



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

## College of Pharmacy

### TEXAS A&M IRMA LERMA RANGEL COLLEGE OF PHARMACY GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

*Recommended by the Faculty Development Committee: March 6, 2017*

*Updated and Approved by the Executive Committee: March 22, 2017*

*Reviewed and Approved by the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties: April 24, 2017*

*Annual Review and Approval by the Faculty Development Committee: May 2018*

*Mid-term Review Updated and Ratified by the College of Pharmacy Faculty: August 9, 2019*

*Emeritus Status Added and Approved by the Executive Committee: January 14, 2021*

*Reviewed and Approved by the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties: March 4, 2021*

#### **Table of Contents**

1. Introduction	2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	3
3. Areas of Faculty Evaluations	4
a. Teaching (Effectiveness and Excellence)	
b. Scholarly Activity/Research (of Teaching, Research, Application, and Integration)	
c. Service (Academic, Professional, and Patient Care)	
d. Academic Citizenship (Engagement, Collegiality and Teamwork, Harmonious Relations, and Safety and Compliance)	
4. Criteria (expectations) for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion	16
a. Criteria by Rank and Track	
b. Tenure	
c. Time Perspective	
d. Rolling Contracts for Non-Tenure Track Faculty	
e. Merit Compensation	
5. Annual Review	21
a. Required Documentation	
b. Process	
6. Mid-term Review	23
7. Tenure and Promotion Review	24
a. Required Documentation	
b. Solicitation of External Reviewers	
c. Process	
d. Department Review Committee (DRC)	
e. College Review Committee (CRC)	
f. Non-Tenure Track Promotion	
g. Expected Performance Ratings	27
8. Post-Tenure Review	27
a. Peer-Review	
b. Professional Development Review	
c. Professional Development Plan	
1) Assessment	
2) Completion of the Plan	
d. Appeal	

- e. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review
- 9. Faculty Emeritus Status

31

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Fulfillment of the Texas A&M University (University) and the Texas A&M Irma Lerma Rangel College of Pharmacy (College) goals of excellence require the recruitment, development, and retention of outstanding faculty members based on qualifications that are exclusive of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, age, or veteran status. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support these goals are essential.

It is recognized that the goals and objectives of the University, College, academic departments, and individual faculty members are dynamic. Therefore, while it is not feasible to list a universally applicable set of criteria for faculty evaluation, it is desirable and appropriate to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria consistent with the long-range goals and objectives of the College.

Each faculty member is expected to develop a scholarly and balanced approach of teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. Because the nature of scholarly enterprise requires both flexibility and freedom, a single formula for effective performance is undesirable. Thus, this document provides guidelines with specific examples and model patterns of emphasis as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

Effectiveness is defined as performance at a satisfactory or good level that is appropriate and expected for faculty at their given rank and their area of specialty. Excellence is defined as performance at an excellent or exceptional level, which should facilitate promotion or tenure, or other forms of positive recognition or reinforcement. Within this general set of guidelines, a variety of contributions to the goal of excellence is possible. The purpose of this document is to describe the unique aspects of the College regarding the various assessments required to gauge faculty performance.

This document describes the College's guidelines and procedures for faculty in the Departments of Pharmacy Practice and of Pharmaceutical Sciences who are undergoing the processes of annual review, mid-term review, promotion (with or without tenure), and post-tenure review. These guidelines and procedures are intended to be used in conjunction with and supplement University documents listed below and provide specific information for the College as outlined and required in the University documents:

- University Rule 12.01.99.M2, *University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion*
- Dean of Faculties document: Promotion and Tenure Packages, Submission Guidelines (updated annually)
- University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01, *Post-Tenure Review, Standard Administrative Procedure*
- Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles

This document should be used in conjunction with the University documents listed above which may be accessed at <http://dof.tamu.edu/>. The College guidelines also provide the information required by the above referenced University documents.

## 2. FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS

The College has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities ranging from those faculty members who focus primarily on didactic, clinical, or experiential instruction to those who focus mainly on research and those with a focus on some combination of research and teaching. Depending upon the faculty candidate's background and needs of the college, faculty are appointed with a primary responsibility in teaching or research, and a secondary area of responsibility in teaching, research, or service. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the College recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. Within the College, faculty may be tenure track and have an unmodified title or non-tenure track (academic professional track) and have a modified title. In general, most faculty members in the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences are in the tenure track and have unmodified titles, whereas in the Department of Pharmacy Practice, most faculty members are within a non-tenure accruing track and, as a result, have modified titles reflective of their participation in clinical pharmacy practice and/or instructional teaching activities; however, exceptions to this generalization can exist within either department.

**Tenure Track.** Tenure is a mechanism by which the institution provides a formal assurance that a faculty member will continue in their academic position unless dismissed for cause. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable and productive in research, teaching and service, and who have demonstrated over time they will likely continue to be especially productive in teaching, research (or other creative contributions outlined in annual reviews) and service, based on the terms and conditions of their appointment letter or annual expectations of the Department Head. These faculty must demonstrate an appropriate level of academic citizenship in performing all of their duties: teaching research/scholarship and service. Tenure is intended to provide a level of intellectual freedom and economic security that will facilitate a high level of academic achievement, particularly as demonstrated by exemplary, world-class research activities especially when coupled with excellence in teaching. The tenure track is not considered appropriate for faculty members who are primarily focused on clinical pharmacy activities or are narrowly focused on either teaching or research activities. Tenure should not serve as a guarantee for: 1) continued employment, 2) specific duty assignments, or 3) designated salary level, because tenure can be withdrawn for *cause* at any time, in accordance with established University policy.

**Included in the *Tenure Track* are the following unmodified titles/ranks:**

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

**Academic Professional Track.** The College can appoint academic professional track faculty when programmatic needs can be best satisfied with faculty whose academic responsibilities make a tenure track appointment inappropriate. For example, faculty who make vital contributions by practicing in clinics located in the community, in a hospital, or in a variety of other health care settings, or who principally instruct students about clinical aspects of pharmacy, but who are not engaging in research activities considered essential for a tenure track appointment. Other faculty in the academic professional track can be those who are focused predominately on teaching or on research activities.

The academic professional track can be further divided into Professional Track and Research Track segments. For example, Clinical and Instructional faculty are usually considered to be in the Professional Track and will usually not be heavily involved in research/scholarly activity but are encouraged to participate in research to the degree that their other commitments allow. However, it is important to note that all faculty members are expected to be involved significantly in scholarly publishing. Professional Track faculty are under the direct supervision of the Department Head, as with Tenure Track faculty. Research faculty members are in the academic professional Research Track and are usually under the direction of a tenure-track faculty supervisor. University guidelines for appointment and promotion of academic professional Research Track faculty are provided from the Dean of Faculties in the document *Research Professor Hiring Guidelines*.

