including the following information should be provided to the candidates and must be included and analyzed in the teaching section of the report:

Year	Semester	Course Number	Course Section	Credits	Course Title	Enrollment	Candidate Rating Question 1*	Appropriate Average for Question 1*	Candidate Rating Questions 2*	A	A	Q

*Departments decide which question(s) for the student course evaluations will be considered. These questions should be the same for all faculty within the unit. The department and the candidate should work together to determine the appropriate comparison for the candidate ratings. It makes no sense to compare the candidate ratings to all courses taught at all levels in the department. Rather, it makes the most sense to compare the candidate ratings to similar courses in the department or the college/school. For example, if the candidate teaches a 200 level core curriculum course to meet the program requirement, which serves both students in the department and students from many other majors, the best comparison might be the average of all 200 level core curriculum courses offered in the college/school.

The indicators of *effectiveness* and *excellence* in research and publication (see sections 4.5 and 4.6 of this document) serve as the basis for committee’s assessment. External reviewers’ letters are extremely important when evaluating an individual’s research productivity. Assertions of “quality” of publications and research require evidence. When using grant activity as an indicator of research quality, the candidate includes information about the extent of peer review in the competitive process.

Peer evaluation of the quality of service to the candidate’s department, Mays Business School, University, or other relevant constituencies is part of the review process. This section of the report may also include service beyond the campus, such as service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

A section of the report may also include the departmental evaluation of the quality of other activities, if any, that are relevant to the visions and/or missions of the University, Mays Business School, and the candidate’s department. No information appears in this section if it lacks relevance with respect to the candidate’s performance.

This report documents the analysis and assessment of each area of responsibility assigned to the candidate. It should not repeat information that can be found elsewhere

in the dossier. It should refer to the external reviewer letters and other materials without directly quoting them. Those who review the candidate's dossier should not interpret a lack of response from a reviewer as a negative statement against the candidate.

The report from the P&T committee must include a section that summarized the discussion of the committee about the qualification of the candidate, and offers an advisory recommendation about the case. The main purpose of this section is to convey the essence of the departmental committee's discussion and vote regarding the candidate's performance and impact of their work as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure. The summary discussion section should address all areas of assigned responsibility, including teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities, as applicable to the candidate. The collegiality of the faculty member is not relevant to this discussion and should not be included in the report; if there are issues with faculty conduct, they should be addressed by the department head through personnel actions; if the issue is unresolved, the department head will document as part of the dossier.

Avoid summarizing information that can be found in other documents, although that information can be referenced. The summary discussion section should clearly highlight the impact (or lack thereof) of the work of the candidate in the context of their field. The summary section should not include quotes, minutes, or transcripts of the discussion. The summary discussion section should address any negative comments made by the external reviewers. Avoiding such comments calls into question the quality of the analysis by the department P&T committee.

The summary discussion section should make it clear that adequate consideration was given to all areas of the candidate's faculty responsibilities, and that the recommendation is based on a set of written and widely circulated promotion and tenure guidelines promulgated by the unit. The summary discussion section should reflect the vote, such that positive evaluative statements are associated with positive votes, mixed statements are associated with mixed votes, and negative evaluative statements are associated with negative votes. A mixed vote requires further explanation of both the candidate's demonstrated abilities and the committee's concerns.

The summary discussion section should reflect the essence of the evaluative concerns and support regarding the candidate's case, and the committee's recommended action. For example, "the majority thought the quantity of publications was good, but questioned the quality," or "a minority was concerned about the rate of productivity," or "the research and scholarly publications were excellent but a few committee members expressed concerns about the quality of the teaching." The summary discussion section should summarize the most relevant issues brought up during the committee discussion and which will explain the outcome of the vote. Discussion and views of any minority or dissenting faculty should be reflected in the discussion report.

A table should be prepared as part of the summary discussion section that lists the committee members and their titles, and has a place for signatures. All committee

members should review the contents of the committee report and recommendations and indicate agreement that the document reflects the discussion and voting outcome with their signature. Electronic signatures obtained via DocuSign are acceptable when completed from the committee member’s DocuSign account.

At the conclusion of the committee discussion, a vote should be taken of eligible faculty following unit guidelines.

The vote of the committee must be included in the summary discussion section, as formatted in the table below:

	Yes	No	Absent	Recused	Total Eligible
Votes					

**Note that for appointment or promotion with tenure, only one table should be included*

- Abstain votes are not allowed.
- Absent should be used for a committee member with a justified absence (professional
- travel, illness, faculty development leave). Absent should not be used for a committee
- member who does not wish to participate or review the dossier.
- Members with a conflict of interest must recuse themselves (e.g. a relative of the
- candidate; a graduate or post-doc advisor).
- All votes across should add to make up the total eligible

The vote of the P&T committee must be included in the summary discussion section, as formatted in the table above. A brief justification should be included for recusals or absences.

Department Head Recommendation

This section includes the Department Head’s independent assessment of the candidate. She or he includes in this section a discussion of the peer review committee’s evaluations and recommendations as well as the external letters and any further evaluation she or he wishes to make.

This report should include a discussion of the departmental P&T committee evaluations and recommendations, as well as the external letters (if applicable) and any further evaluation the Department Head desires to offer. An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate’s scope (quality, productivity overtime) and impact of her or his performance in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific discipline and departmental vision, mission, expectations and criteria.

School P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendation

This section includes the complete report and recommendation of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee. Similar to the departmental P&T committee report, this document reflects the college committee's discussion, primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other, and the final committee vote. The documentation of the votes of the College P&T Committee is the same as the Department P&T Committee requirements. This report addresses the candidate's accomplishments and her or his impact in the context of the college's goals and expectations. An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate's impact in all the areas of responsibility in the context of the specific discipline and college Mays' vision, mission, expectations and criteria.

All committee members review the contents of its discussion report and recommendations and indicate agreement that the document reflects the discussion and voting outcome with their signature. Electronic signatures obtained via DocuSign are acceptable when completed from the committee member's DocuSign account.

Dean Recommendation

This section includes the Dean's independent evaluation and recommendation. Similar to the Department Head's report, the Dean's report is an analysis of the case that provides a general basis for strengths or weakness, addresses any mixed or negative votes, and explains the vote of the Dean. If the Dean's vote is contrary to any departmental or college recommendations that fact should be clearly and specifically addressed.

The report from the Dean should make an independent determination helpful in laying out the case without merely summarizing or quoting other materials in the package. An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate's impact in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific discipline and college mission, goals, expectations and criteria. This is especially important for cases that have generated strong differences in recommendation during the evaluation process.

Other Materials and Documentation

This section includes other materials and documentation deemed pertinent to the case, but not placed in one of the other sections. Letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process are example of other materials that could be included. Annual performance evaluations by the Department Head and mid-term review reports to the candidate may also be included in this section. However, publications and student evaluations do not appear in this section.

Appendix D: Hiring Faculty with Tenure Review-upon-Hire and/or at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor

D.1. Regular Process

Hiring external faculty candidates with tenure review-upon-hire and/or at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor follows as closely as possible the process used for the granting of tenure and/or promotion for current Mays faculty members. The exception is that it is possible to submit such requests outside of the standard promotion and tenure cycle.

Accordingly, the Department Head of the potential hiring department assumes responsibility for creating a dossier that includes all of the documents required of internal candidates. The current process calls for using Interfolio to assemble the review documents (as indicated in Appendix C), followed by a submission of the complete P&T packet in the Faculty Affairs Portal.

