Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.

--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:

--Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit
The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.

--Dean of Faculties
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1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences is to generate scientific discoveries that shed light on psychological processes and human behavior, provide a rigorous undergraduate and graduate education in psychological science, and provide outreach about psychological science and the application of this science to real-world issues. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

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

Please see department maintained documents, including department by-laws, faculty evaluation procedures, and tenure and promotion guidelines, for additional specific information on these processes (see Appendix). This document articulates general Unit guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</td>
<td><a href="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</td>
<td><a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit.

Faculty ranks and tracks within the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences are as listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Expectations and criteria are listed in the Appendix documents. The CLLA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines relevant to the titles in the Department are here:

Tenure-Track and Tenured Titles:

Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or development leave appointments).

Faculty with the title of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer will normally hold a PhD degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in such service and administrative activities as is required to carry out their instructional duties (e.g. coordinating multiple sections of a large core curriculum course, or running placement exams for language instruction). The standard teaching load per semester for a full-time Lecturer or Senior Lecturer is four courses.

Faculty with the title of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor normally hold a PhD degree in their teaching fields and will be engaged in both instruction and significant service. The standard load each semester for a full-time faculty member with instructional in their title is three courses. Only regular course offerings (major or general academic) will count for the purpose of calculating teaching loads for instructional faculty. This course load may be reduced in instances of a substantial service assignment (e.g., directing a program). Faculty in the Instructional titles are not expected to engage in research, but it may be taken into account in annual performance evaluations or for promotion in the category of Enhancing Instructional Effectiveness.

Faculty with the title of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor will hold a doctoral degree in an applied professional discipline and be licensed or license-eligible in that discipline. This appointment often involves teaching graduate students who are working toward a degree that leads to state licensure in an applied professional discipline and teaching pre-doctoral practica with close supervision and monitoring of students, consistent with national and state professional standards. The position may also involve graduate student committee work, faculty committee work, curriculum development, undergraduate teaching, advising, or other administrative duties, and scholarship as appropriate to working with graduate and undergraduate students. As part of their assigned duties, faculty in clinical title appointments may also serve clients within the University-operated programs for the purposes of providing learning opportunities to students, maintaining a department-supported service, or to generate revenue for programmatic activities. Expectations for teaching, service, and scholarship should be outlined in the offer of appointment and in annual renewal letters. The standard teaching load for a faculty member in a Clinical title is comparable to the standard teaching load for the tenured and tenure-track faculty and determined by departmental needs and the objectives and responsibilities for the position.

Faculty with the title of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor will be primarily engaged in research, typically funded with extramural funds. They may engage in some instructional activities. Service is not required in these titles, but is not prohibited.
Senior Professor is a non-tenure title for retirees. See https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/hiring/Hiring-Guidelines_1.pdf for University guidelines on faculty in this title.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member’s performance in the assigned categories of performance (scholarship, teaching, and service). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Teaching

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the departmental mission of educating undergraduate and graduate students about up-to-date psychological science (see Appendix for expectations).

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work: Faculty members are expected to have an active and impactful research program focused on understanding some aspect of behavioral, psychological, or neurobiological function relevant to one or more of the many interest areas of the department and the field of psychological science at large (see Appendix for expectations).

3.3 Service Faculty members are expected to provide service to the psychology profession at the national level and locally at the university, college, or department at a level commensurate with their rank (see Appendix for expectations).

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:

1. Teaching performance that is significantly above the departmental average for relevant comparator courses as evidenced by student evaluations or other means of evaluation adopted by the faculty.
2. Direction of research by a graduate student published in a refereed journal, where the student is the first (or primary) author.
3. Selection for a University, College, or national professional society outstanding teacher award.
4. Direction of an undergraduate University Honors Thesis.
5. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
6. Developing a course that is new to the curriculum.
7. Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
8. Invitation to teach a course (not to give a lecture) at a domestic or an international institution of recognized excellence.
9. Facilitation of the receipt by one’s graduate advisee(s) of awards for research (e.g., NIH, NSF, or APA awards.).
10. Placement of graduate students into significant academic or research positions, including post-doctoral positions.
11. Chairing a doctoral committee. Credit is received upon completion of the dissertation and for the next two years.
12. Facilitating the inclusion within the graduate and undergraduate student body and the success of members of minority groups that are under-represented among graduate and undergraduate students in psychology. In accordance with the practice of the American Psychological Association, under-represented minority groups include Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Americans of Polynesian/Pacific Island descent.
13. Awards for a presentation (poster or paper) won at a national or international conference by a graduate student.

Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
1. Chair of a master’s or member of a doctoral research committee. Credit is received upon completion of the thesis or dissertation and for the next two years.
2. Classroom teaching performance at or near the department norm for relevant comparator courses as evidenced by student evaluations or other means of evaluation adopted by the faculty.
3. Development of new pedagogical methods and materials.
4. Major revision of existing courses, not including normal updating.
5. Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
6. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
7. Graduate or undergraduate presentation (poster or paper) at a national or international conference.

Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:
1. Publications in leading refereed journals in psychology or allied fields.
2. Receiving a major external fellowship or research award (not including research grants).
3. Frequent citation of publications as indicated by the Social Science and Science Citation Indexes. Citations of any article regardless of when it was published that appear within the 3 year rolling window are included in the evaluation process.
4. Publication of scholarly books by leading publishers.
5. Presentation of keynote addresses or invited papers at international and national meetings.
6. Receiving, as a PI or Co-PI, significant (as defined relative to the norms of the sub-disciplines represented in the department) external peer-reviewed funding for research; Co-PI’s must provide a description of their contribution to the writing and execution of the grant that indicates a major contribution on their part to meet the requirements of this indicator.
7. International scholarly visibility, including but not limited to collaborations with international scholars and presentations at international professional meetings. Funding obtained from international sources will be considered in the merit raise process under the provisions established for research grants.
8. Editing a scholarly book.

Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:
1. Publication of scholarly books.
2. Publications in refereed journals.
3. Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book.
4. Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines.
5. Submission of external grants that were not funded.
6. Receipt of internal peer-reviewed funding for research.

Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:
1. Serving on the mentoring committee of an assistant professor.
2. Organizing a department workshop session that involves the development of junior faculty.
3. Serving as editor, associate editor, or editorial board member of a major journal.
4. Being an officer in a national or international professional organization.
5. Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board.
6. Serving in an unsalaried administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University.
7. Serving as committee or program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting.
8. Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate.
9. Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee.
10. Serving as a member of review panel for a national research organization.
11. Outstanding performance as the department’s Director of Graduate Training.
12. Outstanding performance as a member of a university, college, departmental, or national committee or task force. (It is responsibility of faculty members to document their committee or task force activities).
13. Organizing and hosting a national or international scholarly conference.

Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:
1. Participation in department workshop sessions that involve the development of junior faculty.
2. Attending a training workshop or session on best practices and/or development as a mentor.
3. Being an officer in regional or state professional organization.
4. Serving as program or committee chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting.
5. Effective service as department’s Director of Graduate Training.
6. Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate. (It is the faculty member’s responsibility to list their Senate activities.)
7. Active service on university, college, and department committees and task forces. (It is the faculty member’s responsibility to document their committee or task force activities. Service on a largely inactive committee or task force will not be credited in the evaluation process.)
8. Being an advisor to a student organization.
9. Serving as an ad hoc reviewer for a professional journal or research funding agency.

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

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

Assistant Professor: We recruit scholars conducting research in any area of psychology and whose research interests and strengths will build on and enhance the strengths of the Department. Candidates will need to contribute to one or more existing doctoral training programs (behavioral and cellular neuroscience, clinical psychology, cognition and cognitive neuroscience, industrial/organizational psychology, or social and personality psychology). Successful applicants should have a strong record of research achievement consistent with their rank, and evidence of, or demonstrated potential for, external funding. All candidates should have a strong commitment to undergraduate and graduate education; preference will be given to candidates with an interest and ability to teach graduate-level statistics courses. A PhD in psychology or a closely related field is required.
Associate Professor: Candidates being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (with tenure) in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences at Texas A&M University are expected to be outstanding scholars, teachers, and academic citizens. Candidates are expected to establish an independent, productive, impactful, visible research program involving graduate and undergraduate students, and actively seek extramural research funding. Candidates are expected to be competent instructors on both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and to contribute to the teaching mission of the department by teaching courses important for the undergraduate major and the graduate core requirements. Although assistant professors’ time should generally be spent on research and teaching, assistant professors are also expected to contribute to the common mission of the Department, although to a lesser extent than tenured colleagues.

Professor: Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate continued and outstanding and impactful accomplishment in research and teaching, and valuable contributions to leadership and professional service. Rather than simply evaluating the total productivity of a faculty member since tenure (e.g., completion of a second book, series of articles, or a specific number of grant awards), the College will assess as grounds for promotion the quality, trajectory, and impact on the field of a candidate’s entire body of scholarship, as well as the candidate’s national (or international) visibility. More particularly, successful candidates for promotion to professor are expected to be well established and highly respected figures in their fields, and should demonstrate achievements sufficient to merit such a promotion in any AAU institution aspiring to be a consensus top 10 public university. It is important that a candidate’s standing in the field and the impact of the research record be documented by the department through multiple indicators. Outstanding teaching is demonstrated by evidence of a strong motivation to engage students in the learning process, by the rigor and scope of the courses taught, by student achievements, and by leadership in programmatic and curricular development. A strong record of undergraduate teaching is essential, as is a commitment to graduate education and the mentoring of graduate students. Outstanding service and leadership are demonstrated by engagement in departmental, College, University and professional activities that further the intellectual and pedagogical profile of the institution.

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

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

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

5.3: Process

See description of evaluation process for tenure and promotion in the departmental bylaws (Appendix 1).

