

**Department of
Philosophy
Guidelines for Faculty
Evaluation**

*Submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Affairs for review: January 4, 2025
Approved by College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Affairs: November 25, 2025
Approved by University Faculty Affairs: November 26, 2025*

Table of Contents

Section 1:	Introduction	3
Section 2:	Faculty Tracks and Ranks	4
2.1	Tenure Track Titles	4
2.2	Academic Professional Track Titles	5
Section 3:	Expectations for Areas of Responsibility	5
3.1	Teaching	6
3.2	Research and/or Creative Work	7
3.3	Service	7
3.4	Administration	7
Section 4:	Scale and Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Performance	8
4.1	Rating Scale for Annual Reviews	8
4.2	Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Areas of Responsibility	8
Section 5:	Annual Review	13
5.1	Purpose	13
5.2	Focus	14
5.3	Time Period of Review	15
5.4	Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance	15
5.5	Required Components for Annual Review and Process	18
5.6	Promotion Progress Review	22
5.7	Assessment Outcomes that Require Action	23
5.8	Timeline	24
5.9	Complaint Procedure	25
Section 6:	Midterm Review for Untenured Assistant Professors	25
6.1	Purpose	25
6.2	Process	26
6.3	College-Level Requirements for the Midterm Dossier	26
6.4	Feedback for Midterm Review	27
Section 7:	College-level Processes for Promotion and Tenure	28
7.1	Purpose	28
7.2	Focus	28
7.3	Time Period of Review	28
7.4	Time Considerations	29
7.5	College-level Requirements for the Candidates Promotion Dossier	31
7.6	College-level Requirements for the Departmental-level Review	35
Section 8:	Department of Philosophy Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	37
8.1	Evaluation Criteria for Tenure Track Faculty	37
8.2	Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty	39
Section 9:	Post-tenure Review	41
9.1	Purpose	41
9.2	Peer Review Committee	42
9.3	Process for Periodic Peer Review	42
9.4	Professional Development Review	43
9.5	Professional Development Plan	45

9.6	Appeal Process (Post-tenure Review & Professional Development Review)	45
9.7	Voluntary Post-tenure Review	45

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Philosophy is to produce significant research in the discipline of philosophy and related areas, to provide high quality undergraduate and graduate teaching, advising, and mentoring, and to contribute service to the College of Arts and Sciences, Texas A&M University, the discipline of philosophy (or other areas of the academic profession), and the state of Texas. 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 Philosophy for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. ([UR 12.01.99.M1](#)) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLES AND LINKS TO DOCUMENTS
12.01.99.M1 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (including Appendix I)
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review
University Guidelines for Annual and Midterm Review
University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

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.

SECTION 2: FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). Faculty ranks and tracks within the Department of Philosophy are:

2.1 Tenure Track Titles

Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of tenure track faculty members. In this document, “tenure track” includes untenured assistant professors, untenured associate professors, tenured associate professors, and untenured or tenured professors. Tenure track faculty in the Department of Philosophy are expected to make significant contributions in all three areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. The concept of tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom and is granted to a subset of faculty who have a strong record of research and/or creative work and who have demonstrated that they will continue to be productive in this area of responsibility, in addition to having strong records of teaching and service.

Assistant Professor. The position of Assistant Professor is a tenure track appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Assistant professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in all three areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service.

Associate Professor. The position of Associate Professor is typically a tenured appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. (In rare cases, a faculty member may be at the rank of associate professor without tenure.) Associate professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of research and/or creative work, teaching, and service. The status of tenure is recognition of excellence in all three areas of responsibility and entitles the faculty member to continue in their academic position unless dismissed for good cause.

Professor. The position of Professor is a tenured appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Professors are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which they will be primarily teaching. All faculty in this title are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. The status of tenure is recognition of excellence in all three areas of responsibility and entitles the faculty member to continue in their academic position unless dismissed for

good cause, and the promotion to the rank of professor is based on continuing accomplishment and national or international recognition for scholarship.

2.1.1 Temporary Title

Instructor is a title that is used for an individual who was recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree prior to the beginning of the appointment. This title would normally be used for less than one year after hire. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title will be reclassified to Assistant Professor and the tenure probationary period will begin. Instructors are expected to make significant contributions in three areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service.

2.2 Academic Professional Track Titles

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty titles are general terms used to describe non-tenure accruing appointment titles that are eligible for promotion.

Faculty with the title of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer will normally hold a master's or terminal degree in the teaching field and will make significant contributions to teaching activity (usually at the undergraduate level). Lecturer faculty can also be assigned to service activity but are not expected to consistently make significant contributions in either research and/or creative work or the area of service. Any activity outside of teaching should be a small percentage of their time and effort. In all reviews, lecturer faculty will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity.

Faculty with the title of Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Professor normally hold a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which the faculty member will teach and are expected to make significant contributions to teaching activity at undergraduate or graduate level. All faculty in these titles will also make significant contributions in either research and/or creative work or service. Typically, most of an instructional faculty's time and effort will be in the area of teaching, with an expectation to engage in professional development within the discipline or industry in which they teach. Faculty in these titles will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity, plus contributions to either the area of service or the area of research and/or creative work.

SECTION 3: EXPECTATIONS FOR AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance of (1) teaching, (2) research and/or creative work, and (3) service. Alternate work assignments, such as administration, may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the

written approval of the department head and the Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties, including any administrative assignments. The nature of a faculty member's contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not contain a specific formula for faculty contribution; however, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable college evaluations. [Appendix B](#) of the College guidelines contains a list of sample indicators that are aligned with the rating scale. The tables in Appendix B provide suggested guidance for evaluating faculty performance in each of the assigned areas of responsibility. All faculty should strive to "meet expectations" (minimally) and to "exceed expectations" (ideally) in all their assigned responsibilities. Departments are responsible for using departmental guidelines to evaluate all faculty members annually according to their assigned area(s) of responsibility.

The [TAMU Faculty Affairs Guidelines to Faculty Titles](#) document outlines the expected responsibilities of all faculty members according to their title. More details regarding expectations of faculty within the various tracks are summarized in Section 8.

Tenure track faculty members (whether tenured or not) are expected to make substantial contributions in all three primary areas of responsibility: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Faculty members in Philosophy receive annual appointment letters outlining percentage effort in assigned areas. With the approval of the college, a department head may modify an individual faculty member's research effort for a specified period of time. If the research and/or creative work area is reduced, it should not be below 25%, except for faculty members whose percent effort in administrative duties at the department, college, or the university level is 50% or above.

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the Department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty with assigned teaching responsibilities. As such, all faculty members who teach are expected to:

- (a) use teaching practices known to motivate and actively engage students in the learning process,
- (b) contribute to meaningful instruction and acquisition of knowledge for all students,
- (c) aim to continuously improve their teaching practices,
- (d) foster a positive, inclusive, and equitable learning environment for students,
- (e) promote and diversify the development of the college's instructional programs, and
- (f) be a positive role model, mentor, or advisor.

3.2 Research and/or creative work

All tenure track faculty members (whether tenured or not) are expected to engage in continuous research and/or creative work conducted individually or/and collaboratively. For Philosophy, this category consists principally of research and publications. Some academic professional track faculty may have a percentage of effort assigned to research and/or creative work. The evaluation of research and/or creative work is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion for those faculty who have percentage of effort assigned to research and/or creative work.

Given the diversity of fields and subfields represented in the College of Arts and Sciences, and even within departments, the college recognizes that evaluation of performance in scholarship and creative work does not follow rigid college-prescribed criteria; the Department of Philosophy likewise recognizes that there are a diversity of subfields within the field, and the specific criteria below are reflective of this.

3.3 Service

Service contributions include service to the department, college, university, academic discipline, and the broader community. Service to the department, college, or university typically involves activities that are essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of these units. This can include, but is not limited to, actively serving on committees and task forces, coordinating departmental programs, or leading initiatives that improve the functions of the units. Service to the discipline includes reviewing scholarly work, coordinating disciplinary events, and leading scholarly organizations. Service to the broader community includes extramural service and outreach activities that benefit local schools, industry, local/state/national agencies, or community organizations. Service is an integral part of most faculty tracks (except for lecturer titles). However, the amount and the nature of a faculty member's service contributions are likely to vary depending on the faculty member's job title, track, career stage, and interest.

3.4 Administration

This area of responsibility is limited to faculty who have leadership roles within the department, college, or university (i.e., department heads, associate/assistant heads, program directors, associate/assistant deans, etc.). Appointment letters should clearly state the percentage of time and effort for the administrative appointment. The evaluation of administrative duties should be based on criteria and expectations specified in individual appointment letters.

SECTION 4: SCALE AND GUIDING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE

This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance; it does, however, provide rating scales along with guiding criteria and indicators for evaluating faculty performance. A description of these tools for evaluating faculty performance are provided below. Departmental specific criteria are outlined in Section 8.