D.2. Expedited Tenure Review for the Rank of Professor

In exceptional cases (full professors with tenure from peer or aspirant institutions, national academy members, recipients of a Nobel Prize), candidates for tenured positions at the rank of Professor are eligible for an expedited tenure review. The expedited process applies for both tenure and appointment at rank.

The process for Expedited Tenure Review is the same as that used for internal candidates, with the following exceptions:

- The Department Head requests a minimum of three arms-length external review letters, in addition to reference letters received as part of the hiring package. Department Heads consult with the Office of the Dean about the process for requesting these three arms' length external reviews.
- It is not necessary to receive individual reports on teaching, research and publication and service reports as long as the department committee's summary report addresses teaching, research and service.
- In cases of time pressure, the review by departmental and the Mays Promotion and Tenure committees may be conducted electronically. However, P&T committees must make every effort to meet and discuss the expedited tenure case under review.

D.3. Contingencies in Offer Letters

A department is free to make its own hiring recommendation decisions prior to completing the dossier. Moreover, with the consent of the Office of the Dean, candidates may receive an offer prior to the official completion of the tenure and promotion review process. In such cases, however, the offer letter must indicate that the offer at rank

and/or with tenure upon hire arrival is contingent on a positive outcome of the tenure and review process at all levels.

Given the lead times necessary to obtain external letters and to prepare dossiers, Department Heads keep all relevant parties informed as to their intentions regarding hiring with tenure upon hire and/or at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. For example, it may be useful to discuss anticipated hiring recommendations with the chair of the Mays promotion and tenure committee in advance.

If a department desires to appoint a newly hired faculty member to an endowed chair or to an endowed professorship, assistant or associate professorship (in addition to tenure and/or advanced rank), the Mays Research Council also reviews the dossier and makes recommendations to the Dean regarding the candidate's qualifications for an endowed position. Typically, the Mays Research Council completes its review after the Mays promotion and tenure committee completes its review. In some cases, however, these reviews may occur simultaneously. However, since the appointment to an endowed position requires approval by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, the offer letter to the candidate indicates that such appointment is subject to final approval at the university level.

Appendix E: University Distinguished Professor Nomination Guidelines

Submitting nominations for the University Distinguished Professor award is the Dean of Mays Business School's prerogative. No candidate advances to the university selection committee without a Dean's recommendation.

However, to achieve fairness and transparency, each college adopts an internal selection process that is consistent with university requirements. Additionally, college Deans prepare and make available to faculty a document outlining college procedures to include the selection process used in the college as well as the criteria for selecting UDP candidates.

At Mays Business School, the selection process and nomination criteria appear in this Appendix.

Mays Business School forwards no more than three nominations each academic year. However, the School may not forward any nominations in one or multiple academic years.

E.1. Eligibility Criteria

E.1.1 Scope of the Award

The University Distinguished Professor (UDP) award is an honorific title recognizing extraordinary contributions as well as national and international eminence in the area of research. The words traditionally used to describe the contributions of a University Distinguished Professor are *transformational*, *seminal*, and *impactful*. The university and Mays Business School believe these words connote outcomes from a scholar's research portfolio that demonstrate eminence in her or his field. These words represent the fundamental criteria for the UDP award.

The definition and use of the term "research" encompass all creative and scholarly contributions in our business disciplines, consistent with the culture of each discipline.

Mays expects each business discipline to have metrics and qualitative measures that define eminence (as specified in the paragraph above) and extraordinary standing among peers. The context of an academic discipline informs the use of these factors to evaluate a candidate for the University Distinguished Professor award.

The eligibility criteria and selection process detailed in this Appendix follow the published university guidelines.

E.1.2. Eligibility

A candidate for the UDP award must be viewed as eminent in his or her field and as someone who is, without question, in the "top 2%" of his or her peer group. At Mays

Business School, the peer group is the group of full professors in the candidate's discipline with full-time faculty appointments at peer and aspirational universities.

The "top 2%" assessment is a qualitative, not statistical, evaluation. Meritorious performance in teaching and service, however excellent, do not receive consideration in selecting UDP award nominees.

Faculty eminence indicates that peers recognize an individual's contributions as truly exceptional with respect to one or more performance dimensions. Faculty eminence accrues to a field's intellectual leaders.

Commonly, research is the basis of faculty eminence. The research of individuals achieving eminence creates significant value for the knowledge stock of their academic domain and transforms the direction of scholarly research within that domain. Through their work, faculty achieving eminence move current paradigms forward and/or develop new paradigms. Those achieving eminence in their field produce research that is of the highest quality relative to peers' work. Eminence indicates that individuals possess standing in their discipline as agents of change primarily because of the force of their ideas and the influence of those ideas on problems others identify to study.

Multiple indicators determine faculty eminence. These indicators include many of those demonstrating research excellence as presented in this document. In this sense, those achieving faculty eminence satisfy many of the indicators of research excellence *as well as* at least some of the additional indicators shown here in alphabetical order:

- Appearance of a special issue of a top-tier journal around a topic for which an individual is known to be an intellectual leader or for which an individual moved a paradigm forward or developed a new paradigm
- Consistent flow of PhD students to work with an individual scholar primarily to study a topic for which that person is known to be an intellectual leader or the developer of a new paradigm or the shifting of an existing paradigm in a meaningful manner
- High citation counts (e.g., Google Scholar, h-index, i-10 index) on an *overall basis*
- High citation counts (e.g., Google Scholar, h-index, i-10 index) *relative to peers* participating in the domains of a discipline in which an individual works
- Recognition by reputable external bodies that an individual's citation count places them in the top two percent of his or her peers
- Recipient of one or more of the most prestigious research awards offered in the individual's discipline
- Serving as editor of one of the journals in an individual's discipline that is recognized widely as among the top three or four for that field
- Standing as a fellow in the most prestigious national and/or international association(s) that is (are) part of an individual's discipline
- Validation by national and international scholars of an individual's standing as among the top two percent most influential scholars in their discipline

- Evidence of one or more original or transformational contributions that many others in an academic discipline recognize to have significantly advanced or redirected scholarship in the relevant field
 - Transformational implies that the work was a substantial intellectual leap forward, rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge
 - Moreover, the impact of the candidate's contribution should result in the candidate's recognition as a pre-eminent world authority in his or her field.

These indicators serve as guidelines for faculty candidates, for external reviewers, for the Mays faculty review committee, for the Dean of Mays Business School, and for the University Distinguished Professors' Review Committee. The ultimate determination, however, is whether, through the evidence submitted, faculty candidates have established their broad-based standing by meaningfully transforming scholarly research in their discipline and being uniformly considered among the top two percent of researchers by their national and international peers. Some candidates may be stronger in one area than in another. Nevertheless, the overall conclusion should be that the faculty candidate is viewed as eminent in his or her field. Mere presentation of evidence that relates to one or more of the listed indicators does not, by itself, imply that the faculty candidate is eminent. The evidence must be weighed and evaluated as part of the review process. If the Mays faculty review committee, or the Dean of Mays Business School, determine that the evidence submitted does not fully establish that the faculty candidate is eminent, or raises underlying questions regarding the faculty member's qualifications, the review committee, or the Dean, may request additional evidence.

