

Texas A&M University School of Law
Policies for Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, and Review
 (Revised May 16, 2019)
 Approved by Dean of Faculties June 16, 2021

Table of Contents

1.	Purpose and scope.....	1
1.1	Purpose.....	1
1.2	Faculty’s rights and obligations	1
1.3	Other policies	1
2.	Significant policy positions	1
2.1	Mission of the Law School	1
2.2	Academic freedom and academic tenure	1
2.3	Non-discrimination policy	2
3.	Categories of teachers and faculty rank	2
3.1	Faculty.....	2
3.1(a)	Definition of faculty.....	2
3.1(b)	Faculty Voting	2
3.1(b)(1)	Voting rights	2
3.1(b)(2)	Quorum	3
3.1(b)(3)	Approval Thresholds.....	3
3.1(b)(4)	Presence for Voting.....	3
3.1(c)	Teaching load.....	3
3.1(d)	Classifications of faculty	4
3.1(e)	Courses taught by doctrinal faculty and professional skills faculty.....	4
3.1(f)	Change in faculty classification for tenure-track faculty	4
3.1(g)	Change in faculty classification for tenured faculty	5
3.1(h)	Change in faculty classification for long-term contract faculty.....	5
3.1(i)	Change from long-term contract faculty to tenure-track or tenured faculty for doctrinal faculty and professional skills faculty	5
3.1(j)	Change from long-term contract faculty to tenure-track or tenured faculty for Law Library faculty	5
3.1(k)	Change from tenure-track or tenured faculty to long-term contract faculty.....	5

3.2	Long-term contract faculty	5
3.3	Limited-term instructors	6
3.4	Interim visitors and distinguished visitors	6
3.5	Adjuncts	6
3.6	Joint appointments	6
4.	Recruitment and appointment of faculty to tenured or tenure-track positions.....	6
4.1	Recruitment for tenured and tenure-track positions.....	7
4.1(a)	Method of selecting candidates	7
4.1(b)	Alternate method of selecting candidates	7
4.2	Faculty and Tenure Committee approval of candidates for tenured position	7
4.3	Faculty approval of candidates for tenure-track position.....	7
4.4	Dean’s initial appointment of all candidates.....	7
4.5	Law Library faculty	7
5.	Recruitment and appointment of non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty	7
5.1	Long-term contract faculty	7
5.1(a)	Selection of candidates.....	7
5.1(a)(1)	Method of selecting candidates.....	8
5.1(a)(2)	Alternate methods of selecting candidates.....	8
5.1(b)	Clinic director recommendation.....	8
5.1(c)	Faculty approval of candidates for long-term contract faculty positions	8
5.1(d)	Dean’s initial appointment of candidates	8
5.1(e)	Law Library faculty	8
5.2	Limited-term instructors	9
5.2(a)	Selection of candidates.....	9
5.2(b)	Dean’s initial appointment of candidates	9
5.3	Distinguished and interim visitors	9
5.3(a)	Distinguished visitors	9
5.3(b)	Interim visitors.....	9
5.4	Emeritus faculty	9
5.5	Adjuncts	9
5.6	Non-budgeted joint appointments.....	9
5.7	Budgeted joint appointments	10
6.	The Law Library and Law Library faculty.....	10

6.1	The Director of the Law Library	10
6.2	Law Library faculty	10
	6.2(a) Responsibilities of Law Library faculty	10
	6.2(b) Committees	10
6.3	Initial appointment of Law Library faculty.....	11
6.4	Recruitment procedures	11
	6.4(a) Law Library search committee	11
	6.4(b) Approval	11
7.	Retention grants of tenure, and promotion of tenure-track and tenured faculty.....	11
7.1	General requirements for tenure of faculty	12
7.2	Teaching requirement	12
7.3	Librarianship requirement.....	12
7.4	Scholarship requirement	12
	7.4(a) Scholarship requirement for doctrinal faculty and professional skills faculty	12
	7.4(b) Scholarship requirement for Law Library faculty.....	13
	7.4(c) Equivalent writing.....	13
7.5	Service requirement	13
7.6	General requirements for promotion.....	13
	7.6(a) Promotion to associate professor	13
	7.6(b) Promotion to professor.....	13
7.7	Retention, tenure, and promotion process.....	14
	7.7(a) Role of the Tenure Committee.....	14
	7.7(b) Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee	14
	7.7(c) Differences in University and Law School processes for promotion, tenure and review.....	14
	7.7(d) Time period for tenure decision.....	14
	7.7(e) Dates of notification to candidates and right to subsequent contracts	15
	7.7(e)(1) Retention granted	15
	7.7(e)(2) Retention denied	15
	7.7(e)(3) Review in first year of service.....	15
	7.7(e)(4) Review in second year of service.....	16
	7.7(e)(5) Review in subsequent years of service prior to mandatory year.....	16
	7.7(e)(6) Final tenure review	16

7.7(e)(7)	Promotion.....	16
7.7(f)	Counting years of service.....	17
7.7(g)	Tenure Committee and PTAC review.....	17
7.7(h)	Midterm review.....	19
7.7(i)	Reports and recommendations.....	20
7.7(i)(1)	Tenure Committee vote.....	20
7.7(i)(2)	Tenure Committee report.....	20
7.7(i)(3)	Dean’s action	21
7.7(i)(3)(i)	Recommendation on retention.....	21
7.7(i)(3)(ii)	Recommendation on tenure and promotion.	21
7.7(j)	Notice.....	21
7.8	Termination of tenure	22
8.	Long-term contracts	22
8.1	General requirements for grant of initial five-year contracts.....	22
8.2	Teaching requirement	22
8.3	Librarianship.....	23
8.4	Scholarship requirement	23
8.5	Service requirement	23
8.6	Criteria for promotion.....	23
8.6(a)	Promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor or research associate professor.....	23
8.6(b)	Promotion to clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, senior professor, or research professor	24
8.7	Contract renewal	24
8.7(a)	Term of contracts	24
8.7(b)	Counting years of service; early application.....	25
8.7(c)	Committee review.....	25
8.7(d)	Role of the faculty.....	26
8.7(e)	Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee’s and faculty’s review	26
8.7(f)	Dates of notification to candidates and right to subsequent contracts.....	29
8.7(f)(1)	Retention granted.....	29
8.7(f)(2)	Retention denied	29
8.7(f)(3)	Review in contract years prior to the final year of the long-term contract faculty member’s probationary period	29

	8.7(f)(4)	Review in final probationary contract year.....	29
	8.7(f)(5)	Review in subsequent contract years	30
	8.7(f)(6)	Outcomes for comprehensive peer review.....	30
	8.7(g)	Report of the faculty eligible to vote.....	31
	8.7(h)	Action by the dean.....	31
	8.7(h)(1)	Retention.....	31
	8.7(h)(2)	Promotion.....	31
	8.7(i)	Notice.....	31
	8.7(j)	Terminal Contract	32
	8.7(k)	Prior Version	32
9.	Annual, post-tenure, and long-term-contract comprehensive review.....		32
9.1	Purpose and timing of annual review.....		32
	9.1(a)	Purposes of annual review.....	32
	9.1(b)	Time period for annual review	33
9.2	Responsibilities.....		33
	9.2(a)	Individual faculty.....	33
	9.2(a)(1)	Annual Activity Report.....	33
	9.2(a)(2)	Portfolio	33
	9.2(b)	Dean.....	34
	9.2(c)	Peer Review Committee.....	34
	9.2(c)(1)	Creation.....	34
	9.2(c)(2)	Composition.....	34
	9.2(c)(3)	Election	34
	9.2(c)(4)	Conflicts.....	34
9.3	Annual review		34
	9.3(a)	Focus	34
	9.3(b)	Process.....	35
	9.3(b)(1)	Period of annual review	35
	9.3(b)(2)	Creation of annual review assessment	35
	9.3(b)(3)	Areas to be Assessed.....	35
	9.3(b)(4)	Overall Assessment.....	36
	9.3(b)(5)	Consultation with PRC	37
	9.3(b)(6)	Consultation with PTAC.....	37

	9.3(b)(7)	Consultation with Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee ..	37
		
9.3(c)		Basis for evaluation	37
	9.3(c)(1)	Required materials	37
	9.3(c)(2)	Other materials	37
9.3(d)		Assessment indicators	38
	9.3(d)(1)	Purpose.....	38
	9.3(d)(2)	Specific indicators of unsatisfactory performance	38
	9.3(d)(3)	Specific indicators of performance that needs improvement	39
	9.3(d)(4)	Specific indicators of outstanding and effective performance	40
		9.3(d)(4)(i) Instruction and teaching.	40
		9.3(d)(4)(ii) Librarianship	41
		9.3(d)(4)(iii) Scholarship	42
		9.3(d)(4)(iv) Service	44
9.3(e)		Effects of negative assessment	46
	9.3(e)(1)	Unsatisfactory assessment.....	46
	9.3(e)(2)	Needs improvement assessment	46
	9.3(e)(3)	Professional development review	46
9.4		Post-tenure review.....	47
	9.4(a)	Purpose.....	47
	9.4(b)	Process for post-tenure review	47
		9.4(b)(1) Period	47
		9.4(b)(2) Role of the PRC	47
		9.4(b)(3) Appeals	48
	9.4(c)	Peer review of teaching.....	48
	9.4(d)	External peer review of scholarship.....	48
		9.4(d)(1) Application.....	48
		9.4(d)(2) Period of assessment	48
		9.4(d)(3) Reviewers.....	48
		9.4(d)(4) Selection of reviewers	49
		9.4(d)(5) Number and contents of reviews.....	49
		9.4(d)(6) Non-exclusivity.....	49
	9.4(e)	Responses to reviews and additional submissions.....	50

9.5	Comprehensive peer review of long-term contract faculty.....	50
9.5(a)	Purpose	50
9.5(b)	Process for comprehensive peer review	50
9.5(b)(1)	Period	50
9.5(b)(2)	Role of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee.....	50
9.5(b)(3)	Appeals	51
9.5(b)(4)	Conflicts.....	51
9.5(c)	Peer review of teaching	51
9.5(d)	External peer review of scholarship	52
9.5(d)(1)	Application.....	52
9.5(d)(2)	Period of assessment	52
9.5(d)(3)	Reviewers.....	52
9.5(d)(4)	Selection of reviewers.....	52
9.5(d)(5)	Number and contents of reviews.....	52
9.5(d)(6)	Non-exclusivity.....	53
9.5(e)	Responses to reviews and additional submissions	53
10.	Innovative and Effective Pedagogy	53
10.1	General Policy.....	53
10.2	Relation to Annual Activity Report	54
10.3	Nonexclusive Examples	54
10.4	Learning Across Student Demographic Groups	54
10.5	Addressing Group Achievement Deficiencies	55
10.6	Ongoing Policy Development.....	55
11.	Amendments to the Law School Policies.....	55

Texas A&M University School of Law

Policies for Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, and Review

1. Purpose and scope

1.1 Purpose

This document sets forth certain rules, policies, and procedures governing faculty appointments, annual reviews, promotion, tenure, and other pertinent elements of the professional employment relationship of the faculty of Texas A&M University School of Law (the “**Law School**”) (collectively such rules, policies, and procedures are referred to as the “**Law School Policies**”). In addition to the other rules, policies, and procedures set forth in the University Faculty Handbook and the University Rules that are applicable to Law School teachers, the Law School Policies are subject to the American Bar Association (“**ABA**”) Standards and Rules of Procedure.

1.2 Faculty’s rights and obligations

The Law School Policies put all Law School faculty on notice of their rights and obligations under the ABA Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure and under the Law School Academic Standards and the Law School’s Honor System Rules.

1.3 Other policies

In addition to these Law School Policies, the Law School maintains policies and procedures relating to the academic program and other matters dealing with teaching and the Law School’s internal governance.

2. Significant policy positions

2.1 Mission of the Law School

The mission of the Law School is: To provide excellence in legal education, emphasizing service to our diverse student body, our profession, and our community. The Law School is founded on a commitment to academic honesty, integrity, and professionalism by its teachers and students. This commitment is essential to the Law School’s mission.

2.2 Academic freedom and academic tenure

The Law School adheres to the principles of academic freedom as set forth in the ABA Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

2.3 Non-discrimination policy

The Law School provides equal opportunity in its program of legal education for all applicants for admission, enrolled students, and graduates without discrimination or segregation on the ground of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. In addition, the Law School provides its faculty and other employees with equal opportunity in hiring, continuation, promotion, and tenure.

3. Categories of teachers and faculty rank

3.1 Faculty

3.1(a) Definition of faculty

Faculty consists of:

3.1(a)(1) teachers who are appointed with tenure at the rank of professor or associate professor, or who are appointed on the tenure track at the rank of professor, associate, or assistant professor;

3.1(a)(2) professional librarians in the Dee J. Kelly Law Library (the “**Law Library**”) who are appointed with tenure at the rank of professor or associate professor, or who are appointed on the tenure track at the rank of professor, associate, or assistant professor;

3.1(a)(3) long-term contract faculty who are teachers appointed at the rank of instructional professor, instructional associate professor, instructional assistant professor, executive professor, executive associate professor, executive assistant professor, senior professor, or senior associate professor;

3.1(a)(4) long-term contract faculty who are scholars appointed at the rank of research professor, research associate professor or research assistant professor;

3.1(a)(5) long-term contract faculty who are employed in a law clinic appointed at the rank of clinical professor, clinical associate professor, or clinical assistant professor; and

3.1(a)(6) long-term contract faculty who are employed in the Law Library appointed at the rank of instructional professor, instructional associate professor, or instructional assistant professor.

3.1(b) Faculty Voting

3.1(b)(1) Voting rights

Except as limited by section 3.2, faculty have full voting rights at the Law School.

3.1(b)(2) Quorum

The presence of a majority of the persons eligible to vote on a specific matter constitutes a quorum for purposes of these Law School Policies. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, where a two-thirds vote is required under these Law School Policies, the quorum requirement is the presence of two-thirds of the persons eligible to vote on that matter. All persons who are eligible to vote and who are present are counted in determining the existence of a quorum, whether or not they vote on a specific matter. An established quorum is presumed to continue until successfully challenged.

3.1(b)(3) Approval Thresholds

3.1(b)(3)(i) Where these Law School Policies provide for faculty approval for a grant of tenure, of an initial long-term contract, or of a promotion, such approval requires the affirmative vote of a majority of all faculty eligible to vote on such approval.

3.1(b)(3)(ii) Where these Law School Policies require a two-thirds vote for approval of any matter not covered by section 3.1(b)(3)(i), such approval requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the faculty who are present and eligible to vote on that matter, not two-thirds of the eligible faculty as a whole. Where these Law School Policies require a majority vote for approval of any matter not covered by section 3.1(b)(3)(i), such approval requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the faculty who are present and eligible to vote on that matter, not a majority of the eligible faculty as a whole.

3.1(b)(3)(iii) To the extent there is a direct conflict between the voting thresholds stated in this section 3.1(b)(3) and a Texas A&M University or Texas A&M System rule, the university or system rule controls.

3.1(b)(4) Presence for Voting

Faculty are “present” at a meeting for purposes of voting when they are in attendance in person or in attendance by electronic remote access.

3.1(c) Teaching load

The normal teaching load in an academic year for faculty will be approved by the Dean of the Law School (the “**dean**”) in consultation with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs consistent with the internal policies and procedures set by the Law School, ABA principles and University rules.