- A rating scale for evaluating faculty performance ([Section 4.1](#)). The rating scale is most applicable for annual reviews, though the points along the scale are also relevant for assessing performance during midterm, promotion, and post-tenure reviews.
- A set of guiding criteria describing general expectations of faculty within each assigned area of responsibility ([Section 4.2](#)). The guiding criteria are applicable for all reviews. The guiding criteria will be used by college-level committees when evaluating performance during midterm and promotion reviews.
- A wide-ranging list of sample indicators, or common accomplishments, for evaluating faculty performance ([Appendix B](#)). Sample indicators, aligned with both the rating scale and the guiding criteria associated with each assigned area of responsibility, are provided in a series of tables located in Appendix B.

4.1 Rating Scale for Annual Reviews

The Department of Philosophy uses the following five-point scale for evaluating faculty performance:

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

The five-point scale is most relevant for annual reviews. More information on the rating scale can be found in Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Areas of Responsibility, below.

4.2 Guiding Criteria for Evaluation Areas of Responsibility

4.2.1 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Philosophy will use the following guiding criteria, following the College of Arts and Sciences, in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of teaching:

- Quality of Teaching - Any review of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence the faculty member has an established record of high-quality teaching. Quality teaching encompasses a variety of skills and best practices including, but not limited to, (a) use of teaching techniques proven to motivate students and engage them in the learning process; (b) careful selection and preparation of course content (i.e., sequencing of topics, level of rigor, pacing of topics, etc.); (c) use of accurate, organized, neat, and up-to-date teaching materials; (d) appropriate methods to assess student work and progress in the course; (e) proper course management; (f) use of effective communication (i.e., clear explanations in class, timeliness of email responses, clarity of course or assignment expectations, etc.) ; and (g) maintaining a positive, inclusive, and equitable learning environment for all students.
- Professional Development – Any review of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member engages in professional development activities that enhance and improve their instructional effectiveness. This could include, but is not limited to, programs offered by the professional organizations, the Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Transformational Teaching and Learning Conference.
- Curricular Development - Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that the faculty member creates, improves, or enhances the curriculum for a course or a set of courses, or a new course.
- Impact Beyond the Classroom - Reviews of faculty performance for teaching will consider evidence that a faculty member’s teaching has an impact that extends beyond the classroom. This would include (a) supervising high-impact learning experiences (e.g., internships, honors contracts, study abroad, undergraduate research, etc.); (b) mentoring and advising undergraduate and/or graduate students, (c) activities that contribute to the professional success of students (e.g., reviewing student’s grant proposals or manuscripts, writing reference letters, etc.); and (d) disseminating teaching methods and course materials to other instructors.

4.2.1.1 Sources for Evaluating Teaching Performance

The evaluation of teaching is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement or the use of a single source of information (i.e., student evaluations of teaching). To better protect against potential bias and ensure a more holistic review of a faculty member’s teaching performance, multiple sources of information must be considered.

The following two sources are required for any review (annual, midterm, promotion, or post tenure) of faculty performance in teaching.

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

For promotion reviews, the Department will conduct two peer-evaluations via observation of teaching, per College requirements. Individuals who conduct these peer observations should provide documentation summarizing their review of the observation to the candidate and ideally discuss the observation with the candidate. For this purpose, reviewers may use either the sample classroom observation instrument provided in [Appendix C](#) of the College guidelines, or the instruments available on the Center for Teaching Excellence website. The departmental P&T committee must include summaries of the two peer observations in the teaching evaluation section of the P&T committee report. If a candidate has received more than two peer observations of teaching prior to promotion, the candidate may choose which two peer observations the P&T committee should summarize in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching. A candidate may choose to include information in their impact statement about how the peer feedback helped to improve or modify their teaching.

Other possible sources that can be used, but are not required, for annual, midterm, and promotion and post-tenure reviews are:

- (a) self-evaluation and reflective practices to improve teaching methodologies,
- (b) peer-evaluation of course materials including syllabi, assignments, and assessments,
- (c) peer-evaluation of the organization and layout of websites or the University's learning, management system to organize and disseminate course materials,
- (d) peer-evaluation of assessment techniques or grading rubrics,
- (e) evidence of student learning or attainment of learning objectives,
- (f) description of projects related to curricular innovation or development,
- (g) faculty member's grade distributions and course GPA relative to overall grade distribution and course GPA for all instructors who teach the course, and
- (h) quality of the mentoring of colleagues or graduate students for teaching.

4.2.2 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Research and/or Creative Work

The Department of Philosophy will use the guiding criteria described below in the

evaluation of faculty performance in the area of research and/or creative work, following the College of Arts and Sciences. The first criterion is relevant for all four types of faculty performance evaluation (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review and post-tenure review). The other three guiding criteria may be used for all types of review but are of particular relevance for promotion reviews.

- Productivity - Productivity encompasses a variety of activities including, but not limited to, time and effort spent conducting research; the delivery of research presentations; the submissions of research proposals for funding (in disciplines where funding is available and normally expected); the production of digital scholarship (in disciplines where digital scholarship is relevant); and the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly or creative work. Specific evaluation criteria are given below. Any review of faculty performance (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review or post-tenure review) will consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member is a productive scholar with an active research and/or creative work agenda.
- Independence and Intellectual Leadership - Any review of faculty performance will consider demonstrated evidence that the faculty member has established an independent record of research and/or creative work that goes beyond early career mentors (particularly for early career scholars) and/or that the faculty member is regarded as an intellectual leader within a chosen area of specialty (particularly for senior scholars). To meet this guiding criterion, a faculty member's scholarly or creative work must be regarded as original, authentic, or innovative within the discipline and/or subspecialty. To achieve independence and intellectual leadership, a faculty member needs to have the skills and resources necessary to design and conduct a feasible study. In some disciplines, this would include serving as the principal investigator on external grants. In some disciplines, this would include the development of networks and collaborations critical for success.
- Scholarly Impact – Any review of faculty performance will consider evidence that the faculty member's work is making an impact. The impact may be limited to impacts on the discipline, but may also include broader impacts to the local community, the state of Texas, the nation, or beyond. Broader impacts may include practical applications of research, including but not limited to the production of patents. Specific criteria for impact are given below. For promotion reviews, external review letters should address the impact of a faculty member's research and/or creative work, and department reports and department head letters must provide information to help understand how individual metrics fit within the context of the discipline and subspecialty.
- Positive Trajectory - Any review of faculty performance will consider

evidence that the faculty member is on a positive trajectory within the next 3-5 years, with projects at various stages of completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future.

4.2.2.1 Sources for Evaluating Research and/or Creative Work

The evaluation of research and/or creative work is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Multiple sources of information must be considered when reviewing records of research and/or creative work. Each type of review (i.e., annual review, midterm review, promotion review, and post-tenure review) requires a different set of required sources (as indicated in more detail in the sections below).

4.2.3 Guiding Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

The Department of Philosophy uses the following guiding criteria in the evaluation of faculty performance in the area of service, following the College of Arts and Sciences:

- **Institutional Engagement** - Institutional engagement includes activities that benefit the department, college, and university. This includes serving on committees commensurate with one's academic rank and job title and making meaningful contributions to the governance of the institution.
- **Academic Leadership** - Academic leadership exemplifies a commitment to the institution and the discipline. Leadership activities include, but are not limited to, chairing committees and task forces on campus, coordinating operations of multi-section courses, and serving as a leader to scholarly organizations and entities that serve academia.
- **Professional Mentoring** - Professional mentoring encompasses a variety of activities, including the informal and formal mentoring of colleagues, participating in and/or leading programs designed to provide professional development to others, serving as a faculty advisor to a student group, and writing letters of recommendation.
- **Commitment to the Discipline** - There is a wide variety of review work that falls outside the scope of committee work (e.g., reviews for internal and external grant programs, scholarly journals, awards programs, tenure and promotion reviews, program reviews, etc.). This work is a normal component of service activities. Invitations to review work signifies stature in the discipline, or interdisciplinary field, while providing review work demonstrates a commitment to the discipline.
- **Public Outreach and Engagement** - Public outreach and engagement consists of service and leadership activities that benefit the local community, the state, the nation, and the broader society. This includes but is not limited to speaking engagements for broader audiences, publication of editorial opinions, outreach activities to local schools, serving on the

board of a community organization (relevant to one's area of scholarly expertise), and providing testimony based on one's area of expertise.

4.2.3.1 Sources for Evaluating Service

The evaluation of service is considered in decisions regarding merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. Evaluation of service should focus on the significance and impact of the service activities to the department, college, university, academic discipline, or the broader community relative to the faculty member's title and percentage of assigned responsibility. There is not a prescribed list of items or sources to use in the evaluation of service. The key sources of information for evaluating service include the CV, annual review form (for annual reviews), and impact statement (for midterm and promotion reviews). Faculty may opt to include additional evidence for their service performance, including, but not limited to, support letters and emails that denote service contributions.