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.
In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member’s performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1 Purpose
● Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.

● Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.

● Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  ○ See University Rule 12.01.99.M2. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

● Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Process
The Department bylaws and Faculty Evaluation document contain the process for annual evaluations (Appendix 1).

6.3 Focus
The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).
6.4 Time Period of Review
Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window. The expanded window for the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences is three years.

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

6.5.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:
- Unsatisfactory – Failing to meet departmental expectations for teaching in terms of quantity AND quality.
- Needs Improvement – Falling below departmental expectations for teaching in terms of quantity OR quality.
- Satisfactory – Some clear examples of satisfactory teaching performance are:
  a. Fulfilled one’s required teaching load, offered undergraduate service courses and graduate courses and mentored undergraduate and graduate students on research.
  b. Fulfilled one’s required teaching load, offered undergraduate service courses, taught study abroad, and demonstrated student learning in courses.
  c. Fulfilled one’s required teaching load, offered undergraduate and/or graduate courses and developed a new course that contributed to the department’s mission.
  *There are other examples of satisfactory performance (see statement on equifinality in Appendix 1) and the evaluation committee will consider quantity and quality of contributions in rating faculty performance.
- Very Good – Meeting departmental expectations for teaching with some evidence of exceeding expectations in terms of quantity or quality.
- Excellent – Exceeding departmental expectations for teaching in terms of quantity or quality.
- Extraordinary – Far exceeding departmental expectations for teaching in terms of both quantity and quality.

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

6.5.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are
- Unsatisfactory – Failing to meet departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and/or funding) in terms of quantity AND quality.
Needs Improvement – Falling below departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and/or funding) in terms of quantity OR quality.

Satisfactory – Meeting departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and/or funding) in terms of quantity and/or quality. Some clear examples of satisfactory research performance are:
   a. Published 2 articles per year (on average) in peer-reviewed journals, with at least one of these published in an impactful journal, and submitting at least one application to an extramural funding source per year.
   b. Maintained an active grant, published one article per year (on average) in a peer-reviewed journal, and presented work at conferences.
   c. Published more than 2 articles per year (on average) in impactful journals.
   *There are other examples of satisfactory performance (see statement on equifinality) and the evaluation committee will consider quantity and quality of contributions in rating faculty performance.

Very Good Performance. Meeting departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and funding) with some evidence of exceeding expectations in terms of quantity or quality.

Excellent Performance. Exceeding departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and funding) in terms of quantity or quality.

Extraordinary Performance. Far exceeding departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and funding) in terms of both quantity and quality.

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

Unsatisfactory – Failing to meet department expectations for service in terms of quantity AND quality.

Needs Improvement – Falling below departmental expectations for service in terms of quantity OR quality.

Satisfactory – Meeting departmental expectations for service in terms of quantity and/or quality. Some clear examples of satisfactory service performance are:
   a. Chaired a major professional organization committee, reviewed for peer-reviewed journals, and engaged in multiple faculty recruitment activities.
   b. Reviewed for peer-reviewed journals and served as a contributing member to a local committee.
   c. Chaired a college-level committee and served on the mentoring committee of an assistant professor.
   *There are other examples of satisfactory performance (see statement on equifinality) and the evaluation committee will consider quantity and quality of contributions in rating faculty performance.

Very Good Performance. Meeting departmental expectations for service with some evidence of exceeding expectations in terms of quantity or quality.

Excellent Performance. Exceeding departmental expectations for service in terms of quantity or quality.
Extraordinary Performance. Far exceeding departmental expectations for service in terms of both quantity and quality.

6.6 Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.6.1 Faculty member’s report of previous activities.

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

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

Examples of possible content for the report are:

- Grant activity
- Publications
- Evidence of scholarly impact
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of service effectiveness

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

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

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

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

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

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

6.7 Assessment outcomes that require action
As per University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

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

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

6.7.2 Needs Improvement Performance
If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

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

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:
A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2.

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2

3. Mid-Term Review
In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of University SAP 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1 Purpose

● A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.

● This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.

● This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.

● This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.

● This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

● This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.

● If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.
7.2 Process

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hired</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year 2019</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

The Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences will conduct the midterm review following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

4. Post-Tenure Review

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

1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).

2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Peer Review Committee

The peer-review committee shall consist of all eligible associate and full professors for peer evaluation of faculty at the associate rank; the peer-review committee shall consist of all eligible full professors for peer evaluation of faculty at professor rank.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

---

1 Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.
The faculty member undergoing peer review will provide an updated list of accomplishments, to include information about graduate student mentoring and placement, teaching evaluation information, journal 5-year impact factors, and citation figures for all publications. The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation.

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

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

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

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

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

8.3.8 By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 8.2) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review.

2 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

8.6 Appeal

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

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

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see Institutional Rule 31.08.01, which indicates the process for this situation.
See the Dean of Faculties website for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

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

A. The faculty of the Psychology Department will include those individuals meeting the Dean of Faculties definition of “faculty” in the “Guideline to Faculty Titles document (http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/hiring/Guideline_Faculty_Titles.pdf) and who have a primary or joint appointment in Psychology.

B. Psychology Faculty who are Members of the Graduate Faculty (see OGAPS document on Graduate Faculty Membership; http://ogaps.tamu.edu/OGAPS/media/media-library/New%20Forms%20and%20Information/Guidelines-for-Graduate-Faculty-Membership.pdf?ext=.pdf) and whose primary appointment (at least 50%) is within the Psychology Department, have the right to vote on department issues, excluding decisions for promotion and tenure for tenure track faculty, which is described in section VII.A.

C. Non-tenure-track faculty who wish to become Graduate Faculty must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty and the College of Liberal Arts, and the appropriate paperwork must be submitted by the Department Head according to OGAPS procedures (http://ogaps.tamu.edu/OGAPS/media/media-library/documents/Forms%20and%20Information/Graduate_Faculty_Membership.pdf).

II. Departmental Meetings

A. The parliamentary authority for all meetings in the Department of Psychology will be Robert’s Rule of Order, Newly Revised.

B. After consulting with the Advisory Committee, the Department Head will identify regularly scheduled times for AC meetings, faculty meetings, and a regular colloquium series. Special faculty meetings may be called by the Head or upon petition to the Head of 20 percent of the voting faculty in residence.

C. The departmental faculty will meet at least twice per semester to receive committee reports, to discuss departmental affairs, and to advise the Department Head in areas of faculty and departmental concerns.

D. Faculty meetings will be open to all faculty and duly elected representatives of the graduate students. The Head, or a designated substitute, will chair the meetings. A quorum for departmental meetings is defined as the presence of at least two-thirds of the voting faculty in residence for the semester during which a meeting is called. Unless defined differently in specific sections of these Bylaws, options or decisions that require a vote must be approved by at least two-thirds of the voting eligible faculty in attendance at the faculty meeting.

E. Unless otherwise noted in the bylaws, all votes for non P&T-related issues will be held during faculty meeting. Faculty members who are absent from a meeting in which a vote is held must request an absentee ballot from the Department Head.
prior to the scheduled meeting, and return the completed ballot within 24 hours of the faculty meeting for the vote to be counted. Votes in Faculty meetings can take place via paper/electronic ballot votes. Should one or more faculty request a delay in the vote, the vote will be delayed by 24 hours and completed ballots will be returned to the Department Head by that time.

F. The Head shall announce the meeting in a timely fashion, with a written request for any items to be put on the agenda. The written agenda will be distributed electronically to faculty members 24 hours before the meeting.

G. Summary minutes of all faculty meetings will be distributed to the faculty and will be kept as a permanent record in the department office. Actions on specific students, faculty, or other personnel matters will be confidential and will not be included in the summary minutes.

III. Organization of the Department

The Department of Psychology will be organized into Areas. Each area will represent a coherent specialization within psychology, including a defined graduate training program in that area of specialization leading to the Ph.D. degree in Psychology. Faculty members may join the areas of their choice, pending acceptance by the majority of faculty in each area and approval by the Head. A faculty member with a zero-time appointment (e.g., adjunct faculty), joint appointment faculty whose primary appointment is in another department, or faculty with less than half-time appointments may be an affiliate of one or more areas, but will have no vote within the area.

The Psychology Department areas in existence at the time of approval of these Bylaws are as follows:

- Behavioral and Cellular Neuroscience
- Clinical Psychology
- Cognition and Cognitive Neuroscience
- Industrial-Organizational Psychology
- Social and Personality Psychology

Any change to the names of these areas would have to be put forward as a motion to change the bylaws and would need to be approved by a 2/3 majority of voting faculty.

Because of the American Psychological Association's criteria for accreditation of doctoral programs in clinical psychology, a Clinical Training Faculty shall be established within the Clinical Psychology Area. This Clinical Training Faculty shall consist of those members of the area whose training is in clinical psychology or related behavioral health field and/or whose primary professional interests are involved in teaching core clinical courses and conducting supervision in the Psychology Department Clinic. This subgroup of the Area shall have principal administrative responsibilities for the doctoral program in clinical psychology, including matters of student admission, continuance, and evaluation; curriculum; and practicum assignment, subject to qualifications that may be expressed elsewhere in these Bylaws.
Each area subsumes a field of research and teaching specialization within psychology.

Each area represents:

A. **an educational unit**, which is responsible for organizing and delivering graduate programs in its area of specialization. All area curricular actions are subject to review and require approval by the Department working through various departmental committees:

B. **an administrative unit**, in which faculty of each area are responsible for planning and conducting a variety of administrative functions – graduate admission recommendations to the Graduate Studies Committee, graduate student education, graduate student advising, graduate student placement, program training grants, specialized facilities (e.g., the Psychology Clinic, animal care facilities); and

C. **representative unit**, in which each area elects a representative to standing departmental committees.

The faculty of each area does the following:

1. Elects a representative to certain departmental committees, as described below.
2. Elects an Area Coordinator (duties defined in Section IV.C)
3. Develops and conducts graduate education programs and collectively manages student evaluations and placements under the authority of the Graduate Studies Committee and Psychology faculty.
4. Develops and conducts undergraduate courses appropriate to its area of specialization under the authority of the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Psychology faculty.
5. Develops and conducts research programs appropriate to its area of specialization.
6. Manages specialized programs and facilities within its area of specialization. Each area is free to set its own operating procedures for elections.