The following accomplishments, in themselves, are insufficient to qualify for the University Distinguished Professor award:

- A substantial and sustained record of high-quality research productivity;
- Testing, applying and/or implementing original work done by others.

In addition, while distinguished professor nominees are typically excellent teachers and mentors, these criteria do not factor into the analysis of a nomination of an individual to receive a UDP award. Accordingly, comments about teaching accomplishments are absent in the nomination package.

Candidates must be active, full-time faculty members at Texas A&M University for a minimum of one year before nomination and consideration for the title of University Distinguished Professor. The rules of the faculty senate determine the full-time status of a faculty member.

Candidates may hold administrative assignments; but administrative competency is not an evaluation criterion.

Mays requires a minimum of ten letters of evaluation from leading scholars in a candidate's field. Mays seeks letters written by distinguished researchers from national and international academic institutions. At least four of the letters should be from international scholars. The letters should confirm that the candidate meets the meritorious standards set forth above and that accordingly, the letter writer endorses the granting of a UDP award to the candidate.

E.2 Nomination Process

At Mays Business School, the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship (ADRS) is the "unit head" in charge of the nomination process for UDP awards.

Department Heads typically initiate the nomination process for UDP. Other paths through which nominations surface are: (a) a current UDP at Mays, (b) a submission from the Mays Research Council (by majority vote), or (c) through petition from three or more faculty members.

All UDP nominations within a department go first to the Department Head. No formal letter is necessary at this stage because the ADRS writes the formal nomination letter at the conclusion of the review process.

When the nominator is a person other than the Department Head, the nominator sends a short email to the Department Head to nominate the candidate. When the Department Head receives such email, or if the Department Head is the nominator, the Department Head contacts the candidate to assess his or her interest in receiving a nomination for the UDP award.

If the candidate accepts the nomination, the Department Head directs the candidate to prepare his or her dossier as described below in Section E.2.1.

The initiation of the nomination process occurs annually through an announcement from the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

E.2.1 Role of the Candidate

A candidate receiving a nomination for a UDP award submits to the Department Head the following information:

1. A complete *Curriculum Vitae* that satisfies the following specifications:
 - Refereed publications (or other types of creative works) listed separately from non-refereed publications, with the lists captioned accordingly
 - Complete documentation for each citation, including a date of publication and inclusive page numbers
 - Items accepted but not published receive this designation; items that are under review, but not accepted, appear in a separately captioned list

- If any coauthors are the candidate's graduate students (past or present), they are delineated in such a manner that this relationship is discernible
 - Any major invited presentations and major awards won. For awards, the candidate provides a brief description of the selectivity and process for winning such an award.
2. The names of six outside reviewers who are distinguished researchers at peer or aspirational schools, and/or at leading international universities.
- The reviewers are individuals at universities of high repute, similarly ranked and distinguished scholars in the business discipline of the candidate; the preference is for letters from scholars who are qualified to hold the same rank and distinction as the candidate if they were faculty members at Texas A&M University
 - Between two and three of the outside reviewers hold positions at leading international universities
 - In addition to their professional accomplishments, reviewers are persons whose objectivity is unquestionable – that is, reviewers may not be co-authors, longtime friends, former students, or former mentors of the candidate
 - The candidate submits a statement discussing the credentials and qualifications of the outside reviewers
 - The candidate submits a signed statement certifying that each reviewer meets the stated arm's length criteria.
3. A detailed statement of three to five pages in length, emphasizing the candidate's transformational contributions to the discipline, with specific reference of how these contributions satisfy the departmental criteria developed by the faculty and approved by the Dean (see Section E.1, above).

E.2.2 Role of the Department Head

Upon receipt of the candidate's materials, the Department Head verifies that the dossier is complete, and that there is approval from the Dean's office of the list of criteria, metrics, measures, and characteristics, quantitative and qualitative, that define the assessment of faculty eminence in their respective business disciplines, as required in Section E.1., above.

The Department Head then forwards the candidate's materials to the ADRS and to the Senior Associate Dean.

E.2.3 Role of the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship

The ADRS approves the list of reviewers the candidate selected, for compliance to these guidelines.

Subsequently, the ADRS selects six additional outside reviewers who are distinguished researchers at peer or aspirational schools, and/or at leading international universities.

- The reviewers are individuals at universities of high repute, similarly ranked and distinguished scholars in the candidate’s business discipline; the preference is for letters from scholars with qualifications to hold the same rank and distinction as the candidate if they were faculty members at Texas A&M University
- Between two and three of the outside reviewers hold faculty positions at leading international universities
- In addition to their professional accomplishments, reviewers are persons whose objectivity is unquestionable – that is, reviewers may not be no co-authors, longtime friends, former students, or former mentors of the candidate
- The ADRS prepares a statement discussing the credentials and qualifications of the outside reviewers
- The ADRS submits a signed statement certifying that each of the reviewers satisfies the stated arm’s length criteria.

The ADRS solicits outside letters of reference from the twelve outside reviewers (those recommended by the candidate and those selected by the ADRS). When soliciting outside letters, the ADRS:

- Explains the criteria and standards required for the UDP award at Texas A&M University
- Includes the candidate’s statement and *Curriculum Vitae*
- Solicits from each reviewer a specific evaluation of the candidate in relation to the criteria set forth in Section E.1, emphasizing that the evaluation must provide a rank of the candidate’s pre-eminence in the discipline in relation to peers, and that it must specifically identify and discuss one or more original or transformational contributions of the nominee and the impact of those contributions
- Includes the following statement “Your letter will be kept confidential; however, under Texas law your letter may be relinquished through an open records request.”

The ARDS includes a copy of the written request in the appropriate section of the candidate’s dossier (see below).

The ADRS is responsible for ensuring that no fewer than ten external letter writers submit a letter for subsequent review.

The ADRS documents all cases when an outside reviewer declines to write a letter, or fails to write the letter after accepting the invitation previously. The ADRS also documents any reasons given by outside reviewers for declining the invitation or for not being able to complete the letter.

E.2.4 Role of Faculty UDP Review Committee

After receiving the review letters, the ADRS forms a *Faculty UDP Review Committee*. All full-time Mays faculty members holding the title or the rank of University Distinguished Professor are part of this Committee. The ADRS, in consultation with the Dean and with the university-level DP Executive Committee, may invite UDPs from other colleges to join the Committee.

The ADRS convenes a meeting of the Committee at a time when all voting committee members are available. At the beginning of their meeting, Committee members elect a committee Chair by secret ballot. The Senior Associate Dean or the ADRS administers the vote. The ballot format appears at the end of this subsection.

The committee holds a meeting (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of the candidate. A quorum is present when no more than one voting member is absent.

The ADRS attends attend the meeting of the Faculty UDP Review Committee. The role of the ADRS is to serve as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if individuals present inaccurate statements, the ADRS shares information to assist in clarifying or presenting the facts. However, the ADRS abstains from efforts to influence the thinking or voting of the faculty. For instance, the ADRS avoids championing or advocating for a positive or negative outcome. The ADRS has no vote on the committee.