3.1(d) Classifications of faculty

Faculty members who teach predominantly professional skills courses, a Clinic Director, and the Director of the Law Library are initially hired as professional skills faculty on the tenure track, with tenure, or as long-term contract faculty. Any other faculty positions to be hired as professional skills faculty must be approved by the dean and a two-thirds vote of the faculty eligible to vote on such positions. Other teachers employed in a law clinic are initially hired as long-term contract faculty. Professional librarians employed in the Law Library are initially hired on the tenure track, with tenure, or as long-term contract faculty. Other faculty members are initially hired as doctrinal faculty on the tenure track, with tenure, or as long-term contract faculty.

3.1(e) Courses taught by doctrinal faculty and professional skills faculty

The normal teaching load during an academic year for professional skills faculty members must consist of at least 50 percent of professional skills course credit hours, and the normal teaching load during an academic year for doctrinal faculty members must consist of at least 75 percent of doctrinal course credit hours. Professional skills courses are those courses in the Law School curriculum that are primarily designed to teach writing, oral advocacy, law practice, and similar skills required in law practice and that are designated as such by the faculty. Doctrinal courses are those courses in the Law School curriculum that are primarily designed to teach the principles of certain areas of law and that are designated as such by the faculty. A faculty member's "core teaching assignment" is the type of courses required to be taught by such faculty member under the foregoing provisions, provided, however, that courses taught during the summer term are not considered in determining whether a faculty member has satisfied the core teaching assignment requirement unless the summer teaching assignment is to make up for the faculty member's underload in an academic year. This core teaching assignment may be amended or changed only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the faculty. In extraordinary circumstances, the dean may permit a temporary change in the core teaching assignment of a faculty member, whether tenured or untenured, for up to one year, without requiring the faculty member to apply for a change in faculty classification under section 3.1(f), 3.1(g) or 3.1(h). Under this rule, the faculty member may have a teaching assignment consisting entirely of courses generally taught by faculty members who are in the other classification of faculty.

3.1(f) Change in faculty classification for tenure-track faculty

To change from professional skills faculty to doctrinal faculty or from doctrinal faculty to professional skills faculty, a tenure-track faculty member must make a written request for such change in faculty classification to the dean, and the faculty member's request must receive the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty and approval by the dean, which request may be approved or denied in the faculty's or dean's discretion.

3.1(g) Change in faculty classification for tenured faculty

To change from professional skills faculty to doctrinal faculty or from doctrinal faculty to professional skills faculty, a tenured faculty member must make a written request for such change in faculty classification to the dean, and the faculty member's request must receive the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty and approval by the dean, which request may be approved or denied in the faculty's or dean's discretion.

3.1(h) Change in faculty classification for long-term contract faculty

To change from professional skills faculty to doctrinal faculty or from doctrinal faculty to professional skills faculty, a long-term contract faculty member must make a written request for such change in faculty classification to the dean, and the faculty member's request must receive the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty and approval by the dean, which request may be approved or denied in the faculty's or dean's discretion.

3.1(i) Change from long-term contract faculty to tenure-track or tenured faculty for doctrinal faculty and professional skills faculty

To change from long-term contract faculty to tenure-track or tenured faculty, a long-term contract doctrinal or professional skills faculty member must apply for a vacant position through the recruitment and hiring process under sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, as applicable.

3.1(j) Change from long-term contract faculty to tenure-track or tenured faculty for Law Library faculty

To change from long-term contract faculty to tenure-track or tenured faculty, a long-term contract faculty member employed in the Law Library must apply for a vacant position through the recruitment and hiring process under section 6.4.

3.1(k) Change from tenure-track or tenured faculty to long-term contract faculty

A tenure-track or tenured faculty member who desires to change to a long-term contract faculty member must make a written request for such change in faculty category to the dean, and the faculty member's request will be approved or denied by the dean in the dean's discretion, provided however, that a tenure-track faculty member may not be appointed to an initial five-year contract by the dean unless such appointment is approved by affirmative vote of a majority of the tenured faculty and the long-term contract faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts.

3.2 Long-term contract faculty

There are four categories of long-term contract faculty: (i) teachers whose primary responsibilities consist of teaching and service, (ii) scholars whose primary responsibilities consist of scholarship and service; (iii) teachers employed in a law clinic whose primary duties are supervising students and representing law clinic clients; and (iv)

professional librarians employed in the Law Library whose primary responsibilities consist of librarianship and service. Long-term contract faculty do not include limited-term instructors, teachers with short-term appointments, those employed in an experimental program of limited duration, or those whose position is funded primarily by a grant. Long-term contract faculty have voting rights at the Law School, except that: (i) long-term contract faculty members may vote only on the recruitment and appointment of faculty who are candidates for long-term contract faculty or dean positions; (ii) long-term contract faculty may not vote on matters related to tenure, retention, and promotion of faculty who are not long-term contract faculty; and (iii) long-term contract faculty may not vote on amendments to the Law School Policies that affect only faculty who are not long-term contract faculty. A long-term contract faculty member who desires to change to a tenure-track or tenured faculty member must apply for a vacant position through the recruitment and hiring process under sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, or 6.4, as applicable.

3.3 Limited-term instructors

Limited-term instructors are teachers appointed for up to three academic years. Limited-term instructors are appointed with the title of assistant lecturer, lecturer, senior lecturer, assistant professor of the practice, associate professor of the practice or professor of the practice. Limited-term instructors have no voting rights and no service obligations at the Law School or at the University.

3.4 Interim visitors and distinguished visitors

Interim visitors and distinguished visitors are teachers appointed for up to one academic year. Interim visitors and distinguished visitors are appointed with the title of visiting professor, visiting associate professor, or visiting assistant professor. Interim visitors and distinguished visitors are not tenured and are not on tenure track. They have no voting rights and no service obligations at the Law School or at the University.

3.5 Adjuncts

Adjuncts are part-time teachers appointed for one semester. Adjuncts generally teach only one course in a semester. Adjuncts are appointed with the title of adjunct professor.

3.6 Joint appointments

Joint appointments involve the appointment of a faculty member of another department of the University to split such faculty member's full-time effort with the Law School. A University faculty member appointed under a joint appointment is appointed at the Law School with the same title such faculty member hold at the faculty member's other University department. University faculty members appointed under no budgeted joint appointments have no voting rights and no service obligations at the Law School. University faculty members appointed under budgeted joint appointments have voting rights at the Law School as set forth in section 3.1(b).

4. Recruitment and appointment of faculty to tenured or tenure-track positions

4.1 Recruitment for tenured and tenure-track positions

4.1(a) Method of selecting candidates

The Faculty Appointments Committee identifies and screens applicants and recommends candidates to the faculty for consideration.

4.1(b) Alternate method of selecting candidates

An applicant not recommended by the Faculty Appointments Committee may be considered by the faculty if the applicant's candidacy is approved by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty and if the applicant has visited the campus and interviewed with a substantial number of faculty members.

4.2 Faculty and Tenure Committee approval of candidates for tenured position

Initial appointment of a candidate to a tenured position requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. In addition, Tenure Committee shall consider the grant of tenure to the candidate and provide its recommendation to the dean.

4.3 Faculty approval of candidates for tenure-track position

Initial appointment of a candidate to a tenure-track position requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

4.4 Dean's initial appointment of all candidates

The dean may make job offers only to candidates who have received the necessary approval under section 4.2 or section 4.3. The names of candidates who have received approval are submitted to the dean, who selects the candidate or candidates to receive offers. The dean may reject a candidate, but he/she must inform the faculty of the reason for rejection. The dean may, in appropriate circumstances, offer candidates one or more years of credit toward tenure, but an offer of more than three years of credit requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Tenure Committee. The dean may offer the candidate an initial appointment to a tenured position only if the requisite approval for tenure upon hire has been obtained in accordance with University rules.

4.5 Law Library faculty

The method for recruitment and appointment of Law Library faculty, other than the Director of the Law Library, is set forth in section 6.4.

5. Recruitment and appointment of non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty

5.1 Long-term contract faculty

5.1(a) Selection of candidates

5.1(a)(1) Method of selecting candidates

A Long-term Contract Faculty Hiring Committee, consisting of five faculty members selected by the faculty, identifies and screens applicants and recommends candidates to the faculty for consideration.

5.1(a)(2) Alternate methods of selecting candidates

During its screening of candidates for tenured or tenure-track positions, the Faculty Appointments Committee may identify candidates for long-term contract faculty positions. The Faculty Appointments Committee may recommend such candidates to the faculty for consideration.

An applicant not recommended by the Long-term Contract Faculty Hiring Committee or Faculty Appointments Committee may be considered by the faculty if the applicant's candidacy is approved by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the faculty and if the applicant has visited the campus and interviewed with a substantial number of faculty members.

5.1(b) Clinic director recommendation

For any candidate to be employed as teacher in a law clinic, the relevant Clinic Director will provide his or her recommendation to the faculty for consideration.

5.1(c) Faculty approval of candidates for long-term contract faculty positions

Initial appointment of a candidate to a long-term contract faculty position requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the faculty.

5.1(d) Dean's initial appointment of candidates

The dean may make job offers only to candidates who have received the necessary approval under this section 5.1. The names of candidates who have received approval are submitted to the dean, who selects the candidate or candidates to receive offers. The dean may reject a candidate, but he/she must inform the faculty of the reason for rejection. The dean may, in appropriate circumstances, offer candidates one or more years of credit toward the long-term contract; provided, however that, (i) an offer of more than three years of credit towards the initial probationary period requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the faculty; and (ii) the grant of a five-year contract upon hiring requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the combined eligible tenured faculty and the long-term contract faculty appointed on five-year contracts.

5.1(e) Law Library faculty

The method for recruitment and appointment of Law Library faculty, other than the Director of the Law Library, is set forth in section 6.4.

5.2 Limited-term instructors

5.2(a) Selection of candidates

A Limited-term Instructor Hiring Committee, consisting of five faculty members selected by the dean, identifies and screens applicants and recommends candidates to the dean for consideration.

5.2(b) Dean's initial appointment of candidates

The names of candidates who have received recommendation from the Limited-term Instructor Hiring Committee are submitted to the dean, who selects the candidate or candidates to receive offers. The dean may appoint limited-term contract instructors for an initial term of up to three years. Appointment for any additional term requires the approval of the majority of the faculty. There is no limit on the number of additional terms to which a limited-term instructor may be appointed; provided however, that at least once every five years, a faculty committee appointed by the dean is used in the annual review process to evaluate the limited-term instructor's teaching and reports its recommendation on retention of the limited-term instructor to the dean.

5.3 Distinguished and interim visitors

5.3(a) Distinguished visitors

The dean may appoint distinguished visitors for an initial term of up to one academic year. Appointment for any additional term requires the approval of the majority of the faculty. There is no limit on the number of additional terms to which a distinguished visitor may be appointed.

5.3(b) Interim visitors

The dean may appoint interim visitors to fill temporarily vacant full-time positions for an initial term of up to one academic year. Appointment for any additional term requires the approval of a majority of the faculty.

5.4 Emeritus faculty

Emeritus faculty members are appointed under the rules set out for such appointments in the University Rules.

5.5 Adjuncts

The dean appoints all adjunct faculty for a period of one fall, spring, or summer term. Adjunct faculty may be reappointed by the dean for additional terms, without limitation.

5.6 Non-budgeted joint appointments

A faculty member of another University department may be appointed to split such faculty member's full-time effort with the Law School under a non-budgeted joint appointment when the faculty member performs non-remunerated duties at the Law School. The dean makes non-budgeted joint appointments in accordance with University guidelines for such appointments.

5.7 Budgeted joint appointments

A faculty member of another University department may be appointed to split such faculty member's full-time effort with the Law School under a budgeted joint appointment when the faculty member performs remunerated duties at the Law School. The dean makes budgeted joint appointments in accordance with University guidelines for such appointments and requires the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty for faculty candidates appointed as tenure-track or tenured faculty or at least two-thirds of the faculty for all other faculty candidates.

6. The Law Library and Law Library faculty

6.1 The Director of the Law Library

The Director of the Law Library supervises the overall operation of the Law Library. For matters involving Law Library faculty and staff, the Director makes recommendations regarding retention and salary increases to the dean of the Law School.

6.2 Law Library faculty

6.2(a) Responsibilities of Law Library faculty

Law Library faculty are the professional librarians in the Law Library who have tenure or who are on the tenure track or who are long-term contract faculty. Law Library faculty members are an integral part of the teaching, research, and service of the Law School. The instructional responsibilities of the Law Library faculty consist of assigned tasks in the areas of legal research instruction, bibliographic instruction, cataloging, reference, collection development, collection control, preservation, and other general library functions. Law Library faculty will also engage in appropriate University, Law School, and community service as well as in a continuing program of professional growth and development. With the approval of the Director of the Law Library and the consent of the individual Law Library faculty member, a Law Library faculty member may be asked to teach in the formal classroom setting of the Law School as part of his/her library duties. If such classroom-teaching assignments are made, the Law Library faculty member will have parallel adjustments made in his/her other library assignments so as not to create a work overload.

6.2(b) Committees

Law Library faculty may serve on University committees and are eligible for candidacy as Law School representatives on the Faculty Senate. In addition, Law Library faculty members may serve as voting members on Law School committees.

6.3 Initial appointment of Law Library faculty

Law Library faculty members are appointed to twelve-month contracts that operate on a fiscal year basis.

6.4 Recruitment procedures

6.4(a) Law Library search committee

Upon the vacancy in a Law Library faculty position or the creation of a new Law Library faculty position, the faculty will select five faculty members to serve on a Law Library search committee. The search committee shall consist of three Law Library faculty members and two non-Law Library faculty members. The search committee identifies and screens applicants and recommends candidates to the Director of the Law Library for consideration.

6.4(b) Approval

At the conclusion of the search, the committee will forward its recommendation to the Director of the Law Library for approval. The Director of the Law Library then forwards his or her recommendation(s) to the faculty for approval. Initial appointment of a candidate to a Law Library faculty position requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the eligible faculty. Eligible faculty are determined based on section 4 or section 5, depending on whether the candidate seeks a tenured, tenure-track, or long-term contract appointment. The names of candidates who have received approval by the eligible faculty are submitted to the dean, who selects the candidate or candidates to receive offers. The dean may make job offers only to candidates who have received the approval of the Director of the Law Library and the faculty. The dean may reject a candidate, but he/she must inform the Director of the Law Library of the reason for rejection. The dean may, in appropriate circumstances, offer candidates one or more years of credit toward tenure or a long-term contract; provided, however that, (i) an offer of more than three years of credit towards the initial probationary period requires the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the faculty; and (ii) the grant of a five-year contract upon hiring requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the combined eligible tenured faculty and the long-term contract faculty appointed on five-year contracts. For a candidate for a tenured position, the Tenure Committee shall consider the grant of tenure to the candidate and provide its recommendation to the dean. The dean may offer the candidate an initial appointment to a tenured Law Library faculty position only if the requisite approval for tenure upon hire has been obtained in accordance with University rules.

7. Retention grants of tenure, and promotion of tenure-track and tenured faculty

7.1 General requirements for tenure of faculty

The decision to grant tenure to a faculty member who is a teacher is based on satisfaction of the following requirements: excellence in teaching and communicating knowledge of the law; excellence in scholarly research and writing; and excellence in national, state, community, University, Law School, or professional service. The decision to grant tenure to a faculty member who is a professional librarian in the Law Library is based on satisfaction of the following requirements: excellence in librarianship; excellence in scholarly research and writing; and excellence in national, state, community, University, Law School, or professional service.

7.2 Teaching requirement

Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by excellent teaching ability both inside and outside the classroom. In accordance with University guidelines, the Tenure Committee must consider peer evaluations of course syllabi, assignments, examinations and grading methods, student teaching evaluations and peer evaluation of other teaching contributions of value to the Law School. The Tenure Committee also may consider evaluations by other faculty members and by the dean.