**Included in the *Academic Professional Track* are the following unmodified or modified titles with adjectives:**

- Lecturer
- Clinical Assistant Professor
- Clinical Associate Professor
- Clinical Professor
- Instructional Assistant Professor
- Instructional Associate Professor
- Instructional Professor
- Senior Professor
- Research Assistant Professor
- Research Associate Professor
- Research Professor
- Visiting or Adjunct Assistant Professor
- Visiting or Adjunct Associate Professor
- Visiting or Adjunct Professor

### **3. AREAS OF FACULTY EVALUATIONS**

The nature of a faculty member's contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not provide a specific formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable College evaluations. For those with academic responsibilities requiring year-round duty assignments, twelve-month appointments are expected. For others, nine-month or other appropriate appointment terms may be considered. Regardless of appointment length, all faculty members are required to spend at least eight hours per workday to meet the qualifications for State employment. Visiting or Adjunct faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission and goals of the College.

All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, and service. Academic professional track faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in two of these three areas (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), but, in some cases, can make contributions in all areas.

Alternate work assignments (such as administration, *etc.*) may replace one or more categories in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Alternate work assignment faculty will be reviewed based on the assigned duties (including administrative assignments). Faculty with administrative appointments (*e.g.*, vice deans, assistant/associate deans, and Department Heads) will be reviewed by the Dean.

**Criteria for Review.** Faculty evaluations will be conducted at regular intervals, at least once per year, to support and retain faculty who have been hired by the College. The value of a faculty member to the institution determines the degree to which the institution is interested in retaining and promoting the faculty member. Thus, assessment of the value to the institution of a faculty member is of importance. This assessment must take into account the diverse contributions by any faculty member to the diverse needs and missions of the College, as well as the assigned duties of the faculty member. Consistent with Texas A&M policy and the philosophy of the College, it should be emphasized that both, an established track record of excellent performance and the potential for continued excellent performance, are of primary importance.

Briefly stated, decisions on tenure, promotion and financial compensation will be based on Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. In addition, Academic Citizenship is expected of all faculty members and will be considered in these decisions. Therefore, decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon:

- a. Teaching
- b. Scholarship
- c. Service
- d. Academic Citizenship

Overall performance will be described using these terms of teaching, scholarship, research, and academic citizenship.

#### **a. Teaching**

Teaching is central to the College's mission, and effective teaching is required of all faculty members in tenure and non-tenure tracks. 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 in the assessment of teaching. Appropriate input from students, graduates, peers, Department Heads, and other sources maximizes the validity of the judgment value. Key aspects in this category include teaching qualities, educational innovation, impact on students, and the extent of teaching responsibility as described below.

Teaching qualities. The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one's discipline. Essential components of teaching are: the use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; rapport with students of all abilities; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving; modeling professionalism; mentoring students; using appropriate methods of evaluation; and

providing adequate feedback to students. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

Educational innovation. Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Innovations in teaching must accomplish more than mere change. New methods should demonstrate measurable advantage over those previously used. Examples of innovations in teaching are: taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness; developing new learning experiences, courses, programs, or curricula; developing unique methods to evaluate student learning, skills, or professionalism; and developing methods to evaluate individual teaching, courses, or curricula.

Impact upon students. A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. The ultimate outcome of effective teaching is students who achieve competency that leads to proficiency and eventual mastery of their profession.

Degree of teaching responsibility. The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to College teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course. Course coordination requires active teaching by the coordinator, and active participation in course design, rather than simply delegating teaching responsibilities to others. It is expected that faculty members will assume more responsibility for teaching as they gain academic experience.

## **b. Scholarly Activity/Research**

Scholarly Activity Defined. Scholarly activity is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers as original in content and communicated in an effective manner. For purposes of the College, it encompasses or includes the following four categories, a scholarly discovery, or the creation of new knowledge (often referred to as research); scholarly integration, whereby the relationships among isolated facts are compiled, elucidated, and given perspective; scholarly application, where a thesis proposes the application of existing facts and ideas to products and methods of procedure; and scholarly teaching (which is distinct from effective or excellent teaching), where faculty engage in scholarly teaching by both *drawing upon* resources and best practices in the field and by *contributing resources* to it.

Scholarly activity is an essential part of the central mission of the College. All faculty in the tenure track must engage in scholarly activity, and faculty in non-tenure or professional tracks should participate in scholarly activity to enhance their teaching. Such scholarly activity may be centered on a basic science discipline or involve pharmaceutical, behavioral, translational, and/or clinical scholarship. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence. Scholarly activity is measured against the following four criteria:

1. Begins with intellectual curiosity and identification of a topic needing study
2. Centers on a thesis (or hypothesis) that has been proposed to clarify the topic being researched
3. Requires documentation in writing
4. Requires that the documentation be peer-reviewed and worthy of recommendation for

## publication

Scholarly activities and publications before institutional affiliation will be considered in the overall evaluation; however, major emphasis will be on publications since hiring or last promotion at the institution of record. Quality and impact of scholarly activity can be measured most readily through two peer-review mechanisms: 1) publications in refereed journals and books and 2) the acquisition of grant funds from sources that evaluate proposals using a quality peer review system. It is recognized that quality research can be conducted without the support of peer-reviewed grant awards and publications/grants may be co-authored.

The College expects that all faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarship, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure or promotion. Scholarship is broadly defined; however, to be most effective, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge as well as focused, discipline-based expertise. High-quality research and scholarly publications are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence, independent of the area of scholarship undertaken (*e.g.*, discovery, integration, application, or teaching). Scholarly contributions to the body of knowledge by faculty are critical to the academic reputation for excellence by learned organizations.

Individual contributions as well as collaborative, interdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary research and publication are all valued; however, individuals are encouraged to develop a balanced publication record. External funding of research from a peer-reviewed system will be an indicator of excellence when such research contributes to the body of scientific knowledge and/ or to student and/or faculty development in educational endeavors.

### c. Service

The College must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence; a variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of that goal.

Additionally, the contribution a faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the College, the University, and the greater profession of pharmacy. The amount and nature of the faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage of career; however, all faculty members are expected to participate in service activities. Service is related to those activities that pertain to one's role as a professional and as a College or University faculty member. Faculty effort in this area of evaluation can include: institutional programs/initiatives, professional activities, and patient care.

Academic service. All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the Department, College, and the University. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving programs and services.

Professional service. Faculty should contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession. Continuing education is both an instructional and public service activity that the College is well-positioned to provide. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve the community at-large in a professional capacity that enhances the stature of the College.

Patient care. Faculty members in the practice disciplines are expected to provide exemplary patient care that is respected by patients and peers both within the College and in the professional community.



#### **d. Academic Citizenship**

Academic Citizenship is defined as a measure of one's commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and goals of the Department, College, University, and profession.

Some dimensions of Academic Citizenship include (1) effective and timely engagement, (2) collegiality and teamwork, (3) harmonious relations, and (4) attention to safety and compliance matters.

Engagement is making positive contributions in assigned activities, and active participation in additional opportunities toward the development and advancement of the Department, College, University, specialty, profession, or practice site.

Collegiality and teamwork are the positive, interactive relationships between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research, and service, and are essential for the mission of the College. Colleagues are explicitly united in a common purpose and respect each other's abilities to work toward that purpose. Support of the missions of the Department, College, University, and of their programs is important in the practice of good academic citizenship. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, accountability, timeliness, and willingness to cooperate are vital. Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators and must work toward solutions of problems.

Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2 states that "professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University" is a requirement for promotion and tenure. There should be no effort by the College to discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks, and promoting resolution of differences.

#### **4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

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

##### **Evidence of *effectiveness* in teaching includes, (but is not limited to):**

- Good evaluations based on classroom visitation by Department Heads, peers, or other administrators
- Good evaluations of teaching performance by students
- Evidence of contributing to or coordinating courses or both
- Coordination of team-taught or integrated courses

- Rigorous, accurate and equitable grading
- Development of assessment tools to measure student learning outcomes
- Service as a member of thesis/dissertation committees of graduate students
- Mentoring and training pharmacy students or post-graduate residents in experiential experiences and postgraduate residencies
- Direction of independent student research
- Mentoring of junior colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness
- Introduction of current and emerging instructional methodologies and technologies in the curriculum
- Development of pedagogical approaches to enhance student engagement and to optimize student learning
- Introduction of practices to evaluate the engagement of students in a critical analysis of course material, or which evaluate their involvement in research or scholarly activity
- Contribution to a college-wide culture of evidence-based approaches to evaluation and improvement of academic programs

- Development of valuable evidence-based metrics for teaching effectiveness
- Preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs
- Development of questions for Benchmark exams and other standardized assessments
- Preparation and presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of pharmacy or other health-related topics

**Evidence of *excellence* in teaching includes (but is not limited to):**

- Outstanding evaluations based on classroom visitation by Department Heads, peers, or other administrators
- Outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students
- Selection for College, University, or professional association outstanding teacher awards
- Development of questions for licensure board examination
- Contribution to new instructional program development
- Development of new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses
- Serving as a chair of Master's thesis and doctoral dissertation committees
- Publication of the results of education research endeavors
- Publication of scholarly review articles, textbooks, original clinical investigations, descriptions of clinical experience, or case reports/results that emphasize education endeavors
- Presentations at professional meetings or other institutions of higher education that serve the teaching mission of the College
- Evidence of successful career paths of former graduate students and post-doctoral fellows
- Evidence of consistent excellence in teaching performance through teaching evaluations, letters from program directors, course coordinators, the Department Head, former students and/or trainees
- Receipt of awards for teaching excellence training of residents, graduate students, and post-doctoral fellows
- Obtaining external grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching or course development
- Promotion of the engagement of members of the teaching community in the collaborative, scholarly examination of their practice as teachers
- Leading a major curriculum development, assessment, or redesign effort for the introduction of innovative technology or novel teaching methodologies in the instructional setting
- Introduction of outcomes assessments for course or program evaluation in the curriculum that are disseminated or used at the Department or College level

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of teaching are (ratings from 1-5):

Unsatisfactory (1) – sub-standard effectiveness in teaching and lack of progress in pedagogy. Individuals receiving this rating need improvement and mentoring in one or more areas of teaching.

Needs Improvement (2) – minimal effectiveness in teaching. Obvious need for mandatory mentoring in specific areas of teaching (*e.g.*, content, delivery, pedagogy, *etc.*)

Satisfactory (3) – adequate effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and educational accomplishments of students.

Excellent (4) – outstanding 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, curricular development and mentoring of junior faculty.

Exceptional (5) – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an *Excellent* faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as an elite educator through their leadership, receipt of awards, and/or solicited involvement in educational organizations.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment or course load, evidence of adequate effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance.

**Evidence of *effectiveness* in scholarship may include (but is not limited to):**

- Publication of technical reports, case reports, or monographs in peer-reviewed journals
- Presentation of papers of original research or case reports at professional meetings
- Active participation in research within a University-recognized center or institute that is either interdisciplinary or interprofessional
- Contribution in area of expertise to the scholarship of others
- Authorship of review articles
- Serving as a research mentor for pharmacy students or residents
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies adopted by other faculty members within the College

**Evidence of *excellence* in scholarship may include (but is not limited to):**

- Recognition from peers in the field, *e.g.*, fellowships, research awards, publication awards, invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings
- Publications of original research in the leading peer-reviewed, discipline-related journals
- Favorable citation index listing of research/educational publications within their respective discipline
- Significant competitive external funding for research
- Key participation in forming productive collaborative research arrangements with industry, community agencies, foundations, and other academic institutions
- Significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements
- Coordination of or participation in interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and projects
- Publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s)
- Authorship of a textbook, textbook chapters, review articles, contributions of published symposia
- Editorship or associate editorship of scholarly, refereed journals, or of special issues of a journal
- Recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative

- contributions by others, *e.g.*, use or review of electronic media by other scholars
- Evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the interface with other academic disciplines
  - Originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication of new understanding of, perspectives on, and uses of information
  - Peer-reviewed publication of instructional materials, *e.g.*, case studies, textbooks, or electronic instructional materials
  - Extramural recognition for contributions to the advancement of teaching, such as presentations at national or international conferences, invitations to serve as a consultant, service on editorial boards of prestigious journals in the chosen area of teaching scholarship, and invitations to present keynote or plenary national and international meetings concerning education
  - Significant extramural funding for research on issues of importance in teaching
  - Publication of critically acclaimed chapters, books, or comparable electronic materials about education
  - Election to membership in major national research societies
  - Dissemination of teaching materials at national workshops, with the materials cited by other programs
  - Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the College
  - Editorship or associate editorship of a major journal in the chosen area of teaching scholarship
  - Serving on national grant organization study sections, review panels, or site visit teams
  - Serving on national professional society program committees
  - Serving on editorial boards of recognized journals
  - Election to major national professional societies

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of scholarship are (1-5):

Unsatisfactory (1) – lack of recent/past evidence of effectiveness in scholarship.

Needs Improvement (2) – limited evidence of recent/past effectiveness in scholarship.

Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of scholarly impact as supported by funding, publications, citations, and prominent presentations.

Satisfactory (3) – adequate evidence of effectiveness in scholarship. Effectiveness must be supported by quality publications, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.

Excellent (4) – outstanding evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in scholarship. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their scholarship as supported by high quality publications, funding, citations, and invited presentations.