Voting faculty members must attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote. Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote; however, within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting, such individuals may write a separate letter, addressed to the ADRS, containing their personal recommendation. The letter may inform the recommendation made by the ADRS but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

The Committee reviews the candidate's dossier and outside review letters and recommends to the ADRS whether Mays Business School should nominate the candidate for the UDP award.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Committee drafts a written report addressed to the ADRS. With specificity, the report evaluates the extent to which:

- The candidate is thought to be pre-eminent in his or her own field (at a minimum, the candidate must be among the top 2% of active researchers in his or her area of research or scholarship among full professors at leading and aspirational institutions)
- The candidate has made at least one highly documented transformational contribution (i.e. the work caused a substantial intellectual leap forward in the discipline rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge)

- The candidate has had a major impact on his/her field (i.e. his/her work is central in any narrative of the field, and many scholars conclude that her or his scholarship redirected conversations in the field).

The report concludes with an overall summary of the candidate's qualifications in relation to the UDP nomination criteria, and provides a specific recommendation to the ADRS for or against forwarding the nomination to the university level.

If four or more nominees receive review in any particular year, the Committee also drafts a separate recommendation addressed to the ADRS to recommend which nominees, if any, who should advance for consideration at the university level, keeping in mind that no more than three nominees may go forward in any given year.

A secret ballot reflects the committee's recommendation. Ballot formats include paper and ballot box, or an online voting or survey platform where each committee member receives a unique, anonymous link to cast a vote. If an online platform is the choice, the administrator of the voting process ensures that no committee member may vote more than once and that the vote of each committee member remains secret to all parties involved in the process. For example, if Qualtrics is the voting method in use, ballot secrecy happens by choosing the following settings for a survey "by invitation only" and "anonymous."

E.2.5 Role of the Senior Associate Dean

The Senior Associate Dean ensures that all stages of the nomination process remain in compliance with this Appendix and with applicable college and university guidelines.

The Senior Associate Dean is also responsible for submitting a complete dossier to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs at the conclusion of the review process.

The Senior Associate Dean may attend the meeting of the Faculty UDP Review Committee unless otherwise requested in writing by a majority of the voting members of the committee to abstain from doing so. If the Senior Associate Dean attends the meeting, he or she serves as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if individuals present inaccurate statements, the Senior Associate Dean shares information to assist in clarifying or presenting the facts. However, the Senior Associate Dean abstains from efforts to influence the thinking or voting of the faculty. For instance, the Senior Associate Dean avoids championing or advocating for a positive or negative outcome. The Senior Associate Dean has no vote on the committee.

At the request of the Dean, or in cases of a vacancy in the ADRS position, the Senior Associate Dean may substitute for the ADRS during any or all stages of the review process. Alternatively, with the concurrence of the Dean, the Senior Associate Dean may appoint a senior chaired professor to perform the role of the ADRS during the review process.

E.2.6 The Joint Roles of ADRS and Dean

After receiving the report of the UDP committee, the ADRS performs her or his own independent assessment of the candidate.

If the ADRS supports the nomination, he or she prepares a detailed *Statement on Quality and Impact of the Candidate as a Scholar*. The statement specifically addresses the extent to which:

- The candidate is thought to be pre-eminent in his or her own field (at a minimum, the candidate must be among the top 2% of active researchers in his or her business discipline scholarship among full professors at leading and aspirational institutions)
- The candidate has made at least one highly documented transformational contribution (i.e. the work caused a substantial intellectual leap forward in the discipline rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge)
- The candidate has had a major impact in his/her field (i.e. his/her work is central in any narrative of the field, and he/she is widely recognized to have redirected scholarship in the field).

The Statement also provides a detailed description of the process used to select the outside reviewers.

The ADRS forwards the nomination dossier to the Dean through the Senior Associate Dean. If the Dean agrees with the ADRS's recommendation, the Dean writes a short affirmation and returns the complete dossier to the Senior Associate Dean who forwards it to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

If the ADRS does not support the nomination, she or he will inform the candidate that the nomination will not move forward to the university level. The candidate may appeal the ADRS' decision to the Dean.

The expectation of this process is that the Dean follows the recommendation of the ADRS except under very rare and unusual circumstances that receive clear explanation.

If the Dean agrees with the ADRS decision, the Dean informs the candidate and the case does not move forward to the university.

If the Dean disagrees with the ADRS decision, the Dean writes the *Detailed Statement on Quality and Impact of the Candidate as a Scholar* and the Senior Associate Dean forwards the dossier to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The statement specifically addresses the extent to which:

- The candidate is considered pre-eminent in his or her own field (at a minimum, the candidate must be among the top 2% of active researchers in his or her area of research or scholarship among full professors at leading and aspirational institutions)

- The candidate has made at least one highly documented transformational contribution (i.e. the work caused a substantial intellectual leap forward in the discipline rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge)
- The candidate has had a major impact in his/her field (i.e. his/her work is central in any narrative of the field, and she or he is a person many prominent scholars see as producing work that redirected scholarship in the field).

The Statement also provides a detailed description of the process used to select the outside reviewers.

In all cases, the Dean's decision is final.

E.3 Nomination Dossier

E.3.1. Materials Submitted by the Candidate

The candidate who accepts the nomination submits to his or her Department Head the following materials to initiate the review process:

1. A complete *Curriculum Vitae* that meets the specifications of Section E.2.1
2. The names of six outside reviewers who meet the criteria mentioned in Section E.2.1
3. A detailed statement of three to five pages in length, emphasizing the candidate's transformational contributions to the discipline, with specific reference of how these contributions meet the departmental criteria developed by the faculty and approved by the Dean (see Section E.1, above)
4. A short verification statement by the candidate that accurately identifies the materials submitted for review.

E.3.2 Materials Submitted by the Department Head

The Department Head submits to the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship the following documents:

1. The dossier submitted by the candidate (item E.3.1, above)
2. A list of criteria, metrics, measures, and characteristics, quantitative and qualitative, that define the assessment of faculty eminence in their respective business disciplines, as required in Section E.1., above; this list requires previous approval by the Office of the Dean.

E.3.3 Materials Submitted by the Dean

The Dean submits the following materials for review at the university level:

1. The form titled “Dossier Cover Sheet – University Distinguished Professor” provided by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.
2. *A Statement on Quality and Impact of the Candidate as a Scholar* prepared by the ADRS or Dean, as mentioned above in Section E.2.6
 - a. If the ADRS is the author of this Statement, the Dean includes a short letter of affirmation and support
 - b. This section also includes the departmental criteria, metrics, measures, and characteristics, quantitative and qualitative, that define the assessment of faculty eminence in their respective business disciplines, as required in Section E.1., above
3. The candidate’s complete *Curriculum Vitae* (item #1 of Section E.2.1)
4. A minimum of ten outside review letters obtained using the process described in Section E.2.
 - a. This section includes copies of the written requests the ADRS sent to solicit these letters
 - b. We also include clear documentation of the internal Mays process used to identify and select the outside reviewers
5. The report of prepared by the Faculty UDP Review Committee (Section E.2.4)
6. The following biographical materials
 - a. A 250-word paragraph in Word format that includes the following information, in this order:
 - i. Name
 - ii. Terminal degree, year, and institution
 - iii. Year they joined the Texas A&M faculty
 - iv. Area(s) of specialty
 - v. Description of her or his contribution to the scholarship in the candidate’s field.
 - vi. Any notable honors or awards received
 - b. A digital photograph that is a head or upper-body shot, in which the head is one inch high. Digital photos are of high quality with a minimum of 300 dpi.