A tenure-track candidate who is a Clinic Director or otherwise employed in a law clinic will be evaluated on the candidate's law practice management as part of the evaluation of the candidate's teaching. Excellence in law practice management is demonstrated by excellent training and supervision of students engaged in law practice through the law clinic, demonstrating proficiency in the practice of law and management of client cases, and maintaining good standing with the State Bar of Texas.

7.3 Librarianship requirement

Excellence in librarianship is demonstrated by excellence in the candidate's performance of the following duties in the Law Library: (a) legal research instruction; (b) bibliographic instruction; (c) cataloging; (d) reference and research assistance; (e) collection development activities; (f) preservation; (g) faculty services; (h) information retrieval and analysis; (i) management and supervision; (j) archival management; (k) library computer systems management; (l) budget planning and oversight; (m) other general library functions. The Tenure Committee may consider evaluations by the Law Library Director, by other faculty members, by students, and by the dean.

7.4 Scholarship requirement

7.4(a) Scholarship requirement for doctrinal faculty and professional skills faculty

To satisfy the requirement for excellence in scholarly research and writing, a doctrinal or professional skills faculty member must produce and have published no fewer than three substantial scholarly law review articles or their equivalent, although the third of the three articles may merely have been accepted for publication at the time of the tenure decision. These three articles or their equivalent must have been completed within the five years prior to the tenure decision, or

within the candidate's probationary period, whichever is longer. Although scholarship completed before joining the faculty will be considered, there must be evidence that scholarship continues to be a regular part of the faculty member's professional life.

7.4(b) Scholarship requirement for Law Library faculty

To satisfy the requirement for excellence in scholarly research and writing, a Law Library faculty member must produce and have published no fewer than two substantial scholarly articles or their equivalent, although the second of the two articles may merely have been accepted for publication at the time of the tenure decision. These two articles or their equivalent must have been completed within the five years prior to the tenure decision, or within the candidate's probationary period, whichever is longer. Although scholarship completed before joining the faculty will be considered, there must be evidence that scholarship continues to be a regular part of the faculty member's professional life.

7.4(c) Equivalent writing

A faculty member may satisfy the scholarship requirement under section 7.4(a) or (b) by producing works equivalent to scholarly law review articles. The Tenure Committee must consider the quality and quantity of the work, the time devoted to its production, and the forum in which it appears and must determine that the work is the equivalent of the required number of substantial scholarly law review articles. The equivalent work must appear in a written format.

7.5 Service requirement

The Tenure Committee considers institutional, professional, and community service in making tenure decisions. Such service may be determinative in close cases, but it cannot make up for teaching, librarianship, or scholarship deficiencies. The quality of the participation is crucial in evaluating the significance of the service.

7.6 General requirements for promotion

7.6(a) Promotion to associate professor

Candidates for promotion to associate professor will be evaluated for promotion concurrently with evaluation for tenure and will not be awarded one without the other.

7.6(b) Promotion to professor

Candidates for promotion to professor must show a record of (1) continuing excellence in teaching or librarianship, as applicable; (2) continuing excellence and some measure of national or international recognition in scholarship; and (3) evidence of valuable professional service.

7.7 Retention, tenure, and promotion process

7.7(a) Role of the Tenure Committee

The Tenure Committee (consisting of all tenured Law School faculty) makes recommendations to the dean on all matters of tenure and promotion of faculty members who are candidates for tenure or promotion. The Tenure Committee will use a Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (“PTAC”) to assist in the evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion and retention of tenure-track faculty. The dean retains the discretion whether to follow the Tenure Committee’s recommendation regarding a faculty member’s retention, tenure, or promotion.

7.7(b) Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee

The PTAC will consist of five tenured faculty members unless the Tenure Committee determines that a different number of committee members is desirable for a given year. The Tenure Committee Chair will serve as an *ex officio* member of the PTAC. A majority of the PTAC members will be elected by the Tenure Committee at the last faculty meeting of the academic year to be effective for the next academic year. The remaining member(s) of the PTAC will be appointed by the Tenure Committee Chair by September 1 of each year, in consultation with the dean. The PTAC’s role is to gather information regarding a tenure-track faculty member’s teaching or librarianship, as applicable, scholarship and service and to prepare a report regarding the faculty member’s satisfaction of those three requirements. The PTAC provides its report for tenure-track faculty in their third year of service and mandatory year for tenure consideration to the Tenure Committee Chair. The PTAC provides its report for promotion candidates to the Tenure Committee Chair. The Tenure Committee Chair will provide the PTAC’s report to the Tenure Committee for consideration by the Tenure Committee in conjunction with the midterm review, tenure review or promotion review of the faculty member, as applicable. For other tenure-track faculty, the PTAC provides its report to the dean to the faculty member and to the dean at least ten days before the date set for notification of the retention decision

7.7(c) Differences in University and Law School processes for promotion, tenure, and review

These Law School Policies for promotion, tenure and review of faculty are intended to follow and supplement institutional procedures for University faculty as outlined in University Rule 12.01.99.M1, “Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion.” To the extent there is a direct conflict between these Law School Policies and University Rule 12.01.99.M1, University Rule 12.01.99.M1 shall control.

7.7(d) Time period for tenure decision

Faculty hired on the tenure-track normally will be considered for tenure in the sixth year of service; provided, however, that the faculty member’s appointment contract with the University will specify such faculty member’s probationary period. The

academic year prior to the end of the faculty member's probationary period is the faculty member's "**mandatory year**" for tenure consideration. For example, if the faculty member's appointment contract specifies a seven-year probationary period, then the faculty member's mandatory year for tenure consideration is the faculty member's sixth year of service. A faculty member instead may choose to be considered for tenure prior to the faculty member's mandatory year. The faculty member must notify the dean of this decision in writing at the time of hiring or at any time before December 1 prior to the academic year in which the faculty member desires to be considered for tenure. In the event a faculty member is considered for tenure prior to the faculty member's mandatory year and is denied tenure, the faculty member will be considered for tenure again in the faculty member's mandatory year, provided the faculty member is retained on the tenure-track.

7.7(e) Dates of notification to candidates and right to subsequent contracts

7.7(e)(1) Retention granted

If retention is granted, a tenure-track faculty member will receive a contract for the subsequent year at the time contracts are normally awarded. Retention of a faculty member on tenure track means that progress is being made toward tenure and the faculty member should be continued on tenure track for the next year. Although retention does indicate that the dean believes that the faculty member is capable of meeting the tenure requirements in the remaining time on the tenure track, it does not amount to a statement by the dean that the faculty member will meet the requirements.

7.7(e)(2) Retention denied

If a tenure-track faculty member does not receive a recommendation for retention from the dean, then the faculty member will not be retained. The dean will notify a faculty member of any adverse retention recommendation of the dean. A faculty member has the right to appeal any adverse retention recommendation of the dean to the University Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1.

7.7(e)(3) Review in first year of service

Tenure-track faculty in the first year of service must be notified not later than March 1 of the retention decision. For a faculty member whose appointment terminates during an academic year, the faculty member must be notified of the retention decision at least three months in advance of the faculty member's termination of the appointment. If a tenure-track faculty member in the first year of service is not retained, such faculty member will not receive a subsequent contract.

7.7(e)(4) Review in second year of service

Tenure-track faculty in the second year of service must be notified not later than December 15 of the retention decision. For a faculty member whose appointment terminates during an academic year, the faculty member must be notified of the retention decision at least six months in advance of the candidate's termination of appointment. If a tenure-track faculty member in the second year of service is not retained, such faculty member will not receive a subsequent contract.

7.7(e)(5) Review in subsequent years of service prior to mandatory year

Tenure-track faculty with more than two years of service but not yet in the mandatory year of service for tenure consideration must be notified of the retention decision before contracts are issued for the next academic year; if not retained, such tenure-track faculty member must receive a terminal contract for the next academic year.

7.7(e)(6) Final tenure review

Tenure is not granted piecemeal. For example, a tenure-track faculty member will not be told that he/she has tenure as it relates to teaching and therefore need complete only the scholarship and service requirements within the remaining time. Except as provided in section 7.7(d), the Tenure Committee votes on tenure only once for each candidate; at that time the Tenure Committee considers the requirements for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service for professional skills faculty and doctrinal faculty, or the requirements for excellence in librarianship, scholarship, and service for Law Library faculty. The action of a prior year's PTAC or Tenure Committee does not bind the Tenure Committee in the year of the tenure vote. Final review for tenure of tenure candidates, and notification to the candidates of the tenure recommendation of the Tenure Committee must occur as soon as practicable after the Tenure Committee vote on tenure, but not later than December 1. The dean will notify the candidate of the dean's tenure recommendation at the time the dean makes such recommendation. The dean will notify a candidate of the tenure recommendation by the Provost and Executive Vice President, the President of the University, or the Board of Regents as soon as practicable. If tenure is not granted in the mandatory year for tenure consideration, the candidate must receive a terminal contract for the next academic year. If a candidate applies for tenure prior to the mandatory year and is not granted tenure, then the candidate may be retained or not retained in accordance with sections 7.7(e)(1)-(5), as applicable.

7.7(e)(7) Promotion

Candidates for promotion during the tenure decision will be notified of the promotion decision at the time the candidate is notified of the tenure

decision. Final review for candidates seeking promotion after achieving tenure, and notification to the candidates of the Tenure Committee's recommendation must occur as soon as practicable after the Tenure Committee vote on promotion, but not later than December 1. The dean will notify the candidate of the dean's promotion recommendation at the time the dean makes such recommendation. The dean will notify a candidate of the promotion recommendation by the Provost and Executive Vice President, and the President of the University as soon as practicable. If a candidate for promotion to professor does not receive a promotion, the candidate may apply for promotion again in another academic year, provided the candidate is retained as a tenured faculty member.

7.7(f) Counting years of service

The first year of University service counted toward tenure is the first year of a faculty member's appointment, unless one or more years' credit toward tenure is granted at hiring.

7.7(g) Tenure Committee and PTAC review

The Tenure Committee and PTAC consider teaching, scholarship, and service for professional skills tenure-track faculty, doctrinal tenure-track faculty, professional skills tenured promotion candidates and doctrinal tenured promotion candidates and librarianship, scholarship, and service for Law Library tenure-track faculty and Law Library tenured promotion candidates. In evaluating candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion, the PTAC and Tenure Committee review these items:

7.7(g)(1) The faculty member's portfolio, which must contain the following: (A) the faculty member's current vita and all annual activity reports; (B) copies of the faculty member's publications; (C) reports from the faculty member describing service to the Law School, the University, the community, and the profession; and (D) any other information the faculty member deems pertinent. The faculty member may choose to include teaching evaluations by students, evidence of excellence in librarianship, if applicable, and current drafts of works in progress. A faculty member in his/her mandatory year of service for tenure consideration must prepare those portions of the dossier that are required to be prepared and submitted by the candidate and which comply with the guidelines set forth by the Dean of Faculties and must submit those portions of the dossier to the PTAC for consideration by September 1 of the candidate's mandatory year. A candidate for promotion consideration must prepare those portions of the dossier that are required to be prepared and submitted by the candidate and which comply with the guidelines set forth by the Dean of Faculties and must submit those portions of the dossier to the PTAC for consideration by September 1 of the academic year in which the candidate is applying for promotion. A faculty member required to undergo a midterm review pursuant to section 7.7(h) must prepare those portions of the dossier that are required to be prepared and submitted by the faculty member and which comply with the guidelines set forth by the

Dean of Faculties and must submit those portions of the dossier to the PTAC by the date established by the Chair of the Tenure Committee.

- 7.7(g)(2)** The faculty member's confidential file, which is available only to the PTAC, Tenure Committee and the dean and which may contain some or all of the following: (A) teaching evaluations by other faculty members; (B) evaluations of the faculty member's teaching (including law practice management) by the relevant Clinic Director and the Associate Dean of Experiential Education, if applicable; (C) librarianship evaluations by the Law Library Director or other faculty members; (D) recommendations from appropriate individuals; (E) student evaluations; (F) annual reviews of the faculty member by the Dean; (G) reports of the PTAC for the faculty member from previous years; and (H) other information found in the course of the review of the faculty member.
- 7.7(g)(3)** Evaluations of publications or works in progress by other faculty members or outside evaluators, which may be requested by the faculty member, the PTAC or the Tenure Committee and are available only to the faculty member, the PTAC, the Tenure Committee and the dean. The dean or the dean's designee, in conjunction with the tenured faculty, will solicit outside reviewers of a tenure track candidate's or a promotion candidate's scholarship in sufficient time to anticipate receipt of the external reviews before October 1 of the candidate's year of service for tenure or promotion consideration, as applicable. By no later than the March 1 prior to the start of a tenure-track candidate's mandatory year for tenure consideration or a promotion candidate's year of service in which the candidate's promotion will be considered, such candidate shall provide the dean and the Chair of the Tenure Committee with a list of potential reviewers of the candidate's scholarship, a copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae (c.v.), and a copy of the candidate's statement on research, teaching and service. This list of reviewers should include only established scholars in the candidate's field of scholarship. Typically, the reviewers will also be tenured faculty members at ABA-approved law schools who hold the same or higher rank for which the candidate is applying.

The Law School's tenured faculty will make every effort to have an equal number of reviewers chosen from the candidate's list and a list of reviewers prepared independently by the PTAC. Any reviewer will be requested to assess a maximum of two of the candidate's scholarly articles that are being considered in the tenure or promotion decision. The actual total number of articles that will be considered under this outside review process may vary depending on the number of articles the candidate has already published along with the number of drafts of unpublished articles that the candidate provides the tenured faculty to consider in making a tenure or promotion decision.

Absent extraordinary circumstances, at least two of a doctrinal faculty or professional skills faculty candidate's articles will be subject to this process, and at least one of a Law Library faculty candidate's articles will be subject to this process. The reviewer will be provided with a copy of the candidate's c.v., the candidate's statement on research, teaching and service, and the Law School's current standards regarding required excellence in scholarly research and writing. For professional skills faculty and doctrinal faculty candidates, the reviewer will be asked to assist the tenured Law School faculty by commenting on whether the candidate's article(s) are substantial scholarly law review articles (or their equivalent) that contribute to the growth and understanding of the law and legal institutions. For Law Library faculty candidates, the reviewer will be asked to assist the tenured Law School faculty by commenting on whether the candidate's article(s) are substantial scholarly article(s) (or their equivalent) that contribute to the growth and understanding of the law and legal institutions or the field of information sciences. For candidates seeking promotion to professor, the reviewer will also be asked to comment on what the article(s) indicate about the candidate's current and potential national and/or international prominence.

Reviewers will also be asked to identify what the article(s) indicate about the candidate's ongoing potential to make a substantial contribution in research and writing as a scholar in his/her field. The solicitation letter to potential reviewers must contain the following statement:

Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state, and your review could be requested and relinquished.

To the extent that outside reviewers are used as stated, the Tenure Committee will provide a summary to the candidate of any key points made by the reviewer that were considered by the Tenure Committee in making a tenure or promotion decision about the candidate to the extent permitted by University guidelines. The use of outside reviewers does not limit the discretion of the Tenure Committee to select reviewers, in addition to the outside reviewers, who are members of the tenured faculty; nor does the use of outside reviewers as stated herein prevent any tenured faculty member from reviewing a candidate's scholarship independently or in any manner other than this outside review process when deciding about a candidate's promotion or tenure.

7.7(g)(4) Other pertinent information the PTAC or the Tenure Committee receives.