If a group of faculty wishes to institute a new area, they must present a petition to the full faculty, signed by the requisite three members of the proposed area. This petition should include a statement of the purpose of the area, a full description of its proposed Ph.D. program of specialty, and the employment prospects for graduates of such a program. The establishment of a new area requires a two-thirds majority vote of the full voting faculty, contingent upon final approval by the Department Head.

Three voting members are necessary for an area to be considered active, and warranting formal representation on various Departmental Committees. Areas with fewer than three voting members will lose formal representation on Departmental Committees until the area returns to a membership of three. Should an area have a faculty size below three voting members for three consecutive years, the Department Head must call a faculty vote on the continuation of the area. A vote must be held every three years until the faculty size for that area increases to at least three. A two-thirds majority vote is required to discontinue the area, contingent upon final approval by the Department Head.
IV. Administrative Positions in the Department

A. Head.

The Head is the administrative and executive officer of the department and its spokesperson to the University administration and communities outside the University.

1. Term of Office. The term of office of the Head shall normally be four years. The term is renewable, but is normally limited to 2 terms.

2. Procedures for Selection and Review of the Head. When the Head needs to be replaced (either at the end of a normal term or for any other reason), and for midterm review of the Head, the Department will follow the guidelines outlined in the University Rules statement entitled “Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Department Heads” (University Rule # 12.99.99.M6; http://rules.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.99.99.M5.pdf).

3. Duties of the Head. The Head, through direct action or delegation and in consultation with appropriate departmental committees:

   a. formulates and implements policies of the department;
   b. consults at least once per semester with all departmental committee chairs and area coordinators;
   c. presides at departmental faculty meetings;
   d. formulates and manages the departmental budget;
   e. manages office operations;
   f. hires and evaluates office staff;
   g. evaluates faculty (in accordance with procedures specified in the sections dealing with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Evaluation Committee; see below)
   h. encourages faculty development;
   i. assigns teaching loads and schedules;
   j. carries on departmental correspondence;
   k. resolves student complaints and other potential conflicts;
   l. receives advice from individual faculty members, from committees, and from the faculty as a whole;
   m. identifies individual faculty members to oversee the following operations/tasks: the Psychology Human Participant Pool, the Department colloquium series, faculty and staff awards, and the Department website.
4. Authority of the Head.

a. The Head makes appointments to fill terms on committees and to assist in the daily operation of the department.

b. It is expected that the Head will usually support the decisions of committees and the faculty. If the Head is unable to support a recommendation made through usual procedures, he or she should, within a month, provide an explanation to the faculty or to the appropriate committee. In cases of disagreement, the Head should include relevant votes of committees or the Department as a whole when reporting to the College and the University.

c. The Head, serving as principal financial officer of the Department, shall:

   i. supervise receipt and expenditure of all monies;

   ii. in conjunction with the Associate Head, prepare an annual operating budget and previous year-end financial report. These documents shall be presented to the faculty as early in the academic year as circumstances permit;

   iii. in conjunction and close collaboration with the Chair of the AC, provide an annual state of the Department report to the faculty, during the last faculty meeting of the spring semester. This report should include a summary of: the budget, activities performed by the committees and positions appointed by the Head, negotiations with the upper administration, and progress towards long-term goals. To allow ample time for discussion, this meeting should be scheduled for an extended time slot (e.g., an afternoon) during a day (e.g., a designated reading day) that minimizes conflicts with other scheduled events.

iv. The Head, in conjunction with the Dean, appropriate departmental committees and the Advisory Committee, shall supervise and coordinate the recruiting of new faculty members (see Section VI).

v. The Head, in consultation with the Evaluation Committee, shall make recommendations for faculty salary increases to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

vi. The Head shall be responsible for initiating meetings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee in order to ensure timely recommendations for promotion and tenure decisions in the Department and at the College level.

5. Timetables for Appointments:

   a. Evaluation Committee: In years when a member of the Evaluation Committee must be replaced, the Head should seek nominations and circulate a ballot in April (prior to the end of the spring semester).
b. Area Representatives for Standing Committees. During the first week of the fall semester, each Area should provide the Head with a list of their representatives for each of the departmental committees that require area representation.

c. Administrative Leadership. The Associate Head, Associate Head for Graduate Studies, Associate Head for Undergraduate Studies, Director of the Psychology Clinic, and Area Coordinators should be in place at the start of each academic year. Additional administrative appointments can be developed by the Head based on department need, in consultation with the Advisory Committee.

d. Appointing Leadership for New Head. For a newly appointed Head, the process of nominating and confirming an Associate Head should be completed within the first month of the Head’s appointment. The Director of the Psychology Clinic, the Associate Head for Graduate Studies, and Associate Head for Undergraduate Studies should normally continue to serve until the end of their terms/contracts, whereupon the new Head should review their appointments.

B. Associate Head

1. The Associate Head is nominated by the Department Head in consultation with the Advisory Committee and confirmed by the faculty.

2. The term of office of the Associate Head shall be two years, renewable through re-nomination by the Head and with faculty confirmation. The Associate Head is always coterminous with the resignation or departure of the Head. A new Head may request that the current Associate Head remain in that position through the first year for transition purposes. The faculty must confirm this one-year appointment.

3. The duties of the Associate Head include:

   a. Serving in the capacity of the Department Head whenever the Head is unavailable.

   b. Serving as a non-voting member of the Advisory Committee.

   c. Maintaining records of faculty meetings and committee activities.

   d. Coordinating (with the staff) the electronic distribution of information about Department issues.

   e. Assist Head in completion of Campus Reports

   f. Assist Head in Faculty management (e.g., hiring of instructors, monitoring teaching loads)

   g. Ensure faculty and course instructor compliance with State and University regulations on instruction

   h. Leading efforts to ensure faculty development.
C. **Area Coordinators:**

1. Are elected by faculty within each area to 2-year terms, normally limited to 4 consecutive terms.
2. Chair the meetings of their areas, and set meeting agendas. In addition to any regular area-centric educational program meetings, the Area Coordinator will hold at least one meeting per semester with Area faculty to discuss program status/planning and issues of graduate education.
3. Must facilitate the election of at least one graduate student representative in the area to attend the meetings defined in Section C.2.
4. Serve on the Advisory Committee
5. Are responsible for the administrative and educational functions of the area.
6. Are responsible for providing course plans to the Head office for faculty in their areas.
7. Will meet annually with the Department Head to discuss Area status, accomplishments, and future plans.

D. **Associate Head for Graduate Studies**

1. Is nominated by the Head, in consultation with the Advisory Committee and confirmed by the faculty, for an initial term of 3 years. The normal term limit is 2 consecutive terms.
2. Must be a Member of the Graduate Faculty
3. Must be a tenured faculty member
4. The primary duties of the Associate Head for Graduate Studies include:
   a. Serving as a non-voting member of the Advisory Committee.
   b. Chairing the Graduate Studies Committee and responsibility for the administration of its functions
   c. Overseeing graduate admissions process

E. **Associate Head for Undergraduate Studies**

1. Is nominated by the Head, in consultation with the Advisory Committee and confirmed by the faculty, for an initial term of 3 years. The normal term limit is 2 consecutive terms.
2. Chairs the Undergraduate Studies Committee and is responsible for the administration of its functions.
3. Must be a tenured faculty member
4. The primary duties of the Associate Head for Undergrad Studies include:
   a. Serving as a non-voting member of the Advisory Committee
   b. Chairing the Undergraduate Studies Committee and responsibility for the administration of its functions.
   c. Supervising the Advising Office and its functions
F. **Director of the Psychology Clinic**

1. Must be a licensed or provisionally licensed Psychologist in the State of Texas.
2. Chairs the Clinic Coordination Committee.
3. Is responsible for all administrative duties in the Psychology Clinic, including implementation of policy and supervision of Clinic assistants, the Clinic secretary, and the Clinic budget.
4. The Director of the Psychology Clinic will be appointed by the Head using standard faculty hiring procedures in which the Head receives a hiring recommendation from the search committee and the faculty at large. The position is either tenure-track or a non-tenure three-year appointment. In the circumstance of a three-year appointment, the Head, in consultation with the clinical faculty and the Advisory Committee, will renew the position. The Head must give a one-year notice of intent to terminate the appointment.

V. **Committee Structure and Procedures**

A. **General Procedures**

1. Service on standing departmental committees is considered to be part of each faculty member's duties. All faculty members are welcome, indeed encouraged, to raise issues to be considered by any committee. Meetings of committees will be held only when a quorum (a two-thirds majority of the voting members on each committee) are present. Unless otherwise specified, all committee members serve in a voting capacity. Any committee may elect to hold a closed meeting by a majority (two-thirds) vote of the members present. However, all decisions made and all votes taken by any committee will be communicated through appropriate channels to the Head and to the faculty as a whole.

2. Except as otherwise noted, the agendas for all meetings will be determined by the committee chairs in consultation with committee members.