Appendix F: Ethics and Professional Conduct

F.1. General Principles of Ethical and Professional Conduct

To promote an academic environment that fosters respect for sharing intellectual ideas and protecting academic freedom in the pursuit of knowledge while reinforcing the core values of Texas A&M University, Mays Business School adopts the following standards and principles of ethical and professional conduct to which faculty and staff members must adhere. In this regard, faculty and staff should:

1. Treat all colleagues with respect.
2. Give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within Mays Business School in determining the amount and character of work done outside of it.
3. Create a welcoming and inclusive environment that values and respects the contributions of all members.
4. Act in accordance with the public trust placed in them by the state of Texas and make decisions solely in terms of the public interest.
5. Recuse themselves from any decision processes that may involve financial or other benefits received by them. This includes matters related to administrative appointments, merit raises, awards, or the assignment of teaching activities that earn additional revenue. Instead, they should escalate the decision authority to their supervisor or to an appropriate individual appointed by the Dean. The same applies to situations where the beneficiary is a member of the individual's immediate family. If the beneficiary is the Dean, or a member of the Dean's immediate family, the decision authority is escalated to the Office of the Provost.
6. Recuse themselves from any decision processes that may involve financial or other benefits received by an individual who is in their direct supervisory chain. Instead, they should escalate the decision authority to the next higher level in the supervisory chain. The same applies to situations where the beneficiary is an immediate family member of an individual who is in the direct supervisory chain. If the beneficiary is the Dean, or a member of the Dean's immediate family, the decision authority is escalated to the Office of the Provost.
7. Base all decisions on legitimate academic considerations in a manner that is open, transparent, and based on metrics that are fair and equitable to all. Opportunities for earning additional revenue from sources within Mays Business School should be made available to all qualified faculty or staff members.
8. Maintain proper decorum, characterized by good temper and moderation, in their interactions with members of the university community and external constituencies. There is no hard and fast definition of proper decorum. Whether something said or done is a breach of decorum depends on the context.

Generally, faculty and staff members should refrain from making disparaging personal remarks about other members of the university community. Any abusive or insulting language, imputations of false or concealed motives, or misrepresentation of statements made by another member of the university community, should not be tolerated. Accusations of deliberate falsehood or unethical behavior should not be made without the accused being afforded due process to defend against such accusations.

Nothing in the above guidelines is intended to limit the rights of faculty and staff members to enjoy the benefits of academic freedom or to abridge the constitutionally protected rights to express freely their opinions on matters of public concern.

F.2. Due Process, Corrective Actions, and Remedies

F.2.1. Due Process

Allegations of unethical or unprofessional conduct that involve violations of civil rights are to be referred immediately to the appropriate unit on campus that is authorized to conduct such investigations. As of the date of this document, that unit is the Department of Civil Rights and Equity Investigations.

All other allegations of unethical or unprofessional conduct are referred initially to the respondent's appropriate supervisor. Generally, the appropriate supervisor will be the head of the unit where the conduct is alleged to have occurred, except that if the respondent is the unit head, the case will be referred to the next level in the supervisory chain, and if two or more persons in the supervisory chain are respondents to the allegation, the case will be referred to the lowest-ranked administrator in the supervisory chain who is not the subject of such allegation. When a supervisor cannot be easily identified, the Dean will appoint a faculty member to serve as supervisor, invested with the necessary authority to conduct an investigation. Allegations of unethical conduct pertaining to the Dean will be referred to the Office of the Provost.

Upon being presented with an allegation of unethical conduct, the supervisor will address the matter immediately, using the most appropriate investigative approach, taking into account the nature of the allegations. This approach may include one or more of the following:

- i. Conversations, dialogue or external mediation involving the respondent and/or aggrieved parties;
- ii. Investigation conducted by an independent ad hoc faculty and/or staff committee (provided that the findings of such committee are advisory to the supervisor);
- iii. Consultations with appropriate individuals at Texas A&M University (for cases involving entities at Texas A&M University outside Mays Business School) or appropriate external bodies (for entities outside of Texas A&M University). Any

cases involving other universities should be routed through the Office of the Provost.

When necessary, the supervisor should consult with the Office of the Dean before selecting the appropriate investigative approach. In some cases, the Dean may consult with appropriate university officials before deciding on the best course of action.

In all investigative procedures the burden of proof remains with the university, and the standard of proof is that of clear and convincing evidence.

Any investigation into the alleged conduct is to remain independent of any other investigation or proceeding involving the particular respondent, and the existence of any such other investigation or proceeding will not in itself be considered as evidence.

At the conclusion of this review process the supervisor will make a determination about the alleged unethical or unprofessional conduct and, if the supervisor determines that such unethical or unprofessional conduct has occurred, the supervisor shall further implement (with administrative approvals) appropriate corrective actions and remedies as described below.

If the supervisor does not act on reports of unethical conduct, the aggrieved party is expected to bring the case to the attention of the next person in the supervisory chain. If the supervisor is the Dean, the case shall be referred to the Office of the Provost.

F.2.2. Corrective Actions and Remedies

The corrective actions for the respondent may range from warnings to potential termination of employment, in accordance with applicable University rules and System policies. Corrective actions will generally depend upon the severity of the case.

The remedies for the aggrieved party may include but are not limited to receiving formal apologies, revisiting or reversing adverse academic or administrative decisions that are contrary to the provisions of these guidelines, changing the reporting structure, or moving the aggrieved party to another unit within Mays, provided that both the aggrieved party and the receiving unit are agreeable to such move.

With the exception of reports that are frivolous or demonstrably false, no one should take an adverse action (including both employment and financial actions) against a member of the Mays community for reporting unethical or unprofessional behavior committed by a faculty member. A report that is frivolous or demonstrably false is in itself evidence of unprofessional conduct. Allegations of filing false or frivolous reports will be handled in the same manner as are all other cases of unprofessional conduct.

A faculty member may grieve an adverse decision resulting from unprofessional or unethical behavior in accordance with established university grievance procedures.

Appendix G: Faculty Development Leave

G.1. Purpose

A Faculty Development Leave (FDL) provides an opportunity for tenured full-time faculty members to engage in transformational experiences through which they expand the impact of their scholarship. Faculty members should visit with their department head as they begin to plan for an FDL. Considering that only a limited number of FDL opportunities are available each year, as dictated by the university, department and school level approvals are likely to favor those applications proposing activities that advance the vision and mission of Mays Business School towards national and international preeminence.

G.2. Process and Deadlines

Mays Business School requires pre-approval of all FDA applications that are forwarded to the university for consideration. No later than May 1st during the academic year two years prior to the target FDL academic year, each department head may submit to the Senior Associate Dean no more than two nominations for pre-approval. (For example, May 1, 2023 is the nomination deadline for FDL activities proposed to take place during the 2024-2025 academic year.)

Each nomination package will include: (i) the nominee's resume, (ii) export control clearance (if applicable), and (iii) a short statement from the nominee (one page maximum) that contains the following information: (a) place(s) where the leave would take place, (b) activities that would occur during the leave, (c) benefits and expected impacts of the leave to the faculty member's research and teaching program, with a focus on how the proposed leave moves the school towards preeminence.

The export control clearance portion of the nomination package is only for proposed FDLs involving international activities. In all cases in which a proposed FDL includes one or more activities to take place outside the United States, or in collaboration with foreign nationals, the faculty member must seek export control clearance from university-level officials housed in the VPR's office. If such activities involve a country of concern, or collaboration with citizens of such country of concern, additional approval from the System Research Security Office is required. Faculty members will submit these approvals as part of the nomination package.