7.7(h) Midterm review

All tenure-track faculty are required to undergo a midterm review in the academic year stated in the faculty member's appointment contract, which is generally the faculty member's third year of service. The midterm review is a detailed and

comprehensive review conducted by the Tenure Committee. This review will focus on:

- 7.7(h)(1)** The faculty member's teaching performance or librarianship performance, as applicable, during the first three years of service;
- 7.7(h)(2)** The faculty member's scholarship performance during the first three years of service;
- 7.7(h)(3)** The faculty member's service performance during the first three years of service;
- 7.7(h)(4)** An explicit statement of whether the faculty member is on, above, or below trajectory for a positive tenure decision at the appropriate time; and
- 7.7(h)(5)** An explicit statement of what area(s) of performance, if any, is/are of concern.

The Tenure Committee will complete a midterm review and submit a recommendation report to the dean before May 1 of a faculty member's year of service in which the midterm review is conducted. After the Tenure Committee's recommendation report is prepared and forwarded to the dean, the dean will meet with the faculty member. During this meeting, the dean will provide his or her own feedback to the faculty member and answer questions/address concerns or issues raised by the faculty member. A summary memorandum of this meeting and the Tenure Committee's recommendation report will subsequently be added to the dossier and returned to the faculty member. Complete copies of the faculty member's dossier will also be retained by the dean's office.

7.7(i) Reports and recommendations

7.7(i)(1) Tenure Committee vote

The Tenure Committee members vote by secret ballot to recommend the grant of tenure or promotion of candidates or to recommend retention of a faculty member undergoing midterm review. A recommendation of retention during the midterm review requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the Tenure Committee. A recommendation of promotion or tenure requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the Tenure Committee eligible to vote.

7.7(i)(2) Tenure Committee report

After the Tenure Committee's vote on the candidate's tenure or promotion or the retention of a faculty member undergoing midterm review, the Chair of the Tenure Committee must promptly prepare a recommendation report for the dean. The report remains in the faculty member's confidential file. The Tenure Committee Chair will provide a copy of the Tenure Committee

recommendation report for a tenure or promotion candidate to such candidate when the candidate's dossier is submitted to the Provost and Executive Vice President through the Dean of Faculties. A copy of the Tenure Committee recommendation report on retention of a faculty member undergoing midterm review is provided to the faculty member in accordance with section 7.7(h).

7.7(i)(3) Dean's action

7.7(i)(3)(i) Recommendation on retention.

If the PTAC or Tenure Committee recommends the grant of retention of a tenure-track faculty member, and the dean approves the recommendation, the dean will notify the faculty member of the favorable retention recommendation not later than the applicable date specified in sections 7.7(e)(3)-(5). If the dean does not approve the faculty member's retention, the dean will notify the faculty member of the adverse retention decision not later than the applicable date specified in sections 7.7(e)(3)-(5).

7.7(i)(3)(ii) Recommendation on tenure and promotion.

The dean will forward the candidate's dossier and the Tenure Committee's reports on recommendation of promotion or grant of tenure to the Provost and Executive Vice President through the Dean of Faculties. After informing the candidate of the Tenure Committee's recommendation on tenure in accordance with section 7.7(e)(6) or promotion in accordance with section 7.7(e)(7), the dean makes a written recommendation on tenure or promotion to the Provost and Executive Vice President through the Dean of Faculties. The dean will notify the candidate of the dean's recommendation at the time the dean submits the dean's recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

7.7(j) Notice

For purposes of this section 7.7, notice may be given to a faculty member in person or by U.S. mail, interoffice mail, e-mail, phone, or voicemail, provided, however, that any notice of an adverse promotion or tenure decision by the President of the University must also be provided by certified mail, return receipt requested. Notice is effective when it is sent or transmitted to the faculty member. The PTAC report and the Tenure Committee report on recommendation of retention, tenure, or promotion are not required to be included in the notice provided to the faculty member.

7.8 Termination of tenure

The grant of tenure carries the academic freedom and job security associated with tenure, subject to termination in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1, “Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion.”

8. Long-term contracts

8.1 General requirements for grant of initial five-year contracts

The decision to grant an initial five-year contract for long-term contract faculty employed in a law clinic is based on satisfaction of the following requirements: excellence in teaching and communicating knowledge of the law, including excellence in law practice management; and excellence in national, state, community, University, Law School, or professional service. The decision to grant an initial five-year contract for long-term contract faculty employed in the Law Library is based on satisfaction of the following requirements: excellence in librarianship; and excellence in national, state, community, University, Law School, or professional service. The decision to grant an initial five-year contract for other long-term contract faculty who are teachers is based on satisfaction of the following requirements: excellence in teaching and communicating knowledge of the law; and excellence in national, state, community, University, Law School, or professional service. The decision to grant an initial five-year contract for long-term contract faculty who are researchers is based on satisfaction of the following requirements: excellence in scholarship; and excellence in national, state, community, University, Law School, or professional service.

8.2 Teaching requirement

Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by excellent teaching ability both inside and outside the classroom. In accordance with University guidelines, the Long-Term Contract Faculty Review Committee described in section 8.7(c) must consider peer evaluations of course syllabi, assignments, examinations and grading methods, teaching evaluations by students and peer evaluation of other teaching contributions of value to the Law School. The Long-Term Contract Faculty Review Committee also may consider evaluations by other faculty members and by the dean.

A long-term contract faculty member employed in a law clinic will be evaluated on the faculty member’s law practice management as part of the evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching. Excellence in law practice management is demonstrated by excellent training and supervision of students engaged in law practice through the law clinic, demonstrating proficiency in the practice of law and management of client cases, and maintaining good standing with the State Bar of Texas. The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee must consider all available evaluations by the Associate Dean of Experiential Education and the relevant Clinic Director, as applicable.

8.3 Librarianship

Excellence in librarianship is demonstrated by excellence in the performance of the following duties in the Law Library, as applicable: (a) legal research instruction; (b) bibliographic instruction; (c) cataloging; (d) reference and research assistance; (e) collection development activities; (f) preservation; (g) faculty services; (h) information retrieval and analysis; (i) management and supervision; (j) archival management; (k) library computer systems management; (l) budget planning and oversight; (m) other general library functions. The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee must consider all available evaluations by the Law Library Director and other long-term-contract librarians and may consider evaluations by other faculty members, by students, and by the dean.

8.4 Scholarship requirement

Excellence in scholarship is demonstrated by national or international recognition as a preeminent scholar in the candidate's field and a continuous record of publication of substantive scholarly articles, book chapters, books, or their equivalent.

8.5 Service requirement

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee considers institutional, professional, and community service in making contract decisions. Such service may be determinative in close cases, but it cannot make up for teaching, librarianship, scholarship, or law practice deficiencies. The quality of the participation is crucial in evaluating the significance of the service.

8.6 Criteria for promotion

8.6(a) Promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor

8.6(a)(1) Candidates for promotion to clinical associate professor must show a record of excellence in teaching and law practice management and must show a valuable record of service and leadership in the candidate's profession. Candidates for promotion to instructional associate professor or executive associate professor must show a record of excellence in teaching or librarianship, as applicable, and must show a valuable record of service and leadership in the candidate's profession. Candidates for promotion to research associate professor must show a record of excellence in research and scholarship and must show a valuable record of service and leadership in the candidate's profession.

8.6(a)(2) A candidate who does not already hold the rank of clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor will be considered for promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor, as applicable, at the time the

candidate is considered for appointment to an initial five-year contract. Faculty recommendation for promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor requires the vote of a majority of the faculty who hold the rank of associate professor, professor, clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, research associate professor, clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, or research professor. The dean makes a written recommendation on promotion to the Provost and Executive Vice President through the Dean of Faculties. The dean will notify the candidate of the dean's recommendation at the time the dean submits the dean's recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

8.6(b) Promotion to clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, senior professor, or research professor

8.6(b)(1) Candidates for promotion to clinical professor must show a continuous record of excellence in teaching and law practice management and must show a valuable record of service and leadership in the candidate's profession. Candidates for promotion to instructional professor, executive professor, or senior professor must show a continuous record of excellence in teaching or librarianship, as applicable, and must show a valuable record of service and leadership in the candidate's profession. Candidates for promotion to research professor must show a continuous record of excellence in research and scholarship and must show a valuable record of service and leadership in the candidate's profession.

8.6(b)(2) Promotion to clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, senior professor, or research professor will be considered upon request of the candidate. The candidate must provide written notice of such request at any time before December 1 prior to the academic year in which the candidate desires to be considered for promotion. Faculty recommendation for promotion to clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, senior professor, or research professor requires the vote of a majority of the faculty members who hold the rank of professor, clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, senior professor, or research professor. The dean makes a written recommendation on promotion to the Provost and Executive Vice President through the Dean of Faculties. The dean will notify the candidate of the dean's recommendation at the time the dean submits the dean's recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

8.7 Contract renewal

8.7(a) Term of contracts

After an initial one-year appointment, the contracts of long-term contract faculty may be renewed annually for a total of up to six years. During this initial

probationary period, the renewal of a long-term contract faculty member's contract is governed by section 8.7(f)(1)-(4).

After this initial probationary period, promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor, as applicable, and approval of appointment on an initial five-year contract under this section 8.7, each five-year contract is renewable in order to ensure academic freedom. Similarly, a five-year contract granted upon hiring in accordance with either section 5.1(d)(ii) or section 6.4(b)(ii) is renewable in order to ensure academic freedom. The renewal of a five-year contract is governed by section 8.7(f)(5).

During any five-year contract period, a contract may be terminated in accordance with the procedures for dismissal set forth in University Rule 12.01.99.M1, "Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion."

8.7(b) Counting years of service; early application

The first year of Law School service counted toward the initial probationary period of a long-term contract faculty member is the first year of a long-term contract faculty member's appointment, unless one or more years' credit of service is granted at hiring or—in the case of tenure-track faculty transitioning to contract—granted at the time of transition.

A faculty member may choose to be considered for an initial five-year contract prior to the end of the initial probationary period. The faculty member must notify the dean of this decision in writing at the time of hiring or at any time before December 1 prior to the academic year in which the faculty member desires to be considered for the initial five-year contract. In the event a faculty member is considered for the initial five-year contract prior to the end of the faculty member's probationary period and is denied a five-year contract, the faculty member will be considered for a five-year contract again at the end of the probationary period, provided the faculty member is retained on a long-term contract.

8.7(c) Committee review

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee will consist of five members unless the Tenure Committee Chair and the dean determine that a different number of committee members is desirable for a given year. Only tenured faculty and long-term contract faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts are eligible to serve on the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee. The Tenure Committee Chair will serve as an *ex officio* member of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee. A majority of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee members will be elected by the tenured faculty and long-term faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts at the last faculty meeting of the academic year to be effective for the next academic year. The remaining member(s) of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee will be appointed by the Tenure Committee Chair by September 1 of each year, in consultation with the dean.

The Long-term

Contract Faculty Review Committee evaluates long-term contract faculty members for contract renewal and submits a written report and recommendation to the dean and in the case of candidates being considered for an initial five-year contract or promotion, to the dean and the Chair of the Tenure Committee.

8.7(d) Role of the faculty

For candidates being considered for an initial five-year contract and, if applicable, promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor, the Chair of the Tenure Committee provides the written report and recommendation of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee to the Tenure Committee and all long-term contract faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts, such persons being the faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. For candidates being considered for promotion to clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, senior professor or research professor, the Chair of the Tenure Committee provides the written report and recommendation of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee to all tenured faculty who hold the rank of professor and all long-term contract faculty who hold the rank of clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, senior professor or research professor, such persons being the faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. The faculty eligible to vote makes independent recommendations to the dean on all matters of the grant of an initial five-year contract to and promotion of long-term contract faculty members who are candidates for such appointment or promotion. The faculty members vote by secret ballot to recommend the grant of an initial five-year contract to or promotion of a candidate. Such action requires the affirmative vote of a majority of faculty members eligible to vote.

8.7(e) Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee's and faculty's review

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee and the faculty eligible to vote consider the long-term contract faculty member's teaching, law practice management, research, or librarianship, as applicable and service. In evaluating long-term contract faculty for retention, appointment to an initial five-year contract, and promotion, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, and the faculty eligible to vote review these items:

8.7(e)(1) The review portfolio, which must contain the following: (a) the long-term contract faculty member's current vita and all annual activity reports; (b) copies of any publications that the long-term contract faculty member wants to be considered; (c) reports from the long-term contract faculty member describing service to the Law School, the University, the community, and the profession; and (d) any other information the long-term contract faculty member deems pertinent. The long-term contract faculty member may choose to include teaching evaluations by students, descriptions of cases worked on by the long-term contract faculty member over the review period, letters from clients and judges, evidence of excellence in librarianship, and current drafts of works in progress. A candidate being

considered for promotion must prepare those portions of the dossier that are required to be prepared and submitted by the candidate and which comply with the guidelines set forth by the Dean of Faculties and must submit those portions of the dossier to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee for consideration by September 1 of the academic year in which the candidate is seeking consideration for promotion.

8.7(e)(2) The long-term contract faculty member's confidential file, which is available only to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, the faculty eligible to vote, and the dean and which may contain some or all of the following: (a) teaching evaluations by other faculty members; (b) evaluations of the long-term contract faculty member's teaching (including law practice management) by the relevant Clinic Director and the Associate Dean of Experiential Education, if applicable; (c) evaluations of the long-term contract faculty member's librarianship performance by the Law Library Director, if applicable; (d) recommendations from appropriate individuals; (e) student evaluations; (f) annual reviews of the long-term contract faculty member by the Dean; (g) reports of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee for the long-term contract faculty member from previous years; and (h) other information found in the course of the review of the long-term contract faculty member.

8.7(e)(3) Evaluations of scholarship for long-term contract research faculty by other faculty or outside evaluators. The long-term contract faculty member or the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee may request outside evaluation of the faculty member's publications or works in progress. Results of the evaluation are available only to the dean, the long-term contract faculty member, the Long-Term Contract Review Committee, and faculty eligible to vote on the long-term contract faculty member's initial five-year contract or the candidate's promotion. When long-term contract research faculty become candidates for promotion or for appointment to an initial five-year contract, the dean or the dean's designee, in conjunction with the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, will solicit outside reviewers of a candidate's scholarship in sufficient time to anticipate receipt of the external reviews before October 1 of the candidate's year of service in which the candidate's promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract, as applicable, is being considered. By no later than the March 1 prior to the start of a candidate's year of service in which the candidate's promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract will be considered, such candidate shall provide the dean and the Chair of the Tenure Committee with a list of potential reviewers of the candidate's scholarship, a copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae (c.v.), and a copy of the candidate's statement on research and service. This list of reviewers should include only established scholars in the candidate's field of scholarship. Typically, the reviewers will also be tenured or long-term contract faculty members at ABA- approved law schools who hold the same or higher rank for which the candidate is applying.

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee will make every effort to have an equal number of reviewers chosen from the candidate's list and a list of reviewers prepared independently by the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee. Any reviewer will be requested to assess a maximum of two of the candidate's scholarly articles that are being considered in the promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract decision. The actual total number of articles that will be considered under this outside review process may vary depending on the number of articles the candidate has already published along with the number of drafts of unpublished articles that the candidate provides the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee to consider in making a promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract decision.