3. Except as otherwise noted, all committees will establish their own procedures, provided that the following conditions are met:
   a. Members of the department who are concerned with a given matter should be given an opportunity to present their views;
   b. Any faculty or staff member of the Department may make proposals to the committee in writing. Such proposals will normally be given consideration within 45 days;
   c. Each committee will establish procedures for receiving and considering proposals from undergraduate and graduate students, as appropriate;
   d. Each committee will maintain a record of its significant policy actions in the form of minutes. When committee actions may be of
general faculty/student interest, the committee is encouraged to
prepare a summary of those actions for distribution to the faculty;
e. Some committees include student representation. During
discussions involving the evaluation of particular students or
faculty members, the student representatives will be excused.

4. Depending on the type of committee, committee chairs will be either
appointed by the Head or elected at the first annual meeting of the
committee (or when a new chair needs to be elected). Chairs will
normally serve a 1-year term and usually no more than 2 consecutive
terms. If a committee believes that its Chair has become ineffective, the
committee can vote or recommend to replace the Chair. During the
appointment or election of new committee chairs, the past-chair will serve
as the committee chair and will take responsibility for communicating with
the Head and initiating the first committee meeting.

5. Every committee should meet at least once per year.

B. Specific Guidelines

1. To assure that no individual has disproportionate influence, and to help
assure that department duties are equitably distributed, no individual can
concurrently chair more than one of the following committees: Advisory,
Promotion and Tenure, Graduate Studies, Evaluation, or Diversity. In
cases where a conflict arises, the individual must either decline the new
appointment or resign from the conflicting appointment. Neither the Head
nor the Associate Head can chair any of these committees.

2. It is expected that the Head will normally follow committee and faculty
recommendations. In cases where the Head departs from
recommendations, the faculty and the relevant committee shall be orally
informed of the reasons for the decision within a month.

3. During the first week of the fall term, the Head will request the names of
area representatives for each area-elected committee. If an Area declines
to have a representative on a committee or does not submit a name for a
committee within 3 weeks, the area will have a representative appointed
by the Department Head. Area Coordinators are responsible for requesting
nominations and confirmations of representatives for each area.

4. Area Coordinators must be elected (or reelected) by the area through
ballot. Area Coordinators will continue to serve until a new Coordinator is
elected. If an Area Coordinator reaches the end of his/her 2-year term and
an election or reelection is not held by the end of the first week of the fall
semester, the Department Head shall appoint an interim Area Coordinator
until the area votes on a permanent coordinator.

5. The Head will conduct an election for the Evaluation Committee in April
(prior to the end of the spring semester). A list of potential nominees will
be distributed to the faculty, who will indicate their top 3 choices for each
position. The 3 nominees who receive the most votes for each position will
be placed on a ballot for that position. Each elected member will serve for 3 years, with the first term beginning at the start of the following fall semester. The results of votes conducted by ballot shall be counted by the Head and 2 members of the AC, and made available to the entire faculty.

VI. Advisory Committee

A. Membership and Operation

The AC shall be composed of the area coordinators, the Associate Head for Graduate Studies, the Associate Head for Undergraduate Studies, the Chair of the Diversity Committee, the Associate Head, and the Department Head. Only those faculty serving as area coordinators will have a vote on the AC. The chair of the AC shall be a voting member of the AC who is elected by the Advisory Committee for a term of 2 years, which shall be reconfirmed by the AC in the second year and normally limited to 2 consecutive terms. If, at any point, the AC believes that the chair has become ineffective, it can vote to replace the chair. A two-thirds majority vote is required for removal.

The AC will establish a regular time for meetings. The agenda for these meetings will be set by the Head (in consultation with the AC Chair and other members of the AC), and will be posted in a timely fashion. It is expected that AC meetings usually will occur at least once per month. Additional meetings may be requested by the Head or any member of the AC. For voting purposes, 4 or more members constitute a quorum for the AC.

B. Functions

The purpose of the AC is to advise the head and serve as his or her resource for long-range planning and policy issues. The AC will represent the department as a whole, keeping the Head aware of both current problems confronting the faculty as well as articulating directions for future department development. Although the AC’s decisions are not binding, the Head will consult with the AC when appropriate, and any decision taken by the Head against the advice of a majority of the AC will be reported to the committee within a month of the decision. The Head is expected to provide an oral explanation of the reasons for the decision.

The AC offers advice regarding:

1. Budget items;
2. Policies on allocations/funding of graduate student slots;
3. Justification of new faculty positions;
4. Creation of new areas;
5. Improving instruction;
6. Encouraging research;
7. All committee actions that have major policy implications;
8. New acquisitions, including space and equipment;
9. Allocations of departmental space;
10. Maintenance of departmental property;
11. Purchases of new computer equipment and software;
12. Information, plans, or initiatives relevant to the Department/College/University’s long-term strategic goals/objectives.

C. Duties

The Head shall normally seek the advice of the AC before enacting any major changes in the budget, organization, or policy within the department, and prior to the open discussion of these matters at faculty meetings. After appropriate discussion, a motion for a vote can be requested by the Head, the Chair of the AC, or any 2 members of the AC. It is expected that most votes will be conducted publicly. If a ballot is requested, the motion must be approved by a majority (two-thirds) of the voting members of the AC. For votes conducted by ballot, the votes shall be counted by 2 elected members of the AC. The results of all votes shall be made available to the members of the AC.

VII. Promotion and Tenure Committee

All actions of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be governed by the University Rules statement entitled “University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion” (University Rule # 12.01.99.M2) and the most recent Promotion and Tenure guidelines from the Office of the Dean of Faculties (http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/promotion_and_tenure/tamu_pt_guidelines_1.pdf) and for the College of Liberal Arts. Cases of promotion for non-tenure track faculty will be guided by the Office of the Dean of Faculties (http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/promotion_and_tenure/tamu_pt_guidelines_1.pdf) and the College of Liberal Arts guidelines (https://liberalarts.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/FacultyAcademicProfessionalTrackGuidelines.pdf)

A. Membership and Operation.

The policies specified in University Rule #12.01.99.M2 and in the most recent Promotion and Tenure guidelines of the College of Liberal Arts will be implemented in the Department as described below. Both of these policies state specific procedures for the evaluation of joint appointments, which will be implemented in the Department. For consideration of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be composed of all tenured faculty holding the rank of either Associate Professor or Professor. For consideration of promotion to the rank of Professor (within the tenure track), the committee shall be composed of tenured faculty holding the rank of Professor. For promotion of faculty with Instructional, Research, or Clinical appointments, the P&T Committee shall be composed of all faculty listed in VII.A as eligible to vote for promotion and tenure, plus all Instructional, Research, or Clinical appointments with Associate or Full titles (in the cases of promotion to Associate) or Full titles (in the cases of promotion to Full).
For promotion of faculty with a lecturer appointment, the P&T Committee shall be composed of all faculty listed in VII.A. as eligible to vote for promotion and tenure, plus all Instructional, Research, or Clinical appointments with Associate or Full titles and all faculty with senior lecturer titles (only in cases of appointment to a senior lecturer position).

Individuals who are eligible to vote on Promotion and Tenure matters may vote absentee if they are out of town and unable to vote in person. Votes may be cast by telephone, fax, or email. Absentee votes should be provided to the Chair of the P&T Committee.

The chair of the P&T Committee shall be appointed by the Head. Typically, a person should serve as Chair of the P&T Committee no more than once every five years.

In consultation with the Chair of the P&T Committee, the Head shall appoint P&T committee members to each evaluation subcommittee. There will be one evaluation subcommittee for each candidate being considered by the committee. Different subcommittee members will evaluate each candidate’s research, teaching, and service.

The Chair of the P&T Committee shall request from the Head any information contained in hiring or appointment documents that modify the expectations for a faculty member. These expectations will be conveyed by the Chair of the P&T Committee to the Committee at the time that a subcommittee is designated.

B. Duties:

The P&T Committee has five primary responsibilities; annual reviews of tenure-track faculty; third-year reviews of tenure-track faculty; reviews of candidates for promotion and tenure; reviews of academic professional track faculty (APTF) for promotion; periodic peer reviews of tenured faculty.

1. Annual reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty
   
   a. The candidate shall provide a vita, a description of job performance, and other information the candidate would like to have considered. For tenure-track faculty, the description will include information about the research program, information on teaching responsibilities (including teaching evaluations), and information on service.

   b. The P&T committee shall meet as a whole and prepare a summary report, including a recommendation for further action and suggestions for continued progress, which shall be forwarded to the Head. Following College rules, the committee will conduct two votes on the candidate. The first vote will indicate whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward promotion. The second vote will recommend for or against reappointment of the candidate. The department Head’s annual evaluation of the candidate shall report the results of both votes and whether or not the Head concurs with each one.
c. In his/her report, the Head shall convey the committee's report and votes as well as his/her own evaluation to the candidate in writing and shall also meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her own suggestions for progress.

2. **Third-year reviews**
The third-year review will assess the progress of the candidate toward receiving tenure. The committee shall provide an in-depth review of the candidate's progress toward tenure, using the same criteria as shall be applied for the awarding of tenure. The committee's report shall include recommendations for action and suggestions for progress and, if necessary, areas of required improvement.

a. As specified in University and College guidelines, the candidate shall provide:

   (1) a vita and copies of recent publications, articles in press or submitted for publication, a description of the research program, and grant proposals or other evidence of scholarly activity.

   (2) a description of teaching responsibilities and accomplishments, including course load, enrollments, syllabi, exams, formal student evaluations, and other relevant material.

   (3) a description of service to the department/university, to the community, and to the profession.

   (4) a 3-page maximum statement of goals in research, teaching, and service addressing the impact of the candidate in all three areas.

b. As specified in University or College guidelines, the committee shall provide:

   (1) Peer evaluations. The committee shall obtain relevant information from the faculty regarding research, teaching, and service.