Exceptional (5) – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an *Excellent* faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing scholarship, awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

**Evidence of *effectiveness* in academic service activities may include (but is not limited to):**

- Actively serving on departmental, College, and University committees and task forces
- Mentoring students of diverse cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds
- Serving as an advisor to student organizations
- Participating in service learning, interprofessional education (IPE) and Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) programs/activities in the College
- Membership in and contribution to professional organizations (includes offices held)
- Contributing to external developmental efforts
- Service as reviewer for major refereed journals
- Leadership roles in curriculum reform, development, and implementation
- Participation in: departmental or College strategic planning, search committees, College seminar programs, faculty development programs, assessment programs, symposia and colloquia, and student recruitment activities
- Presentation of continuing education programs
- Invited presentations at academic and professional groups
- Development and participation in health care service to community programs

**Evidence of *excellence* in academic service may include (but is not limited to):**

- Serving as an officer, committee chair, or board/committee member in a national/international professional organization in one's discipline or national/international task force
- Serving as an effective committee chair within the department, College, or University
- Demonstration of a significant time commitment to or role in committee work
- Service as editor or on editorial and manuscript review boards of scholarly, refereed journals
- Effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards
- Attainment of significant external development support
- Significant community or national service in an organization with programmatic importance to the pharmacy profession
- Actively participating in partnerships initiated with corporate or community organizations, including funded research, training programs, and development of coursework
- Membership on boards and committees in the community-at-large as a professional
- Organization of regional, national, international symposia and colloquia
- Significant and effective mentorship of junior faculty members as evidenced by selection for College, University, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards
- Service as a grant/contract reviewer for research organizations, institutions, professional societies, or foundations (*e.g.*, NIH, NSF, USDA)

**Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of academic service are (1-5):**

Unsatisfactory (1) – limited evidence of effectiveness in academic service. Such individuals may impede the function of their department through their inactivity and/or negative behaviors.

Needs Improvement (2) – marginal evidence of effectiveness in academic service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited local involvement with an absence of statewide or national service.

Satisfactory (3) – adequate evidence of effectiveness in academic service. Those in this category will be involved in local service appropriate for their career stage and duty assignments and often will have evidence of national service.

Excellent (4) – outstanding evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in academic service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing critical committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be common.

Exceptional (5) – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an *excellent* faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

**Evidence of professional and clinical service may include (but is not limited to):**

- Performing as a professional role model for pharmacy students and health care providers at practice site
- Obtaining certification by specialty board; awards or certification that recognizes clinical expertise

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of professional and/or clinical service are (1-5):

Unsatisfactory (1) – limited evidence of effectiveness in professional and/or clinical service. Such individuals may impede the function of their department/unit through their actions and behaviors.

Needs Improvement (2) – marginal evidence of effectiveness in professional and/or clinical service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited local involvement with an absence of statewide or national service.

Satisfactory (3) – adequate evidence of effectiveness in professional and/or clinical service. Those in this category will be involved in local service appropriate for their career stage and duty assignments and often will have evidence of national service.

Excellent (4) – outstanding evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in professional and/or clinical service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing critical committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or patient care and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be common.

Exceptional (5) – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an *excellent* faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally recognized for

service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

**Evidence of *engagement* may include (but is not limited to):**

- Cooperative interactions with faculty and staff
- Promotion of collegiality as an important predictor of faculty and staff retention
- Active promotion of the College and University
- Produces as much as capable at all times
- Regardless of circumstances, produces highest quality of work
- Meets all deadlines set by Department, College or University
- Volunteers for overtime work when needed
- Attends Department, College or University meetings regularly, as required

**Evidence of *collegiality* may include (but is not limited to):**

- Recognizing and responding appropriately to the needs of colleagues and the Department; assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs
- Actively and effectively striving to achieve Departmental and College goals and mandates
- Engaging and promoting in intra- and inter-campus collaborations
- Engaging in activities that benefit others apart from oneself (examples include accepting reasonable amounts of committee work commensurate with one's academic rank, engaging in or initiating activities that benefit others, and making reasonable adjustments that accommodate others or enhance the greater good of the group)
- Engaging in the creation of a University culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance
- Voicing dissenting views in a constructive manner and setting that enable resolution; balancing skepticism and opposition with willingness to compromise and to work toward satisfactory solutions
- Avoiding engaging in personal attacks as a means of dealing with colleagues
- Making personal contributions to the mission of the University to forward its programs for the public good
- Engaging in activities that foster diversity and positive interaction among students and colleagues from different cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds
- Using professional judgment to assess right and wrong

**Evidence of *teamwork* may include (but is not limited to):**

- Mentors others
- Shares ideas for projects and research collaborations with others
- Involves others for the benefit of the College and University
- Involves others in projects related to teaching, research, and service
- Makes creative suggestions to peers
- Encourages others to speak up in meetings
- Helps peers critically think for themselves
- Cooperates with others on research, teaching and service projects



**Evidence of *harmonious relations* may include (but is not limited to):**

- Working with other faculty to achieve common goals
- Cooperating with the administration regarding duties and academic citizenship
- Assisting Department, College and University staff to achieve shared goals, and cooperating with staff in the conduct of their duties as they apply to faculty activities
- Maintaining harmonious relationships with all faculty and staff, even if there are significant professional disagreements between the individuals involved

**Evidence of involvement in *safety and compliance* may include (but is not limited to):**

- Working with safety and compliance staff to assure that safety and compliance goals are achieved in a practical and effective way
- Engaging in the creation of a culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance
- Comes to work on time
- Is mentally alert and ready to work when arriving at work
- Follows department, College and University rules and regulations
- Does not waste College resources
- Keeps work area clean and neat

Performance ratings (rating scale of 1-5) to be used for annual evaluation of academic citizenship include (but are not limited to):

Unsatisfactory (1) – the lack of collegiality and other demonstrations of incompatibility with the mission and goals of the Department, College and University. Such demonstrations or lack of support interferes with the function of their Department or College through their actions and behaviors. Some examples may include but are not limited to:

- Insulting students in front of other students or faculty members in front of students
- Consistently absent from department or faculty meetings, college graduations, white-coat ceremonies, and other college events
- Unwilling to provide minimal assistance to other faculty members, the department, or college when expertise, help, or advice is needed

Needs Improvement (2) – marginal evidence of effectiveness, ability, and willingness to engage in collegial behavior which adversely affects the Department, College or University.

Some examples may include but are not limited to:

- Disagrees with and/or berates students in front of other students or faculty members in front of students
- Infrequently attends department or faculty meetings, white-coat ceremonies, college graduations, and college events
- Provides minimal assistance to other faculty members, department, or college when expertise, help, or advice is solicited

Satisfactory (3) – unequivocal demonstration of collegial behavior with students, faculty peers, supervisors, and members of the community.

- Routinely communicates with colleagues in a respectful manner
- Routinely demonstrates respect for students, faculty peers, supervisors, and community members
- Routinely collaborates with student advisees to promote student success

- Demonstrates professional behavior consistently and follows department, College and University rules/policies, performs assigned tasks; completes assignments in a timely and consistent manner
- Attends department or faculty meetings, white coat ceremonies, College graduations, and college events unless inadvertent circumstances intervene
- Cooperates consistently with others to meet departmental/College/University goals

Excellent (4) – outstanding evidence of effectiveness, ability, and willingness to engage in collegiality and maintains harmony with students, faculty peers, supervisors, and members of the community

- Communicates consistently with colleagues in a respectful manner
- Clearly demonstrates respect for students, faculty peers, supervisors, and community members
- Facilitates collaboration with student advisee to promote student success
- Routinely demonstrates professional behavior consistent with being a productive university citizen (follows department, college, and university rules/policies, performs assigned tasks; completes assignments in a timely manner; provides assistance when asked)
- Almost always attends department or faculty meetings, white coat ceremonies, College graduations, and College events
- Cooperates consistently with others to meet departmental/College/University goals