Absent extraordinary circumstances, at least two of a candidate's articles will be subject to this process. The reviewer will be provided with a copy of the candidate's c.v., the candidate's statement on research and service, and the Law School's current standards regarding required excellence in scholarly research and writing. The reviewer will be asked to assist the Law School faculty by commenting on whether the candidate's article(s) are substantial scholarly law review articles (or their equivalent) that contribute to the growth and understanding of the law and legal institutions. In addition, the reviewer will also be asked to comment on what the article(s) indicate about the candidate's current and potential national and/or international prominence.

Reviewers will also be asked to identify what the article(s) indicate about the candidate's ongoing potential to make a substantial contribution in research and writing as a scholar in his/her field. The solicitation letter to potential reviewers must contain the following statement:

Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state, and your review could be requested and relinquished.

To the extent that outside reviewers are used as stated, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee will provide a summary to the candidate of any key points made by the reviewer that were considered by the faculty eligible to vote in making a decision about the candidate's promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract to the extent permitted by University guidelines. The use of outside reviewers does not limit the discretion of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee to select reviewers, in addition to the outside reviewers, who are members of the tenured faculty or long-term contract faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts; nor does the use of outside reviewers as stated herein prevent any faculty member eligible to vote from reviewing a candidate's scholarship independently or in any manner other than this outside review process when deciding about a candidate's promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract.

8.7(e)(4) Other pertinent information received by the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee and the faculty eligible to vote.

8.7(f) Dates of notification to candidates and right to subsequent contracts

8.7(f)(1) Retention granted

If retention is granted, a long-term contract faculty member in the initial probationary period will receive a contract for the subsequent year at the time contracts are normally awarded.

8.7(f)(2) Retention denied

If a long-term contract faculty member in the initial probationary period does not receive a recommendation for retention, then the candidate will not be retained. The dean will notify such long-term contract faculty member of any adverse retention decision of the dean. If a long-term contract faculty member in the initial probationary period is not retained and such faculty member holds the rank of clinical assistant professor, instructional assistant professor, executive assistant professor, or research assistant professor and has not achieved the equivalent of 5 or more academic years of full service within a 7-year period, such long-term contract faculty member will not receive a subsequent contract. A long-term contract faculty member in the initial probationary period who either (i) holds the rank of clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, senior associate professor or research associate professor or (ii) holds the rank of clinical assistant professor, instructional assistant professor, executive assistant professor or research assistant professor and has achieved the equivalent of 5 or more academic years of full service within a 7 year period will receive a contract that terminates not earlier than twelve months following the date such long-term contract faculty member is notified of the adverse retention decision.

8.7(f)(3) Review in contract years prior to the final year of the long-term contract faculty member's probationary period

A long-term contract faculty member in any contract year prior to final year of the faculty member's probationary period must be notified of the retention decision before contracts are required to be issued for the next academic year.

8.7(f)(4) Review in final probationary contract year

A long-term contract faculty member in the final year of the faculty member's probationary period must be notified not later than December 1 of the retention decision.

8.7(f)(5) Review in subsequent contract years

After the initial probationary period, and grant of a five-year contract under this section 8.7; or after the grant of a five-year contract upon hiring in accordance with either section 5.1(d)(ii) or section 6.4(b)(ii), long-term contract faculty are reviewed every year in accordance with the annual review process set forth in Article 9. During the fifth year of a five-year contract, long-term contract faculty appointed on five-year contracts must undergo a comprehensive peer review by the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee in accordance with Section 9.5.

8.7(f)(6) Outcomes for comprehensive peer review

8.7(f)(6)(i) If the long-term contract faculty member receives an overall rating of satisfactory during an annual review that includes a comprehensive peer review, the faculty member will receive a contract for a subsequent five-year period at the time contracts are normally awarded.

8.7(f)(6)(ii) If the long-term contract faculty member receives an overall rating of unsatisfactory during an annual review that includes a comprehensive peer review, but the long-term contract faculty member did not receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory in the immediately preceding year, the faculty member will receive a one-year contract and shall develop a written plan consistent with the provisions of section 9.3(e)(1) and also be subject to mandatory comprehensive peer review the following year. If that faculty member then receives an overall rating of satisfactory during the annual review that includes such mandatory comprehensive peer review, the faculty member will receive a contract for a subsequent five-year period at the time contracts are normally awarded, consistent with the provisions of section 8.7(f)(6)(i).

8.7(f)(6)(iii) If the long-term contract faculty member receives an overall rating of unsatisfactory during an annual review that includes a comprehensive peer review, and the long-term contract faculty member also received a rating of unsatisfactory in any area in the immediately preceding year, the faculty member will not be retained.

8.7(f)(6)(iv) The dean will notify such long-term contract faculty member of any adverse retention decision before contracts are required to be issued for the next academic year.

8.7(g) Report of the faculty eligible to vote

After the vote by the faculty eligible to vote on the long-term contract faculty member's grant of an initial five-year contract, or on the candidate's promotion, the Chair of the Tenure Committee must promptly prepare a recommendation report for the dean. The report remains in the faculty member's confidential file. The Tenure Committee Chair will provide a copy of the recommendation report to such long-term contract faculty member when the report is submitted to the dean.

8.7(h) Action by the dean

8.7(h)(1) Retention

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, and if applicable, the faculty eligible to vote, forward their respective reports and recommendations to the dean. If the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, or if applicable, the faculty eligible to vote recommends the grant of retention of a long-term contract faculty member during the initial probationary period, and the dean approves the recommendation, the dean will notify the faculty member of the favorable retention decision not later than the date for notification set forth in sections 8.7(f)(3) and (4). If the dean does not approve the recommendation of retention, the dean will notify the faculty member of the adverse retention decision not later than the date for notification set forth in sections 8.7(f)(3), (4) and (6).

8.7(h)(2) Promotion

The dean will forward the candidate's dossier and the faculty eligible to vote's report on recommendation of promotion to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academics through the Dean of Faculties. The dean must notify the candidate of the promotion recommendation of the faculty eligible to vote as soon as practicable after the vote on promotion, but not later than December 1. After informing the candidate of the faculty eligible to vote's recommendation on promotion, the dean makes a written recommendation on promotion to the Provost and Executive Vice President through the Dean of Faculties. The dean will notify the candidate of the dean's recommendation at the time the dean submits the dean's recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

8.7(i) Notice

For purposes of this section 8.7, notice may be given to a long-term contract faculty member in person or by U.S. mail, interoffice mail, e-mail, phone, or voicemail, provided, however, that any notice of an adverse promotion decision by the President of the University must also be provided by certified mail, return receipt requested. Notice is effective when it is sent or transmitted to the long-term contract faculty member. The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee report on

recommendation of retention or promotion must be provided to the long-term contract faculty member concurrently with the notice.

8.7(j) Terminal Contract

A long-term contract faculty member who receives an adverse retention decision will receive a contract that terminates not earlier than twelve months following the date such long-term contract faculty member is notified of the adverse retention decision.

8.7(k) Prior Version

This version of section 8.7 is prospectively enacted as of May 16, 2019. The version of section 8.7 in effect prior to May 16, 2019 is attached as Appendix A to these Law School Policies and is incorporated herein by reference.

9. Annual, post-tenure, and long-term-contract comprehensive review

9.1 Purpose and timing of annual review

The Law School recognizes that the quality of the institution directly depends upon the quality of its faculty. Thus, the Law School is committed to providing resources and policies that support the faculty's efforts to enhance quality and pursue academic excellence. These efforts confirm that the Law School and its faculty remain accountable to the public and worthy of the public's trust.

Consistent with University guidelines, faculty reviews are professional development opportunities that provide faculty with feedback and resources needed to continue to perform as productive members of the Law School faculty in furtherance of the Law School's mission. Reviews shall be conducted in an environment of openness and collegiality. Their purpose is to assess a faculty member's ongoing development as a teacher or librarian, scholar, and member of the broader academic, legal and library communities.

The reviews are not intended and should never be used to assess or influence that faculty member's opinion on any matter as represented in his or her teaching, writing, or service. A faculty member must have the freedom to engage in the presentation and representation of any causes, issues, and clients, so long as such engagement does not impair that faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher or scholar, and even if such activities are disapproved of by university officials, alumni, or contributors, public officials, or other interest groups.

9.1(a) Purposes of annual review

The purposes of the annual review include:

- 9.1(a)(1)(i)** Creating a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations;

9.1(a)(1)(ii) Providing evaluative feedback regarding how well the faculty member is currently performing relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position;

9.1(a)(1)(iii) Providing developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved in the future; and

9.1(a)(1)(iv) Providing feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.

9.1(b) Time period for annual review

The performance of all Law School faculty will be evaluated on an annual basis. This annual review will typically occur in the spring of each year so as to coincide with the University deadlines for such activities. There are occasions, however, when a faculty member's overall record may be assessed at another time, the most obvious situation being the promotion and/or tenure reviews, all of which are normally performed in the fall. When a faculty member has been reviewed in this manner, the subsequent annual process can be compressed by referencing the earlier review.

9.2 Responsibilities

9.2(a) Individual faculty

9.2(a)(1) Annual Activity Report

Each year, by a date specified by the dean, each faculty member shall complete and submit to the dean an Annual Activity Report ("AAR"). To ensure consistency over time, the school shall publish its annual review procedure on paper or by electronic means. Annual review procedures for the Law School shall be approved by the dean before publication and shall be reviewed by the Dean of Faculties for consistency with University rules. The creation and modification of this document should be a product of joint deliberation by faculty members and the dean. The dean shall solicit information from faculty members regarding their performance in each relevant area (scholarship, teaching, librarianship, and service) during the period under review, together with their plans and goals for the coming period.

9.2(a)(2) Portfolio

Each faculty member shall annually prepare a portfolio, to be submitted at the same time as the AAR, which must, at a minimum, contain the AAR and may include other materials that the faculty member believes relevant to the assessment of his or her performance over the period being reviewed.

9.2(b) Dean

The dean shall be responsible for the conduct of all reviews under this Article 9, and shall ensure the fairness, thoroughness, and consistency of each review.

9.2(c) Peer Review Committee

9.2(c)(1) Creation

The Tenure Committee shall establish a Peer Review Committee (“PRC”), which will have the duties specified in this Section 9.

9.2(c)(2) Composition

The Tenure Committee shall annually elect three members and one alternate to constitute the PRC and perform the duties of the PRC described in this document.

9.2(c)(3) Election

The members and the alternate must be elected annually by a majority vote of the Tenure Committee.

9.2(c)(4) Conflicts

No member of the PRC may participate, as a member of the PRC, in his or her own review process or in the review process of his or her spouse, partner, child or parent. Whenever a member of the PRC has a conflict of interest related to a particular faculty member’s review, or is otherwise unavailable, the member shall recuse himself or herself for purpose of that review. Such a recusal may be requested by the faculty member being reviewed, and upon a showing of cause, either the dean or any two members of the PRC must grant the recusal request. In any situation in which there are fewer than three non-recused members to conduct a review, the alternate shall assume the position of member for purposes of that review. Where two or more PRC members are recused, additional alternates shall be elected by a majority vote of the tenured faculty to complete the PRC.

9.3 Annual review

9.3(a) Focus

The focus of the annual review process varies depending on the rank of the individual faculty member and the stage of his or her career. (1) For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective performance. (2) For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as the dean’s assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. (3) For faculty members who are not tenured or tenure-track, the annual review evaluates performance and serves as the dean’s assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable.

9.3(b) Process

9.3(b)(1) Period of annual review

The usual period for evaluation will be the previous academic year's accomplishments. For tenured and tenure-track faculty engaged in long-term projects, including scholarly research and publication, a longer evaluation period will be appropriate.

9.3(b)(2) Creation of annual review assessment

The dean shall supervise the annual review as provided in this Article 9. In connection with the annual review, the dean shall prepare an annual review assessment ("**Assessment**") once each year for each faculty member. The Assessment shall be in a consistent form as prescribed by the dean and shall include assessment of all of the materials in the faculty member's portfolio, and other information as set forth in section 9.3(c).

9.3(b)(3) Areas to be Assessed

The dean shall assess each doctrinal or professional skills tenured and tenure-track faculty member on each of three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and the legal profession. The dean shall assess each tenured and tenure-track Law Library faculty member on each of three areas: librarianship, scholarship, and service to the University and the legal profession or the library profession. The dean shall assess each long-term contract faculty member on the faculty member's teaching, librarianship, or scholarship, as applicable and the faculty member's service to the University and the legal profession or the library profession. A faculty member employed in a law clinic will be evaluated on the faculty member's law practice management as part of the evaluation of the faculty member's teaching.

Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily at teaching or librarianship (as applicable), scholarship and service, and if applicable, other assigned responsibilities throughout their career. Normally, equal consideration is given to a tenured faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching or librarianship (as applicable), scholarship and service. Modifications to the expectations in these areas may be made as a tenured faculty member's career changes but cannot go to zero in any area, subject to replacement of one area with an alternate work assignment described below. A decrease in expectation in one area should be matched by a concomitant increase in expectations in another area. Significant changes in effort allocations of a faculty member should be reflected in the faculty member's annual appointment contract. The annual review of a faculty member should take into account the effort allocation in each area for such faculty member and performance expectations in each area should be

commensurate with the effort allocations. For example, a faculty member who is assigned to lead a major service project (e.g., drafting an ABA self-study, chairing a committee with a particularly heavy agenda) may be expected to expend more effort on service and less effort on scholarship for such review period. Accordingly, expectations for such faculty member's performance in service should be proportionally greater than the expectations for a tenured faculty member generally and expectations for such faculty member's performance in scholarship should be proportionally lower than the expectations for a tenured faculty member generally during the applicable period.

Alternate work assignments (such as administrative assignments) may replace or modify one or more areas of assessment in certain situations but only with the written approval of the dean. Faculty members with alternate work assignments shall be reviewed based upon the assigned duties in lieu of or concomitant with the areas of assessment that were replaced or modified. After the alternate work assignment ends, a tenured faculty member is expected to perform satisfactorily at teaching or librarianship (as applicable), scholarship and service.

For each area, guided by the indicators set forth in section 9.3(d), the dean shall rate the faculty member's work as (1) outstanding, (2) effective, (3) needs improvement or (4) unsatisfactory.

"Outstanding" describes performance that exceeds expectations for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage; this rating is appropriate when the faculty member makes exceptional achievements in the area being assessed.

"Effective" describes performance that meets expectations for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage; this rating is appropriate when the faculty member satisfactorily meets the expectations for performance in the area being assessed with no significant deficiencies.

"Needs improvement" describes performance that does not meet expectations for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage; this rating is appropriate when there are specific and remediable deficiencies in the area being assessed.

"Unsatisfactory" describes performance that is seriously deficient for a faculty member at the particular rank and career stage; this rating is appropriate when there are chronic or substantial deficiencies in the area being assessed.

9.3(b)(4) Overall Assessment

As required by the University, the Assessment must include an overall rating of the faculty member's work as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Generally, an overall satisfactory rating will be an affirmation that there is no unsatisfactory assessment in any of the areas assessed and no more than one needs improvement assessment in the areas assessed. An overall unsatisfactory rating is given when the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory in any one of the areas assessed or is rated as needing improvement in two or more of the areas assessed.

9.3(b)(5) Consultation with PRC

At any time during the annual review process for a tenured faculty member, the dean or the individual faculty member under review may ask the PRC to review the faculty member's performance in one or more areas. The PRC shall inform both the dean and the individual faculty member of the PRC's involvement and of the areas it will evaluate. The PRC shall submit a report containing its assessment and recommendation to the dean in writing. The dean shall consider the PRC report in issuing the Assessment.