   (2) Copies of all annual progress reports and all review letters previously sent to the Dean’s Office.

c. As specified in University or College guidelines, evaluation subcommittees will then prepare reports of research, teaching, and service. A final summary report will also be prepared that includes a recommendation for continuation or issuance of a terminal contract. That recommendation will be based on a vote of all committee members (by secret ballot) and the results of that vote will be reported in the candidate's summary report. The Head shall convey the results of the committee's report and his/her own report to the candidate in writing in a timely fashion. The Head shall also
meet with the candidate to discuss the recommendation of the committee and the Head’s decision.

3. Promotion and Tenure Reviews for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

(1) The P&T committee is responsible for preparing four documents for each candidate: a summary report, and teaching, research, and service reports. In all cases, research quality and productivity will be the most important criterion for promotion and tenure. However, in some cases, individuals may be hired to fill special needs. In these cases, criteria specified in the hiring contract can modify the weighting of traditional criteria.

(2) Research. The committee shall consider the following information:

(1) A curriculum vitae. The candidate shall provide copies of his/her curriculum vitae, including current citation impact scores of each journal, and full citations of all publications, divided by refereed vs. non-refereed journals, and identifying co-authors.

(2) Representative research. The candidate shall provide copies of 5 recent representative publications (which may include articles in press). In press is defined as a work that has been officially accepted for publication with no further revisions needed.

(3) Outside letters. The candidate shall provide a list of at least 8 people outside the University who are qualified to evaluate the candidate’s research. The candidate also may provide the names of people not to be solicited. The P&T committee also shall generate a list. The committee shall obtain a minimum of 5 and preferably 7 letters of evaluation, ensuring that the letters are balanced between the candidate’s and department’s lists.

(4) Research statement. As part of the maximum 3-page statement, the candidate shall provide a personal statement summarizing past accomplishments and outlining future research directions and specific goals.

(5) Other information. The candidate should provide other information that he/she believes pertinent (e.g., grant applications and reviews).

(6) For promotion to full professor, the Evaluation Subcommittee shall provide citation figures for all publications included in Science Citation Index and Social Science Citation Index.

(3) Teaching. The candidate shall provide the committee with information regarding course loads, enrollments, syllabi, handouts, exams, and a personal statement of teaching accomplishments and
future plans (as part of the maximum 3-page statement). The candidate also shall provide summaries of standard course evaluations, and the committee will verify the evaluation scores and department averages for equivalent courses.

(4) Service. The committee shall consider the following information in several categories: service to the Department and University, to the community, and to the profession.

(1) Department and University. The candidate shall provide a listing of committees served on in the Department and University (including dates of service), as well as other relevant activities.

(2) Community. The candidate shall provide a description of professional community involvement (e.g., speeches to community groups, volunteer consulting to organizations).

(3) Profession. The candidate shall provide a description of professional activities that may include involvement in APA or other national or state professional organizations, journal reviews, or grant reviews.

4. Promotion Reviews for Academic Professional Track Faculty (APTF)
   
a. The P&T committee is responsible for preparing documents for each candidate, consistent with University or College guidelines for promotion within the faculty title. The specific documents that will be prepared vary based on faculty title.

b. Consistent with College guidelines, the P&T committee shall obtain letters of evaluation from outside the department or university for Instructional appointments and Clinical and Research appointments.

c. Candidates shall provide information relevant to performance in their faculty title and appointment as specified in their hiring or appointment letters.

   (1) In all cases, the candidate shall provide copies of his/her curriculum vitae, including information specific to the APTF title and job duties as specified in hiring or appointment letters.

   (2) In faculty appointments where research is expected, candidates should provide, and the committee will consider, information specified in Section VII.B.3.b.

   (3) In faculty appointments where teaching is expected, candidates should provide, and the committee will consider, information specified in Section VII.B.3.c.

   (4) In faculty appointments where service is expected, candidates should provide, and the committee will consider, information specified in Section VII.B.3.d.
5. Periodic Peer Review for Tenured Faculty
   a. The P&T committee will conduct a peer-review for faculty who have not been reviewed through other means during the previous 6 years (i.e., faculty who have not undergone review as part of promotion or tenure reviews), consistent with SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (http://rules.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf).
   b. The peer-review committee shall consist of associate and full professors for peer evaluation of faculty at the associate rank; the peer-review committee shall consist of full professors for peer evaluation of faculty at professor rank.
   c. The faculty member undergoing peer review will provide an updated list of accomplishments, to include information about graduate student mentoring and placement, teaching evaluation information, journal 5-year impact factors, and citation figures for all publications. This information will be submitted no later than the start of spring semester during the 6th year since last evaluation.
   d. The peer-review committee will evaluate the submitted materials and provide a brief summary report that documents performance in research, teaching, and service. The committee will consider the entirety of an individual’s record as well as recent performance (i.e., the last 6 years). For each area of research, teaching, and service the summary report will include a statement evaluating whether the faculty member’s productivity is satisfactory, using the Department's Evaluation Guidelines. The report of the committee must specifically state the basis for a finding of needs improvement or unsatisfactory in any of the three categories. The Head shall convey the results of the committee's report in a timely fashion.

VIII. Committees

A. Evaluation Committee

1. Membership and Operation. The Evaluation Committee consists of two elected members and one member appointed by the Head, with the appointment being sensitive to diversity in the Department. Only tenured faculty members may serve on this committee. When the term of an elected member nears completion, the Department Head will request nominations and circulate a ballot. The nominees will be rank-ordered by the faculty, and the outcome of the vote will be determined by the hare system. Ballots are sorted by the number 1 ranked choice on each ballot. The nominee receiving the lowest number of votes is declared defeated. If more than one nominee remains, the ballots from the defeated candidate are transferred to the voter’s next choice and the nominee receiving the lowest number of votes is declared defeated. This process is repeated until there is no next choice. Elections will normally be held in April, and the newly appointed member will take office at the start of the fall term. Members will serve for 3 years, as Chair-Elect (first year), Chair (second
year), and Past-Chair (third year). If more than one member of the Committee must be replaced within a year, the Committee shall elect the chair.

2. **Functions.** The Evaluation Committee will advise and consult with the Head on the yearly faculty evaluation process. Duties include advising the Head on: (a) how to rate/interpret yearly faculty evaluation materials, (b) how available funds should be distributed among faculty members, (c) equity cases, and (d) special merit cases. Faculty will be evaluated according to the Evaluation Guidelines developed by the Department of Psychology and any modified duties or expectations that were agreed upon in the hiring/appointment documents will be provided to the Evaluation Committee. College and university guidelines on evaluation for joint appointed faculty will be followed. These guidelines should be reviewed by the Evaluation Committee periodically. If the Committee believes they require modification, a recommendation for changes should be made to the faculty. All votes to approve or modify the Evaluation Guidelines must be conducted by ballot and require approval by 2/3 of the voting faculty.

3. **Annual Review.** The Department's Evaluation Guidelines specify how annual reviews are to be conducted and delineate the role of the Evaluation Committee and the Department Head in assessing a tenured faculty member's performance each year. Consistent with University guidelines, an evaluation of “unsatisfactory” in any one category of research, teaching, or service or an evaluation of “needs improvement” in any two categories will result in an overall “unsatisfactory” evaluation (Standard Administrative Procedure on Post-Tenure Review; SAP 12.06.99.M1). College and university guidelines on evaluation for joint appointed faculty will be followed. Unsatisfactory evaluations will be reported to the Dean with a written plan for improvement.

**B. Diversity Committee**

1. **Membership and Operation.** The Diversity Committee is composed of members from each of the Departmental training areas, appointed by the Head, each of whom serves a three-year term. When appointing committee members, the Head should be sensitive to issues of gender, rank, and area, as well as other aspects of the Department that merit broad representation. The Head will appoint the committee chair. Diversity includes all relevant issues of gender, culture, and ethnicity at all levels.

2. **Functions.** The committee has the task of recruiting and representing students and faculty from non-traditional populations. Specifically, the committee works with representatives of relevant areas to facilitate recruitment and retention of candidates, and serves as a forum for considering special issues involving the ethnic minority or female members of the Department.
C. **Graduate Studies Committee**

1. **Membership and Operation.** The Graduate Studies Committee is composed of the Associate Head for Graduate Studies, who shall serve as the non-voting chair, plus one representative elected by each remaining graduate training area. One additional member will be elected from the ranks of the graduate students. The Associate Head for Graduate Studies shall be appointed by the Head for a term of three years. The other faculty members will serve two-year terms. The student representative will serve a one-year term. All terms are renewable. The GSC shall meet at least once each semester and more often if needed at the discretion of the Associate Head for Graduate Studies. Agendas will be determined by the Associate Head for Graduate Studies. Agenda items pertaining to evaluation of students will be considered in closed sessions, and graduate student members will be excused from attendance.

2. **Functions.** The GSC is responsible for advising the Head through the Associate Head for Graduate Studies, on the development and implementation of department-wide graduate training curricula, and for ensuring that areas conduct appropriate and timely yearly evaluations of their graduate students. It has 3 major duties:

   a. **Curricula.** The GSC shall help the department define the core curriculum. Changes in the core curriculum will be considered by the GSC. Proposals for new courses also will be approved by the GSC.

   b. **Evaluation.** All graduate students will be formally evaluated by their areas at least once per year. The Clinical Training Faculty shall be responsible for the evaluations of all graduate students in the Clinical Psychology Program. An Area's recommendation that the Department either reward or discipline a student can be reviewed by the GSC, if requested by the student. Evaluations of students may not be initiated by persons outside the student's area, but when the GSC is aware of concerns expressed by persons outside the student's area, it may request that the area consider these concerns and take appropriate action. Students who are discontinued in one graduate program may only remain in the Department if accepted by another graduate program. The GSC will also serve as an appeals board for disputes between students and faculty and for considering all cases of academic dishonesty involving graduate students. Decisions made by the GSC in these matters may be appealed by either party to the Head.

   c. **Admissions.** The GSC administers the graduate admission process and screens all applicants to all program areas. The applicant pool will be delivered to the relevant area, which will then rank the applicants according to its own selections procedures. No
applicant can be admitted for graduate training without the consent of both the area and the GSC. The GSC is responsible for communication with the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies (OGAPS) and the College for selecting nominees for College and University Fellowships, and for determining when and how many offers to applicants can be made. The offers themselves, however, may come from the area. All offers of funding that involve the admissions process are subject to final approval by the Head.