The Senior Associate Dean will convene the Mays Research Council to evaluate all nominations received before the May 1 deadline. The council will be charged to recommend which of the nominations, if any, should be forwarded to the Dean for consideration. If supported, the Dean will direct the faculty member to submit the formal FDL application through the university's process. In this sense, the council's recommendations are advisory to the Dean, who will select the school's nominees.

Each selected nominee will prepare a complete FDL application package for submission to the university prior to the published deadline (typically early in the fall semester following Mays Business School's evaluation process).

G.3. Change in Venue, Purpose, or other Terms of the FDL

Faculty members are required to seek approval from the Dean for any material changes in the purpose, venue, scope, or other terms of their proposed FDL activities. The Dean may consult with the Senior Associate Dean and with the Mays Research Council prior to rendering a decision. If such changes occur prior to the formal submission of an FDL application to the university, the approval authority is vested in the Dean. If such changes occur after the faculty member has formally submitted the FDL application to the university, the Dean will seek additional approvals at the university level.

Faculty members who seek to change the terms of their original FDL must submit a memo to the Vice President of Faculty Affairs, through the Department Head and Dean, explaining that the benefits of the FDL are not diminished as a result of the changes being contemplated.

G.4. Budgetary Guidelines

Subject to the usual annual limits for faculty development expenses, and provided that the faculty member does not receive reimbursement from other sources, a faculty member may use funds in his or her annual faculty development account (defined below) for the purpose of covering expenses mentioned in Section B.4.2 of Appendix B.

For faculty members holding an endowed position, the faculty development account is the one mentioned in Section 2.3.1.7 of these guidelines. For all other faculty members, the head of the department will communicate the amount of the faculty development account (if any) directly to the faculty member, usually (but not always) through annual appointment letters.

Under exceptional circumstances, faculty members may request permission from the Dean to carry over unused faculty development funds from the previous academic year to the academic year when the FDL is to occur. Faculty members are expected to justify the need for this additional funding and to explain how such funding, if granted, would enhance the outcome of the proposed FDL activities. Faculty members who wish to seek this permission will present their request in writing together with their nomination package, no later than May 1 during the academic year two years prior to the target FDL academic year.

The university may grant a FDL either for one academic year at one-half the faculty member's regular nine-month salary or for one-half academic year at the faculty member's full salary for four and one-half months. In the case of faculty members who chose the latter option, their nominal teaching load during the other half of the academic year will be one-half of their nominal teaching load for that academic year. If such

number is not an integer, and provided that the head of the department does not grant additional course releases for other valid reasons, the teaching load will be rounded up to the nearest integer.

A faculty member on FDL may not accept employment from any other person, corporation or government, without explicit approval from the Board of Regents of Texas A&M University System. In addition, the faculty member cannot accept teaching activities in excess of 100% in Mays and Texas A&M University programs during the duration of the FDL.

G.5. Report of FDL Activities

No later than three calendar months after concluding the FDL, the faculty member will submit to the Dean (with copies to the Senior Associate Dean and to the head of the department) a four-page report detailing the professional activities that took place during the FDL. The report will explain how these activities contributed to achieving the benefits of the FDL described in the original application.

G.6. Faculty who Previously Served in Administrative Positions

Faculty members who have served in an administrative position for a minimum of four years may, within the first 12 months after concluding such administrative appointment, apply for a FDL on the basis of being a former administrator. Former administrators may receive up to one full year of leave with full pay, provided that they stay for the same period of time as the time taken for the leave upon their return. If the former administrator does not stay for at least the same period of time, they must pay the salary back. The guidelines pertaining to FDLs for former administrators are identical to those presented in this Appendix, with one exception: subject to university approval, the leave does not count towards the school's annual FDL limit.

Appendix H: Periodic Evaluation of Centers and Institutes

H.1. General

The policies and procedures described in this document pertain to all centers and institutes within Mays Business School. With the exception of the Center for Executive Development (CED), all Centers and Institutes listed below are approved by the Board of Regents and are subject to mandatory periodic review, as required by System Policy 11.02, Creation of Centers and Institutes.

Article 2 of System Policy 11.02 states that “All centers and institutes shall be periodically reviewed at least every five years.” Generally, Mays reviews centers and institutes every four years. Although not required by System Policy, Mays also reviews the CED every four years.

In the case of new centers and institutes, the Dean will generally request a review after the first two years of operation. In exceptional cases, the Dean (or, in the case of departmental centers, the Head of the Department) may also request a review at any other time.

H.2. Definitions

Institute: A large integrative unit, housing intercollegiate or interagency activities, administered by a director reporting to the dean (or above), focused on largely external supported research or educational activities much broader than those interests of a given department or administrative unit.

Center: A smaller, interdisciplinary collaborative effort, revolving around a specific research or education activity whose participants involve more than one academic department or unit, administered by a director, focused on largely externally supported research or education activities broader than those interests of a given department or administrative unit.

Program: A lesser administrative, educational or research entity, usually residing within an academic department or unit.

H.3. Centers and Institutes Covered

These policies and procedures apply to the following centers and institutes:

H.3.1. College Level

Center for Executive Development (CED)
Center for International Business Studies (CIBS)
McFerrin Center for Entrepreneurship

Reynolds and Reynolds Sales Leadership Institute (supervisory authority delegated to the Department of Marketing)
Mays Innovation Research Center (MIRC)

H.3.2. Department Level

Center for the Management of Information Systems (CMIS)
Center for Retailing Studies (CRS)
Center for Human Resources Management (CHRM)
Reynolds and Reynolds Sales Leadership Institute (supervisory authority delegated to the Department of Marketing)

H.4. Frequency and Criteria

At least every four years, a formal review of each center and institute in Mays shall be conducted. In addition to the regularly scheduled reviews, formal reviews may be conducted in conjunction with the appointment or reappointment of a center or institute director or for other reasons.

The following criteria (questions) shall be used when reviewing each center or institute (hereafter referred to as “unit”):

1. How does the unit contribute to propelling Mays on the path to preeminence?
2. Does the unit contribute to enhancing the quality of at least one educational program at Mays (BBA, MBA, or PhD)?
3. Does the unit contribute to enhancing the quality of scholarly research at Mays?
4. Does the unit contribute financially to Mays?
5. Is the unit director effective in the performance of his or her duties?
6. For all centers and institute except CED: Is the unit successfully accomplishing the mission and activities described in its funding documents?
7. For all centers except CED: Should the unit continue as a center or should it be either (a) reclassified as an institute, (b) reclassified as a program, or (c) discontinued? For institutes: should the unit continue as an institute or should it be either (a) reclassified as a center, (b) reclassified as a program, or (c) discontinued?
8. For CED: Is the unit generating a sustainable level of new business?
9. For CED: Is the unit transparent and inclusive in making teaching opportunities available to all qualified faculty at Mays?
10. For CED: Should the unit continue for another term?

The Dean may identify additional criteria that are specific to each unit.

H.5. Review Committee and Report

The Dean will appoint a Review Committee that consists of five faculty members, at least three of which do not serve in an administrative position, and will designate a committee chair. For the purpose of these guidelines, administrative positions are defined as Dean, Senior Associate Dean, Associate Dean, Department Head, Associate Department Head, as well as administrative positions outside Mays Business School, designated as such by the Dean. The Review Committee may not include the Director of the center or institute that is the subject of the review.