9.3(b)(6) Consultation with PTAC

The dean will be provided with a report from the PTAC in accordance with section 7.7(b) for use in the annual review process for a tenure-track faculty member. The dean shall consider the PTAC report in issuing the Assessment.

9.3(b)(7) Consultation with Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee

The dean will be provided with a report from the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee in accordance with section 8.7(c) or section 8.7(f)(5) for use in the annual review process for a long-term contract faculty member. The dean shall consider the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee report in issuing the Assessment.

9.3(c) Basis for evaluation

9.3(c)(1) Required materials

The following sources of information must be used for evaluation as part of the annual review: (1) AAR and (2) portfolio.

9.3(c)(2) Other materials

The following sources of information may be used for evaluation as part of the annual review: (1) personal observation by evaluators, (2) discussions with colleagues, students, or others; (3) student evaluations of teaching, provided that standard end-of-semester evaluations shall not be the sole means used to determine teaching quality and effectiveness; (4) Law Library Director assessment of librarianship performance; (5) Associate Dean of Experiential Education and Clinic Director evaluation of teaching,

including law practice management performance; (6) peer evaluations of teaching; (7) peer evaluations of service; and (8) peer evaluations of scholarship.

A tenured faculty member undergoing comprehensive peer review should provide to the PRC a narrative description of the faculty member's accomplishments in teaching or librarianship (as applicable), scholarship and service during the review period and may provide such additional information as the faculty member deems appropriate to assist the PRC in assessing the faculty member's teaching or librarianship (as applicable), scholarship and service.

A long-term contract faculty member undergoing comprehensive peer review should provide to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee a narrative description of the faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, librarianship or scholarship (as applicable), and service during the review period and may provide such additional information as the faculty member deems appropriate to assist the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee in assessing the faculty member's teaching, librarianship or scholarship (as applicable), and service.

9.3(d) Assessment indicators

9.3(d)(1) Purpose

The goal of the guidelines set forth in this Article 9 is to assess the performance of faculty and provide necessary information to help them be highly effective contributors to the Law School. The indicators in this section 9.3(d), which are illustrative and not exclusive, are broad suggestions for use in making assessments; other indicators that are not listed in this section may be appropriate to use in any individual evaluation. Assessments depend on many things, which may vary with the faculty member's field of specialization and the stage of his or her career. Some indicators may implicate more than one field of assessment. Although the assessment is prepared for a specific period, evaluators should look for broad patterns of success, with an emphasis on the quality of the faculty member's work, rather than on quantity. Nothing in these guidelines shall be read to affect in any way the applicable tenure standards of the Law School set forth in sections 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5.

9.3(d)(2) Specific indicators of unsatisfactory performance

9.3(d)(2)(i) Unsatisfactory teaching may be evidenced by any combination of factors that evidence chronic or substantial deficiencies in the areas of preparation, effort, classroom presentation and availability to students outside the classroom. Unsatisfactory teaching includes a consistent and repeating pattern of incompetence that impedes student learning as evidenced by: unsatisfactory preparation or

delivery of material; unsuitable pedagogy; outdated content; content inconsistent with the subject matter of the course; failure to stay current in the course subject matter; arbitrary and capricious grading standards; or unprofessional treatment of students. An unsatisfactory rating in teaching may not be based exclusively on student evaluations.

9.3(d)(2)(ii) Unsatisfactory librarianship may be evidenced by any combination of factors that evidence chronic or substantial deficiencies in the areas of legal research instruction; bibliographic instruction; cataloging; reference and research assistance; collection development activities; preservation; faculty services; information retrieval and analysis; management and supervision; archival management; library computer systems management; or budget planning and oversight, as may be applicable to the faculty member undergoing review.

9.3(d)(2)(iii) Unsatisfactory scholarship may be evidenced by any combination of factors that evidence chronic or substantial deficiencies in developing or producing scholarship that makes a significant contribution to scholarly debates. Unsatisfactory scholarship includes a consistent and repeating pattern of failure to produce scholarship of significant originality, research, analysis, and communicative skill and that evidences a commitment to engage in scholarly debate on a regular and continuing basis. The fact that a faculty member has not published in a particular year is not the basis for an unsatisfactory rating if the faculty member demonstrates significant progress on one or more research projects. In assessing scholarship, the volume produced by a faculty member is not sufficient in and of itself to avoid an unsatisfactory rating if the quality is deficient.

9.3(d)(2)(iv) Unsatisfactory service may be evidenced by any combination of factors that evidence chronic or substantial deficiencies in engaging in opportunities for service to the Law School, the University, or the professional community at a level reasonably commensurate with the faculty member's other responsibilities. Unsatisfactory service includes repeated unwillingness or failure to contribute to the governance of the Law School or the University along with failure to contribute externally to the academic discipline or professional community.

9.3(d)(3) Specific indicators of performance that needs improvement

9.3(d)(3)(i) A needs improvement rating in teaching may be evidenced by any combination of factors that evidence specific and remediable deficiencies, such as deficiencies in the areas of preparation, effort, pedagogy, classroom presentation and availability to students outside

the classroom. A needs improvement rating in teaching may not be based exclusively on student evaluations.

9.3(d)(3)(ii) A needs improvement rating in librarianship may be evidenced by any combination of factors that evidence specific and remediable deficiencies in the areas of legal research instruction; bibliographic instruction; cataloging; reference and research assistance; collection development activities; preservation; faculty services; information retrieval and analysis; management and supervision; archival management; library computer systems management; or budget planning and oversight, as may be applicable to the faculty member undergoing review.

9.3(d)(3)(iii) A needs improvement rating in scholarship may be evidenced by any combination of factors that evidence specific and remediable deficiencies in developing or producing scholarship that makes a significant contribution to scholarly debates. A needs improvement rating in scholarship may not be based exclusively on the volume of scholarship.

9.3(d)(3)(iv) A needs improvement rating in service may be evidenced by any combination of factors that evidence specific and remediable deficiencies in engaging in opportunities for service to the Law School, the University, or the professional community at a level reasonably commensurate with the faculty member's other responsibilities.

9.3(d)(4) Specific indicators of outstanding and effective performance

9.3(d)(4)(i) Instruction and teaching.

- a. Nonexclusive indicators of outstanding performance in instruction and teaching include:
 - i. Peer-awarded university, law school, or professional society outstanding teacher/instruction award.
 - ii. Outstanding teaching performance as demonstrated by, for example, student ratings, peer reviews of teaching, and interviews with students and alumni.
 - iii. Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials, including high-quality distance learning courses and online materials.
 - iv. Publication of high-quality instructional materials (e.g., casebook, textbook, instructional software, programs, cases, readings, simulations, and the like).

- b. Nonexclusive indicators of effectiveness in instruction and teaching include:
 - i. Student awards for outstanding teaching/instruction.
 - ii. Development of a new course or major revisions of an existing course.
 - iii. Evidence of high-quality class preparation that facilitates student interaction, reflection, or engagement beyond the classroom.
 - iv. Evidence of class preparation resulting in high achievement of course learning objectives.
 - v. Supervision of independent student projects.
 - vi. Significant contributions to student development through student advising and mentoring.
 - vii. Active participation in programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
 - viii. Presentations in teaching-focused programs.

9.3(d)(4)(ii) Librarianship

- a. Nonexclusive indicators of outstanding performance in librarianship include:
 - i. Initiative in advancing the Law Library's strategic mission.
 - ii. Development of innovative services, organizational methods, or materials.
 - iii. Creative application of technology.
 - iv. Excellence as a leader of change.
 - v. Awards recognizing outstanding librarianship.
 - vi. Selection for a university, college, or professional society award.
 - vii. Evidence of outstanding performance at a rigorous and challenging level.
 - viii. Understanding and anticipating user needs and devising solutions for user problems.

- ix. Experimenting with new ideas, innovative techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures.
 - x. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional or procedural materials.
 - xi. Outstanding performance evaluations.
 - xii. Evidence of creative professional practice.
 - xii. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced performance.
- b. Nonexclusive indicators of effectiveness in librarianship include:
- i. Development of services having significant effect on the Law School or University.
 - ii. Development and introduction of innovations with respect to library collections, services, or methods.
 - iii. Providing advice and guidance to law student organizations.
 - iv. Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and other instructional accomplishments.
 - v. Participation in establishing objectives and planning, organizing, and coordinating operations.
 - vi. Accepting responsibility or assuming leadership.
 - vii. Self-development activities leading to enhanced performance.

9.3(d)(4)(iii) Scholarship

- a. Nonexclusive indicators of outstanding performance in scholarship include:
- i. Publication in a leading student-edited or peer reviewed journal. “Leading” is generally determined by reference to outside ranking systems, but individual faculty may present objective information to demonstrate why a particular journal is a “leading” journal in his or her field.

- ii. Publication of a high quality scholarly, professional, or practitioner-oriented book.
 - iii. Frequent citation of publications in law journals, academic journals, scholarly books, judicial opinions, and briefs.
 - iv. Receipt of fellowship, research, or publication award that is based on the quality of the recipient's research.
 - v. Receipt of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research.
 - vi. Invitation to present paper or address at an important conference.
 - vii. Invitation to present research at peer school(s).
- b. Nonexclusive indicators of effectiveness in scholarship include:
- i. Publication in a respected academic journal. Individual faculty members may present objective information to demonstrate why a particular law journal is a "respected" journal for his or her field.
 - ii. Presentation of research at a law school, an academic conference, a practitioner-oriented conference, or a professional meeting of an appropriate discipline.
 - iii. Editorship of a high quality scholarly, professional, or practitioner-oriented book or editorship or associate editorship of a leading peer-review journal.
 - iv. Substantial contribution to a high-quality, scholarly, professional, or practitioner-oriented book.
 - v. Membership on and substantial contribution to a review panel for national or international research or to a law reform organization.
 - vi. Publication of a research report for outside entity (e.g., ABA White Papers or EPA funded reports).
 - vii. Publication in a practitioner-oriented journal.
 - viii. Peer reviewer for a refereed journal, a national or international law-related organization, a national or international librarianship professional organization, or an academic publisher.

- ix. Well-documented mentorship of the research of others.
- x. Substantial contribution to a legal brief that raises complex issues of scholarly interest. Substantial contribution to web site that engages in scholarly debate.
- xi. Organization of a major conference that engages in scholarly debate.
- xii. Testimony before a Congressional body, a federal agency, or a state agency related to the faculty member's research.
- xiii. Substantial contributions to externally funded research activities.
- xiv. Ongoing work or research that shows substantial progress.

9.3(d)(4)(iv) Service

- a. Nonexclusive indicators of outstanding performance in service include:
 - i. Officer in a national or international professional organization.
 - ii. Officer in the Faculty Senate.
 - iii. Chair of a major University or Law School committee.
 - iv. Outstanding performance of an administrative role within the Law School or University.
 - v. Coach of moot court, mock trial, or other advocacy program team.
 - vi. Advisor to a student journal.
 - vii. Other demonstrated leadership in the Law School or the university.
 - viii. Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board.
 - ix. Attraction of significant external financial support for the University or the Law School.

- x. Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
- b. Nonexclusive indicators of effectiveness in service include the following:
- i. Committee chair of a national or international professional organization.
 - ii. Officer or committee chair of a regional or state professional organization.
 - iii. Program chair or similar position for the meeting of a professional or scholarly organization.
 - iv. Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate.
 - v. Service as chair or an active member on a university or law school committee.
 - vi. Substantial contribution to external development efforts.
 - vii. Substantial contribution to student recruitment efforts.
 - vii. Substantial contribution to moot court, mock trial, and other advocacy programs through judging or a related role.
 - ix. Advisor to a student organization.
 - x. Performance of an administrative role within the Law School.
 - xi. Substantial contribution to the development or enhancement of the Law School's clinical program by developing clinic-wide policies and practices or fostering relationships between or among clinics or between or among clinical and non-clinical programs.
 - xii. Speeches or consulting for major practitioner groups, including American Bar Association events and Continuing Legal Education program.
 - xii. Service as consultant to other libraries, business organizations, nonprofit organizations, or government entities.

- xiv. Substantial contribution to a legal brief that raises issues of public interest.
- xv. Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large.
- xvi. Op-ed in a well-respected, established media venue.
- xvii. Interaction with news media (e.g., television, radio, or print interviews).

9.3(e) Effects of negative assessment

9.3(e)(1) Unsatisfactory assessment

An “unsatisfactory” assessment in any area must state the basis for the assessment, drawing upon the indicators described in section 9.3, as well as any other appropriate indicators, and all other relevant information. A tenured faculty member, or a tenure-track faculty member or long-term contract faculty member reappointed for the following year, whose work receives an assessment of unsatisfactory in any area or who receives an overall unsatisfactory annual review shall work together with the dean to develop a written plan for near term improvement of his or her performance, including an improvement timetable for the faculty member.

9.3(e)(2) Needs improvement assessment

A “needs improvement” assessment in any area must state the basis for the assessment, drawing upon the indicators described in section 9.3, as well as any other appropriate indicators, and all other relevant information. A tenured faculty member, or a tenure-track faculty member or long-term contract faculty member reappointed for the following year, whose work receives an assessment of needs improvement in any area, shall work together with the dean to develop a written plan for improving his or her performance in that area, including an improvement timetable for the faculty member. For teaching, librarianship or service, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In scholarship or other assigned responsibilities, this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. For a multi-year improvement plan, the faculty member’s rating in the applicable area remains “needs improvement” as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “unsatisfactory.”

9.3(e)(3) Professional development review

A tenured faculty member whose work receives an overall annual rating of “unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an overall rating of “unsatisfactory” during a comprehensive peer review shall

be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01.

9.4 Post-tenure review

9.4(a) Purpose

Post-tenure review is a professional development opportunity, not a re-assessment of the original tenure decision or a means to accomplish curricular or programmatic changes. The purpose of post-tenure review is to: (i) assess whether the faculty member is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member of the same rank; (ii) provide guidance for continuing and meaningful professional development; (iii) assist the faculty member with enhancing professional skills and setting appropriate goals; and (iv) refocus the faculty member's academic and professional efforts, when appropriate. In this document, the Law School recognizes the American Association of University Professors' Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review.

9.4(b) Process for post-tenure review

9.4(b)(1) Period

Post-tenure review, as required by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01., consists of annual reviews by the dean and must include a comprehensive peer review component that is conducted at least once every six years. If the annual review process includes a peer review component in each of the three areas of assessment (through consultation with the PRC), then comprehensive peer review is not required. Otherwise, the dean must incorporate a comprehensive peer review into the annual review process at least once every six years.

9.4(b)(2) Role of the PRC

When the dean incorporates peer review into the annual review process, or when a comprehensive peer review is conducted, the PRC shall conduct the peer review process, and the PRC shall provide the dean with its own written assessment and recommendation. In making its assessment and recommendation, the PRC must consider, at minimum, the faculty member's portfolio. It may consider other relevant sources of information from among those specified in section 9.3(c). The review must be guided by the indicators outlined in section 9.3(d). The PRC, on its own initiative, may also initiate an external peer review, using the procedure in section 9.4(d). A faculty member under peer review may, at his or her discretion, submit additional information to the PRC and may request that the PRC conduct an external peer review. Absent a showing of good cause, such a request should be granted. In making its assessment, the PRC must bear in mind that (1) faculty members have differing responsibilities and make different kinds of contributions to the Law School and the University; (2) a

faculty member's activities vary over time according to his or her strengths, interests, and career path; and (3) innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes fail.

9.4(b)(3) Appeals

If at any point a faculty member believes that the post-tenure review provisions are being unfairly applied, the faculty member can file a grievance under the provisions of University Rule 12.99.99.M1 "Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights."