D. Undergraduate Studies Committee

1. Membership and Operation. The USC consists of the Associate Head for Undergraduate Studies, and an appointed (by the Head) representative from each of the Departmental program areas. Appointed members will serve two year terms. The USC usually shall meet at least once per semester and more often as needed at the discretion of the Chair.

2. Functions. The USC is charged with:

   a. developing policies relevant to undergraduate education in the Department.
   
   b. proposing and approving curriculum changes and academic requirements for undergraduate majors.
   
   c. Approving new courses for Development.
   
   d. overseeing the implementation of undergraduate program policies.
   
   e. facilitating the nomination of psychology undergraduates for departmental, college, university, and national awards.
   
   f. provide advice to the Head on undergraduate advising, including new student advising.

X. Other Committees

A. Membership and Operation

All other standing committees will be appointed by the Head. Each committee should meet at least once per year and provide reports of committee actions to the Associate Head, as detailed above.

B. Search Committees.

Search committees will normally be composed of at least one representative from at least three of the Department’s areas, at least one junior tenure-track faculty, and a member of the Department’s Diversity Committee (one person may serve multiple roles). Search committees will follow the University Rules for conducting searches (University Rule # 12.99.99M1, titled “Faculty Recruitment Procedures”; see below).
XI. Other Appointed Positions

A. Appointment and Operation

Each of the positions described in sections XI B through XI F is appointed by the Head. Individuals will serve for one year and can be re-appointed for a second year. After 2 years of service, faculty should not be re-assigned to the same position for at least 2 years. Faculty can be re-assigned if the individual seeks to continue in the position and no other faculty request the appointment.

B. Faculty Development & Awards

The Faculty Development and Awards Committee, appointed by the Head and Chaired by the Associate Head, with representation from the various Departmental areas, will be responsible for organizing and sponsoring nominations of faculty and staff for any awards offered within the department, in the college, within the University, or at the regional or national level. The Committee will also oversee the Faculty Mentoring Program and identify strategies to promote faculty development.

C. Psychology Human Participant Pool

No research may be conducted in the Department without ensuring that the American Psychological Association's ethical principles for human research guidelines are followed. A faculty member will be appointed to this duty by the Department Head to oversee the operation of the Introductory Psychology Research Participant Pool.

D. Website

The Web Advisor will provide input to the Head and the Department on issues involving the Internet, including new hardware and software developments, new educational and research applications, the Department Website, and other matters.

E. Alumni Relations and Development

The Alumni Relations and Development committee is designed to help create a supportive and inviting environment for TAMU Graduate and Undergraduate students as well as to develop strategies for tracking and staying in contact with our Psychology graduates. In addition, the ARDC should work with the College development office on possible development initiatives that affect the Department. The ARDC will consist of three faculty members appointed by the head, the elected chair of Psi Chi, and a representative elected by the Graduate Students. ARDC members should elect a faculty member to chair the body. The ARDC should meet at least twice per semester.

F. Space Committee

The Space Committee, appointed by the Head, with representation from the various Departmental areas, will be responsible for conducting periodic review of Departmental space allocation and for planning the space needs/renovations of the Department. At the beginning of each academic year, the Space Committee will elect a chair.
XII. Recruitment of Faculty

According to University rules, the Department must seek permission from the Dean to initiate a job search. Justifications and recommendations for new faculty positions and replacement of departing faculty are provided by the Advisory Committee based on current and projected needs of the various areas within the department, including undergraduate studies and minority concerns. With the advice of the Advisory Committee, the Department Head shall appoint an ad hoc Search Committee for each position. The results of these deliberations will be announced to the faculty at large and may be amended in the light of recommendations by the faculty.

After the search is authorized by the Dean, the responsibilities of the Search Committee will be to prepare the position advertisement, to solicit recommendations from the faculty concerning worthy candidates, to provide access to the candidates' vitae, and to arrange visits and agenda for the candidates. Typically, a minimum of two candidates will be interviewed for each available position. Usually the Head will offer a contract only to those candidates who have been recommended by at least a two-thirds majority vote of the voting faculty. Such votes are to be by secret ballot.

In some cases, appointments can be made on an emergency basis or under circumstances in which the normal procedures (a national search, interviews, a colloquium) are impractical or inappropriate. Under such circumstances, the Advisory Committee shall be consulted prior to considering such an appointment. With the exception of hiring ad-hoc faculty to fill standing course vacancies, both hiring and continuing appointments should be based on a two-thirds majority vote by the voting faculty.

XIII. Procedures for the Ratification and Amendment of the Bylaws

A. Ratification.

These bylaws will take effect when they have been ratified by a vote of two-thirds of the voting faculty and are approved by the Dean. The vote, by secret ballot, will be organized by the Head.

B. Amendments

1. Amendments to these bylaws may be proposed by the Head, Advisory Committee, or by a petition signed by at least 20% of the voting faculty.

2. The faculty shall vote upon proposed amendments through a ballot conducted only during the Fall or Spring semesters. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must be approved by two-thirds of the voting faculty.

XIV. Conflict between the Psychology Department Bylaws and other Regulations

Should any part of these Bylaws be in conflict with regulations of the College of Liberal Arts or Texas A&M University, those regulations take precedence over the Psychology Department Bylaws.

XV. Nepotism

Faculty must take all precautions to prevent actions that would be considered or perceived to be considered acts of Nepotism according to defined University Policies.
Cases of potential Nepotism will be dealt with according to published University policies.

XVI. Ethical Behavior

Faculty will engage in ethical behavior according to defined System Policies (http://policies.tamus.edu/07-01.pdf)
There are three department-level processes that involve the evaluation of faculty.

1. (a) Annual evaluation and (b) Merit raise allocations
2. Promotion and Tenure evaluations
3. Periodic peer review

This document describes annual evaluations, merit raise allocations, and periodic peer review. (There is a different document describing guidelines for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor).

It is important to note that evaluations involve subjective judgements. Accordingly, the Department entrusts a committee in conjunction with the Department Head to maximize objectivity and ensure evaluations reflect consensus ratings by peers. This document is intended to convey departmental expectations so faculty can allocate their efforts accordingly and to guide those conducting evaluations.

An important and overriding philosophy that the Department of Psychology has adopted when evaluating faculty is the principle of equifinality, which is the notion that satisfactory performance can be achieved by many potential means or paths, as illustrated by the multiple examples provided.

Faculty members are to be evaluated on the quality and scope of their work in fulfillment of the research, teaching, and service missions of Texas A&M University. The field of psychology is broad and changing and some of our work is interdisciplinary. Given that one overarching goal of the university and the department is to become one of the top twenty public universities and psychology departments, respectively, the performance indicators included in this document reflect that goal. These indicators are not intended to be static. This document should be reviewed regularly to ensure that the indicators match current expectations. The number of indicators, the number of accomplishments within an indicator category (e.g., the number of scholarly articles published in leading journals), and the quality of each accomplishment will be considered. The listed indicators are prototypical performance exemplars of strong performance in the specified performance dimension (i.e., research, teaching, and service) and are not intended to be exhaustive. Their order is random. See Appendix for more detailed information on indicators of performance.

I. General Procedure

A. Evaluations are conducted annually and based on accomplishments in the past 3 calendar years. See “clarifications” at the end of this document for additional details.

B. Faculty members are to be evaluated based on the weights assigned to research, teaching, and service. For the majority of tenured and tenure-track faculty, the weights are: 60% research
(25% funding; 35% scholarship), 30% teaching, and 10% service. For the annual review and periodic peer review, research will be considered as a compensatory aggregate of funding and scholarship, but will be disaggregated as non-compensatory for merit allocation. Consequently for merit allocations, a weighted combination will be calculated.

C. Academic professional track faculty will typically have different weights that reflect the duties associated with their position. Any modification to typical weights or expectations of faculty that is agreed upon between the faculty member and the Department Head will be detailed in a memo to the faculty member and this information will be provided to the evaluation committee. In situations where weights are modified in a given category, this memo should identify expectations for satisfactory performance in that category.

D. Annual evaluations and merit allocations will be conducted by the Evaluation Committee and the Department Head. Procedures for election and appointment to the committee are specified in the department's by-laws. Annual evaluation reviews will be completed first, followed by merit evaluation reviews. Each review will include four steps (a) each member of the evaluation committee and the Department Head will independently complete their review, (b) the evaluation committee will meet and reach consensus for each person being reviewed, (c) the committee and Department Head will meet to resolve differences in evaluation, and (d) the Department Head makes final decisions and shares them with the committee. During annual evaluation, the performance of each person reviewed will be categorized as satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory on research (broadly defined to include contributions in funding and/or scholarship), teaching, service, and overall. During merit evaluation, the performance of each person reviewed will be categorized as extraordinary, excellent, very good, satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in funding, scholarship, teaching, and service, for the purposes of merit raise allocations. It should be noted that funding and scholarship are compensatory for annual review. That is one (e.g., scholarship) can be offset or counterbalanced by the other (e.g., funding). However, for merit allocations, consistent with the weighting of 25% to funding and 35% to scholarship, funding and scholarship are NOT compensatory.

E. Procedures for periodic peer review are specified in the department's by-laws. The performance indicators and categorical evaluations described below for the annual evaluation process will also be used for periodic peer review. During periodic peer review, the performance of tenured faculty will be categorized as satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory on research (broadly defined to include contributions in funding and/or scholarship), teaching, and service. Funding and scholarship are compensatory for periodic peer review.

II. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
Faculty members are expected to have an active and impactful research program focused on understanding some aspect of behavioral, psychological, or neurobiological function relevant to one or more of the many interest areas of the department and the field of psychological science at large. Activities that indicate scholarship include grant funding for research activities or attempts to secure funding; publications of books, book chapters, articles, conference proceedings, or
other outlets appropriate to one’s area; research presentations and addresses at disciplinary meetings; awards and fellowships for scholarship.

A. Strong Performance Indicators

**Funding**
1. Receiving extramural funding from a federal funding agency.
2. Receiving extramural funding (grant, contract, etc.) from a private foundation.
3. Receiving major intramural (TAMU) funding.
4. Applying for major funding from internal or external sources.
5. Maintaining an active grant.

**Scholarship**
7. Editing a scholarly book for a leading publisher.
10. Publishing peer-reviewed journal articles in impactful journals.
11. Receiving a major external fellowship or research award.
12. Presenting a keynote address or paper at an international and national meetings.

B. Categorical Evaluations

6. **Extraordinary Performance.** Far exceeding departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and funding) in terms of both quantity and quality.

5. **Excellent Performance.** Exceeding departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and funding) in terms of quantity or quality.

4. **Very Good Performance.** Meeting departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and funding) with some evidence of exceeding expectations in terms of quantity or quality.

3. **Satisfactory Performance.** Meeting departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and/or funding) in terms of quantity and/or quality.

Some clear examples of satisfactory research performance are:

a. Published 2 articles per year (on average) in peer-reviewed journals, with at least one of these published in an impactful journal, and submitting at least one application to an extramural funding source per year.

b. Maintained an active grant, published one article per year (on average) in a peer-reviewed journal, and presented work at conferences.

c. Published more than 2 articles per year (on average) in impactful journals.
There are other examples of satisfactory performance (see statement on equifinality) and the evaluation committee will consider quantity and quality of contributions in rating faculty performance.

2. Needs Improvement. Falling below departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and/or funding) in terms of quantity OR quality.

1. Unsatisfactory performance. Failing to meet departmental expectations for scholarship (publications and/or funding) in terms of quantity AND quality.

III. Teaching
Faculty members are expected to contribute to the departmental mission of educating undergraduate and graduate students about up-to-date psychological science. Activities that are indicative of teaching include developing and teaching courses, mentoring, and placement of graduate and undergraduate students; chairing and serving on thesis and dissertation committees for undergraduate and graduate students; evidence of student learning via learning measurement, student evaluations, and peer observations; participation in development activities for pedagogy; publishing or developing new pedagogical materials and texts; receiving or applying for grant support for teaching related activities; engaging in diversity-related efforts to facilitate inclusion.

A. Strong Performance Indicators
1. Placing doctoral students into academic or research positions, including post-doctoral positions.
2. Chairing a completed doctoral dissertation that results in a submission to a peer-reviewed journal.
3. Publishing a peer-reviewed journal article with a graduate or undergraduate student.
4. Receiving a teaching or mentoring award.
5. Receiving a majority of exceeds expectations ratings on a peer observation of teaching rating form.
6. Demonstrating student learning through meaningful pre- and post-test gains over the course of a semester.
7. Directing an undergraduate University Honors Thesis.
8. Publishing instructional materials (e.g., test bank).
9. Developing new pedagogical methods and materials and sharing with the department.
10. Developing a graduate or undergraduate course that helps the department fulfill its teaching mission.
11. Incorporating effective pedagogy into courses and demonstrating its effectiveness in terms of student learning.
12. Receiving extramural or intramural (TAMU) grant support for teaching/learning projects.
13. Teaching a full course at an outside institution of recognized excellence.
14. Actively engaging in diversity-related efforts to facilitate the inclusion and success of under-represented students. According to the American Psychological Association, under-represented minority groups include African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Americans of Polynesian/Pacific Island descent.
15. Completing significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness and demonstrating improvement in terms of student learning. For example, attending formal university-sponsored training (e.g., courses offered by the Center for Teaching Excellence, teaching-related conferences and workshops).

16. Supervising/mentoring a graduate/undergraduate student who receives an award.

17. Teaching courses as a part of a study abroad program.

18. Supervising/mentoring an undergraduate student on an internship (PSYC 484).

B. Categorical Evaluations


5. Excellent Performance. Exceeding departmental expectations for teaching in terms of quantity or quality.

4. Very Good Performance. Meeting departmental expectations for teaching with some evidence of exceeding expectations in terms of quantity or quality.

3. Satisfactory Performance. Meeting departmental expectations for teaching in terms of quantity and/or quality.

Some clear examples of satisfactory teaching performance are:

a. Fulfilled one’s required teaching load, offered undergraduate service courses and graduate courses and mentored undergraduate and graduate students on research.

b. Fulfilled one’s required teaching load, offered undergraduate service courses, taught study abroad, and demonstrated student learning in courses.

c. Fulfilled one’s required teaching load, offered undergraduate and/or graduate courses and developed a new course that contributed to the department’s mission.

There are other examples of satisfactory performance (see statement on equifinality) and the evaluation committee will consider quantity and quality of contributions in rating faculty performance.

2. Needs Improvement. Falling below departmental expectations for teaching in terms of quantity OR quality.

1. Unsatisfactory performance. Failing to meet departmental expectations for teaching in terms of quantity AND quality.
IV. Service
Faculty members are expected to provide service to the psychology profession at the national level and locally at the university, college, or department at a level commensurate with their rank. Activities that are indicative of service include reviewing for grant panels, journals, and conferences; organizing programs, conferences, or other meetings or events; participating in or leading committee work; contributing to administrative work; contributing to the professional development of faculty, staff, and students.

A. Strong Performance Indicators
1. Serving as a member of review panel for a national research organization or agency.
2. Serving as editor, associate editor, or editorial board member of a major journal.
3. Serving as an ad hoc reviewer for a professional journal or research funding agency.
4. Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board.
5. Being an officer or in a leadership position in a professional organization.
6. Serving as committee or program chair or in a similar position at an international, national, regional, or state meeting.
7. Organizing and hosting a national or international scholarly conference.
8. Serving in an unsalaried administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University.
9. Serving as an officer or member in the Faculty Senate.
10. Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee.
11. Organizing a department workshop session that involves the development of junior faculty.
12. Serving as an Area Coordinator.
13. Attending a training workshop or session on best practices and/or development as a mentor.
14. Being an advisor to a student organization.

B. Categorical Evaluations


5. Excellent Performance. Exceeding departmental expectations for service in terms of quantity or quality.

4. Very Good Performance. Meeting departmental expectations for service with some evidence of exceeding expectations in terms of quantity or quality.

3. Satisfactory Performance. Meeting departmental expectations for service in terms of quantity and/or quality.

Some clear examples of satisfactory service performance are:

a. Chaired a major professional organization committee, reviewed for peer-reviewed journals, and engaged in multiple faculty recruitment activities.
b. Reviewed for peer-reviewed journals and served as a contributing member to a local committee.

c. Chaired a college-level committee and served on the mentoring committee of an assistant professor.

There are other examples of satisfactory performance (see statement on equifinality) and the evaluation committee will consider quantity and quality of contributions in rating faculty performance.

2. Needs Improvement. Falling below department expectations for service in terms of quantity OR quality.

1. Unsatisfactory performance. Failing to meet department expectations for service in terms of quantity AND quality.

Clarifications

1. For the purposes of evaluating research, all publications and conference presentations/proceedings will be evaluated when they appear in print. Advance publications online and “in press” will not be counted, as publications can be “in press” for inconsistent amounts of time across outlets and therefore would be included for variable periods of time.

2. Impactful academic journals have at least several of the following qualities: indexed in standard databases (e.g., PubMed, PsycINFO); a rigorous peer review process; publish significant work (indexed by citation metrics including 5-year impact factor); led by an internationally recognized editor and editorial board; published by the American Psychological Association or the Association for Psychological Science or by equivalently prestigious international associations.

3. A grant application is included in the evaluation process when a decision to fund has been made. Up to two revisions and resubmissions of a grant proposal will be treated as separate “accomplishments.”

4. Funded grants are counted in the annual evaluation process throughout their term.

5. It is the responsibility of faculty members to document their teaching activities and the impact of their teaching on student learning and/or student outcomes. Service courses are courses that appear in the menus of required classes for psychology majors, as well as required courses for graduate students.

6. It is the responsibility of faculty members to document their committee or task force activities and the impact of their participation.
Appendix: Evaluative Criteria

A. Criteria for Scholarly Activities

*Indicators of Outstanding Merit*

1. Publications in leading refereed journals in psychology or allied fields.
2. Receiving a major external fellowship or research award (*not including research grants*).
3. Frequent citation of publications as indicated by the Social Science and Science Citation Indexes. Citations of any article regardless of when it was published that appear within the 3 year rolling window are included in the evaluation process.
4. Publication of scholarly books by leading publishers.
5. Presentation of keynote addresses or invited papers at international and national meetings.
6. Receiving, as a PI or Co-PI, significant (as defined relative to the norms of the sub-disciplines represented in the department) external peer-reviewed funding for research; Co-PI’s must provide a description of their contribution to the writing and execution of the grant that indicates a major contribution on their part to meet the requirements of this indicator.
7. International scholarly visibility, including but not limited to collaborations with international scholars and presentations at international professional meetings. Funding obtained from international sources will be considered in the merit raise process under the provisions established for research grants.
8. Editing a scholarly book.

*Indicators of Merit*

1. Publication of scholarly books.
2. Publications in refereed journals.
3. Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book.
4. Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines.
5. Submission of external grants that were not funded.
6. Receipt of internal peer-reviewed funding for research.