Exceptional (5) – preeminent evidence of effectiveness, ability, and willingness to engage in collegiality that both the Department and College require. At all times:

- Communicates with colleagues in a respectful manner
- Demonstrates respect for students, faculty peers, supervisors, and community members
- Collaborates actively with the student advisee(s) to promote student success
- Demonstrates professional behavior consistent with being a productive academic citizen (follows department, College and University rules/policies, performs assigned tasks; completes assignments in a timely manner; provides assistance when asked)
- Attends and participates constructively in departmental or faculty meetings, white coat ceremonies, College graduations, and College events
- Cooperates with others to meet departmental/College/University goals

## **5. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL, TENURE AND PROMOTION**

Texas A&M Rules and Guidelines relevant to faculty evaluation and promotion are contained in University Rule 12.01.99.M2 *University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion* and in the *Tenure and Promotion Packages: Submission Guidelines*, provided annually by the Dean of Faculties. Tenure and promotion decisions cannot be made solely by committee outcomes and majority rule; thus, Department Heads and the Dean are charged with making independent decisions and recommendations that may differ from faculty recommendations, stating clear reasons for such variances if they exist.

Criteria for effectiveness and excellence in academic teaching, scholarship, service, and academic citizenship apply to all faculty members. The weighting of the criteria will be based on the faculty member's appointment and effort of assignment.

### **a. Criteria by Rank and Track**

1. Assistant Professor or [Adjective] Assistant Professor. Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching and scholarship and demonstrating effectiveness in service and academic citizenship. Individuals, employed with the advent of future completion of board certification in a specialty and/or completion of advanced degrees as a stipulation of continued employment, will be expected to satisfy these goals prior to promotion to Associate Professor or [Adjective] Associate Professor.

2. Associate Professor or [Adjective] Associate Professor. Emphasis for the tenure track faculty should be placed on further development of scholarship within categories described under section (b) for scholarship/research. For the academic professional-track faculty, emphasis should be placed on further accomplishments in their assigned roles. For those with major clinical roles, continued clinical excellence is expected, along with the continued development of leadership in a specialty area. Associate professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship/collegiality, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities with a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen area(s) of scholarship with recognitions at the national level. Associate professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must document effectiveness and excellence in instruction and clinical contributions as defined by the criteria for advancement in rank. Tenure track individuals must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a sustained, peer-reviewed publication record.

3. Professor or [Adjective] Professor. Continued excellence and national/international recognition are required in the areas of (1) continuing accomplishment in teaching or (2) continuing recognition in research or another form of creative activity; and (3) evidence of valuable teaching, scholarship, and service. Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national/international prominence are required of professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major original contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; excellence in patient care or diagnostic medicine; evidence of academic citizenship and collegiality; and excellence in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in contributions by professors, sustained excellence in scholarship is expected for the tenured professor. Merit compensation in the form of salary and research supplementation will be the primary means of recognizing such excellence.

### **b. Tenure**

Academic tenure is granted to those individuals who, as a result of thorough evaluation, are believed capable of earning the rank of Professor in accordance with these guidelines. Academic citizenship, professional knowledge and competence, teaching abilities, and standards of professional integrity are important factors. The individual must demonstrate unequivocal promise of a continuing high level of sustained productivity and scholarly activity.

Examples of types of activities, which are consistent with the general guidelines, follow the three academic activities essential to the mission of the College.

Fulfillment of all criteria in an academic category is not an absolute guarantee for appointment, promotion, or attainment of tenure.

### **Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**

### Teaching

- Is effective as a teacher, evidenced by mastery of both content, method, and evaluation as documented by student and faculty evaluation
- Is responsible for design, organization, coordination, and evaluation of a course or series of lectures and evaluation of mastery by the students
- Is recognized as an exemplary scientist or clinician whose teaching activities can be documented as providing an outstanding role model for junior faculty, students and participating as an effective mentor of students
- Is effective as a supervising professor for post-doctoral/advanced education students
- Demonstrates innovation in teaching methods and production of texts, educational “software”, or digital instructional materials, evaluation instruments, and the production of new knowledge through research in the teaching content area
- Participates in student guidance and counseling
- Responsible for the development of continuing education or other professional programs, as required or serves as an invited speaker at other institutions of higher learning

### Scholarship

- Demonstrates initiative, independence, and sustained scholarly activity in research
- Publishes research findings and scholarly papers in refereed professional journals and books (It is recognized that publications and grants may be co-authored).
- Presents research and scholarly findings at professional meetings
- Obtains funding for research or other scholarly activities
- Serves on thesis or dissertation committees as chair/member as well as other research review boards

### Service

- Serves as chair or member on committees within the department, College, University, and/or affiliated institutions
- Provides administrative responsibility for a service, specific area of patient care or other teaching opportunity for which peer recognition can be documented
- Provides consultation to other departments or schools within the University and to local, state, regional, or national organizations or institutions that seek to benefit from the candidate’s experience/expertise
- Serves on extramural grant review committees or editorial boards of scientific or professional journals
- Performs a key administrative role in patient care, research or teaching activities within a department
- Provides service as a health educator for the community as required

## **Associate Professor to Professor**

### Teaching

- Sustained, outstanding performance of examples cited for the Associate Professor level
- Leadership through design, organization, coordination, and evaluation of a course or courses (PharmD, graduate, or continuing education); administrative responsibility at the College or Department level for curriculum; supervision/coordination of faculty teaching

within a course

- Invitations as visiting professor at other institutions
- Responsibility for student mentoring, guidance, and counseling as well as consultation to student organizations and groups
- Sustained recognition as an exemplary scientist, teacher, mentor, or clinician whose activities can be documented as providing an outstanding role model for students and junior faculty
- Publication of educational works and new area of essential knowledge in relevant journals and books

#### Scholarly Activity

- Senior or corresponding author of papers published in refereed journals (it is recognized that publications or grants may be co-authored)
- Published high-impact research that is nationally and internationally recognized
- Receives funding as a principal investigator for research and/or serves an essential role as a co-investigator in collaborative research
- Invitations to participate as a featured speaker/panelist at national or international professional or scientific meetings
- Invitations to preside as chair of sessions at national or international professional or scientific meetings
- Recognition for excellence in research by professional/scientific institutions or organizations
- Serves as chair of thesis or dissertation committees

#### Service

- Appointment to responsible positions within the institution (chairs a department or a major College/University committee; membership on major decision-making College/University committees)
- Recognition as an authority by other schools and departments within the University and by local, state, regional, or national organizations or institutions
- Senior administrative responsibility for a service or specific area of patient care or clinical teaching
- Consultant to, or serves on, government review committees, study sections, or other national review panels
- Serves as an officer or committee chair in professional or scientific organizations
- Serves on editorial boards of professional scientific journals
- Election to responsible positions on civic boards or organizations concerned with health care issues at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels
- Maintains active membership and participates in key organizations of the individual's discipline

#### **c. Time Perspective**

All initial appointments to faculty positions, except for those faculty members who were granted tenure on arrival, are one-year renewable appointments (unless an exception is requested by the Department Head and approved by the College Dean and the Dean of Faculties (DOF)). Tenure and promotion evaluations will be based on cumulative contributions and expected continued contributions. Considerable additional contributions should be accumulated following promotion prior to being considered for future promotion opportunities. A record of sustained, consistent

excellence is essential in the major area of academic endeavor (teaching or research). There is no required minimum time in one rank before promotion to the next rank may occur.