At the conclusion of the review process, the committee will submit to the Dean a written report, with a copy to the Senior Associate Dean. In the case of departmental centers, the committee will also send a copy to the Head of the Department. Generally, the report will not exceed ten pages, including appendices. The Dean will convene the Review Committee in case additional information is required.

H.6. Director Appointments and Evaluations

H.6.1. Terms of Appointment

The appointment of center and institute directors is at will. If the director is a faculty member, only the administrative portion of the appointment is at will. The appointment of directors will be reviewed at the same time as the periodic review of the unit. However, the Dean (and, in the case of departmental centers, the Head of the Department) may review a director's appointment at any other time.

H.6.2. Selection Process

For college-level centers and institutes, when a vacancy occurs or is imminent, the Dean will appoint a search committee and the search for a new Director shall begin promptly. If necessary, the Dean may appoint an interim Director, normally for a period of time not to exceed one year. In the case of departmental centers, the Head of the Department appoints the search committee and, if necessary, the interim Director, in consultation with the Dean. In some cases, the Dean may decide to solicit additional information before approving the appointment of a search committee and/or an interim Director, provided that the Director position does not remain vacant for more than one year.

H.6.3. Performance Evaluations:

Each Director will receive an annual performance review in accordance with Mays Guidelines.

H.7. Continuation of the Center or Institute

Upon receiving the report of the Review Committee, the Dean will determine whether the unit (a) should be continued for another term in its current form, (b) should be

continued for another term in a different form (i.e., a center upgraded to an institute or downgraded to a program), or (c) should be discontinued. The Dean may also decide to continue the unit (in its current form or in a different form) for a reduced term (shorter than four years) subject to a new review at the end of that shorter term.

Independently, the Dean will determine whether the current Director will continue to serve in that capacity.

The Dean will communicate his or her decision in writing to the center Director and, if applicable, to the Head of the Department. Subsequently, the Dean will forward the committee's report along with his or her own recommendation, to the Office of the Vice President for Research.

The review process concludes successfully if the Dean decides to continue the unit in its current form and with its current Director.

In all other cases, if the Dean decides to make changes to the scope or leadership of the unit (or both), the Dean will seek guidance from appropriate university officials regarding the steps that are required to implement such changes. In the event that the Dean decides to dissolve a center or institute, the Dean will seek approval from the Office of the Chancellor through the appropriate university channels.

Appendix I: Appointment of Assistant Department Heads

I.1 Authority

Department Heads at Mays appoint one faculty member to serve as Assistant Department Head.

I.2 Compensation

Each Assistant Department Head will receive the following compensation:

1. An administrative stipend of 11.11% of the base, nine-month salary paid out over the nine-month period (September to May) and a course release of one course per academic year; OR
2. A course release of two courses per academic year.

I.3 Approvals

If the department chooses to compensate a faculty member with an administrative stipend, appointment of the faculty member as Assistant Department Head requires approval from the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The Faculty Affairs Administrator, with input from the Assistant Dean for Finance and Administration, will create an administrative appointment request from the Department Head, through the Dean, to the VP for Faculty Affairs and route for approvals through the appropriate channels. If the department chooses to compensate a faculty member with only course releases, appointment of the faculty member as Assistant Department Head requires approval from the Dean.

Appendix J: A-level Journals by Department

James Benjamin Department of Accounting

Journal of Accounting and Economics
Journal of Accounting Research
The Accounting Review
Contemporary Accounting Research
Review of Accounting Studies
Accounting, Organizations, and Society

Adam C. Sinn '00 Department of Finance

Journal of Finance
Journal of Financial Economics
The Review of Financial Studies
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis
Review of Finance
Journal of Financial Intermediation

Department of Information and Operations Management

Supply Chain:

Management Science
Operations Research
Manufacturing & Service Operations Management
Production and Operations Management
Journal of Operations Management

Information Systems:

Management Science
Operations Research
Information Systems Research
MIS Quarterly

Department of Management

Administrative Science Quarterly
Academy of Management Journal
Academy of Management Review
Journal of Applied Psychology
Strategic Management Journal
Organization Science
Personnel Psychology

Department of Marketing

Journal of Marketing
Journal of Marketing Research
Marketing Science
Journal of Consumer Research
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science
Journal of Consumer Psychology

Appendix K: Guidelines Outlining Selection and Nomination Process for University and College Level Faculty Research Awards

The following guidelines are intended to recognize excellence in research to ensure that our scholarly culture moves the college toward our vision of national preeminence. The guidelines should also provide a streamlined process for nominating faculty for such awards and maximize opportunities for all faculty to be selected as winners of University- and College-level research awards.

Texas A&M University issues calls for nomination of faculty for research awards based on a specific [timeline](#). The college is given an opportunity to nominate a set number of faculty for most University-level awards. Similarly, Mays Business School will issue calls for nomination of faculty for research awards on August 15. The full list of research awards is given in [Appendix A](#).

Research Awards Committee

The Mays Research Council will serve as the committee responsible for the research awards, will meet once a year. During this meeting, the Council determines the nominees Mays will submit for university-level awards and identifies any college-level award recipients. If any additional awards are added throughout the year, the Council reconvenes as necessary.

The members of the Mays Research Council serve three-year terms. The Dean appoints individuals upon acceptance of a recommendation from the Department Head and the Senior Associate Dean. One faculty member from each of our five academic departments serves as a member of the Council. Those eligible to serve are full professors in the department who hold an endowed chair. Faculty serving in administrative positions such as Department Head, Associate Dean, or Dean are not eligible to serve, except in ex-officio roles without voting rights. The Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship serves as the chair and a non-voting member of the Council.

Timeline for Nomination and Selection of Research Awards

The Council follows a specific timeline for accepting nominations and voting on research awards.

1. The Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship will send the call for nominations (or pre-nominations) as a Qualtrics survey to the Department Heads on August 15. The questions in the survey are provided on Page 2.
2. Department Heads have until September 15 to submit the nomination (or pre-nomination) forms.
3. The Faculty Affairs Administrator distributes the agenda and nomination forms to voting and non-voting members before the meeting.
4. The Research Council meets by October 10 to vote on nominees and award recipients. The meeting is scheduled to ensure the attendance of all members, with at least half of the voting members required for a quorum. The Council's voting is required for all university and college-level research awards when there

are more pre-nominations than awards or nomination spots. Members may vote yes, no, or abstain on all awards.

5. The Research Council's recommendations are passed on to the Dean via the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, and the Dean makes the final selections.
 - a. For College-level awards, the winners are chosen by the Dean and the Senior Associate Dean, and the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship will communicate the names of the winners to the Department Heads close to the day of the Faculty-Staff meeting
 - b. For University-level awards where the winners are chosen by the Dean, the respective Department Heads are responsible for completing the entire nomination packet for relevant faculty who will serve as the College-level nominee. The Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship will submit the University-level award packet of the nominee(s) as per the designated timeline.

Appendix L: Guidelines Outlining Selection and Nomination Process for University and College Level Faculty Teaching Awards

The following guidelines are intended to recognize excellence in teaching to ensure that our teaching culture moves the college toward our vision of national preeminence. The guidelines should also provide a streamlined process for nominating faculty for such awards and maximize opportunities for all deserving faculty to be selected as nominees for university- and college-level teaching awards.