SECTION 5: ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M1 \(University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion\)](#). All university-employed faculty members 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 must collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (see of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1 \(University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion\)](#)).

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 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 50% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

5.1 Purpose

The purpose of annual reviews of faculty performance are to:

- 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 or improved.

- provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion or tenure as relevant (refer to Section 2.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).
- allow for an 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.
- ensure that faculty members are in compliance with all university compliance requirements. ([System Regulation 33.05.02 – Required Employee Training](#)).

In the Department of Philosophy, the annual review process is also an opportunity to provide feedback to faculty regarding their progress toward future promotion. For faculty with mandatory probationary periods, the promotion progress review is a required element of the annual review process. For all other faculty, the promotion progress review is optional.

5.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual faculty member'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 untenured assistant professors, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty, the annual review evaluates performance in their assigned areas of responsibility and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable. For more information see Section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1 \(University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion\)](#).

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

5.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the three-year performance period comprising the most recent three calendar years.

5.4 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 five-point scale: “Unsatisfactory” (0 – 1.74), “Needs Improvement” (1.75 – 2.74), “Meets Expectations” (2.75 – 3.74), “Exceeds Expectations” (3.75 – 4.4), “Outstanding” (4.5 - 5). Faculty performance may receive scores between whole number designations. Overall faculty performance will be a calculation of scores in performance areas relative to assigned efforts in the areas.

Characteristically, tenured faculty’s assignment is 40% effort in teaching, 40% effort in research, and in 20% service; and, tenure-track assistant faculty’s assignment is 45% effort in teaching, 45% in research, and 10% in service. Instructional faculty typically have a distribution of efforts of 75% teaching and 25% service. The annual review process acknowledges that teaching, research, and service assignments may vary among faculty members and may evolve over the course of a faculty person’s career. The characteristic teaching assignment includes a teaching load of two courses per semester for tenured/tenure-track faculty, and three courses per semester for Instructional faculty. The Department Officers of Associate Head, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, and Associate Director of Graduate Studies typically receive appropriate course reductions in conjunction with their leadership roles.

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

Unsatisfactory. The absence of a faculty person’s demonstrated competence as instructor of record for assigned courses, and failure to meet other basic expectations as described below as “Meets Expectations.”

Needs Improvement. Faculty person’s demonstrated competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three-year period is compromised by partial failure to meet basic expectations as described below, as well as failure to meet other basic expectations as described in “Meets Expectations.”

Meets Expectations. Faculty person demonstrates competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three-year period as evidenced by a faculty person’s ability to meet basic expectations, to include: consistently employing sufficient pedagogical techniques to instruct students; holding classes at regularly scheduled times, complying with university policies concerned with special course assignments (such as W, I, CD or ICD courses), the posting of syllabuses and CVs online, and the submitting attendance verification, mid-term and final grades, and carrying out graduate teaching mentorship duties when assigned a TA. The faculty person further regularly contributes to the teaching mission through participation in some teaching priorities, such as, the delivery of large courses, W, I CD or ICD courses, the delivery of graduate and undergraduate directed studies, hosting honors contracts, directing

undergraduate research, individual graduate student teaching mentorship, and graduate student advising.

Exceeds Expectations. Beyond satisfactory competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three-year period as evidenced by a faculty member's ability to meet all basic expectations (as described above), faculty person's efforts are distinguished by achievements, such as: earning a minor grant or award; engaging in some formal efforts to enhance teaching; doing significant notable teaching and graduate or undergraduate advising; making further significant contributions to graduate and undergraduate education within the department; and engaging in some development of curriculum and pedagogy, or engaging in the production of teaching resources.

Outstanding. Beyond satisfactory competence as instructor of record for assigned courses over a three- year period as evidenced by a faculty member's ability to meet all basic expectations (as described above), faculty person's efforts are distinguished by achievements, such as: earning a significant teaching grant or award; doing significant notable teaching and graduate or undergraduate advising; engaging in substantial formal efforts to enhance teaching abilities; making further distinguished contributions to graduate and undergraduate education within the department, college, or university; and regularly engaging in development of curriculum and pedagogy, or engaging in the production of teaching resources.

5.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are:

Unsatisfactory. Faculty person's efforts do not result in the presence of program of research as evidenced by criteria described below as "Meets Expectations."

Needs improvement. Faculty person's efforts do not result in the presence of a significant program of research as evidenced by criteria described below as "Meets Expectations" but include results that are indicative of ongoing research, such as, in the three-year reporting period: publishing at least one article in a suitable blind peer-reviewed journal, peer-reviewed edited volume with a university press, or comparable; earning a minor grant; or presenting two or more papers in significant external professional venues.

Meets Expectations. Faculty person's efforts result in the presence of a significant program of research. While research output cannot be reduced solely to publications or to a specific number of publications, it would be unusual for a faculty person to earn a score of 'Meets Expectations' with

fewer than 3 refereed article or refereed book chapter publications or the equivalent in a three-year reporting period. The primary criterion for the evaluation of “Meets Expectations” is publications, though a faculty person with less than the indicated record of publications may be raised to an evaluation of “Meets Expectations” incrementally by significant scholarly editing roles, significant internal and external grants and awards, presentation of research in a substantial number of significant venues, or comparable accomplishments. Individual significant research accomplishments will also be taken into consideration when assessing publications.

Exceeds Expectations. Beyond satisfactory presence of a significant program of research, a faculty person’s efforts result in a level of achievement evidenced by a record of publications incrementally stronger than that typical of a rating of meets expectations but not as strong as that of outstanding. While the primary criterion for the evaluation of “Exceeds Expectations” is publications, a faculty person with less than the indicated record of publications may be raised to an evaluation of “Exceeds Expectations” incrementally by significant scholarly editing roles, significant external grants and awards, presentation of research in a substantial number of significant venues, or comparable accomplishments.

Outstanding. Beyond satisfactory presence of a significant program of research, a faculty person’s efforts result in a level of achievement that demonstrates high visibility and recognition within the field. The primary criterion for the evaluation of “Outstanding” is publication quality, impact, and visibility, but other factors may be taken into account, such as significant scholarly editing roles, significant external grants and awards, or the presentation of research in significant venues, such as keynote addresses at major national or international conferences, or comparable accomplishments.

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

Unsatisfactory. Faculty person fails to participate in departmental and other administrative processes and service duties as described below as “Meets Expectations.”

Needs Improvement. In the three-year reporting period, a faculty person’s participation in departmental administrative processes is limited or he or she does not adequately fulfill departmental service assignments; or, within the three-year window, a faculty person does not participate in any college- or university-level committee service or any professional service.

Meets Expectations. Faculty person participates in departmental administrative processes, such as attending faculty meetings and (as appropriate) tenure and promotion meetings (or, in any case, providing the

Head with a suitable explanation for an absence from a departmental meeting, committee meeting, or a tenure and promotion meeting); fulfilling duties associated with departmental committee assignments; and, in the three year evaluation window, participating in some further service activities, such as a college- or university level committees, or professional service, such as a manuscript review for a blind peer-review journal.

Exceeds Expectations. Beyond service that “Meets Expectations,” a faculty person engages in significant service initiatives or roles within the college or university (such as service on a significant college or university committee), and profession (such as leadership role in professional organization or in conference planning).

Outstanding. Beyond service that “Meets Expectations,” a faculty person makes an exceptional contribution to the department, to the college, or to the university (such as Director of a major service initiative or Chair of a major university-level committee) or profession (such as executive committee member of the APA or large professional organization).

5.5 Required Components for Annual Review and Process

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

- A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations.
- Faculty member's report of previous activities. See PHIL Appendix I, departmental Faculty Annual Report

5.5.1 Annual Report of Faculty Member's Activities

Each year, every faculty member must submit an annual report in Faculty 180 outlining activities within each of their assigned areas of responsibility. In the report, faculty members should point out the status of long-term projects, set the context in which annual activities have occurred, and state short-term and long-term goals.

Every year on or about December 1, the Head will distribute a “Faculty Annual Report” to each faculty member; this report is to be completed in addition to F180 entries. Faculty members will be required to submit the completed report by January 20 of the subsequent year. Each faculty member's completed “Faculty Annual Report” will detail that faculty person's performance for the three calendar years prior to that of the deadline and will serve as the basis for the evaluation of that faculty person's performance. It is incumbent upon each faculty person to present his or her accomplishments.

- Annual Faculty Performance Reviews (FPRs) will be completed by the Head in consultation with the Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee (FAEAC). In accord with these guidelines:

Section One. The Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee shall have three regular members and one alternate member. All members will be tenured faculty of the Department. Regular members will serve rotating three-year terms in accord with an established faculty rotation schedule. The alternate member will serve a one-year term.