Tenure Track. The usual probationary period for tenure is seven years. Expectations will be stipulated in the agreement of employment. Credit may be given for comparable tenure-track experience at another accredited university. Recommendation for tenure will normally be made during the mandatory tenure consideration year, as defined in the *Tenure and Promotion Packages: Submission Guidelines* published annually by the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

Each annual faculty performance evaluation must address the extent to which their performance is in line with the expectations for their current rank, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion.

Tenure and promotion are linked for persons hired as assistant professors. Thus, recommendation for early promotion must be coupled with a recommendation for early tenure and vice versa. Faculty members must be advised of a decision not to award tenure at least one year before the termination of their employment. In rare cases, the probationary period may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the Department Head, the Dean, and DOF.

Academic Professional Track. Faculty members with professional track appointments are reviewed annually by their Department Head and research track faculty members are reviewed annually by their immediate supervisor and Department Head.

Academic Professional track faculty members will have renewable appointments of one academic year (9 to 12 months) for at least the first five years. Professional track faculty members will receive a 12 months-notice if they are not to be reappointed. Following this initial period, faculty members in these ranks should be considered for multi-year rolling appointments.

Faculty members in academic professional tracks will normally be considered for promotion after five years. However, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates must be considered. Each annual faculty performance evaluation must address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current rank, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion.

#### **d. Rolling Contracts for Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

Faculty members appointed in the academic professional track will normally have renewable appointments of one academic year (9 to 12 months) in their first five years of service. Upon promotion to [Adjective] Associate Professor, a faculty member will be eligible for a three-year rolling contract, and upon promotion to [Adjective] Professor will be eligible for a five-year rolling contract.

The granting of a rolling contract is determined by the Department Head in consultation with the faculty member with concurrence of the Dean. The rolling contract is not guaranteed but is awarded based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the Department and College.

Each faculty member's multi-year, rolling contract is evaluated at the time of their annual review. A "satisfactory", "excellent" or "exceptional" annual review will result in validating the multi-

year term of the rolling contract. In the event an annual review results in an “unsatisfactory” or “needs improvement” evaluation, the contract is deemed suspended or void; a peer evaluation of performance will be initiated as described in the *Post-Tenure Review, Standard Administrative Procedure of Tenured Faculty* (University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01).

#### **e. Merit Compensation**

Merit compensation represents an opportunity to reward short-term contributions of excellence in teaching, scholarship, service, and academic citizenship. The basis for this compensation will be the demonstration by the faculty member of an excellent level of performance during their Annual Review.

### **TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW**

The evaluation of faculty for tenure and/or promotion, and annual review will be based on accomplishments in each of the four categories: teaching, scholarship, service, and academic citizenship. Excellence in performance is of primary importance; that is, the quality, significance and impact of accomplishments are of great importance. Peer assessment by professionals in the faculty member's field provide the best and most reliable basis for making sound decisions about tenure and promotion. Consequently, the level of accomplishment and potential relative to disciplinary norms and standards as judged by peer review are central to the tenure and promotion process. Accomplishments that are not subject to peer review generally will not be a major consideration in tenure and promotion evaluations.

University mandates also require awarding appropriate credit to faculty who actively work toward achieving the University's goals in three major areas: (1) supporting multidisciplinary collaboration; (2) enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences; and (3) requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance.

#### **a. Required Documentation**

Department Heads should meet individually with candidates to discuss the entire process. The Office of Academic Affairs will provide each candidate with documentation describing how to prepare and submit the required items, according to specified deadlines. The process and the required documents are described in detail in the yearly edition of the *Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines* available from the Dean of Faculties website: <http://dof.tamu.edu>.

The Department Head should inform the candidate that these materials may be updated by documentation in a memo at any stage of the process; updates must be signed and dated by the candidate. The update should not include a changed CV, but rather, be succinct in what specific changes are being pointed out. The changes should be substantive ones to merit such a memo, *e.g.*, newly published papers or newly awarded grants.

#### **b. Solicitation of External Reviewers**

To facilitate the solicitation of input from external reviewers for tenure and promotion cases, the process should begin as early as possible. Department Heads are required to review all potential external reviewers to ensure they are from recognized peer institutions and are clear leaders in the field. Texas A&M considers peer institutions to mostly be those who are members of the American Association of Universities. In addition, efforts should be made to avoid individuals

with whom the candidate has had a close working relationship, such as the candidate's faculty advisor, post-doctoral advisor, or frequent co-author. Letters from former students are irrelevant except as supportive documents for the teaching evaluation. The candidate may also include a do-not-contact list.

Contact with individuals requesting their service as a reviewer will be in the form of a personal letter from the Department Head. The Department Head should make telephone or email inquiries to potential reviewers prior to the letter request and submit a list of reviewers who have agreed to participate in the review process. The solicitation letter 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.' At no time is the candidate to inquire about the status of the reviewers he or she nominates or to contact them.

After receiving an affirmative response, a letter from the Departments, along with selected materials for review, will be sent to external reviewers by OAA as early as possible in the review cycle. Thus, it is essential that the candidate does not delay in the preparation of these materials.

The College expects a minimum of five and no more than seven letters, with a roughly equivalent number of letters received from reviewers selected by the Department Head and letters received from reviewers selected by the candidate (2 to 3 or 3 to 2). All letters will be collected and made available to the Department Head by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA). All letters received will be included in the candidate's dossier by the OAA.

### **c. Process**

Information about any candidate for promotion or tenure will be reviewed by a series of groups and individuals, as described below. "Briefly, the required tenure and promotion material will be provided by faculty to the OAA, and that material, along with external reviews, will be compiled into a dossier by OAA and **turned** over to the Department Heads. The Department Heads will provide the dossier to the Departmental Review Committee. The dossier will be reviewed in sequence by the Departmental Review Committee, the Department Head, the College of Pharmacy APT Committee and the Dean of the College.

Confidentiality of the dossier should be maintained throughout the process. Signed and dated memos to the Department Head with substantive updates by the candidate (see Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines) will be distributed immediately to the committee members and will be incorporated into the candidate's original dossier by the Department Head as an addendum.

### **d. Department Review Committee (DRC)**

The Department Head appoints three tenured faculty members at the associate or professor rank to the Department Review Committee (DRC). When such members are unavailable, the Department Head will work with the Dean to enlist members from the other department as needed. The DRC is charged with reviewing tenure and promotion dossiers. Tenured faculty may serve on DRC committees for faculty on academic professional track lines, but not vice versa. Two academic professional track committee members must be included in the DRC for non-tenure track faculty promotions.

The DRC should meet to discuss and vote on each candidate. The DRC also prepares teaching,



scholarship, service, and academic citizenship peer evaluations as required for the dossier. The DRC should not merely list the accomplishments of the candidate but rather they should provide an argument as to why the candidate is or is not acceptable for promotion or tenure.