Texas A&M University issues calls for nomination of faculty for teaching awards throughout the year, based on a specific timeline. The college is given an opportunity to nominate a set number of faculty for most university-level awards. Mays Business School will issue calls for nomination of faculty for all teaching awards on August 15. The full list of teaching awards is given in Appendix A.

Teaching Awards Committee

The Mays Teaching Council – the committee responsible for teaching awards – will meet once a year. During this meeting, the Teaching Council determines the nominees Mays will submit for university-level awards and identifies any college-level award recipients. If any additional awards are added throughout the year, the Teaching Council reconvenes as necessary.

The members of the Mays Teaching Council serve two-year terms. The Dean and Senior Associate Dean appoint individuals upon acceptance of a recommendation from the Department Head. Department Heads should recommend one faculty representing the tenure/tenure track and one faculty representing the academic professional track. Faculty serving in administrative positions such as Department Head, Associate Dean, or Dean are not eligible to serve, except in ex-officio roles without voting rights. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs serve as a non-voting members. The voting members of the committee elect a chair during the meeting.

Timeline for Nomination and Selection of Teaching Awards

The Teaching Council follows a specific timeline for accepting nominations and voting on teaching awards.

6. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs will send the call for nominations (or pre-nominations) as a Qualtrics Survey to the Department Heads on August 15. The questions in the survey are provided on Page 2.
7. Department heads have until September 15 to submit the nomination (or pre-nomination) forms.
8. The Faculty Affairs Administrator distributes the agenda and nomination forms to voting and non-voting members before the meeting.
9. The Teaching Council meets by October 10 to vote on nominees and award recipients. The meeting is scheduled to ensure the attendance of all members, with at least half of the voting members required for a quorum. The Council's voting is required for all university and college-level research awards when there

are more pre-nominations than awards or nomination spots. Members may vote yes, no, or abstain on all awards., and the Dean makes the final selections.

10. The Teaching Council's recommendations are passed on to the Dean and Senior Associate Dean via the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs.
 - a. For College-level awards, the winners are chosen by the Dean and the Senior Associate Dean, and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs will communicate the names of the winners to the Department Heads close to the day of the Faculty-Staff meeting.
 - b. For University-level awards where the nominees are chosen by the Teaching Council, the respective Department Heads are responsible for completing the entire nomination packet for relevant faculty who will serve as the College-level nominee. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs will submit the University-level award packet of the nominee(s) as per the designated timeline.

Appendix M: Guidelines Outlining Selection and Nomination Process for University and College Level Staff Awards

The following guidelines are intended to recognize staff to ensure that our culture moves the college toward our vision of national preeminence. The guidelines should also provide a streamlined process for nominating staff for such awards and maximize opportunities for all staff to be selected as nominees of university- and college-level awards.

Texas A&M University issues calls for nomination of staff for awards based on a specific [timeline](#). The college is given an opportunity to nominate staff for University-level awards. Mays Business School will issue calls for nomination of staff for all staff awards on August 15. The full list of staff awards is given in [Appendix A](#).

Staff Awards Committee

The Dean, Senior Associate Dean, and Chief of Staff are responsible for the staff awards and will meet once a year in September/October to review nominations. During this meeting, they will determine the nominees Mays will submit for university-level awards and identify any college-level award recipients. If any additional awards are added throughout the year, they will reconvene as necessary.

Timeline for Nomination and Selection of Staff Awards

The timeline for accepting nominations and voting on staff awards is as follows.

1. The Chief of Staff will send the call for nominations (or pre-nominations) as a Qualtrics survey to all Mays faculty and staff on August 15. The questions in the survey are provided on Page 2.
2. Employees have until September 15 to submit the nomination (or pre-nomination) forms.
3. The Dean, Senior Associate Dean, and Chief of Staff meet by October 10 to determine the award recipients.
 - a. For College-level awards, the Senior Associate Dean will communicate the name of the winner to the Chief of Staff close to the day of the Faculty-Staff meeting.
 - b. For University-level awards, the respective Unit Heads are responsible for completing the entire nomination packet for relevant staff member who will serve as the College-level nominee. The Chief of Staff will submit the University-level award packet of the nominee(s) as per the designated timeline.

Appendix N: Adoption and Revision of Mays Guidelines

N.1. Adoption

The following shared-governance process is in use at Mays Business School to adopt these guidelines:

1. The Department Heads from the five academic departments meet to review the proposed document. Together, they consider implementing those changes and suggestions that are likely to gather broad support from the faculty and to advance the vision and mission of Mays Business School in significant ways.
 - i. Some proposed changes may be departmental-specific, others will be college-wide changes
 - ii. Most changes related to research and publication and teaching standards, workload, and promotion and tenure requirements likely require college-wide approval
 - iii. At the same time, some level of variance in terms of processes and difference in emphasis across the five departments may surface
 - iv. Changes must be consistent with Mays Business School's vision and mission, with AACSB requirements, and with university requirements; the document may not, under any circumstance, deviate from university or AACSB requirements
 - v. The five Department Heads consult with the Senior Associate Dean where appropriate during this process.
2. If the Department Heads agree to a common set of changes, they propose the revised document to the Senior Associate Dean for approval. If the Senior Associate Dean requests further changes, the Department Heads continue to work on the document until the proposed revisions are acceptable to the Dean's Office. The Senior Associate Dean consults with the Dean at this stage.
3. After the document is acceptable to the Dean's Office, the Department Heads from each academic department solicit input from departmental faculty. Department Heads have broad discretion to select within their departments the most appropriate shared-governance mechanism for soliciting input.
4. After obtaining faculty input, the Department Heads meet with the Senior Associate Dean to review the faculty input and to consider further changes to the document. The Senior Associate Dean consults with the Dean at this stage.
5. If the five Department Heads and the Senior Associate Dean jointly agree to a final set of revisions, they submit the document to the Dean for final approval. Otherwise, the process reverts to a previous step for a new iteration.

6. If, after three iterations, the Department Heads and the Senior Associate Dean do not agree on a final document, the Dean of Mays Business School, after consulting with the Senior Associate Dean, with the Department Heads, and with other relevant constituencies determines the final content of the document.
7. In all cases, the Dean of Mays Business School approves the final document.

N.2. Revisions

The following shared-governance process is in use at Mays Business School to revise these guidelines over time:

1. At any time, each of the five Department Heads may recommend to the Senior Associate Dean that revisions to the guidelines be a topic of discussion. When this occurs, the person who initiates this conversation states the reasons for recommending such revision.
2. Departments may establish internal procedures to allow faculty members to recommend revisions; however, these revisions must go through the Department Head and receive her or his approval.
3. Upon receiving from a Department Head a request for revision, the Senior Associate Dean consults with the Dean and convenes a meeting of the five Department Heads. The meeting's purpose is to solicit the Department Head's views about the necessity of a revision. If the Dean, the Senior Associate Dean, and at least three of the five Department Heads concur, the Senior Associate Dean initiates the revision process.
4. The Dean or the Senior Associate Dean may also initiate revisions to this document.
5. Following an initiation of a revision, we follow the process outlined in Section I.1 for adoption.

N.3. Technical Corrections.

The revision process outlined in Section I.2 applies to major, substantive revisions. Minor, technical corrections require approval of the five Department Head, the Senior Associate Dean, and Dean.

Trivial corrections (such as typos) require approval of the Senior Associate Dean only.

Mays circulates the guidelines to the Dean and to the five Department Heads after each technical correction made under the provisions of Section I.3.