9.4(c) Peer review of teaching

In assessing a tenured faculty member's teaching during a comprehensive peer review, the PRC must consider peer evaluations of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods; teaching evaluations by students for courses taught during the relevant review period; and peer evaluation of other teaching contributions of value to the Law School. The PRC must confer with the faculty member under review about his or her pedagogical approach, course preparation, and availability for student consultation. At least once during a six-year interval, the PRC shall schedule one or more class visits. If the PRC or the dean determines that student teaching evaluations indicate a potential for a rating of needs improvement or unsatisfactory, the PRC shall schedule class visits on a more frequent basis.

9.4(d) External peer review of scholarship

9.4(d)(1) Application

Use of external peer review of scholarship may be instituted at the request of the faculty member undergoing assessment or by the PRC in accordance with Section 9.4(b)(2).

9.4(d)(2) Period of assessment

If external peer review of scholarship is instituted in accordance with section 9.4(d)(1), the PRC shall consider all scholarship that was produced during the relevant assessment period. Scholarship considered under this external review can include single-authored pieces and co-authored pieces.

9.4(d)(3) Reviewers

Potential reviewers should include only established scholars in the faculty member's field of scholarship. Typically, the reviewers will also be tenured faculty members at ABA-approved law schools, but established scholars in programs that do not provide for tenure are also eligible to be reviewers.

9.4(d)(4) Selection of reviewers

If external peer review of scholarship is instituted in accordance with section 9.4(d)(1), the PRC shall designate the external reviewers, subject to the following guidelines: Within two months of a request by the PRC, each faculty member undergoing external scholarship review shall submit to the PRC (i) his or her scholarship, in such form as the PRC shall prescribe, (ii) a list of names and contact information for two to three appropriate peers to review the faculty member's scholarship, and (iii) names of up to three potential reviewers who in the faculty member's opinion should not be consulted. At least one reviewer will be selected from the faculty member's list of appropriate peers.

9.4(d)(5) Number and contents of reviews

In conducting an external scholarship review instituted in accordance with section 9.4(d)(1), the PRC shall obtain at least two external reviews of scholarship for each faculty member. Each external scholarship reviewer will be invited to assess a minimum of two scholarly articles or their equivalent. The actual total number of publications that will be considered under this outside review process may vary depending on the number of articles the faculty member submits. Each external scholarship reviewer will be provided with a copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae, in addition to the publications to be assessed. The solicitation letter to potential reviewers must contain the following statement:

Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state, and your review could be requested and relinquished.

Each external scholarship reviewer will be asked to comment on whether the publications constitute substantial scholarly works that contribute to the growth and understanding of the law, legal institutions, and/or the legal profession. For Law Library faculty, each external scholarship reviewer will also be asked to comment on whether the publications constitute substantial scholarly works that contribute to the growth and understanding of the field of information sciences and/or the library profession. Each external scholarship reviewer will also be asked to identify what the publications indicate about the faculty member's ongoing potential to continue making a substantial contribution as a scholar in his or her field.

9.4(d)(6) Non-exclusivity

Any use of external scholarship reviewers does not prohibit the PRC from reviewing the faculty member's scholarship itself.

9.4(e) Responses to reviews and additional submissions

Before the PRC submits its assessment, the faculty member assessed will have the opportunity to submit to the PRC comments responding to the assessment; the PRC should consider the faculty member's comments in writing its final assessment. The faculty member may also seek his or her own reviews from peers and may submit them to the PRC. The PRC shall consider these comments in developing its assessment.

9.5 Comprehensive peer review of long-term contract faculty

9.5(a) Purpose

The purpose of comprehensive peer review is to: (i) assess whether the faculty member is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a long-term faculty member of the same rank; (ii) provide guidance for continuing and meaningful professional development; (iii) assist the faculty member with enhancing professional skills and setting appropriate goals; and (iv) refocus the faculty member's academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

9.5(b) Process for comprehensive peer review

9.5(b)(1) Period

Comprehensive peer review is conducted in the fifth year of a five-year contract period for a long-term contract faculty member.

9.5(b)(2) Role of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee shall conduct the comprehensive peer review process, and the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee shall provide the dean with its own written assessment and recommendation. In making its assessment and recommendation, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee must consider, at minimum, the faculty member's portfolio. It may consider other relevant sources of information from among those specified in section 9.3(c). The review must be guided by the indicators outlined in section 9.3(d). The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, on its own initiative, may also initiate an external peer review, using the procedure in section 9.5(d), with respect to a long-term contract research faculty member. A long-term contract faculty member under comprehensive peer review may, at his or her discretion, submit additional information to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee and may request that the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee conduct an external peer review if the faculty member's primary responsibility is scholarship. Absent a showing of good cause, such a request should be granted. In making its assessment, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee must bear in mind that (1) faculty members have differing responsibilities and make different kinds of

contributions to the Law School and the University; (2) a faculty member's activities vary over time according to his or her strengths, interests, and career path; and (3) innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes fail.

9.5(b)(3) Appeals

If at any point a faculty member believes that the comprehensive peer review provisions are being unfairly applied, the faculty member can file a grievance under the provisions of University Rule 12.99.99.M1 "Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights."

9.5(b)(4) Conflicts

No member of the Long-Term Contract Faculty Review Committee may participate, as a member of the Long-Term Contract Faculty Review Committee, in his or her own review process or in the review process of his or her spouse, partner, child or parent. Whenever a member of the Long-Term Contract Faculty Review Committee has a conflict of interest related to a particular faculty member's review, or is otherwise unavailable, the member shall recuse himself or herself for purpose of that review. Such a recusal may be requested by the faculty member being reviewed, and upon a showing of cause, either the dean or any two members of the Long-Term Contract Faculty Review Committee must grant the recusal request. In any situation in which there are fewer than four non-recused members to conduct a review, an alternate shall be appointed by the dean for purposes of completing such review.

9.5(c) Peer review of teaching

In assessing a long-term faculty member's teaching during a comprehensive peer review, as applicable, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee must consider peer evaluations of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods; teaching evaluations by students for courses taught during the relevant review period; and peer evaluation of other teaching contributions of value to the Law School. The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee must confer with the faculty member under review about his or her pedagogical approach, course preparation, and availability for student consultation. At least once during a five- year interval, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee shall schedule one or more class visits. If the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee or the dean determines that student teaching evaluations indicate a potential for a rating of needs improvement or unsatisfactory, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee shall schedule class visits on a more frequent basis.

9.5(d) External peer review of scholarship

9.5(d)(1) Application

For long-term contract research faculty, use of external peer review of scholarship may be instituted at the request of the faculty member undergoing assessment or by the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee in accordance with Section 9.5(b)(2).

9.5(d)(2) Period of assessment

If external peer review of scholarship is instituted in accordance with section 9.5(d)(1), the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee shall consider all scholarship that was produced during the relevant assessment period. Scholarship considered under this external review can include single-authored pieces and co-authored pieces.

9.5(d)(3) Reviewers

Potential reviewers should include only established scholars in the faculty member's field of scholarship. Typically, the reviewers will also be tenured faculty members at ABA-approved law schools, but established scholars in programs that do not provide for tenure are also eligible to be reviewers.

9.5(d)(4) Selection of reviewers

If external peer review of scholarship is instituted in accordance with section 9.5(d)(1), the PRC shall designate the external reviewers, subject to the following guidelines: Within two months of a request by the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, each faculty member undergoing external scholarship review shall submit to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee (i) his or her scholarship, in such form as the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee shall prescribe, (ii) a list of names and contact information for two to three appropriate peers to review the faculty member's scholarship, and (iii) names of up to three potential reviewers who in the faculty member's opinion should not be consulted. At least one reviewer will be selected from the faculty member's list of appropriate peers.

9.5(d)(5) Number and contents of reviews

In conducting an external scholarship review instituted in accordance with section 9.5(d)(1), the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee shall obtain at least two external reviews of scholarship for each faculty member. Each external scholarship reviewer will be invited to assess a minimum of two scholarly articles or their equivalent. The actual total number of publications that will be considered under this outside review process may vary depending on the number of articles the faculty member submits. Each

external scholarship reviewer will be provided with a copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae, in addition to the publications to be assessed. The solicitation letter to potential reviewers must contain the following statement:

Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state, and your review could be requested and relinquished.

Each external scholarship reviewer will be asked to comment on whether the publications constitute substantial scholarly works that contribute to the growth and understanding of the law, legal institutions, and/or the legal profession. Each external scholarship reviewer will also be asked to identify what the publications indicate about the faculty member's ongoing potential to continue making a substantial contribution as a scholar in his or her field.

9.5(d)(6) Non-exclusivity

Any use of external scholarship reviewers does not prohibit the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee from reviewing the faculty member's scholarship itself.

9.5(e) Responses to reviews and additional submissions

Before the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee submits its assessment, the faculty member assessed will have the opportunity to submit to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee comments responding to the assessment; the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee should consider the faculty member's comments in writing its final assessment. The faculty member may also seek his or her own reviews from peers and may submit them to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee. The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee shall consider these comments in developing its assessment.

10. Innovative and Effective Pedagogy

10.1 General Policy

Each law school faculty member must adopt a pedagogy that optimizes the opportunity for all students to: 1) succeed in the course; 2) succeed in the remainder of their curricula; 3) pass the bar exam where applicable; and 4) obtain employment. This policy must be applied in a manner that is consistent with ABA Accreditation Standard 301(a), which requires that "[a] law school shall maintain a rigorous program of legal education that prepares its students, upon graduation, for admission to the bar and for effective, ethical, and responsible participation as members of the legal profession." The Law School must make available the resources to enable faculty members to achieve the policy's goals by supporting faculty members with teaching materials, research, and training on best practices in pedagogy and classroom technology and assessing their efficacy. The faculty should

participate in developing reliable methods of assessing student progress to determine which forms of instruction are most effective in helping all students learn.

10.2 Relation to Annual Activity Report

To effectuate the policy, each faculty member must report to the dean in the Annual Activity Report the efforts the faculty member has made to consider and adopt effective pedagogy appropriate to the structure and subject matter of each course. Faculty members are not required to adopt innovative pedagogy each year as long as there is evidence that students are engaged in and progressing in their courses.

10.3 Nonexclusive Examples

Nonexclusive examples of pedagogy used in legal education to foster active learning and enhance student participation include:

- Formative assessment with feedback for improvement such as graded or ungraded quizzes and midterms with model answers or grading rubrics.
- Administering “before” and “after” exercises to evaluate student progress.
- Experiential exercises that teach practical skills such as interviewing, negotiation, and drafting pleadings, briefs, or contract provisions.
- Developing hybrid/blended distance education courses, i.e., “flipping the classroom.”
- Assigning student reflective writing in a journal, paper, or discussion board.
- Small group work to enhance student engagement.
- Using technology to enhance student learning.
- Incorporating class projects into course plans.
- Interim student evaluations to collect students’ feedback regarding their classroom or experiential learning experience.
- Electronic classroom response systems.
- One-minute papers to assess student learning and progress.
- Assigning students to work in pairs or small groups to solve problems.
- Class field trips.
- Student portfolios.
- Guest speakers in specific practice areas.

10.4 Learning Across Student Demographic Groups

Each faculty member shall seek to employ pedagogy in each course that is appropriate for the purpose of optimizing the opportunity for members of each student demographic group, taken as a whole and without reference to the success or failure of any individual member(s), to succeed in the course at a level that is generally consistent with the level of success achieved by members of other student demographic groups. For purposes of this policy, student demographic groups are to be determined according to University reporting requirements related to the admission and matriculation of students.

10.5 Addressing Group Achievement Deficiencies

The Law School is responsible for identifying the relevant student demographic groups and for informing individual faculty members if members of a particular student demographic group receive grades below the level required to graduate from the Law School at a percentage rate that is significantly higher than the percentage rate of members of other student demographic groups receiving such grades.

Upon receiving this information, the recipient faculty member must make an effort to consider and adopt as appropriate innovative pedagogy designed to implement the Law School policy that will optimize the opportunity for members of the disproportionately affected student demographic group to succeed in the course at the desired level. The fact that a faculty member, after careful consideration, does not adopt a different pedagogy is not in and of itself a violation of the requirements of this section 10.5. Although the faculty member must make an effort to consider and adopt as appropriate innovative pedagogy in the circumstances described in that paragraph, the faculty member may not be given a “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” rating in teaching unless the disproportionate impact on a particular student demographic group persists for a period of three years and the faculty member has not made the requisite efforts in response. Moreover, the faculty member must be evaluated on the appropriateness of the efforts to comply with this policy and not on the effectiveness of any chosen pedagogy.

10.6 Ongoing Policy Development

The Law School recognizes that the development of effective pedagogy in legal education is a dynamic process involving new insights and discoveries. In recognition and anticipation of prospective developments, the Law School shall review this policy on innovating pedagogy annually during the first five years of implementation to evaluate the effectiveness of the policy and determine any revisions to improve or clarify the policy.

11. Amendments to the Law School Policies

Changes to the Law School Policies may be proposed by the faculty, or the Law School administration. Any amendment to the Law School Policies requires a vote of two-thirds of the faculty entitled to vote on such amendment, and the approval of the Dean of Faculties.

APPENDIX A: The following version of Section 8.7 was in effect prior to May 16, 2019.

8. Long-term contracts

* * *

8.7 Contract renewal

(a) Term of contracts

After an initial one-year appointment, the contracts of long-term contract faculty may be renewed annually for a total of up to six years. During this initial probationary period, the renewal of a long-term contract faculty member's contract is governed by section 8.7(f). After this initial probationary period, promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor, as applicable, and approval of appointment on a five-year contract in accordance with section 8.7(h)(1), all subsequent contracts are for five years renewable on a rolling basis in order to ensure academic freedom.

Each long-term contract faculty member who is appointed on a five-year contract will be reviewed annually in accordance with the annual review procedures set forth in Article 9. During any five-year contract period, if a long-term contract faculty member receives a satisfactory annual review, the faculty member's contract will be extended for another year. If a long-term contract faculty member receives an unsatisfactory review, then his or her contract will not be extended until the long-term contract faculty member receives at least two consecutive satisfactory annual reviews. At that time, the long-term contract faculty member's contract will be extended to provide for a five-year term. If a long-term contract faculty member receives three consecutive unsatisfactory reviews, then such long-term contract faculty member will not be retained at the expiration of his or her five-year term.

For example, after completing six one-year appointments, a long-term contract faculty member will be given a contract that terminates in year eleven. If the long-term contract faculty member receives a satisfactory annual review in year seven, the contract will be extended to year twelve. If in year eight, the long-term contract faculty member receives an unsatisfactory review, his or her contract will not be extended another year and will still expire in year twelve. If in year nine and ten, the long-term contract faculty member receives satisfactory reviews, the contract will be extended for a five-year term through year fifteen.

During any five-year contract period, a contract may be terminated in accordance with the procedures for dismissal set forth in University Rule 12.01.99.M1, "Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion."

(b) Counting years of service

The first year of Law School service counted toward the long-term contract is the first year of a long-term contract faculty member's appointment, unless one or more years' credit of service is granted at hiring.

(c) Committee review

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee will consist of five members unless the Tenure Committee Chair and the dean determine that a different number of committee members is desirable for a given year. Only tenured faculty and long-term contract faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts are eligible to serve on the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee. The Tenure Committee Chair will serve as an ex officio member of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee. A majority of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee members will be elected by the tenured faculty and long-term faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts at the last faculty meeting of the academic year to be effective for the next academic year. The remaining member(s) of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee will be appointed by the Tenure Committee Chair by September 1 of each year, in consultation with the dean. The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee evaluates long-term contract faculty members for contract renewal and submits a written report and recommendation to the dean and in the case of candidates being considered for an initial five-year contract or promotion, to the dean and the Chair of the Tenure Committee.