For the tenure and promotion process, the DRC is charged with:

- i. Review and evaluation of the candidate's dossier.
- ii. Preparing separate written peer reviews on each candidate's teaching, scholarship, service, and academic citizenship. The authorship of these documents should be clearly delineated, and all author/s should sign.
- iii. Preparing a complete overall report and recommendation explaining the DRC's vote and reasoning for their recommendation, and, in the case of mid-term tenure review, an overview of the candidate's progress and impact as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion or tenure. Votes should be reported on the overall conclusion, not on the individual area reports; votes should be recorded as Yes, No, Abstain, Absent, or Recused. This document is to be signed by all DRC members. A written proxy is allowed in emergency situations. DRC members should not avoid voting, except in unusual circumstances such as conflict of interest.

The Department Head prepares a separate recommendation evaluating the candidate's teaching, scholarship, service, and academic citizenship. This document must also:

- iv. Describe strengths and weaknesses of the candidate
- v. Describe the context of this particular case within the department
- vi. Provide an explanation of the candidate's impact on academic endeavors
- vii. Explain special considerations (*e.g.*, early promotion or tenure, delays in promotion or tenure, special hiring circumstances)
- viii. Explain any mixed or negative votes if not explained in the committee's report
- ix. Explain the Department Head's vote. If contrary to the department committee's recommendation, detailed arguments should be provided.

#### **e. College Review Committee (CRC)**

The College Dean selects from among ALL tenured faculty members of both departments at the professor rank and who have not participated in the DRC or as an immediate supervisor of the candidates, to appoint a five-member College Review Committee. If sufficient members are not available in the College, other tenured professors from within the Health Science Center colleges and schools will be appointed. This committee is charged with reviewing all tenure and promotion dossiers from the College. External members will be included until the College has enough tenured, professor level faculty from both academic departments to conduct the review. The CRC's report and recommendation should be similar to the DRC report, reflecting the ultimate vote of the committee and the primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other. Votes should be reported on the overall conclusion, not for the individual area; votes should be recorded as Yes, No, Abstain, Absent, or Recused. A written proxy is allowed in emergency situations. CRC members should not avoid voting, except in unusual circumstances such as conflict of interest.

The dossier including the CRC's report will be sent to the Dean of the College for his

recommendation prior to submission to the Dean of Faculties office as described in the University documents listed at the beginning of this document.

The Department Head is responsible for notifying each candidate of the outcome at every level, including an overall summary of the external letters, the DRC's and CRC's recommendation, the Dean's recommendation, the University's decision, and ultimately the Board of Regents decision (only for those being considered for tenure). The Dean will notify the Department Heads of decisions at the College, university, and system level so that they can relay that information to the candidate.

#### **f. Academic Professional Track Promotion**

Promotions among the Academic Professional track faculty should be initiated at the same time-frame and manner as stated for tenure track faculty. An academic professional track faculty member may engage in one or more academic activities, they are evaluated in one of the two main areas of teaching or scholarship. For academic professional track faculty primarily engaged in clinical or teaching activities, scholarship may be considered as part of their evaluation in teaching, especially if the scholarly activity is pertinent to maintaining excellence in their area of instruction or is of value to the overall academic excellence of the College.

#### **g. Expected Performance Ratings**

Tenure track assistant to associate professor:

Primary area: *Excellent* Secondary area: *Satisfactory* Service: *Satisfactory*  
Citizenship: *Excellent*

Tenure track associate to full professor

Primary area: *Exceptional* Secondary area: *Satisfactory* Service: *Excellent*  
Citizenship: *Excellent*

Professional track assistant to associate professor

Primary area: *Excellent* Secondary area: *Satisfactory* Service: *Satisfactory*  
Citizenship: *Excellent*

Professional track associate to full professor:

Primary area: *Exceptional* Secondary area: *Satisfactory*, Service: *Excellent*  
Citizenship: *Excellent*

## **6. ANNUAL REVIEW**

All faculty members in the College, whether tenure track, tenured or academic professional track, must have an annual written review, for which Department Heads are responsible, in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2: *University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion*. University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 2.4.5 addresses the purpose, basis, and requirements for the faculty annual review process.

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling Department Heads to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties' Guidelines for Annual & Mid-term Reviews states, "These

reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.” At the College level, annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year (January 1 to December 31 activities), and the review process must be completed by May 1 of each year.

It will be the task of Department Heads to provide each faculty member with an annual assessment of their performance relative to the established annual performance development plan and the faculty member’s academic appointment. Adjustments to the development plan may be made at the time of the annual assessment by agreement of the Department Head and the faculty member with concurrence of the Dean. Assessment of the candidate’s performance must include measures of teaching performance based upon peer and student reviews, scholarship activity, and a record of service contributions consistent with the candidate's appointment.

- **Required Documentation**

In January of each year, Department Heads must request that all faculty submit an Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation Report. The current version of this report will be made available to the Department Heads by the Office of Academic Affairs.

- **Process**

Each year the academic departments, in accordance with the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion, will carry out an annual review of all faculty in the ranks of Lecturer, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, with and without modified titles. The review will follow the descriptions of academic appointments and job responsibilities including responsibilities assigned by the Department Head. The time- line and criteria for annual faculty evaluations are provided below:

- The criteria to be used in evaluating faculty will be those listed below, and any other criteria agreed upon by the faculty member and the Department Head.
- The annual review will take place in the spring so that it can be used to create the department's annual report, aid in planning and play a role in determining merit raises and project viable candidates for promotion or tenure.
- By March 15, each faculty member should submit the Annual Faculty Self-Assessment, Faculty Development Plan, and student- and peer-teaching evaluation forms when available.
- By May 1, the Department Head will evaluate faculty submissions, complete the faculty report with the above-described 1-5 scale performance rating, and provide the report to faculty with a one-on-one meeting or via videoconference. The report will contain an overall evaluation of the faculty member's activities for the previous year. This evaluation will be based on ratings in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and academic citizenship. The report will be signed by both the Department Head and faculty to acknowledge that the document has been discussed in detail. If there is any disagreement by the faculty, he/she can write a statement of disagreement in the remarks section.
- An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the detailed basis for the rating. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean. A written improvement plan, developed by the faculty

member in collaboration with the Department Head, must be included with the report to the Dean. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the Department Head can request a “Periodic Peer Review” of the faculty member.

- Immediately upon receiving an “Unsatisfactory” or “Needs Improvement” rating, the faculty member must work with the Department Head to develop the improvement plan. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (*e.g.*, scholarship), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. However, milestones must be established for each year of the plan. The ranking of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” if pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the ranking will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”.
- A faculty member with an “Unsatisfactory” rating will be ineligible for a merit salary increase. A “Needs Improvement” rating in more than one area will also render a faculty member ineligible for merit raises. However, “NeedsImprovement” in one area only does not disqualify one from merit raises.