Section Two. Regular and Alternate Members of the Committee will serve on a rotational basis. A list of all tenured faculty members, has been prepared with order arranged by lot. The first three slots become the first three regular members. The fourth slot will become the first alternate member. The next year the fourth slot will become a regular member. The fifth slot will become the alternate member and so on. Newly eligible faculty members are added to the bottom of the list. Faculty who are exempted from service (FDL, nepotism, COI, or on a Professional Development Plan) will be brought back into rotation as soon as they are no longer exempted; they will not be skipped over until they are returned to in the normal course of going through the list. At least one Professor and at least one Associate Professor must be included among the regular members.

Section Three. Duties of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee:

(A) The Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee shall receive from the Department Head a draft annual evaluation of each faculty member and copies of the relevant materials upon which the evaluation was based.

(B) The Committee shall review each annual evaluation in a timely manner and prepare a response to each evaluation. Minority reports from the Committee are permitted. The FAEAC will use the memo prepared in PHIL Appendix II.

(C) Reports from the Committee may

1. Report that the Committee concurs with the Department Head's evaluation.
2. Report that the Committee does not concur with the Department Head's evaluation. In this case, the Committee must indicate precisely what part or parts of the evaluation it disagrees with and present an alternate evaluation. In both types of reports the committee as a whole or

individual members of the committee may prepare statements.

(D) Members of the Committee will recuse themselves when their own evaluation is being considered by the Committee. (This clause is also applicable where potential or actual conflicts of interest could be at issue, for instance if the person being evaluated is a present or former spouse of at least one member of the Committee.) At that time the alternate will be seated as a full member of the Committee.

Section Four. Procedural Issues:

A. The Committee shall vote to select a chair during the fall semester and inform the Department Head of the result.

B. As far as circumstances permit, the Committee and Department Head should strive to observe the following schedule:

(i) The Committee meets with the Head to discuss any general issues pertaining to the year's evaluations.

(ii) The Head delivers preliminary evaluations and all supporting information to the Committee.

(iii) The Committee meets to discuss the evaluations. The Committee may call a further meeting with the Head to discuss specific issues.

(iv) The Committee delivers its report to the Head.

(v) Simultaneous with sending his or her salary recommendations to the Dean, the Head reports to the Committee his or her response to any suggestions made in their report.

C. The Department head will write an evaluation for the calendar year in a memorandum transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member must indicate receipt of the evaluation memorandum by signing a copy of the document. Faculty members should be allowed to provide written comments about the memorandum for their permanent personnel file if they so choose. A

faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgement of the evaluation document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, as well as the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file. Moreover, the memorandum shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research and/or creative work, and/or service. Heads should also provide promotion- eligible faculty with an assessment of their progress towards promotion.

5.5.2 Evaluations from Department Heads or Supervisors

The Department head (or primary supervisor in the case of significant administrative appointments) will write an evaluation for the calendar year in a memorandum transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member must indicate receipt of the evaluation memorandum by signing a copy of the document. Faculty members should be allowed to provide written comments about the memorandum for their permanent personnel file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgement of the evaluation document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, as well as the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file. Moreover, the memorandum shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research and/or creative work, and/or service. Heads should also provide promotion- eligible faculty with an assessment of their progress towards promotion.

5.5.3 Compliance Review

Per system regulation, no faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating (i.e., rating of Meets Expectations or above) if they have not complied with all required Texas A&M University System and Texas A&M 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. All faculty must certify that they are up to date on TrainTraq trainings and submit their TrainTraq transcripts with their annual review materials.

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

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

5.5.4 Meeting between the Department Head (or supervisor) and the Faculty Member

Department heads (and supervisors) must provide an annual opportunity for a personal meeting 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, supervisor, or faculty member. The head (or an appropriate delegate, such as the Associate Head or P&T committee chair) will meet with all untenured tenure track faculty on an annual basis to discuss their progress towards tenure.

5.6 Promotion Progress Review

5.6.1 Feedback on Progress towards Tenure for Untenured Tenure Track Professors

Members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee must participate in an annual review of untenured assistant professors (and untenured associate professor, as applicable). Using annual review materials, this review must provide candid assessment of whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards tenure and promotion (relative to their year on the tenure clock), and to provide constructive feedback on ways to strengthen their overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The feedback is reported to the department head. The feedback includes a vote of all eligible faculty on whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress, as well as a vote on whether the faculty member's appointment as a tenure track faculty member should be continued. Voting eligibility is the same for T&P. The department head will independently review all annual review materials and provide a written memo to the faculty member (incorporating feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process).

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

Promotion eligible faculty should understand that having a series of positive annual reviews is not the best indicator of whether somebody is ready to come up for promotion. In other words, a faculty member can be doing very good work and meet or exceed expectations during annual reviews, but not yet have a record that merits promotion. For that reason, tenured associate professors and academic professional track faculty who are not at the highest rank have the option of requesting informal feedback

on their progress towards promotion as part of the annual review process. The purpose of this optional review is (a) to provide a candid assessment of how the faculty member's record of performance aligns with departmental and college criteria for promotion, and/or (b) to provide constructive feedback on how the faculty member might strengthen the overall record prior to coming up for promotion. The promotion process involves a much more extensive review of performance. For that reason, a "positive" promotion progress review should not be viewed as a guarantee for a successful promotion case.

If a faculty member is interested in having a promotion progress review, they should inform their department head at the time that they submit their annual review materials. If a faculty member requests a promotion progress review, the faculty member's annual review materials should be shared with all faculty eligible to review and vote on that faculty member's promotion case (i.e., members of the department's P&T committee eligible to review and vote on faculty at that rank and title). Members of the committee should review annual review materials and provide feedback to the department head. The department head should independently review all annual review materials and provide oral feedback to the faculty member (incorporating feedback from tenured faculty members who participated in the review process).

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

5.7 Assessment Outcomes that Require Action

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

5.7.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research and/or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities, 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](#)).

For tenure track faculty, 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 the department head, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, 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 \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#).

For academic professional track faculty, an unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean’s office. In consultation with the Dean (and/or their delegates), the head will work with the faculty member to address areas of concern. An academic professional track faculty member who receives “Unsatisfactory” for more than one year may be subject to further action. For additional guidance, see [System Policy 12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure](#), and [University SAP 12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty](#).

5.7.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their department head, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching or service, this plan should take one (1) year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may (but is not required) take up to three (3) years to complete successfully with clearly identified milestones at least yearly. For additional guidance, see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#).

If an academic professional track faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation, they must work with their department head to develop a plan for improvement.

5.8 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.

5.9 Complaint Procedure

A faculty member who believes that 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 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#).

SECTION 6: MIDTERM REVIEW FOR UNTENURED ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

In accordance with Section 4.3.5.2 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive midterm review for untenured assistant professors subject to a probationary period (of five or more years) be conducted to determine the progress towards tenure. In the College of Arts and Sciences, midterm reviews occur in the spring semester.

6.1 Purpose

A midterm review is intended to provide a formative review of untenured assistant professors near the midpoint of their probationary period. This review will familiarize the faculty member with the promotion and tenure process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the promotion and tenure decision. The review will mimic the promotion and tenure process as closely as possible, including the submission of dossier items by the faculty member, with the exception of external letters of recommendation.

As with the promotion and tenure process, the midterm review will include reviews by the department's P&T committee, the department head, the college's Dean's Advisory Committee – Tenure Track (DAC- TT), and the Dean. Midterm reviews, however, do not go beyond the college. The department-level review may be conducted by a subcommittee of the P&T committee if this is allowed in the departmental bylaws, as long as the subcommittee has a minimum of five members.

This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress. The review must result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service to date. The review must also provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

If an untenured faculty member is not progressing adequately towards the requirements for tenure, the review might result in action to not renew the appointment.

6.2 Process

In the College of Arts and Sciences, midterm reviews are normally conducted between March and May of the target academic year. The mandatory probation period (and the timeline for the midterm review) must be clearly stated in the faculty member's offer letter. The table below describes the timeline for a standard probationary period of 7 years.

First year in probationary period	Probationary Period	Midterm Review will occur between
2022-23	7 years	March-December 2025

Faculty with a shorter probationary period may come up for midterm review in their first or second year on the tenure clock, as indicated in their appointment letter. Faculty who are considering the option of coming up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year must come up for midterm review prior to coming up for tenure (unless otherwise stated in their appointment letter).

Midterm reviews are a significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of untenured assistant professors and are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews must be conducted carefully, and faculty members must be provided with accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period. It will be the responsibility of the faculty mentor to communicate with the full Department about the typical research expectations for research in the candidate's specific field.

The Department head will set a deadline for candidates to submit their midterm review materials that allows sufficient time for the department's P&T committee to meet and review the candidate's materials and submit departmental reports to the department head. The head must also submit a recommendation prior to the college deadline for midterm reviews.

6.3 College-Level Requirements for the Midterm Dossier

Each candidate's dossier should be prepared in accordance with the guidance for tenure and promotion. Works under review or in progress should be included. External review letters are not required.