(d) Role of the faculty

For candidates being considered for an initial five-year contract and, if applicable, promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor, the Chair of the Tenure Committee provides the written report and recommendation of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee to the Tenure Committee and all long-term contract faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts, such persons being the faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. For candidates being considered for promotion to clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor, or research professor, the Chair of the Tenure Committee provides the written report and recommendation of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee to all tenured faculty who hold the rank of professor and all long-term contract faculty who hold the rank of clinical professor, instructional professor, executive professor or research professor, such persons being the faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. The faculty eligible to vote makes independent recommendations to the dean on all matters of the grant of an initial five-year contract to and promotion of long-term contract faculty members who are candidates for such appointment or promotion. The faculty members vote by secret ballot to recommend the grant of an initial five-year contract to or promotion of a candidate. Such action requires the affirmative vote of a majority of faculty members eligible to vote.

(e) Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee's and faculty's review

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee and the faculty eligible to vote consider the long-term contract faculty member's teaching, law practice management, research, or librarianship, as applicable and service. In evaluating long-term contract faculty for retention, appointment to an initial five-year contract, and promotion, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, and the faculty eligible to vote review these items:

- (1) The review portfolio, which must contain the following: (a) the long-term contract faculty member's current vita and all annual activity reports; (b) copies of any publications that the long-term contract faculty member wants to be considered; (c) reports from the long-term contract faculty member describing service to the Law School, the University, the community, and the profession; and (d) any other information the long-term contract faculty member deems pertinent. The long-term contract faculty member may choose to include teaching evaluations by students, descriptions of cases worked on by the long-term contract faculty member over the review period, letters from clients and judges, evidence of excellence in librarianship, and current drafts of works in progress. A candidate being considered for promotion must prepare those portions of the dossier that are required to be prepared and submitted by the candidate and which comply with the guidelines set forth by the Dean of Faculties and must submit those portions of the dossier to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee for consideration by September 1 of the academic year in which the candidate is seeking consideration for promotion.
- (2) The long-term contract faculty member's confidential file, which is available only to the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, the faculty eligible to vote, and the dean and which may contain some or all of the following: (a) teaching evaluations by other faculty members; (b) evaluations of the long-term contract faculty member's teaching (including law practice management) by the relevant Clinic Director and the Associate Dean of Experiential Education, if applicable; (c) evaluations of the long-term contract faculty member's librarianship performance by the Law Library Director, if applicable; (d) recommendations from appropriate individuals; (e) student evaluations; (f) annual reviews of the long-term contract faculty member by the Dean; (g) reports of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee for the long-term contract faculty member from previous years; and (h) other information found in the course of the review of the long-term contract faculty member.
- (3) Evaluations of scholarship for long-term contract research faculty by other faculty or outside evaluators. The long-term contract faculty member or the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee may request outside evaluation of the faculty member's publications or works in progress. Results of the evaluation are available only to the dean, the long-term contract faculty member, the Long-Term Contract Review Committee, and faculty eligible to vote on the long-term contract faculty member's initial five-year contract or the candidate's promotion. When long-term contract research faculty become candidates for promotion or for appointment to an initial five-year contract, the dean or the dean's designee, in conjunction with the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, will solicit outside reviewers of a candidate's scholarship in sufficient time to anticipate receipt of the external reviews before October 1 of the candidate's year of service in which the candidate's promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract, as applicable, is being considered. By no later than the March 1 prior to the start

of a candidate's year of service in which the candidate's promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract will be considered, such candidate shall provide the dean and the Chair of the Tenure Committee with a list of potential reviewers of the candidate's scholarship, a copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae (c.v.), and a copy of the candidate's statement on research and service. This list of reviewers should include only established scholars in the candidate's field of scholarship. Typically, the reviewers will also be tenured or long-term contract faculty members at ABA-approved law schools who hold the same or higher rank for which the candidate is applying.

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee will make every effort to have an equal number of reviewers chosen from the candidate's list and a list of reviewers prepared independently by the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee. Any reviewer will be requested to assess a maximum of two of the candidate's scholarly articles that are being considered in the promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract decision. The actual total number of articles that will be considered under this outside review process may vary depending on the number of articles the candidate has already published along with the number of drafts of unpublished articles that the candidate provides the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee to consider in making a promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract decision.

Absent extraordinary circumstances, at least two of a candidate's articles will be subject to this process. The reviewer will be provided with a copy of the candidate's c.v., the candidate's statement on research and service, and the Law School's current standards regarding required excellence in scholarly research and writing. The reviewer will be asked to assist the Law School faculty by commenting on whether the candidate's article(s) are substantial scholarly law review articles (or their equivalent) that contribute to the growth and understanding of the law and legal institutions. In addition, the reviewer will also be asked to comment on what the article(s) indicate about the candidate's current and potential national and/or international prominence.

Reviewers will also be asked to identify what the article(s) indicate about the candidate's ongoing potential to make a substantial contribution in research and writing as a scholar in his/her field. The solicitation letter to potential reviewers must contain the following statement:

Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state, and your review could be requested and relinquished.

To the extent that outside reviewers are used as stated, the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee will provide a summary to the candidate of any key points made by the reviewer that were considered by the faculty eligible to vote in making a decision about the candidate's promotion or

appointment to an initial five-year contract to the extent permitted by University guidelines. The use of outside reviewers does not limit the discretion of the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee to select reviewers, in addition to the outside reviewers, who are members of the tenured faculty or long-term contract faculty who are appointed on five-year contracts; nor does the use of outside reviewers as stated herein prevent any faculty member eligible to vote from reviewing a candidate's scholarship independently or in any manner other than this outside review process when deciding about a candidate's promotion or appointment to an initial five-year contract.

- (4) Other pertinent information received by the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee and the faculty eligible to vote.
- (f) Dates of notification to candidates and right to subsequent contracts
- (1) Retention granted

If retention is granted, a long-term contract faculty member will receive a contract for the subsequent year at the time contracts are normally awarded.
 - (2) Retention denied

If a long-term contract faculty member in the initial probationary period does not receive a recommendation for retention, then the candidate will not be retained. The dean will notify a such long-term contract faculty member of any adverse retention decision of the dean. If a long-term contract faculty member in the initial probationary period is not retained and such faculty member holds the rank of clinical assistant professor, instructional assistant professor, executive assistant professor, or research assistant professor and has not achieved the equivalent of 5 or more academic years of full service within a 7-year period, such long-term contract faculty member will not receive a subsequent contract. A long-term contract faculty member in the initial probationary period who either (i) holds the rank of clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor or research associate professor or (ii) holds the rank of clinical assistant professor, instructional assistant professor, executive assistant professor or research assistant professor and has achieved the equivalent of 5 or more academic years of full service within a 7 year period will receive a contract that terminates not earlier than twelve months following the date such long-term contract faculty member is notified of the adverse retention decision.
 - (3) Review in contract years prior to the final year of the long-term contract faculty member's probationary period

A long-term contract faculty member in any contract year prior to final year of the faculty member's probationary period must be notified of the retention decision before contracts are required to be issued for the next academic year.
 - (4) Review in final probationary contract year

A long-term contract faculty member in the final year of the faculty member's probationary period must be notified not later than December 1 of the retention decision.

(5) Review in subsequent contract years

After the initial probationary period, promotion to clinical associate professor, instructional associate professor, executive associate professor, or research associate professor, as applicable, and grant of a five-year contract in accordance with section 8.7(h)(1), long-term contract faculty are reviewed every year in accordance with the annual review process set forth in Article

9. At least once every five years, long-term contract faculty appointed on five-year contracts must be reviewed by the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee which reviews such faculty member on the criteria set forth in the annual review procedures in Article 9 and provides a report to the dean containing its recommendation for review of the faculty member.

(g) Report of the faculty eligible to vote

After the vote by the faculty eligible to vote on the long-term contract faculty member's grant of an initial five-year contract, or on the candidate's promotion, the Chair of the Tenure Committee must promptly prepare a recommendation report for the dean. The report remains in the faculty member's confidential file. The Tenure Committee Chair will provide a copy of the recommendation report to such long-term contract faculty member when the report is submitted to the dean.

(h) Action by the dean

(1) Retention

The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, and if applicable, the faculty eligible to vote, forward their respective reports and recommendations to the dean. If the Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee, or if applicable, the faculty eligible to vote recommends the grant of retention of a long-term contract faculty member, and the dean approves the recommendation, the dean will notify the faculty member of the favorable retention decision not later than the date for notification set forth in sections 8.7(f)(3) and (4). If the dean does not approve the recommendation of retention, the dean will notify the faculty member of the adverse retention decision not later than the date for notification set forth in sections 8.7(f)(3) and (4).

(2) Promotion

The dean will forward the candidate's dossier and the faculty eligible to vote's report on recommendation of promotion to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academics through the Dean of Faculties. The dean must notify the candidate of the promotion recommendation of the faculty eligible to vote as soon as practicable after the vote on promotion, but not later than

December 1. After informing the candidate of the faculty eligible to vote's

recommendation on promotion, the dean makes a written recommendation on promotion to the Provost and Executive Vice President through the Dean of Faculties. The dean will notify the candidate of the dean's recommendation at the time the dean submits the dean's recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

(i) Notice

For purposes of this section 8.7, notice may be given to a long-term contract faculty member in person or by U.S. mail, interoffice mail, e-mail, phone, or voicemail, provided, however, that any notice of an adverse promotion decision by the President of the University must also be provided by certified mail, return receipt requested. Notice is effective when it is sent or transmitted to the long-term contract faculty member. The Long-term Contract Faculty Review Committee report on recommendation of retention or promotion is not required to be included in the notice provided to the long-term contract faculty member.

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation for The College of Law

REQUIRED

- Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.
--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#).
- Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:
 - Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit
The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.
 - Dean of Faculties

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance 3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness 3-4
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure 4
6. Annual Review 4-9
7. Mid-Term Review 9-10
8. Post-Tenure Review 10-13

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University [*Unit Name*] is to... [*insert your own language here*]. 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 [*Unit Name*] for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. ([UR 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2](#)) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure

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

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Commented [HTL1]: Section 3, page 2

Definition of faculty ranks, and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1) associated with each title within their unit.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), Section 4.4.1)

Commented [HTL2]: Section 9.3(b)(3), p. 35

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance (**teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service; patient care; administration; others, as applicable to your unit**). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Teaching

Commented [HTL3]: Section 7.2, p. 12
Section 8.2, p. 22
Section 9.3(d), p. 38

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are: **[unit fills in]**

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work: **Include a similar paragraph and then fill in the relevant criteria applicable to your unit.**

Commented [HTL4]: Section 7.4, p. 12
Section 8.4, p. 23
Section 9.3(d), p. 38

3.3 Service **Include a similar paragraph and then fill in the relevant criteria applicable to your unit.**

3.4 Patient care, if applicable: **Include a similar paragraph and then fill in the relevant criteria applicable to your unit.**

Commented [HTL5]: Section 7.5, p. 13
Section 8.5, p. 23
Section 9.3(d), p. 38

3.5 Librarianship, if applicable: **Include a similar paragraph and then fill in the relevant criteria applicable to your unit.**

3.6 Administration, if applicable: **Include a similar paragraph and then fill in the relevant criteria applicable to your unit.**

Commented [HTL6]: Section 7.3, p. 12
Section 8.3, p. 23
Section 9.3(d), p. 38

3.7 Other, if applicable: **Include a similar paragraph and then fill in the relevant criteria applicable to your unit.**

Commented [HTL7]: Section 9.3(d)(4), p. 40

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to: **[unit fills in]**

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to: **[unit fills in]**

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to: **[unit fills in]**

4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to: **[unit fills in]**

- 4.5 *Indicators of Excellence in Service* includes, but is not limited to: *[unit fills in]*
- 4.6 *Indicators of Effectiveness in Service* includes, but is not limited to: *[unit fills in]*

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

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

- 5.1.1 Assistant Professor: *[unit fills in]*
- 5.1.2 Associate Professor: *[unit fills in]*
- 5.1.2 Professor: *[unit fills in]*

Commented [HTL8]: Section 7, p. 11

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

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

Commented [HTL9]: Section 8, p. 22

5.3 Process (College specifies process for them; department for them)

Examples: Timing of P&T, Promotion and Tenure Dossiers (CV, letters, etc.) committee construction, voting procedures, etc.

Commented [HTL10]: Section 7.7, p. 14
Section 8.7, p. 24

Deleted: ff:

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: List Paragraph

Deleted: ne

Formatted: Font color: Black

Commented [HTL11]: Section 9.3, p. 34

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

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

6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
 - See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

Commented [HTL12]: Section 9.1, p. 32

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

Commented [HTL13]: Section 9.3, p. 34

6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.

Commented [HTL14]: Section 9.1, p. 32

6.4 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 at least three categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Meets expectations/Satisfactory," "Exceeds Expectations." A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Satisfactory", "Exemplary", and "Most Meritorious" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance.

Commented [HTL15]: Section 9.3(d), p. 38

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

- *Unsatisfactory* – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- *Needs Improvement* – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.

- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

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

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

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.
- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. **Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.**
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

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

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often

will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

6.4.4 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Patient Care** (if applicable) are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in patient care.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in patient care. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in management of cases and medical records.
- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of effectiveness in patient care. Effectiveness can be supported by case load, peer review, and timely management of medical records.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in patient care. Faculty in this category will be leaders in patient care through such factors as leadership in professional societies, external recognition by trainees, awards, and invited presentations.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally recognized as clinicians through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in veterinary medical societies.

6.5 **Required Components**

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1 **Faculty member's report of previous activities.**

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

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

Examples of possible content for the report are:

- **Filled in by unit**
- **Filled in by unit**

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

Commented [HTL16]: Section 9.3(c), p. 37

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

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

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

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

6.5.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

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

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

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

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed

Commented [HTL17]: Section 9.3(e), p. 46

necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an "Unsatisfactory" periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

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

6.7 Timeline

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

Commented [HTL18]: Section 9.1(b), p. 33

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#)

Commented [HTL19]: Section 7.7(h), p. 19

7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.

- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

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

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2019	7 years	Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

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

8. Post-Tenure Review¹

Commented [HTL20]: Section 9.4, p. 47

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

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

8.1 Purpose

¹ Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.

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

8.2 Peer Review Committee

Commented [HTL21]: Section 9.2(c), p. 34

Describe the unit composition/selection of the Peer Review Committee

8.3 Process

Commented [HTL22]: Section 9.4(b), p. 47

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- **Example 1**
- **Example 2**
- **Example 3**

8.3.2 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 unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

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

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

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

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

8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.² If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

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

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

8.4 **Professional Development Review**

Commented [HTL23]: Section 9.3€(3), p. 46

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 8.2.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

Deleted:

Deleted: 9.2.4.4

Deleted: 9.6

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

Commented [HTL24]: Section 9.3(e), p. 46

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

8.6 Appeal

Commented [HTL25]: Section 9.4(b)(3), p.48

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

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

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see [Institutional Rule 31.08.01](#), which indicates the process for this situation.

See the Dean of Faculties website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

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

Appendix

Units may choose to annotate the revisions to previous versions of their evaluation guidelines

Contact Office

[Unit] Office of [Office], e-mail [e-mail]

Commented [HTL26]: Section 5.4, p. 9