B. Criteria for Teaching

*Indicators of Outstanding Merit*

1. Teaching performance that is significantly above the departmental average for relevant comparator courses as evidenced by student evaluations or other means of evaluation adopted by the faculty.
2. Direction of research by a graduate student published in a refereed journal, where the student is the first (or primary) author.
3. Selection for a University, College, or national professional society outstanding teacher award.
4. Direction of an undergraduate University Honors Thesis.
5. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
6. Developing a course that is new to the curriculum.
7. Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
8. Invitation to teach a course (not to give a lecture) at a domestic or an international institution of recognized excellence.
9. Facilitation of the receipt by one’s graduate advisee(s) of awards for research (e.g., NIH, NSF, or APA awards.).
10. Placement of graduate students into significant academic or research positions, including post-doctoral positions.
11. Chairing a doctoral committee. Credit is received upon completion of the dissertation and for the next two years.
12. Facilitating the inclusion within the graduate and undergraduate student body and the success of members of minority groups that are under-represented among graduate and undergraduate students in psychology. In accordance with the practice of the American Psychological Association, under-represented minority groups include Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Americans of Polynesian/Pacific Island descent.
13. Awards for a presentation (poster or paper) won at a national or international conference by a graduate student.

**Indicators of Merit**

1. Chair of a master’s or member of a doctoral research committee. Credit is received upon completion of the thesis or dissertation and for the next two years.
2. Classroom teaching performance at or near the department norm for relevant comparator courses as evidenced by student evaluations or other means of evaluation adopted by the faculty.
3. Development of new pedagogical methods and materials.
4. Major revision of existing courses, not including normal updating.
5. Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
6. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
7. Graduate or undergraduate presentation (poster or paper) at a national or international conference.

**C. Criteria for Service**

**Indicators of Outstanding Merit**

1. Serving on the mentoring committee of an assistant professor.
2. Organizing a department workshop session that involves the development of junior faculty.
3. Serving as editor, associate editor, or editorial board member of a major journal.
4. Being an officer in a national or international professional organization.
5. Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board.
6. Serving in an unsalaried administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University.
7. Serving as committee or program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting.
8. Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate.
9. Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee.
10. Serving as a member of review panel for a national research organization.
11. Outstanding performance as the department’s Director of Graduate Training.
12. Outstanding performance as a member of a university, college, departmental, or national committee or task force. (It is responsibility of faculty members to document their committee or task force activities).
13. Organizing and hosting a national or international scholarly conference.

**Indicators of Merit**

1. Participation in department workshop sessions that involve the development of junior faculty.
2. Attending a training workshop or session on best practices and/or development as a mentor.
3. Being an officer in regional or state professional organization.
4. Serving as program or committee chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting.
5. Effective service as department’s Director of Graduate Training.
6. Serving as an **active** member of the Faculty Senate. (It is the faculty member’s responsibility to list their Senate activities.)
7. Active service on university, college, and department committees and task forces. (It is the faculty member’s responsibility to document their committee or task force activities. Service on a largely inactive committee or task force will not be credited in the evaluation process.)
8. Being an advisor to a student organization.
9. Serving as an ad hoc reviewer for a professional journal or research funding agency.
Candidates being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (with tenure) in the Department of Psychology at Texas A&M University are expected to be outstanding scholars, teachers, and academic citizens. Upon appointment to the Department of Psychology, new Assistant Professors will be assigned a two person faculty mentoring team, each of whom holds the rank of either Associate or Full Professor. Prior to consideration for tenure and promotion, Assistant Professors should work closely with their faculty mentor and the Department Head to ensure that they understand the Departmental expectations for research, teaching, and service. All Assistant Professors are reviewed annually by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, which evaluates the faculty member’s research, teaching, and service contributions during the prior year as well as their overall record to date. The Promotion and Tenure Committee conveys the results of this review to the candidate through a letter and the candidate also receives written/verbal feedback from the Department Head. It is highly recommended that the candidate take this feedback seriously and address any issues or concerns prior to the next annual evaluation. It is also highly recommended that assistant professors speak with their faculty mentors to discuss strategies for maintaining or improving their research, teaching, and/or service record based on the annual review. Specific expectations for research, teaching, and service activity are detailed below. In addition to these expectations, the Department also considers a candidate’s ability to work effectively with colleagues in the department, the College, the University, and in the discipline.

Please note that the list below does not reflect specific requirements for Tenure and Promotion, but only serves as a guideline to developing a successful portfolio. These are recommended guidelines, not fixed criteria.

Research
Candidates are expected to establish an independent, productive, visible research program involving graduate and undergraduate students, and actively seek extramural research funding. Successful candidates for tenure are expected to have contributed to research by:

- Establishing an active research program at TAMU focused on understanding some aspect of behavioral, psychological, or neurobiological function relevant to one or more of the many interest areas of the department and the field of psychological science at large. It is expected both graduate and undergraduate students will be active participants in this research program. Although, candidate should show independence of their primary graduate school research mentor, the development of substantive collaborations with faculty within the department or in other departments and institutions is also encouraged.

- Publishing a programmatic series of papers relevant to the candidate’s research theme. Successful candidates should average 2-3 publications per year (e.g., 10-15) published or in press (within the tenure window) at the time they are reviewed for promotion. Of these, it is expected that candidates publish as a senior author (generally first author, or first faculty author following graduate or undergraduate student authors, or last author as is appropriate in some journals) at least 6 empirical, theoretical, or review papers in which the research, review, or theory development was conducted as an independent principal investigator at TAMU. One hallmark of independence is that the work does not
include the graduate or postdoctoral advisor as authors. Another hallmark of independence is evidence of developing papers that evolve in theory, method, or population relative to the graduate advisor (e.g., work with advisor is correlational whereas independent work is interventions). The papers should describe new data, a substantive theoretical advance, or an extensive scholarly review of an area of research related to the candidate's work.

- Publishing their work in top-tier academic journals in the candidate’s research area or the field at large. There are many factors that influence the quality of various journal outlets and the work published therein. Outstanding academic journals have at least several of the following qualities: indexed in standard databases (e.g., PubMed, PsycINFO); a rigorous peer review process; publish significant work (indexed by citation metrics including 5-year impact factor); led by an internationally recognized editor and editorial board; published by the American Psychological Association or by the American Psychological Society or by equivalently prestigious international associations. Faculty mentors can often provide helpful advice on the appropriate outlets to target for publication. Publications in non-peer reviewed journals, magazines, or newsletters are not considered in the research dossier but might be considered in the teaching or service dossier, depending on their content and audience.

- Presenting at least one scholarly work per year on average at international or national scientific meetings. These presentations can take the form of posters or oral talks presented by the candidate or their students.

- Actively engaging in obtaining extramural research funds. The candidate should submit high quality (as indicated by the P&T review of grant proposals submitted) proposals to a federal agency such as the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation; and/or private foundations such as the Alzheimer’s Association, the Brain & Behavior Research Foundation. The strongest candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure will have secured extramural funding prior to consideration for tenure, in addition to meeting or exceeding expectations in research productivity and manuscript placement.

**Teaching**

Candidates are expected to be competent instructors on both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and to contribute to the teaching mission of the department by teaching courses important for the undergraduate major and the graduate core requirements. Prior to consideration for tenure, the candidate should have contributed to the teaching mission of the department by:

- Teaching at least one high enrollment course on a regular basis, unless specifically tasked to teach other courses (e.g., graduate statistics sequence)
- Teaching courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, unless specifically tasked to teach other courses (e.g., graduate statistics sequence)
- Collecting student evaluations at the end of each course; whether conducted online or in class candidates should encourage students to submit course evaluations
- Having had their teaching evaluated by a committee of 3 tenured faculty before the third year review and again before the tenure materials are produced. This committee will consist of the Undergraduate Committee Chair and two other tenured faculty from the Psychology department (including one from the candidate’s area of research within the
department). This committee will also review the candidate’s teaching evaluations in order to provide additional feedback. The committee will then discuss with the candidate any weak elements of his/her teaching and make suggested changes for improvement in their courses and/or teaching style.

- Demonstrating evidence of supportive and effective mentorship to graduate and undergraduate students in their laboratory or on their research team. Graduate students should have proceeded through the department’s graduate program in a timely manner, meeting departmental deadlines for coursework and graduate program requirements (e.g., Master’s proposal, Master’s thesis) and progressing in their professional development (e.g., presenting at national or international conferences, submitting manuscripts).

Service
The principle of shared governance depends on faculty contributing time and effort to the maintenance and development of the university. Although assistant professors’ time should generally be spent on research and teaching, assistant professors are also expected to contribute to the common mission of the Department, although to a lesser extent than tenured colleagues. The candidate is expected to have contributed through service to the department, University, and scientific community in the following ways:

- Department
  - The candidate should have served on at least 2 departmental committees. Candidates are expected to attend all meetings of the committee, participate actively in committee discussions, and contribute to committee decisions.
  - The candidate shall contribute significantly to the intellectual and pedagogical life of the department by participating in such departmental activities.
  - It is also suggested that the candidate be involved in organizing colloquia or other department-affiliated seminars to give them a chance to interact with internationally known scholars from other institutions.

- College/University
  - Service to or involvement in some College or University level activities prior to consideration for tenure is highly recommended.

- Scientific community
  - Candidates should be actively peer-reviewing manuscripts for various journals in their field.
  - Candidates should be members of scientific societies relevant to their work (e.g., Society for Neuroscience, Association for Psychological Science, Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies, American Psychological Association).
  - It is highly recommended that candidates become involved in other service to their field with such activities as grant reviewing, editorial board memberships, advisory boards, or society leadership positions (e.g., secretary or treasurer of a scientific society).