Each candidate's midterm dossier should include the following:

- 6.3.1 The candidate's personal statement should adhere to university guidelines. The statement should explain the quality, productivity over time, and impact of teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service accomplishments. Each of these three assigned areas of responsibility must be addressed separately.
- 6.3.2 An annotated curriculum vitae (CV) that follows university guidelines for promotion and tenure. This can be done using the university template (word doc) or through the Interfolio Faculty 180 created vita. The CV must include a statement by the faculty member acknowledging that the CV is correct and up to date.
- 6.3.3 Copies of all annual review letters written by the department head and signed by the candidate. These letters are on file in the department and should be provided by the department head for the candidate to include in their midterm dossier.
- 6.3.4 If the candidate is affiliated with an interdisciplinary program, the candidate may choose to include a support letter from the interdisciplinary program director or coordinator. This item is optional.

- 6.3.5 All materials submitted for the department-level review, including publications, course syllabi, course evaluations, peer observations of teaching, etc. Candidates for midterm review should have a minimum of one peer observation of teaching.
- 6.3.6 Departments should submit a summary report with separate sections focused on each area of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). The report should also include a section that summarizes the discussion of the committee about the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure. The teaching section should include a summary of student evaluations of teaching and peer observation(s) of teaching. The report should include the P&T committees' yes/no vote on the following questions: "Is the candidate making satisfactory progress towards promotion with tenure?" and "Should the candidate's appointment be continued for another year?"
- 6.3.7 The department must also submit a recommendation from the department head indicating their overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The head's letter should also indicate their vote on the two questions stated in (6) above. Finally, the head's letter must indicate any progress they think needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

6.4 Feedback for Midterm Review

All faculty members going through the midterm review process must receive feedback on their progress towards promotion. In a memo to the department head, the Dean will convey the assessment and recommendation of the Dean's Advisory Committee – Tenure Track (DAC-TT), as well as the Dean's assessment based on the Dean's independent review of the dossier. The review of the DAC-TT will also include two votes as stated above. The memo will provide formative feedback on the formulating, implementing, and monitoring of plans for necessary actions in the remainder of the probationary period. The department head should schedule a meeting with the faculty member to review the Dean's memo and work with the candidate on a plan to address recommendations from both the department and the college.

SECTION 7: COLLEGE-LEVEL PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

7.1 Purpose

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

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

7.2 Focus

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

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

7.3 Time Period of Review

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

In the spring of each year, the College of Arts and Sciences will release the timeline for

review and submission of promotion materials to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for the following academic year. This includes the deadline for departments to submit a candidate's dossier materials for external review and the deadline for departments to submit the candidate's dossier (including departmental reports) to the college. The Department solicits external review letters (for tenure track promotion cases) in the spring, and conduct department level reviews in the early fall. Candidates should aim to get their external reviewer list to the Head by Feb. 1. The college level review process takes place in October and November, and the college submits promotion cases to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs in December. The university-level review of promotion cases takes place in January. Promotion and tenure decisions are reviewed by the University President (for all cases) and the Board of Regents (in the case of tenure cases only) in the spring. Promotion and tenure decisions become effective on September 1st of each year.

7.3.1 Mandatory Promotion Reviews

The department head or chair of the departmental Promotion and Tenure-Committee should identify mandatory candidates for promotion and tenure in the early part of the calendar year. Faculty with mandatory promotion reviews will be informed of the timeline for their review, and asked to confirm that they intend to submit the documentation for promotion and tenure.

7.3.2 Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH)

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

7.4 Time Considerations

7.4.1 Assistant Professors (Tenure Track)

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

7.4.1.1 "Early" Tenure Reviews

Candidates may opt to undergo review prior to their mandatory year (i.e., early tenure review), as long as they have completed the midterm review. Candidates considering this

option are strongly encouraged to speak to their mentors and department head prior to indicating a desire to come up for tenure earlier than their mandatory year.

7.4.1.2 Tenure Clock Extensions

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

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

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

7.4.2 Tenured Faculty

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

7.4.2.1 “Credit” for Accomplishments Prior to Tenure

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

in their chosen area of specialty.

7.4.3 Academic Professional Track Faculty

Candidates on academic professional tracks do not have a mandatory time to undergo review for promotion. Candidates need to demonstrate sustained excellence in their assigned areas of responsibilities, as defined in their letter of appointment. Prospective candidates considering promotion review are encouraged to use the Promotion Progress Review process outlined in [Section 5.6](#), and/or to seek guidance from informal and formal mentors to assess the degree to which their accomplishments and performance are consistent with promotion to the next rank.

7.5 College-Level Requirements for the Candidate's Promotion Dossier

The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the promotion dossier, as listed in the [University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines](#). The following elements are required and must be submitted by any candidate seeking promotion.

7.5.2 Promotion Impact Statement

Candidates must submit an impact statement that explains the quality, productivity over time, and the impact of their accomplishments in each of their assigned areas of responsibility (teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). Following university guidelines, the candidate's three-page narrative statement should:

- (a) be organized with a separate section for any area of professional responsibility that applies to the candidate's job title,
- (b) explain the quality, productivity, impact, and future trajectory of the candidate in each area of responsibility,
- (c) be written to engage and be understood by both a general academic readership (e.g., dean, president) and by a professional readership (e.g., external reviewers),
- (d) address the candidate's perspective on past, present, and future performance and accomplishments,
- (e) should provide a clear context for any metrics provided as indirect proxies for impact, and
- (f) provide a narrative that provides a context for understanding other items in the dossier.

The weighting of areas of responsibility will vary across title, rank, and departments, and the statement should reflect the weights assigned to the individual faculty member. For example, a faculty member who is assigned 75% responsibility in teaching should dedicate the majority of the statement to describing the impacts of their contributions to teaching. For more detailed guidance on how to craft a promotion impact statement, see

the [additional information on the VPFA's website](#).

Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback on their impact statement from their mentors, P&T chair, department head and/or associate head prior to submission.

7.5.3 Annotated Curriculum Vitae (CV)

Candidates should prepare an annotated curriculum vitae (CV) following university guidelines for promotion and tenure. This can be done using the university template (word doc) or through Interfolio Faculty 180 created vita. Candidates are strongly encouraged to annotate their CV, as needed, to highlight the impact of their work and their specific contributions. Labels can also be added to indicate publications that include undergraduate, graduate or postdoc co-authors. In the areas of teaching and service, annotations can be added to describe new course preparations, modifications based on professional development activities, and contributions within a service role. Candidates should be careful to avoid padding their CV. For example, refereed publications should be listed separately from non-refereed publications, and publications that have been accepted but not yet published should be clearly labeled.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek feedback on their CV from their mentors, P&T chair, department head and/or associate head prior to submission.

7.5.4 Teaching Materials/Portfolio

Candidates are required to submit the documents as evidence and examples of materials they use in courses they teach. Within the [University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#), there is a section on Evaluating Teaching Activity that outlines documents P&T Committees should use when evaluating teaching activity, but this section is also helpful for candidates to determine specific documents to include in their teaching portfolio. Candidates should make sure the teaching materials are well-organized, concise, and kept to a reasonable page length. A list of suggested documents for candidates to include in the teaching portfolio are outlined below.

- (1) Course syllabi. Candidates for promotion (with tenure) should include copies of syllabi for all courses taught as an untenured faculty member at Texas A&M (e.g., one syllabus for each course prep). All other candidates for promotion should include copies of syllabi for the three courses taught most within the last 5 years.
- (2) Representative sample of course assignments and exams. Candidates should provide a small representative sample of materials (e.g., an exam or assignment from one or two courses) for review committees to assess the scope, rigor, and quality of course offerings.
- (3) Complete compiled summary of student evaluations of teaching. Candidates should include a table summarizing their teaching evaluations (as outlined in the [University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#)). Candidates

for promotion (with tenure) should include a complete compiled summary of all student evaluations of teaching for courses taught as an untenured faculty member at Texas A&M. All other candidates for promotion should include a complete compiled summary of student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught within the past 5 years.

Peer observations of teaching. The College of Arts and Sciences requires two reports from peer observations of teaching prior to each promotion evaluation. It is the department's responsibility to ensure that peer observations of teaching are conducted; however, a faculty member may make their own arrangements, as long as they inform their department head.

The college policy allows for peer observations of teaching to be conducted by departmental faculty who are not eligible to vote on a candidate's case (e.g., an instructional professor can conduct a peer observation for assistant or associate professor).

Peer observation should be done by faculty who are at the rank sought or higher. If a candidate has had more than two peer observations of teaching, the candidate may choose which peer observations of teaching to include with their midterm and promotion reviews. Candidates may choose to include reports from peer observations of teaching from different academic years to give a longitudinal evaluation of their teaching. Alternatively, they may choose to include reports from peer observations from different types of classes to show their versatility. Untenured assistant professors may include the report submitted with their midterm review materials as one of the two required reports.

Individuals who conduct these peer observations should provide copies of the report to the candidate and the department personnel file. A sample document that can be used to write a report summarizing the peer observation of teaching is provided in [Appendix C](#) of the College guidelines. Alternative instruments are available on the Center for Teaching Evaluation's website.

- (4) Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdocs. This information should be listed on the CV and may also be in the narrative statement.

7.5.5 Research and/or Creative Work Materials

Candidates who have research and/or creative work as one of their assigned areas of responsibilities are required to submit the selected publications that best exemplify a

scholar's greatest research and/or creative contributions (Faculty may choose to include all publications, or a subset of publications)

Other sources that may be helpful, but are not required, to evaluate research and/or creative work include:

- (a) information regarding digital scholarship, performances, or creative work (other than published work),
- (b) copies of funded grant proposals,
- (c) copies of patents, and/or
- (d) information on scholarly metrics that are valued within the discipline or department, such as journal impact factors, H-index, etc. (If included, metrics should be contextualized within the discipline, and journal impact factors should be provided for all journals.).

7.5.6 Service Materials

There is not a prescribed list of items or sources to use in the evaluation of service. The key sources of information for evaluating service include the CV and the promotion impact statement. Faculty may opt to include additional evidence for their service performance in their dossier, including support letters, emails that acknowledge service contributions, etc.

7.5.7 External Review Letters

Requirements for external review letters vary by track and job title.

7.5.7.1 Tenure Track Faculty

External letters are required for candidates in tenure track positions seeking promotion to either associate professor or professor. Following university guidelines, the college expects a minimum of five letters, with a minimum of three letters selected by the departmental P&T committee. (Per university guidelines, potential reviewers that are on both the department list and the candidate list can count in either category.) Departments should follow university guidelines on procedures for selecting potential letter writers, sending solicitation letter, and for documenting such requests. Departments should request approval from the Dean for any letters that are not "arm's length" from the candidate as defined in the university guidelines. Departments should request no more than eight letters in the initial solicitation, ideally four from the department list and four from the candidate list. Those who review a candidate's dossier should not interpret a lack of response from a reviewer as a negative statement against the candidate. At no time should a candidate inquire about the status of reviewers they nominated or contact them about their review.

7.5.7.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty

Philosophy does not require letters for APT faculty seeking promotion.

7.5.8 COVID-19 Impact Statement (Optional)

Faculty may include an optional COVID-19 impact statement in their promotion dossier that provides a context for evaluating performance in each of their assigned areas of responsibility. For most faculty, this would include a combination of research or creative work activities, teaching activities, and service activities. For some faculty in the college, this might also include clinical and administrative responsibilities. The option to include COVID-19 impact statements will continue until the point at which the timeframe for a given promotion review no longer includes the years that are covered by the COVID-19 impact statement (i.e., 2020 and 2021). The primary objective of the COVID-19 impact statement is to provide a context for understanding the impact of the pandemic on a faculty member's professional workload and responsibilities.

7.5.9 Verification of Contents Letter

This statement, written by the candidate, accurately describes the materials they have submitted for departmental review for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration.

7.6 College-Level Requirements for the Department Level Review

7.6.2 Department P&T Committee

The Department of Philosophy P&T Committee comprises all eligible faculty in the Department. This includes all faculty in the same track (tenure/Instructional) at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. Instructional cases will include both tenure line faculty and Instructional faculty at or above the rank being sought. All P&T committees need to have a minimum of five eligible committee members, as required by university guidelines. All committee members should participate in the discussion and vote of each case, unless there is a legitimate reason for them to recuse themselves from the discussion.

7.6.3 Department Voting Procedures

Eligible committee members should make every effort to attend the P&T committee meetings. Absences are allowed only with a justifiable cause, and that cause should be noted in the department report. Recusals are allowed only in cases where there is a conflict of interest. Committee members with conflicts of interest (e.g., a relative of the candidate; a graduate or post-doc advisor of the candidate) must recuse themselves from voting and deliberation on that specific candidate's case. Per department voting guidelines, ballots will only be issued to those faculty members who have attended the discussion meeting or who have been granted permission from the Chair of the P&T Committee to miss the meeting for justifiable cause.

Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence. P&T discussions are to be held in person, except in exceptional circumstances. If held remotely, steps will be taken to ensure confidentiality.

Individual votes must be obtained confidentially, either through electronic or paper means. Confidential electronic means will be preferred, though exceptions that preserve anonymity may

be made. Faculty will typically have one week from the discussion of the candidate to submit their vote.

7.6.4 Department Report

The department must prepare a summary report with separate sections focused on each of the assigned areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and/or creative work, and service). Sections should be proportional to weights assigned to each area of responsibility. The report should evaluate the level of accomplishment and trajectory relative to disciplinary norms and standards. The research section should include a review of the quality and impact of selected publications or works, and address the candidate's contributions to any multi-authored works. The teaching section should include a summary of student evaluations of teaching and peer observation(s) of teaching. The service section should explain the candidate's involvement and contributions, as well as the impact of their service activities. The report must address any negative comments from external review letters (as applicable), identify any questions that emerged during the discussion of the case, and explain the votes, including the context and justification for negative votes (if discussed during the meeting). The department report and recommendation to the head is advisory in nature. The report should include the P&T committees' yes/no vote on the promotion case, following university guidelines.

Departmental committee discussions must be kept confidential.

7.6.5 Department Head Recommendation

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

SECTION 8: DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

8.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required.

Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the Department are as follows:

8.1.1 Associate Professor:

Associate professors with tenure should demonstrate meritorious performance in teaching, research or creative work, and service.

Teaching. Teaching must be shown to be consistently competent, and the evidence presented should be both substantial and sufficiently thorough to make a strong case. The Department's expectation is that the evidence in successful tenure cases will show a genuine commitment to undergraduate and, where appropriate, graduate teaching.

The Department expects that the record will indicate that the courses taught by the successful applicant will be characterized by diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the students being taught, and fair and appropriate evaluation of students' tests and assignments. Finally, it is expected that any master's theses and dissertations that an applicant supervises will be of high quality.

The successful candidate will demonstrate competence as instructor of record for assigned courses as evidenced by a faculty person's ability to meet basic expectations, to include: consistently employing sufficient pedagogical techniques to instruct students; holding classes at regularly scheduled times, complying with university policies concerned with special course designations, the posting of syllabuses and CVs online, and the submitting attendance verification, mid-term and final grades, and carrying out graduate teaching mentorship duties when assigned a TA. The faculty person further regularly contributes to the teaching mission through participation in some teaching priorities, such as, the delivery of large courses, W, CD or ICD courses, the delivery of graduate and undergraduate directed studies, hosting honors contracts, directing undergraduate research, individual graduate student teaching mentorship, and graduate student advising, and professional development.

Research and/or creative work. Candidates for promotion to associate professor must also demonstrate that they have established scholarly independence and signs of intellectual leadership through a record of accomplishment that goes beyond their dissertation. The candidate should also be making original research contributions within their area of specialty. The research record should also include some signs of scholarly impact within the discipline, and more broadly (as appropriate for the discipline or the department). Candidates for promotion must also demonstrate that they are on a positive trajectory, as evidenced by projects at various stages of

completion, suggesting continuous productivity and further impact for the foreseeable future. For promotion to associate professor, the majority of research and/or creative work activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A). While judgments of quality, impact, and productivity over time cannot be reduced to quantitative measures, in recent cases we have granted tenure to candidates with dossiers that included (a) 1 book with a leading university press or equivalent (for which the manuscript has been published or has passed the final stages of review and been accepted by the press for publication) and a short series of refereed articles and book chapters (4-6) that evidence initial stages of a further project; or (b) a significant series of refereed articles and book chapters (11-14) in reputable refereed journals that evidence one project and the initial stages of a further project. However, the qualitative criteria stated earlier are paramount, and different philosophical subfields evaluate these in different ways.

Service. Service activities must include participating in departmental administrative processes, attending faculty meetings; fulfilling duties associated with departmental committee assignments. In addition, promotion to associate professor would require participating in some further service activities, such as a college- or university-level committees; organizing workshops or conferences or other academic activities; or professional service, such as a manuscript review for a blind peer-review journal.

8.1.2 Professor:

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate continued and outstanding accomplishment in research and teaching, and valuable contributions to leadership and professional service (See Appendix I of Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

Research. 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 Department 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. The candidate's standing in the field and the impact of the research record should be documented in the candidate's dossier through multiple indicators. A prospective promotion candidate is encouraged to pursue productive "exploratory" discussions with her/his department head, professors in the department, and mentors to weigh her/his scholarly and professional stature as substantiated with specific accomplishments. If publications in the pipeline are indicative of scholarly impact and national or/and international recognition, a prospective candidate is encouraged to consider critically the stages of development of such works, assessing whether they are already effective in demonstrating scholarly impact and visibility at the level required for promotion to professor.

Teaching. 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 and graduate teaching is essential, as described in the promotion guidelines for associate professor above. In addition, successful candidates for promotion to professor will demonstrate a commitment to graduate education and contribute to the success of graduate students, and professional development.

Service. In addition to the level of service described in the promotion criteria for associate professor, candidates for full professor must demonstrate a record of engagement and some record of leadership in departmental, College/University, and professional activities that further the intellectual and pedagogical profile of the institution. Public engagement and outreach will also be taken into account where present.

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

Academic professional track faculty members will typically be reviewed by departments for promotion after five years in any rank. If an individual's record of accomplishment is consistent with the expectations of the rank of at the next level, then the individual may seek consideration for promotion prior to five years in rank.

8.2.1 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

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

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

Service. Candidates seeking promotion to instructional associate professor must have a meritorious record of service. In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for institutional engagement, and at least one of the other four guiding criteria: academic leadership, commitment to the discipline, professional mentoring of students or other faculty, and/or public engagement and outreach. For promotion to instructional associate professor, the majority of service activities may be Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A of College Guidelines). Candidates may also have research contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

8.2.2 Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor

To meet expectations for promotion to instructional professor, a candidate should demonstrate how they meet college and department criteria. Foundational criteria for promotion to instructional professor requires meritorious accomplishments in teaching and have demonstrated significant and sustained impact in leadership within the university or have some professional achievements related to their areas of responsibilities beyond the university. The evaluation for promotion to instructional professor must be in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in the candidate's appointment letter. Suggested criteria demonstrating meritorious accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarly work, and service are given in Appendix A.

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

Service or Research/Creative Work. Candidates must either have a meritorious record of service, or a meritorious record of research, but not both. In cases where service is the second assigned area of responsibility, candidates must show evidence that they meet or exceed expectations for institutional engagement, and at least two of the other four guiding criteria for service: academic leadership, commitment to the discipline, professional mentoring and/or public engagement and outreach. For promotion to instructional professor, candidates should have some Level Two activities and accomplishments, in addition to having additional Level One activities (such as those identified in Appendix A of the College guidelines). Candidates may also have research and/or creative work contributions that are integrated into their teaching responsibilities.

SECTION 9: POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

There are two different levels of post-tenure review:

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

9.1 Purpose

The purpose of post-tenure review is to:

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

9.2 Peer Review Committee

The procedure for appointing members to the committee is the same as for the Faculty Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee with one exception: all members shall hold the same rank, or higher, as the faculty member being evaluated.

9.3 Process for Periodic Peer Review

9.3.1 Materials

Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- Head's Faculty Performance Reviews for the period under review
- Most recent Faculty Annual Reports for the period under review
- Current CV
- Other materials as appropriate

9.3.2 Timeline

Periodic Peer Review will be conducted every six years following a faculty promotion.

9.3.3 Responsibility of Peer Review Committee

The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written

evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the department guidelines and should be consistent with annual performance evaluations.

9.3.4 Process for Each Rating of Review

9.3.4.1 Satisfactory

If all 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 department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

9.3.4.2 Unsatisfactory

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

9.3.4.3 Needs Improvement – Two Categories

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

9.3.4.4 Needs Improvement – Single Category

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 and the faculty member.

9.3.5 Joint Appointments

For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department 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 or supervisor will share the report with the department head or supervisor in the second unit).

9.3.6 Department Responsibility to Submit Information on Tenured Faculty

Every year, no later than May 31st, each department will submit the following information to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (through the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences).

- (1) The year when each tenured faculty member in the department last underwent a review.

- (2) Faculty members reviewed that year for post-tenure periodic peer review.
- (3) The outcome of each periodic peer review conducted that year and any required follow-up plans.
- (4) Faculty members who are scheduled to be reviewed the following year.

9.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews or one “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review or upon request of the faculty member. The department head will inform the faculty member that they are subject to a Professional Development Review and provide information on the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head or supervisor, with approval of the Dean, when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and the Dean. The faculty member, review committee and department head/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan.” The professional development plan is reviewed by the executive associate dean or associate dean for faculty affairs and approved by the Dean.

9.4.1 Objectives for Professional Development Review

There are three objectives for the Professional Development Review:

- (1) Identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance,
- (2) Develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies, and
- (3) Monitor progress toward achievement of the Professional Development Plan.

9.4.2 Ad Hoc Review Committee

The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the Executive Associate Dean and/or Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Dean, the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. Specifically, the dean’s office will identify individuals to serve on the ad hoc committee and will confirm their availability (without identifying the faculty member), and then consult with the department head and the faculty member to determine that the committee composition is acceptable. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with one or more of the selected committee members (due to personal conflicts or conflicts of interest), the dean’s office will identify a potential alternate(s). When appropriate, the

committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

9.4.3 Faculty's Review Dossier

The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements that they deem relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of the Professional Development Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. The dossier will include at minimum the following items:

- A current curriculum vitae.
- A teaching portfolio.
- A statement summarizing current research and/or creative work.
- A statement summarizing current service responsibilities.

9.4.4 Department Head's Review/Addition to Dossier

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

9.4.5 Professional Development Review Timeline

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.

- (1) No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and the Dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.
- (2) Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the Dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan.
- (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 the Dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" which is reviewed by the executive associate dean and the associate dean for faculty affairs, and approved by the Dean.

9.5 Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the department guidelines) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head/supervisor, and the dean's office, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, 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 \(Post Tenure Review\)](#).

9.6 Appeal Process (Post-Tenure Review & Professional Development Review)

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-Tenure Review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of [University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01 \(Procedures for Appeal of Faculty Complaints and Appeal of Dismissals and Sanctions for Misconduct or Serious Misconduct\)](#).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the 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. (See Section 6 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

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

9.7 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 or supervisor. (See Section 6 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

APPENDIX I

PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT – 20XX

Reporting period: January 1, 20XX – December 31, 20XX

The information you provide in this report is the primary basis for departmental review of your performance over the three-year reporting period. The information you provide is also the primary source for the recommendation to the Dean for merit pool allocations. Please be as complete as possible when listing your activities. Prompts are provided to assure that faculty members do not overlook contributions that should be considered for their annual review and for the recommendation for merit allocations.

Please attach a current copy of your curriculum vitae.

NAME:

RANK:

DATE APPOINTED TO THIS RANK:

DATE APPOINTED AT TAMU:

ACADEMIC UNIT(S) (Dept/Program): **Philosophy**

I certify that I have updated my Faculty 180 Activities.

Signature

I consent to my updated CV and Annual Report form being included for consideration by the Department Honors and Awards Committee.

- Yes
- No

Please review the College information for awards, and indicate whether and for which you believe your record merits consideration for nomination. <https://artsci.tamu.edu/information/Arts-and-Sciences-Awards-Program.html>

PART ONE: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Note: In this section, include books, articles, and chapters on the scholarship of teaching and learning, but list textbooks, teachers' guides, and other pedagogical publications in the teaching section of this report. Group entries by the three calendar years in the reporting period. For each entry, include an indication of the quality of the press or journal.

BOOKS, JOURNAL ARTICLES AND BOOK CHAPTERS

***If any of your research output is co-authored, please indicate what % of the whole contribution to the project was your own (1 – 100%), and explain your contribution.**

- A. Books published during the reporting period.** (Give a complete citation that includes all coauthors, if any, and a page count. Indicate if the book is edited, translated, or a revised edition of previously published work, and specify whether or not the book was refereed.)
- B. Refereed journal articles published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any.) Please indicate if any articles published appear in a high-impact journal according to the criteria in the Appendix to the Department's Evaluation Guidelines.
- C. Unrefereed journal articles published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any.)
- D. Refereed book chapters published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any. Note that an invited book chapter may nevertheless be refereed.)
- E. Unrefereed book chapters published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any.)

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

- F. Book reviews published during the report period.** (Give a complete citation, including page numbers and coauthors, if any.)
- G. Entries in reference works published during the reporting period.** (Give a complete citation, including citation including page numbers; indicate whether invited, refereed, or unrefereed; and indicate if coauthored).
- H. Other publications during the reporting period.** (Include here popular articles,

notes/comments, publications in conference proceedings, etc. Give a complete citation, including page numbers.)

WRITINGS IN PROGRESS

- I. **Works accepted for publication during this period but not yet published.** (indicate title, length, and venue; invited, refereed, or unrefereed; coauthored, edited, translation, or revised edition).
- J. **Works submitted and under review as of January 1 of the current year.** (Provide title, target journal or press, anticipated submission dates; invited, refereed, or unrefereed; indicate if coauthored, edited, translated, or revised edition.)
- K. **Manuscripts in progress as of January 1 of the current year.** (Describe estimated overall length of work when completed and percentage of work completed as of January 1; provide title, target journal or press, and anticipated submission date; indicate if invited, refereed, or unrefereed and if coauthored.)

SCHOLARLY EDITING

- L. **Scholarly editing activity during the reporting period.** (Describe work here only if it involves responsibilities not covered in other sections—e.g., work as editor of scholarly journal or special issue, member of editorial board as listed on masthead, serving as editor of a book series, etc.)

PRESENTATIONS

- M. **Scholarly presentations in domestic venues during the reporting period.** (Include title, name of organization, place, date, invited or submitted, and note any keynote or plenary presentations.)
- N. **Scholarly presentations in international venues during the reporting period.** (Include title, name of organization, place, date, invited or submitted, and note any keynote or plenary presentations.)

GRANTS

Note: Include submitted and funded fellowships, institutes, seminars, etc.

- O. **Research grants from which funds were received or spent during the reporting period.** (Include titles of projects, funding agencies or sources, dates of submission and award, dollar amount; clearly indicate your role and role of others involved.)
- P. **Research grant proposals submitted during the reporting period.** (Indicate status of proposals as of January 1 of the current year, and include titles of projects, funding agencies or sources,

dates of submission and award, dollar amount; clearly indicate your role and role of others involved.)

OTHER

Q. Other scholarly activities. Give complete descriptions of other scholarly activities during the reporting period that do not fit into the above categories.

R. Summary.

Tenured Faculty: Provide here a brief summary statement of your efforts in this category. Please include discussion of the significance of specific contributions to your field(s). Also include any other information that may not be apparent from the above list. This summary can give further context to evaluating your efforts in research.

Tenure-track Faculty: Include with this report a three page impact statement on research, teaching and service, as called for in the University's guidelines for promotion and tenure: https://tamucs.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/teams/Team-FacultyAffairsIntranet/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7BCC117606-15F9-4365-BC91-4B33214D9FBE%7D&file=Impact-Statement-Example.docx&action=default&mobileredirect=true

PART TWO: TEACHING

Formal courses taught at TAMU during the reporting period.

This information will be provided to the Head and the FAEAC directly from F180. It will include which courses were taught, as well as information on student evaluation scores.

A. Other courses taught during the reporting period. Include directed studies, internships, supervision of honors theses, etc. Include semester/year, course title, student's name and (for honors theses) graduation date.

B. Involvement in undergraduate research experiences. Include here Honors' projects directed, LAUNCH projects directed, papers published with undergraduates, etc.

C. Did you submit departmental assessment data for your undergraduate courses? (If not please provide the reason: for example, you are teaching PHIL 240, which does not have a writing component).

D. Graduate Student Teaching Mentorship Assessment. If you taught a course that utilized TAs, or you served as a Teaching Mentor for a graduate student teaching as an Instructor of Record, please verify that you carried out the full scope of mentorship meant to be provided, and also submitted a teaching observation to be included in the student's assessment portfolio.

https://artsci.tamu.edu/philosophy/_files/_documents/_resources/teaching-mentorship.pdf.

- Yes
- No

Please also indicate whether you have submitted your assessment through the Department spreadsheet for documentation in the assessment system.

- Yes
- No

- E. Service on graduate student committees.** Include student's name, department, degree sought, in progress or date completed, and whether you chaired or were a member of the committee.

- F. Progress of advisees in our graduate program.** Indicate milestones completed by students whose committees you chaired, such as thesis proposals or defenses, preliminary exams, research awards, publications, professional placement, etc.; include semester.

- G. Notable accomplishments by former graduate students.** For students whose committees you chaired, indicate here accomplishments such as placement, promotion to associate professor, etc.

- H. Special activities performed in support of our graduate program.** Include here conducting workshops, helping to recruit graduate students, helping students publish papers or write grant applications, involvement with professionalization activities, efforts to secure funding for graduate students, etc. Provide outcomes if known.

- I. Curriculum development.** Include here courses that were new or significantly revised and other contributions to curriculum development (e.g., proposal of W, I, Honors or team-taught courses).

- J. Published curricular materials.** Include here textbooks, teachers' guides, instructional videos, web-available teaching materials, etc. (i.e., materials intended for use by teachers and students in classroom or pedagogical settings) published during the review period that do not fall under "the scholarship of teaching and learning," which is covered above under research. Provide full citations, including dates, URLs, etc.

- K. Lectures given on pedagogical issues.** Provide title, date, and venue.

- L. Teaching awards/honors received.** Include faculty exchanges, teaching Fulbrights, teaching grants, etc.

- M. Other teaching activity not addressed above.** Include here coordination of multi-section courses, attendance at teaching workshops and subsequent incorporation of workshop material

into your teaching, innovative teaching practices, work with undergraduates on graduate school applications, etc.

N. Summary.

Tenured Faculty: Please provide a brief summary statement of your efforts in this category. Please indicate (as applicable) contributions that your teaching made to Departmental priorities as listed in the Annual Evaluation Criteria. Also include information that may not be apparent from a list format. This summary can give further context to evaluating your efforts in teaching.

Tenure-track Faculty: Include with this report a three page statement on research, teaching and service, as called for in the University's guidelines for promotion and tenure:

https://tamucs.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/teams/Team-FacultyAffairsIntranet/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7BCC117606-15F9-4365-BC91-4B33214D9FBE%7D&file=Impact-Statement-Example.docx&action=default&mobileredirect=true

PART THREE: SERVICE

A. Compliance with University training programs. Please attach a copy of your Training Transcript (available from HRC Connect via <https://sso.tamus.edu>; click on Training, take any training required, click on View My Transcript, and print) showing that you had completed all required trainings as of January 1 of this year.

B. Department, college, and university service. Indicate names of committees or assignments, dates of service, and roles (e.g., committee member, chair).

For each committee role, please provide a self-assessment of the level of your contribution to the committee using the following rubric:

- Below Participation
- Participation (attended meetings, actively provided input, reviewed material provided for all meetings)
- Contribution (contributed to the development of a project, outside of regular meetings)
- Leadership (took responsibility to oversee the development or implementation of a project)

If you served on a committee at the College or University level that required a significant time commitment, please explain.

1. Department:

i. Committee Assignments

1. *As Chair.* Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments

a.

2. *As Member*

a.

ii. **Other Departmental Service**

1.

2. **College:**

i. **Committee Assignments**

1. *As Chair*. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments.

a.

2. *As Member*. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments.

a.

ii. **Other College Service**

1.

3. **University:**

i. **Committee Assignments**

1. *As Chair*. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments.

a.

2. *As Member*. Indicate the extent of committee efforts (e.g., frequency of meetings, assigned tasks) and committee accomplishments.

a.

ii. **Other University Service**

1.

C. Faculty mentoring.

Associate and full professors: List the names of faculty members (including associate professors) for whom you served as either a formal or informal mentor; briefly describe.

Assistant and associate professors: List the names of faculty members who have provided formal or informal mentoring to you over the past year; briefly describe.

- D. Student advising.** Note here work as advisor for student organizations, MENTORs, ALLYs, and other formal advising work with students.
- E. Extra-university service.** List here committees and administrative roles within community organizations, invited popular presentations, etc.
- F. Professional service.** Indicate offices and roles in professional organizations, membership on federal grant review panels, etc. Indicate whether offices are elected or appointed.

For each role, please provide a self-assessment of the level of your contribution to the committee using the following rubric:

- Below Participation
- Participation (attended meetings, actively provided input, reviewed material provided for all meetings)
- Contribution (contributed to the development of a project, outside of regular meetings)
- Leadership (took responsibility to oversee the development or implementation of a project)
- If your service does not accord with the rubric but involved a significant time commitment, please explain.

- G. Event planning.** List any conferences, mini-conferences, and symposia you hosted or for which you served on the planning committee (indicate conference title, your role, date, and location).
- H. Conference panels.** List conference panels for which you served as organizer, chair, or discussant; provide date, organization, and location.
- I. List manuscript/grant reviewing activities.** Indicate academic journals, presses, and/or agencies for which you reviewed manuscripts, performances, and grants during the reporting period.
- J. Service as outside reviewer for tenure and promotion cases.** Give institution and rank; do not list names of faculty members involved.
- K. Other service activities not covered above.**

L. List any service awards/honors received. Indicate whether from TAMU or external.

M. Summary.

Tenured Faculty: Provide a brief summary statement of your efforts in this category. Indicate (as applicable) contributions that your service made; such contributions might include, for instance, special efforts to attract minority graduate students, work on study abroad programs, and work with a visiting international scholar. Also include information that may not be apparent from a list format. This summary can give further context to evaluating your efforts in service.

Tenure-track Faculty: Include with this report a three page statement on research, teaching and service, as called for in the University's guidelines for promotion and tenure:

https://tamucs.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/teams/Team-FacultyAffairsIntranet/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7BCC117606-15F9-4365-BC91-4B33214D9FBE%7D&file=Impact-Statement-Example.docx&action=default&mobileredirect=true