## 8. MID-TERM REVIEW

A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period. Similar formative review is provided to professional and research track faculty in the third year of their appointment. For both tenure- track and academic professional/research track faculty members, a mid-term review following appointment is mandatory in the College. This evaluation 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 or promotion decision. Mid-term review ensures that faculty members have a clear understanding of their current status and progress. This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible; a minimal mid-term review would include dossier items contributed by the candidate and would be reviewed at the Department and College levels by appropriate faculty committees as well as the Department Head and Dean to provide input into the formal mid-term review process.

Mandatory mid-term review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review (at the Department Head’s discretion). All items and acknowledgements mentioned in the annual review must be incorporated into the mid-term review unless already stated in a separate annual review.

Department Heads should meet with mid-term review candidates in the early part of the calendar year to discuss the mid-term review process. To conduct the review, the following items must be provided by the candidate:

- A brief statement (no more than 3 pages) on the faculty member’s accomplishments, goals, and philosophies in teaching, research, and service
- A course evaluation summary
- An up-to-date *curriculum vitae* (CV)
- Copies of two of the faculty member’s most significant papers published while at Texas A&M University

External recommendation letters are not required for the mid-term review. Following submission

of the materials by the candidate, the departmental review committee (DRC) will review each case and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Head. The sequence of evaluation is the same as the tenure process that includes DRC recommendation, Department Head evaluation, College Review Committee (CRC) recommendation, and the Dean's evaluation. Separate evaluation of each area (scholarship, teaching, service, and academic citizenship) as well as an overall assessment must be provided. The DRC and CRC should not merely list the accomplishments of the candidate, but rather, these committees should provide a written rationale as to why the candidate is or is not on track for tenure or promotion. The committee should also furnish what the candidate can do to improve performance. Subsequently, the CRC will provide its recommendation to the Dean, and the Dean completes the evaluation process and prepares a final written report to the candidate. The Department Head meets the candidates to discuss the final written report and recommendation. Candidates will acknowledge receipt of their final evaluation by signing the document. The signed copy will be retained in the faculty member's file.

## **9. POST-TENURE REVIEW**

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, the College expects tenured faculty to perform satisfactorily in academic endeavors of teaching; research, scholarship, service, collegiality, and other assigned responsibilities (*e.g.*, administration, program coordinator, department head, *etc.*) throughout their career. Academic load requirement on these assignments may be modified but should not be reduced to zero in any category. A decrease in expectation in one category should be matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another category. However, volume of work does not equate to quality.

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution. The evaluation should be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching; research, scholarship, service, and other assigned responsibilities, and must include peer review of the faculty member. The expectations of faculty at the periodic peer review must be aligned with the expectations established by the faculty and Department Head.

Post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and periodic review applies to non-tenure professional track faculty members. The reviews will be conducted in accordance with University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01.

The post-tenure and periodic reviews are 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 is comprised of annual performance reviews by the Department Head, as well as a review by a committee of peers that occurs not less frequently than once every six years. For both tenured and professional track faculty members, a promotion in rank through a review by the DRC or CRC is considered a successful post-tenure/periodic review.

Professional track faculty members whose salaries are paid by grants and contracts awarded to principal investigators are exempt from periodic review under these guidelines, and instead are

evaluated annually by their direct supervisor.

**a. Peer Review**

The purpose of the Peer Review is to:

- i. Assess whether the individual is making substantial academic contributions with behavior consistent with those expected of a tenured faculty member;
- ii. Provide guidance for meaningful continued faculty development;
- iii. Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals
- iv. Refocus academic and professional efforts and behaviors, when appropriate.

**The following guidelines regarding post-tenure and periodic review apply to the College:**

The Peer Review Committee (PRC) for tenured faculty members will consist of five tenured faculty members at the same rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. The PRC for professional track faculty members will consist of professional track faculty members at the same rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. If there are an insufficient number of faculty members of the department to form a complete PRC, the balance of the PRC will consist of appropriate faculty members from other Health Science Center colleges and schools selected by the faculty members on the committee.

Faculty members being reviewed will provide the PRC with a current curriculum vitae and a statement on current service, teaching, scholarship, and patient care if applicable. All faculty members must submit appropriate documentation of effectiveness and excellence in teaching consistent with the portion of their effort dedicated to teaching. Each department will determine what documentation is necessary for faculty members with varying proportions of teaching responsibilities. The documentation must be submitted by the faculty member to the committee no later than March 1.

The PRC will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's activities for the Department Head, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of academic citizenship, service, teaching, scholarship, and patient care if appropriate, as well as an overall evaluation. This review will be submitted to the Department Head no later than May 1. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the College of Pharmacy Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

- v. If all the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to post-tenure or periodic peer review again in six years or following an unsatisfactory annual evaluation by the Department Head, whichever is earlier.
- vi. A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the College guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- vii. A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the College guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- viii. A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the Department Head and the faculty member.



For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department, the Department Head will share the report with the Department Head of the secondary department. By no later than May 31, each department will provide to the Dean of the College 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.

#### **b. Professional Development Review**

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review or upon request of the faculty member. 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 and approval of the Dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (*e.g.*, serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.

The purposes of a 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.

The Professional Development Review will be conducted by a three-person *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 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.

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 a minimum the faculty member’s current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, service, and patient care if appropriate.

The Department Head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems 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.

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

1. No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, Department Head, and Dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the *ad hoc* committee report.
2. Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan.
3. Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, Department Head, and Dean. The faculty member, review committee, and Department Head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” acceptable to the Dean.

### **c. Professional Development Plan**

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (measured against stated departmental criteria developed under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the Department Head, and the Dean, and should reflect mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the College. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of, and in consultation with, the faculty member. It is the faculty member’s obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

- i. Identify specific deficiencies to be addressed
- ii. Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies
- iii. Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes
- iv. Set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes
- v. Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan
- vi. Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan

1. Assessment. The faculty member and Department Head will meet regularly to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and to the Dean. Evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (*e.g.*, annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals in the Professional Development Plan.

2. Plan Completion. When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the Professional Development Plan, the Department Head shall make a final report to the faculty member and Dean. The successful completion of the Professional Development Plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the University.

If, after consulting with the review committee, the Department Head and Dean agree that the

faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the Professional Development Plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

d. Appeal

If at any point during the procedure, the faculty member believes the provisions of this procedure are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4, *Faculty Grievance 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, and the Dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final.

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.

If the faculty member, Department Head, 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.

e. 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.

## 10. FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS

University Rule 31.08.01.M0.02, *Faculty Emeritus Status* 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 emeritus status. For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see System Regulation 31.08.01, *Granting of Emeritus Status to Faculty and Staff*, which indicates the process for this situation.

The Dean of Faculties website (<http://dof.tamu.edu/>) should be consulted for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

The intent of these guidelines and procedures is to supplement the University documents listed below and provide specific information for the College:

- University Rule 12.01.99.M2, *University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion*
- Dean of Faculties document: Promotion and Tenure Packages, Submission Guidelines (updated annually)
- University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01, *Post-Tenure Review, Standard Administrative Procedure*
- University Rule 31.08.01.M0.02, *Faculty Emeritus Status*
- System Regulation 31.08.01, *Granting of Emeritus Status to Faculty and Staff*
- Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles