



Texas A&M University at Galveston

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

OFFICE OF FOUNDATIONAL SCIENCES

Contact: Dr. Melanie Moser
Director of Foundational Sciences
200 Seawolf Parkway, Bldg. 3034, MAIN 403
Galveston, TX 77554
Tel: (409) 740-4517 / moserm@tamug.edu
<http://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/>

Revised: November-December 2020
Reviewed by Department Faculty: April 13, 2021
Approved by Chief Academic Officer, TAMUG: April 2021
Approved by Dean of Faculties of TAMU: April 16, 2021
Next Scheduled Review: March 31, 2025



Foundational Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

1. Introduction

These guidelines outline the Foundational Sciences (FSCI) Department's methods of governance for conducting the affairs of the Faculty and the Head of the Department. The bylaws reflect a belief that the responsibility for effective departmental governance rests with both the Faculty and the Department Head (DH) and that effective governance depends on the exercise of responsible leadership by the Faculty and the Head in their appropriate roles. Further, these guidelines shall be implemented with strict adherence to academic freedom, due process, and equal opportunity. The Department is committed to creating a department and campus climate that values diversity and internationalization. Thus, appointments, hiring, promotion, and tenure shall be decided solely on the basis of professional qualifications without regard to such considerations as sex, color, national origin, religion, political affiliation, sexual orientation, disability, and veteran status. Texas A&M has a Veteran's Preference policy; this means that if two applicants are finalists for a position, and equal in all respects, the veteran would be offered the job. Additional rules relating to hiring and recruitment of veterans are explained at the website of the Texas A&M Division of Human Resources & Organizational Effectiveness.

The mission of the Texas A&M University at Galveston's Department of Foundational Sciences is to:

- offer a University Studies Degree with a concentration in Oceans and One Health;
- provide undergraduate students at TAMUG an introduction to mathematics, physics, chemistry, and statistics as a foundation for their degree programs at TAMUG or TAMU;
- carry out original research and to advance discovery and understanding in the various fields of knowledge found within the Department;
- provide research experiences for students in the above noted program and disciplines as well as related programs at TAMU; and
- promote an academic community for whom common goals and a spirit of cooperation are important while bringing order by defining the rights and duties of the members of the Department.

Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

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

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

| TITLE | LINK |
|--|---|
| 12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure | https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/ |
| 12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I | https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/ |
| 12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review | https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/ |
| Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review | https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines |
| Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually) | https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure |

Should any part of the Department of Foundational Sciences’ Bylaws, Guidelines and Procedures be in conflict with rules of TAMUG, TAMU, or the State of Texas, those policies and procedures take precedence over the Department’s. These Department’s Guidelines and Procedures, hence, need to be updated periodically to keep them consistent with the guidelines from the Office of Dean of Faculties (DOF) at TAMU and Chief Academic Officer (CAO) at TAMUG. Please also refer to the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines which supplements this document (<https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html>).

1.1. Faculty Expectations and Responsibilities

The expectations of the Department of Foundational Sciences for its faculty are that they continually striving for impactful contributions in teaching, in service to the department, University and to their profession, and for tenured and tenure track Faculty to establish and maintain sustainable scholarship productivity that leads, at minimum, to a national reputation in their area. What sustainability means for different fields will be different in terms of absolute resources required to allow Faculty to maintain an active output in their discipline. The criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor differ in degree and emphasis as described in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), “*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.*”

The mandatory mid-term reviews and the annual evaluations are expected to evaluate the contributions to our undergraduate and graduate teaching programs, research, scholarly or creative activities, and engagement. Specifically, the impact of faculty members’ activities on academic endeavors needs to be demonstrated. Faculty are also expected to engage in civil discourse with their colleagues, staff, and students, contribute to the common goals of their department or division and respect the decision-making processes of the University.

1.2. Departmental Expectations and Responsibilities

Department Heads are primarily responsible for ensuring that the University and the department of Foundational Sciences’ guidelines are followed so that each faculty member receives a fair and timely assessment of their accomplishments and performance. The overall purpose of these guidelines is to ensure the integrity of the annual evaluations, mid-term review, promotion and tenure process, and post-tenure review to retain and promote the best faculty possible. Within these overall guidelines, it is specifically noted that the departmental practices may differ from other campus departments because of variations in department size, the nature of the department faculty, the degree of inter/multidisciplinary activity, and academic mission. These departmental guidelines should

be reviewed regularly to ensure compliance with System Policy, University Rules, and College guidelines while achieving departmental objectives.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks, and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). The categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title are described below.

2.1. Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty

Faculty with titles of Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor will be expected to achieve impactful performances in these three areas:

- 2.1.1. Teaching
- 2.1.2. Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities
- 2.1.3. Service

2.2. Academic Professional Track Faculty

Faculty with titles of [Adjective] Professor, [Adjective] Associate Professor and [Adjective] Assistant Professor will be expected to achieve impactful performances in two of these three areas:

- 2.2.1. Teaching
- 2.2.2. Service
- 2.2.3. Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities

Academic Professional Track Faculty support as a priority the teaching mission of the university. Most will contribute to the service activities as the second dimension of their responsibilities. In rare cases and with the approval of the department head and CAO, an exception to the service requirement may be made for those Academic Professional Track faculty assigned to conduct research, scholarly or creative activities.

2.3 Lecturers and Adjuncts

Faculty with titles of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer will be expected to achieve impactful performances in this area:

- 2.3.1. Teaching

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

(Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Section 4.4.1)

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

The nature of evaluation of university faculty is such that the human element is essential in a comprehensive and fair procedure, and the faculty peer input assists greatly in this task. It is nevertheless reasonable and beneficial to attempt to delineate specific examples of positive performance in each area. The following descriptions and lists are

in no way intended to be exhaustive or complete but should clearly convey the nature and expectations of satisfactory performance.

3.1 Teaching

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

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

A commitment to excellence in teaching is an expectation of all faculty, no matter the track. This category includes classroom and laboratory instruction, courses that provide experiential learning, development of new courses and teaching methods, including the development or expansion of electronic delivery of course content, academic advising (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate), supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, clinical supervision, and mentoring. Additional criteria and rubrics of assessment are found in [Appendix III Evidence Supporting Performance in Teaching](#). Each Department will need to identify the criteria used in its evaluation guidelines and disseminate this information clearly (e.g., departmental website) and repeatedly (e.g., beginning of each academic year to all faculty in the department).

The Teaching section will document the faculty member's teaching accomplishments for the period of review. Publication of instructional material and development of methods that improve the curriculum are both desired and meritorious. Faculty members shall be permitted to respond to or qualify written comments provided by students in course evaluation forms. The Faculty will thus be provided with these comments prior to the deadline for which the review report is due (annual evaluation, P&T review, PTR).

- 3.1.1 "Courses Taught" covers all courses with classroom contact hours taught at Texas A&M University at Galveston. The TAMU instrument used to assess student perceptions will be used by all faculty members in all courses, each semester. The Department Head will compare assessments by students in comparable courses and subject matters as one aspect of the evaluation. For example, graduate and undergraduate, required and elective, laboratory and didactic or seminar settings should all be factored into the assessment process and may provide important contextual information. Additional contextual information can include the number of courses taught, the size of the class(es), the access or not to grading teaching assistants in large classes, and overall comparison to core curriculum if the course taught is itself in the core.
- 3.1.2. Tools of instruction such as syllabi, assignments, examinations, & grading methods, should also be assessed and may be included in the evaluation. Departments should specify in departmental evaluation guidelines, how many of these artifacts are to be gathered for each level of the review.
- 3.1.3. Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness may be considered in the period of review. In such a case, each department needs to define (in its bylaws and evaluation guidelines) the process for using peer evaluations in the review. Bylaws should be specific in identifying criteria (e.g., rubrics) and goals if the

course observations were based on specific standards (e.g., [Classroom Observation Feedback Form](#)), what should the frequency of the observations be, and who the appropriate "peer evaluators" are. Examples of rubrics for teaching evaluations can be found in [Appendix III](#).

- 3.1.4. Awards from organizations from within and outside the department, TAMUG, and TAMU might be used to substantiate excellence in teaching.
- 3.1.5. Other evidence of excellence could include teaching portfolios, student success in achieving learning outcomes, experimentation with and use of pedagogical approaches to improve student learning and success, responsiveness to student and peer evaluations, publication of instructional materials, evidence of both professional development in teaching and associated improvements, evidence generated by standardized peer evaluation, and involvement with continuing education.
- 3.1.6. Undergraduate and/or graduate students supervised: documents undergraduate or graduate student committee assignments. Indicate whether responsibility is a chair (C) or member of (M) the student's committee, and whether the committee is part of the A&M system or another institution of higher learning. Excellence in student mentoring (as a chair or member of a student committee) can be documented by the successes of the student mentees, which includes quality and quantity of trainee-authored publications, job placement, and time to degree.
- 3.1.7. Other courses taught: recognizes the development of, or participation in, recognized programs for continuing education, short courses, or special workshops. Written assessments by participants are required. Funding support agency (if any) should be identified. Documented national /international recognition or adoption of program by professional society, state agency is also desirable.
- 3.1.8. Teaching innovations such as the development of innovative teaching methods and materials (textbooks, software, new curricula, etc.) should be documented. Any of the following would indicate a contribution: creation and teaching of a new course, adoption by other professors of methods/materials developed during the prior year, contributions to campus-wide programs, such as the Student Success Initiative, that improve connections across the curriculum and supports student success (e.g. decreased DFQ, increased success of underrepresented minority students, contribution to cohort mentoring, increased retention), the introduction or further development of courses or course materials which explicitly incorporate international, interdisciplinary, or multicultural perspectives, high-impact teaching practices, and/or positive review of these methods/materials appearing in respected publications.
- 3.1.9. Invited Lectures: include invitations to teach at outside academic institutions. Normally an invitation from a distinguished institution would constitute a contribution. Combinations of numerous invitations are valued.

3.2. Research, scholarly activity, or creative work:

For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative or professional activity. Engineering technology, fiction, poetry, and dance are examples. Faculty members must document scholarly activities, including works in progress, and clearly identify the impact this scholarship has on their respective field. Refer to [Appendix IV](#) for further details regarding the Evidence Supporting Performance in Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities.

Experts in the same or related disciplines must make decisions about the quality or merit of scholarly and creative work. Peer review is essential. A book or article written but unpublished, an artwork completed but not juried, or the rendering of professional collaboration and consultation not subject to peer recognition is less significant in this category. Examples of the creation, influence, and dissemination of the ideas/work must be documented.

- 3.2.1. Publications include: publications in refereed journals, conferences, and/or leading professional journals; the publication of scholarly books, conference proceedings, and/or chapters in scholarly books; monographs, publication of professional projects; technical reports, including those to a granting agency; patents; publications of open-source material will bear more weight if peer-reviewed and from leading open-source publishers; acknowledgment of creative work through selection as a subject for a published article, inclusion in an exhibition catalogue, or descriptions in a curator's statement; and creative work included in a public or private collection, invited exhibition, traveling exhibition, screening, or broadcast. The essence of this section is that intellectual work and its by-products are subject to external peer review. The intent of this dimension is that the dissemination of intellectual work products leads to impact on the field, which itself is evaluated through citation and reference from members of the intellectual community and others. Candidates must explain the quality, productivity over time, and impact of their research, scholarly or creative work. They should also present how the different elements of productivity create a cohesive body of work that influences the field of scholarship. In the case of multiple authorships and/or multidisciplinary work (publications, research grants, creative work, etc.), candidates should clearly identify the level of their own contributions to the overall project (e.g., percent of total work performed/led by candidate).
- 3.2.2. Showings of creative work in design development or visual and performing arts includes engineering design development; presentation of artistic work in juried or judged venues; inclusion of works in refereed or juried catalogs or collections, or in other invited exhibitions; public forums, screenings, or broadcasts; and acknowledgement of creative work through selection as a subject for a published article, exhibit catalog, or curator's statement; show awards, or other forms of external recognition.
- 3.2.3. Funded research includes recognition of the receipt of external resources for scholarly and creative activities and/or evidence of completed, peer reviewed research activities. External resources might include, but would not be limited to, fellowships, contracts, or research grants. The status of any research work in progress should be stated. Identification of funding sources (particularly from Federal granting agencies) must be included.
- 3.2.4. Affiliations include potential activities of a research center/laboratory at TAMUG/TAMU, or a similar research entity not affiliated with TAMUG/TAMU.
- 3.2.5. Other recognition, may include but is not limited to, juried peer awards by professional societies or national/international groups, refereed non-published presentations, editorship of a refereed journal, member of an editorial board, editorship of a professional journal, lead organizer of special symposium/session at national/international conferences, invited keynote address at conference or organizational meeting, technology transfer/patent, membership as judge/critic for national/international organization, or reviewer for competitions, grants, publications, expert witness, invited exhibition curator, and external peer reviewer for a funding agency or tenure/promotion review for another university. These activities can demonstrate the faculty member's standing within the discipline but may be appropriately designated as service activities in some disciplines.

3.3 Service

This includes service to the institution—to students, colleagues, department, TAMUG, TAMU, and TAMUS—as well as service to the profession/field beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large. Refer to [Appendix V](#) for further details regarding Evidence Supporting Performance in Service.

A variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of our goals of pre-eminence through service to the institution, students, colleagues, professional societies, governmental agencies, and to the public at large. In each case an important consideration is service that results in the creation of ideas, the influence of ideas, and the dissemination of ideas. Quality and impact of service is expected from each member of the faculty. Service is typically the active participation in professional or community organization(s) or other bodies that utilize a faculty

member's professional expertise in their field, as an educator and scholar. The University values both internal and external service, which may include:

- 3.3.1. Advising students at the undergraduate level at or beyond the expectations of regular academic advising of faculty to students is noteworthy.
- 3.3.2. Demonstrated supervisory responsibilities in official departmental or university leadership position.
- 3.3.3. Faculty membership and service on System, University, TAMUG, or departmental committees, or the Faculty Senate. Part of impactful service is a commitment to the responsibilities of being a productive member of the university/department and acting with civility and collegiality towards other members of the university community (e.g., stepping up when needed, following through and meeting expectations on assigned tasks).
- 3.3.4. Administrative performance as evaluated over time and including written assessments concerning vision, new initiative, and programmatic development. Includes demonstrated accomplishments at the departmental, TAMUG, or TAMU level. Higher ranks are expected to demonstrate significant professional service such as leadership in their professional organization, editorial board memberships, grant review panels, national taskforce, or review panels (e.g., NRC reports), international organizations, etc.
- 3.3.5. Demonstrated leadership service on a governmental commission task force, standing committee, council, or board. Holding an office in or serving as a member of a regional, national, or international society, professional organization, or accreditation board. Being the primary organizer of a program for regional, national, or international meetings is considered to have value.
- 3.3.6. External development activity that contributes to TAMUG or Departmental goals such as fundraising, endowments, scholarships, Professorships, service to the larger professional community, etc.
- 3.3.7. Participation in the following activities would be considered a contribution: (1) serving on discipline appropriate editorial boards, (2) judge or critic for national/international competitions, and/or (3) ad hoc reviewer for competitions, grants, journals, or contract funding agencies.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

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

4.1. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching include, but not are limited to:

- 4.1.1. Selection for a university, college, or professional society award;
- 4.1.2. Development of transformational and/or high impact experiences offered to students (field work, study abroad, hand-on experiences) and recognized by students, employers/graduate advisors, peers, and professional organizations;
- 4.1.3. Recognition of pedagogical scholarship by national organizations (invited talks and peer-reviewed articles on the development of best practices);
- 4.1.4. Evidence of outstanding performance at a rigorous and challenging level;
- 4.1.5. Evidence of teaching innovation recognized through production of pedagogical software/hardware development;
- 4.1.6. Outstanding performance evaluations;
- 4.1.7. Development of innovative organizational methods and materials;
- 4.1.8. Evidence of creative professional practice; and

4.1.9. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced performance.

4.2. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching include, but are not limited to:

- 4.2.1. Development of practice having significant effect on the institutional program of TAMU and TAMUG;
- 4.2.2. Development of innovative pedagogical practices;
- 4.2.3. High achievements of students in certification exams;
- 4.2.4. Placement in graduate/professional programs or career
- 4.2.5. Member of graduate student advisory committees;
- 4.2.6. Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and other instructional accomplishments;
- 4.2.7. Participation in establishing objectives and planning, organizing, and coordinating operations;
- 4.2.8. Accepting responsibility or assuming leadership in educational mission(s) of university;
- 4.2.9. Self-development activities leading to enhanced performance.

4.3. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but are not limited to:

- 4.3.1. Publication of scholarly book(s) of highest quality, including library reference works;
- 4.3.2. Publication of scholarship or peer-reviewed creative work in leading refereed journals;
- 4.3.3. Receiving major fellowship or research awards;
- 4.3.4. Frequent citation of publications;
- 4.3.5. Significant self-development activities that earn membership in a major professional organization at the Senior or Distinguished level (e.g., National Academy of Science, Engineering and Medicine);
- 4.3.6. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal;
- 4.3.7. Significant teaching dissemination activities such as invited lecturing at other institutions in field(s) of expertise;
- 4.3.8. Member of review panel for national research agency;
- 4.3.9. Chair of review panel for other research institutions.
- 4.3.10. Presentation of invited papers at national and international meetings;
- 4.3.11. Invited keynote speaker at a professional conference in field(s) of expertise;
- 4.3.12. Substantive participation on externally funded grant programs;
- 4.3.13. Receiving significant external research funding relative to the candidate's discipline.

4.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:

- 4.4.1. Publications in refereed journals;
- 4.4.2. Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals, tenure and promotion review at peer institutions, or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research and/or professional organizations;
- 4.4.3. Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book;
- 4.4.4. Editor of a monograph or special issue;
- 4.4.5. Presentation of papers at national, regional, and state meetings of appropriate disciplines;
- 4.4.6. Publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings;
- 4.4.7. Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals;
- 4.4.8. Preparation of grant proposals or principal investigator status of funded grants;
- 4.4.9. Contributions to externally funded research activities (Co-PI);
- 4.4.10. Evaluative publications, such as book reviews, abstracts, and annotated bibliographies;
- 4.4.11. Presentation of poster sessions at national, regional, or state meetings.

4.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:

- 4.5.1. Officer in a national professional organization;
- 4.5.2. Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board;
- 4.5.3. Administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University;
- 4.5.4. Program chair or similar chair at a national meeting;
- 4.5.5. Officer of Faculty Senate;
- 4.5.6. Chair of a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee.

4.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:

- 4.6.1. Committee chair of national professional associations;
- 4.6.2. Officer in regional or state professional associations;
- 4.6.3. Program or local arrangements committee chair for regional or state professional organization meeting;
- 4.6.4. Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate;
- 4.6.5. Service on University, college, and Libraries committees and task forces;
- 4.6.6. Service as a consultant to other universities, libraries, businesses, or governmental agencies;
- 4.6.7. Advisor to student organizations;
- 4.6.8. Administrative roles within academic departments or Libraries;
- 4.6.9. Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness;
- 4.6.10. Committee membership and participation in international, national, regional, state, and local organizations;
- 4.6.11. Service to evaluate for promotion or tenure of faculty at other institutions;
- 4.6.12. Participation in outreach activities (e.g., judge for the Galveston County Science & Engineering Fair);
- 4.6.13. Organize a campus activity (e.g., Math Olympiad)

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

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

Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

Tenure is granted to recognize demonstrated leadership and impact in a research field nationally and a demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and outreach/service. Promotion to Professor is granted for national/international leadership and impact in a research field and demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and service. In exceptional and rare cases, national/international leadership, and impact to teaching and service can be a basis for promotion from associate to full professor (see [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#)).

Most faculty members should be evaluated for tenure and/or promotion on accomplishments in each of the three dimensions of performance, but with primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research, scholarship, or creative activities, as well as teaching activities. Each Department should clearly indicate in their bylaws and/or evaluation guidelines what are the standards of expectation of impact in each dimension. It is the candidate's

responsibility to make a statement of impact, and the Department Review Committee's responsibility to evaluate the candidate's impact statement and discuss it in the context of external reviewer letters, the department's stated expectations, and standards of impact.

The Department of Foundational Sciences subscribes to the position that although quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence in performance is of primary importance; that is, quality, significance, and impact of accomplishments are of much greater importance than numbers. For tenure and/or promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected.

Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The promotional criteria for the Galveston Campus are as articulated below.

5.1.1. Assistant Professor:

During their probationary period, the work of Assistant Professors is expected to display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. At the point of their mandatory mid-term review, they will need to show effectiveness in all three dimensions of their dossier, and a clear trajectory of acceleration towards establishing a productive pattern of scholarly and creative activities and publications.

5.1.2.1. Is the candidate effective in the dimensions of research, teaching, and service missions of the Department and the University?

5.1.2.2. If applicable, is the candidate developing, during the mid-term period, a research program that suggests sustainability in terms of extramural funding and support for graduate students by the end of the probationary period?

5.1.2. Associate Professor:

Promotion to Associate Professor and the awarding of tenure occur concurrently. Granting of promotion and tenure will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions. At the conclusion of their mandatory review period, Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and service, and to achieve the first measures of excellence in scholarly and creative activities. The following questions should guide the review.

5.1.2.1 Has the candidate contributed successfully to the research, teaching, and service missions of Foundational Sciences and the University?

5.1.2.2 Has the candidate achieved substantial national and/or international recognition in the research of another form of research or creative activity in his/her chosen field(s), or has shown significant evidence to do so in the near future?

5.1.2.3 If applicable, had the candidate developed, in the probationary period, a research program that is sustainable in terms of extramural funding and support for graduate students?

5.1.3 Professor:

The requirements for promotion to Professor in Foundational Sciences recognize the University's minimum requirements of completion of all requirements expected of an Associate Professor and superior accomplishment (excellence) in research/creative activities and a high level of ability in teaching and service. Professors are also expected to demonstrate outstanding merit in the pursuit of excellence and national/international prominence. By itself, administrative experience is insufficient as a justification for promotion to the rank of Professor. However,

extraordinary service in the dimension should be positively taken into consideration in the promotion review. The following questions should guide the review.

- 5.1.3.1. Has the candidate successfully developed a leadership role in the research, teaching, and service missions of Foundational Sciences and the University, recognized at national to international levels?
- 5.1.3.2. Is the candidate recognized by their peers as a leading scholar in their chosen field(s), or has shown significant evidence to do so in the near future?
- 5.1.3.3. If applicable, has the candidate developed, since their last promotion, a research program that is sustainable in terms of extramural finding and shown evidence of successful graduate student supervision?

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

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

Most faculty members should be evaluated for promotion on accomplishments in two of the three dimensions of performance, with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching activities. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a statement of impact, and Foundational Sciences Review Committee's responsibility to evaluate the candidate's impact statement and discuss it in the context of our department's stated expectations and standard of impact.

TAMUG subscribes to the position that although quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence in performance is of primary importance; that is, quality, significance, and impact of accomplishments are of much greater importance than numbers. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected. The criteria for the Foundational Sciences are as articulated below.

5.2.1. Lecturers/Senior Lecturers:

Lecturers are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2. The quality and impact of teaching activities will be given primary emphasis for the granting of promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers are expected, at a minimum, to maintain effectiveness in instruction/teaching at TAMUG and/or TAMU. The granting of promotion to Senior Lecturer will demonstrate, over time, excellence, and effectiveness in instruction/teaching.

5.2.2. [Adjective] Assistant Professors:

[Adjective] Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a productive pattern of service contributions to the department and/or TAMUG and TAMU. The granting of promotion to [Adjective] Assistant Professor (from a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer position) will be based on an assessment of the quality and impact of prior teaching activities and contributions to service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). This would include a pattern over time of excellence and effectiveness in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of effectiveness in service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible.

5.2.3. [Adjective] Associate Professors:

The granting of promotion to [Adjective] Associate Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three dimensions of performance, with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching activities. This would include a pattern over time of excellence and impact in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of effectiveness in service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). [Adjective] Associate Professors are expected to be highly effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a significant pattern of service contributions to the University and/or national professional organizations. The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible.

5.2.4. [Adjective] Professor:

The granting of promotion to [Adjective] Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three major categories of performance, with a primary emphasis on the high quality and impact of their teaching activities. This would include a pattern over time of excellence and impact in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of significant service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible.

5.3. Scheduling

Timelines and schedules of activities are determined by guidelines issued by the Office of the Dean of Faculties. For details, consult the Dean of Faculties website. Also, refer to Appendix I and Appendix II in this document for an overview of the P&T process.

A faculty member is entitled to early consideration for promotion and/or tenure at her/his own request. Any faculty member who wishes to initiate early consideration for tenure shall so notify the Department Head in writing no later than April 15 of the spring semester preceding the academic year in which the faculty member wishes to be considered (e.g., if the Faculty member wants to be considered in AY21-22, they need to notify their Department Head prior to April 15, 2021).

Faculty members undergoing early promotion and/or tenure consideration shall be considered together with the tenure cohort of the year of tenure consideration commencing in May following the request.

A faculty member whose application for early promotion and/or tenure has been unsuccessful shall be considered again in their mandatory year of tenure consideration.

5.4 Department Review Committee

5.4.1. Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

- 5.4.1.1. In each department, stated criteria for rating faculty performance in promotion and/or tenure review may be established by departmental faculty, with approval by the Department Head, the CAO, and Dean of Faculties. These criteria should define discipline-appropriate expectations for impact and productivity in categories of teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, service; and other assigned responsibilities.

- 5.4.1.2. In the absence of departmental guidelines, the following guidelines for P&T review will apply. Each Department will use a Committee of the Whole to perform mid-term and promotional reviews of tenured and tenure-track faculty on Galveston Campus. The Committee of the Whole consists of all tenured faculty at or above the rank sought by the individual seeking promotion and is referred to as the “Department Review Committee” in these evaluation guidelines. In the event that a Department Review Committee cannot be formed at the department level, a committee can consist of tenured faculty from the Galveston Campus and potentially a tenured faculty member from College Station representing the field of study of the faculty member being evaluated.
- 5.4.1.3. Faculty on a Professional Development Plan are not eligible to serve on the Committee of the Whole or any other Committees related to Tenure & Promotion or Post-Tenure Review. If rank holders are not available in the department, then the Department Head will choose faculty member(s) beyond the department or campus as necessary to include at least 5 members in the committee; these appointments are subject to approval by the CAO. If 2 or more candidates in a Department, going through the same rank review, require a similar external committee member(s), then the external committee member(s) will need to agree to review all dossiers under consideration. Exclusions of eligible faculty members from the Committee of the Whole are not permitted except when the faculty has a conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., spouse).
- 5.4.1.4. In cases where the Committee of the Whole is larger than 5 faculty, the Department Head will appoint a sub-committee to form the Department Review Committee, and its Chair (5 total Faculty). The sub-committee and the sub-committee Chair will be appointed for one year, and the Department Head will review sub-committee appointments every year in the spring. The responsibility of the sub-committee is to prepare and review the dossiers for the individual(s) seeking tenure and/or promotion. The sub-committee Chair or the Department Head will solicit letters from outside reviewers. Members of the sub-committee will collect the relevant materials from the department and from the candidate(s), will prepare the reports on teaching; research, scholarly or creative activities; and service, and will make sure the dossier is properly assembled. The sub-committee Chair will lead the writing of the report and will forward the report to the Committee of the Whole for review. The sub-committee Chair will revise the report based on Committee of the Whole comments to reflect the views and opinions of all voting members. The revised report will be open to a vote by the Committee of the Whole. The Chair of the sub-committee will then revise the report to incorporate the Committee of the Whole vote. The sub-committee Chair will then forward the revised report to the Department Head for review. The Department Head will then write her/his own assessment of the performance.
- 5.4.1.5. When only 5 or fewer faculty are eligible to be on the Committee of the Whole, then that group of Faculty constitutes the Department Review Committee with the same roles and responsibilities of the sub-committee described above. See also section 5.4.1.2. for adding external faculty to the Department Review Committee.
- 5.4.1.6. No committee member shall serve at more than one level of the promotion consideration process (e.g., Department and College Review Committees) in the same year of tenure consideration.
- 5.4.1.7. Selection of external reviewers’ letters should be performed according to the University guidelines as outlined in Section IV of the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (available on the Dean of Faculties website). Briefly, the department should aim to include 5 to 7 letters from external reviewers. The minimum number of letters required is 5. External reviewers should be from peer institutions or better, but letters from other clear academic leaders in the field are also acceptable with appropriate justification. Where the stature of an institution, program, or individual is not obvious, include an

explanation of why the program and/or reviewer is appropriate. For example, an institution of lower reputation than Texas A&M may have one of the strongest programs in the candidate's field or the individual may be thought a leader in the field (usually identified with prestigious awards or other clear indicators of intellectual leadership). Although letters may be requested from outstanding individuals outside of academia, the file should still include at least three letters from individuals in peer programs/universities. External reviewers should come from different institutions, with a predominance from U.S. institutions. **IMPORTANT:** Include a list of the department's peer and aspiring institutions if other than AAU-level institutions, and the basis for the selection. It is recommended that an equal number of letters be solicited for all candidates. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers.

5.4.1.8. The candidate may also provide a list of those who should not be consulted by completing the External Reviewer Candidate Checklist. The Department Head or Department Review Committee also provides a list of possible reviewers using the External Reviewer Department Checklist. The Department Review Committee will select a group of at least seven external reviewers from the two lists. The Department Review Committee Chair or the Department Head will then contact the external reviewers (after CAO approval under item 5.4.1.9. below). The committee should ensure that a mix of letters are solicited - some suggested by the candidate and some by the Department. Clearly indicate on the External Reviewer Chart who suggested which reviewers, which requested letters were and were not received. All requested letters that are received must be included in the dossier.

5.4.1.9. Prior to moving forward contacting the external reviewers, the Department Head will seek approval for the selected list from the CAO in late spring (at the latest in early summer) using the External Reviewers Request Excel spreadsheet. The CAO will review the list and may include external reviewers that better match the Tier I peer institutions of Texas A&M University. After approval of the final list of reviewers, the department review committee Chair or the Department Head will contact them to request their service with the P&T review process. The External Reviewer Solicitation Letter template must be used. Any changes to the letter template to better represent a particular discipline must be reviewed and approved by the CAO and Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

5.4.2. Academic Professional Track Faculty

Similar to the TT/T Faculty P&T Review process, each Department will use a Committee of the Whole to perform promotional reviews of academic professional track faculty on the Galveston Campus. The Committee of the Whole consists of all tenured and APT faculty at or above the rank sought by the individual seeking promotion and is known as the "Department Review Committee" in these evaluation guidelines. In the event that a Department Review Committee cannot be formed at the department level, a committee can consist of Senior APT faculty from the Galveston Campus and potentially a senior APT faculty member from College Station representing the field of study of the faculty member being evaluated. All guidelines cited in Section 5.4.1. above apply, with the exception of requiring evaluation letters from external reviewers. The committee should include at least one APT faculty at the same or higher rank.

5.5. Dossier Preparation

All Faculty candidates are required to submit a dossier for promotion according to the provisions and schedule determined by University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines issued by the Office of the Dean of Faculties. With the exception of the tenure and promotion review for TT Assistant Professors, which has a set mandatory review timeline, the decision to submit one's dossier for consideration for promotion from tenured Associate Professor to

Professor and for all APT Faculty should be made by an individual in consultation with their Department Head. The Department Head establishes a Department Review Committee for the individual in accordance with the established departmental evaluation guidelines. The Department Review Committee should meet with the candidates for promotion during the Spring semester of the year in which they wish to be considered, or as soon as possible after the announcement of the schedule for the promotion process for that cycle is announced by the Dean of Faculties, to assist them in developing the supporting documentation for their dossier, their vitae, and their statements concerning teaching; research, scholarly or creative activity; and service.

5.6. Dossier Evaluation

It is a shared responsibility of the Department Review Committee, in consultation with the Department Head, to solicit statements and data from the candidate, external reviewers, former students, TAMUG peers, etc., as appropriate, as explained above. It is then the Department Review Committee's responsibility to review these statements concerning the quality of the candidate's teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities, service, and other activities, based on the dossier that the candidate presents, that will be forwarded through subsequent levels of the review process. The type of information contained in the tenure and/or promotion dossier is mandated in University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and the Dean of Faculties website. The responsibility for the objective analysis of the individual candidate is first that of the Department Review Committee. The Department Review Committee must provide specific, concrete statements based upon documented evidence and peer review to substantiate their recommendations. These recommendations must be consistent with the evidence of performance and impact of all levels of activities as documented in the dossier.

5.7. Role and Responsibility of the Individual Faculty Member in the Review Process

The ultimate responsibility for assuring that all pertinent materials are supplied to the Department Review Committee lies with the faculty member being considered for tenure and/or promotion (herein, "the candidate"). The candidate must explain to the Department Review Committee, and provide evidence of, the significance and impact of their teaching; research, scholarly or creative activity; and service contributions. Candidates should consult with their Department Head and review the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and the Dean of Faculties website for the materials they should collect. Candidates should also be considering potential external reviewers, persons who are familiar with the field in which she/he is working and whose credentials qualify them to evaluate the candidate's work (please consult the statement on selection of external reviewers in section 5.4.1.7. above and the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Section IV). Documents important to the candidate for review, promotion, and tenure are the statements on teaching; research, scholarly or creative activities; and service, and the curriculum vitae. It is the candidate's responsibility to keep their vitae current and organized in a manner appropriate to their discipline and include all professional activities that would be appropriate to be considered for tenure and/or promotion, including, but not limited to, the types of activities mentioned in University Rules and Guidelines, and the Dean of Faculties website.

5.8. The Dossier

The dossier of review materials is prepared according to the content and format requirements set in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The candidate's support dossier to the Department Review Committee may have significant appendix materials, full copies of articles, texts, photographs of creative work, etc.; however, these supporting documents will not be included in the final dossier submitted to the Dean of Faculties. The Department Review Committee reviews the curriculum vitae, the candidate's statement concerning teaching; research, scholarly or creative activity; and service, course listings, etc., and makes suggestions and corrections to improve the dossier.

Appropriate materials, as defined in the Department's evaluation guidelines, may be included along with the request letter mailed to the candidate's external reviewers.

The dossier is then assembled by the Department Review Committee, including a report that addresses the candidate's teaching; research, scholarly or creative activities; and service, drawing from materials provided by the candidate and information extracted from external reviewer's letters. The report from the Department Review Committee will be reviewed and revised as described in section 5.4.1.4. to ensure that the report reflects the views and opinions of all voting members of the Committee of the Whole.

After the Department Review Committee has made its recommendations, they are forwarded to the Department Head to continue with the next stage of review.

5.9. Department Head's Review

In conducting the formal tenure and/or promotion reviews, Department Heads shall draw upon the advice and counsel of the Department Review Committee as well as other appropriate sources. Negative comments contained in external letters are to be addressed by the Department Head as well as by the Department Review Committee. When the review has been completed, the Department Head will transmit the tenure and/or promotion recommendations of both the Head and the Department Review Committee to the TAMUG College Review Committee for review. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to advise the faculty member of the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion at each level of the review. The faculty member may request a written explanation in the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion recommendation at the end of the entire review process.

5.10 TAMUG Review

5.10.1. College Review Committee

In conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews, the CAO shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a TAMUG-wide tenure and/or promotion Review Committee (College Review Committee). Faculty eligible to serve on the College Review Committee include full professors on the tenured and professional tracks in TAMUG departments along with Engineering faculty on the Galveston Campus who hold a courtesy/joint appointment in a TAMUG Department. Membership to the College Review Committee is appointed by the CAO for a period of 2 years and should include, as much as possible, a representative of each TAMUG Department. The composition of this committee will be communicated clearly every year on the Office of Academic Affairs website. If any faculty member under consideration has a concern with the composition of the College Review Committee, they should voice such concerns to the CAO as soon as the committee composition is announced. Finally, the College Review Committee has a responsibility to serve the entire campus with a spirit of inclusion and equity, and thus affirm their commitment to offer a fair and extensive review reducing the impact of implicit bias and other schemas in the evaluation process.

The College Review Committee submits a complete written report with their recommendation to the CAO. A written report from the College Review Committee is required as a part of each dossier leaving TAMUG. The College Review Committee's recommendations should be consistent with the evidence of performance as documented in the dossier but should not be merely reiterations of earlier statements.

5.10.2. Chief Academic Officer

The CAO's evaluations of candidates should be independent and not merely restatements of comments made by the Department Head or a Committee. The CAO will submit recommendations to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President by sending complete dossier files to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. The CAO will notify the Department Head of recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion at levels beyond TAMUG.

5.11 Promotion and Tenure Process beyond TAMUG

After the College Review Committee has made its recommendations, forwarded them to the CAO and the CAO has made their recommendation, the dossier will be transferred electronically to the Office of the Dean of Faculties for TAMU review. For the policies and procedures used at TAMU, consult University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and the Dean of Faculties website.

5.12 Appeal

Faculty members whose appointment is not renewed due to a decision not to grant tenure may appeal the decision to the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (CAFRT) under the Texas A&M University Rule 12.01.99.M2, *“University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion”*.

6. Annual Review

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

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

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

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

6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.

- See [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year. Each faculty member must submit an annual evaluation report to the Department Head each year. The report will normally be due by January 31st for the preceding calendar year. The Department Head will notify faculty members each year of the due date.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

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

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

- *Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.*
- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.*
- *Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.*
- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards*

for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

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

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

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

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

6.5 Required Components

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

6.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities

Tenure track faculty will be evaluated on all three of the following, and APT faculty will be evaluated on teaching and one of the other areas they choose from.

- Teaching
- Research
- Service

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.5.3 Performance Assessment

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

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

6.6.2 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

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

6.6.3 Needs Improvement Performance

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

6.7 Timeline

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

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

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

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

7. Mid-Term Review

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

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

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

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

7.3 Review

Tenure-track faculty will undergo a comprehensive mid-term review in the fall of their fourth academic year (after completion of three full academic years of service). The departmental mid-term review needs to be submitted to the CAO office at the same time as P&T dossiers. The mid-term review is completed during the spring of that academic year, through a meeting with the CAO who submits a report (to the faculty member and the Department Head) on the review prior to May 31st. This review should mimic the tenure review process as closely as possible, with the exception of requesting evaluation letters from external reviewers. Candidates should anticipate the activities and approximate dates noted in the annual Dean of Faculties announcement outlining the dossier process (refer to the Dean of Faculties website or access through the Office of Academic Affairs website for more complete information).

In the year that any faculty member is reviewed for actual promotion, the formal tenure and/or promotion Department Review Committee will be established according to Departmental guidelines. Mandatory reviews for tenure and promotion will occur in the sixth academic year since start of service (see Dean of Faculties Tenure-Track Agreement for each tenure-track faculty member).

Each faculty member reviewed for mid-term, tenure, and/or promotion will be provided with a current description of the materials needed for the review and a timeline for the preparation of those materials, normally during the spring of the preceding academic year in which they will be considered. Materials will be prepared in a manner consistent with the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines issued by the Dean of Faculties Office of Texas A&M University which can also be accessed through the Office of Academic Affairs website.

7.4 Feedback from midterm review

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

8. **Post-Tenure Review**¹

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

1. Review Procedures and Timelines: Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
2. Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 5.4).

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Departments must have post-tenure review guidelines which will clearly state:

- 8.2.1. How peer evaluation of performance is incorporated in the Post Tenure Review process. The process should mimic the P&T process (without external letter of evaluations) and as such should include a review by the promotion and tenure committees, a Department Head evaluation, and a review by the College P&T committee prior to a final review by the CAO;
- 8.2.2. Criteria for rating of faculty performance, which must agree with those established for annual evaluation and clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty;
- 8.2.3. Review guidelines and timelines;
- 8.2.4. The materials to be reviewed. This should include materials beyond those submitted for the annual evaluations (e.g., statements of research, teaching, service). Faculty are to be reviewed based upon their assigned duties and the process by which peer-review committees are selected.

8.3 Peer Review Committee

Refer to Section 5.4.1 for details on composition and selection of the department review committee.

8.4 Process

- 8.4.1. Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
 - Updated CV
 - Statements of research, teaching, and service identifying the contributions to each dimension(s) since the last peer review and the impact in each dimension.

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

- 8.4.2. The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
- 8.4.3. If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.4.4. A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the departmental evaluation guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.4.5. A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.4.6. A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.
- 8.4.7. 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 (ad loc) 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 other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary department.
- 8.4.8. By no later than May 31st, each department will need to have completed the full review (including the College P&T review) of faculty that require such a PTR, provide a list to the CAO of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review.
- 8.4.9. The CAO will report all Periodic Peer Reviews conducted in the annual cycle to the Dean of Faculties on the Annual Evaluation Report for TAMUG.

8.5 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

- 8.5.1 The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by

which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

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

8.5.2a The department head and the faculty member may suggest committee members for the review committee. The faculty member and the department head can request an exclusion of a proposed member based upon conflict of interest. Final approval of the committee will be by the dean. Each member of the review committee will have one vote.

- 8.5.3. The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.
- 8.5.4. The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- 8.5.5. The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

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

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

8.6 The Professional Development Plan

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

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

8.6.1.1. Identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;

8.6.1.2. Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;

8.6.1.3. Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;

8.6.1.4. Set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;

8.6.1.5. Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual evaluations of progress in the plan;

8.6.1.6. Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

8.6.2. 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 CAO. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g., annual evaluations) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the Professional Development Plan.

8.6.3. Completion of the Plan

8.6.3.1. 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 CAO. 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 entire University community.

8.6.3.2. If, after consulting with the review committee, the Department Head and CAO 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.

8.7 Appeal

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

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

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

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

8.8 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

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

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

To be consistent with the DOF recommendation, the faculty member should retire in good standing in order to be positively recommended by the department head.

10. Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Appointments

The adjective modifier of Academic Professional Track Faculty includes the words Executive, Instructional, Of the Practice, Research, and Senior. Faculty in these non-tenure-track appointments will be expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of service or the area of scholarly research or creative work.

- Faculty with “Instructional” in their title will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to teaching and must contribute to service as well.
- Faculty with “Executive” in their title have had an executive position in industry or the public sector and will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to teaching and must contribute to service as well.
- Faculty with “of the Practice” in the title have had or maintain a primary employment in a profession outside of academia.
- Faculty with “Research” in the title will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to scholarly research or creative work and must contribute to teaching as well.

10.1. APT Faculty Appointments

In accordance with [Texas A&M University’s Guidelines to Faculty Titles](#):

- 10.1.1. Newly hired faculty members appointed to Executive Professor, Professor of the Practice, Instructional Professor, Associate Professor of the Practice, Instructional Associate Professor, and Senior Lecturer (exclusive of the adjectives research, visiting, or adjunct) will have annual appointments for at least the first three years, but will always receive 12-months’ notice if they are not to be reappointed. These appointments do not need to be full-time appointments, but intent to change the percent effort of the appointment should either be by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Department, or after 12 months’ notice to the faculty member. (Section 3.4 of Texas A&M University’s Guidelines to Faculty Titles)
- 10.1.2. Newly hired faculty members appointed to Assistant Professor of the Practice, Instructional Assistant Professor, and Lecturer (excluding the adjectives research, visiting, and adjunct) will normally have annual appointments for their first five years of service. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget. Faculty members who have continuously been in one of these ranks for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven-year period are entitled to 12- months’ notice if they will not be reappointed. (Section 3.5 of Texas A&M University’s Guidelines to Faculty Titles)
- 10.1.3. Faculty with the word “Visiting” or “Adjunct” in their faculty title are always given annual or semester appointments. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget.

10.2. Promotion and Multi-Year Fixed Term Appointments for APT Faculty at the Associate and Full Professor Ranks

- 10.2.1. APT faculty members will normally be considered for promotion for these ranks after five years of service. However, unless ‘time in rank’ is one of the criteria for promotion, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking promotion at an earlier time. A clear argument will need

- to be made by the Department Head that the APT faculty has made substantial progress towards the expectations of the next rank. To that end, each annual 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. (Section 3.4 & 3.5 of [Texas A&M University's Guidelines to Faculty Titles](#)). Lecturers and Senior Lecturers can be laterally reclassified to an Academic Professional Track professorial title if their appointment responsibilities are expanded beyond solely teaching. Failure to receive promotion does not affect reappointment consideration at the current rank.
- 10.2.2. Upon hiring, APT Faculty will be offered a 3-year probationary period, with a possibility of multi-year fixed term appointment for senior faculty ranks (Associate and above) at the end of the 3 years.
 - 10.2.3. Granting of multi-year fixed term appointments will be made through the recommendation of the Department Head and an affirmative decision by the CAO. The Department Head will generate a memo with a justification for the request based upon the faculty member's qualifications and achievements, as per the criteria stated in 10.2.5. The request should include past annual evaluations showing consistent achievements over the period of review.
 - 10.2.4. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided, in the penultimate year of a multi-year term appointment, through the recommendation of the Department Head and an affirmative decision by the CAO. The Department Head will generate a memo with a justification for the request based upon the faculty member's qualifications and achievements, as per the criteria stated in 10.2.5. The request should include past annual evaluations showing consistent achievements over the period of review.
 - 10.2.5. Criteria for granting and renewing multi-year fixed term appointment may include but are not limited to:
 - 10.2.5.1. annual evaluations of performance
 - 10.2.5.2. professional growth
 - 10.2.5.3. extent of professional qualifications (including licenses and/or certifications required for the position)
 - 10.2.5.4. excellence in assigned responsibilities
 - 10.2.5.5. professionalism
 - 10.2.5.6. contribution to the mission of the department or program
 - 10.2.5.7. staffing needs
 - 10.2.5.8. funding source alternatives, and
 - 10.2.5.9. continuing program considerations
 - 10.2.6. The multi-year fixed term appointment and/or renewal is not guaranteed but is awarded and renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the department and college. Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed term appointment cannot be appealed.
 - 10.2.7. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed term appointment, will be given in writing in accordance with the standards listed in section 2.2.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) "University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion".
 - 10.2.8. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.
 - 10.2.9. **Guideline for multi-year term appointments for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty**

- Faculty members appointed at Lecturer or [Adjective] Assistant Professor will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments.
- Faculty members appointed to Senior Lecturer and [Adjective] Associate Professor may be eligible for a three-year fixed term appointment. [Adjective] Professors may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment.
- Upon promotion to Senior Lecturer and [Adjective] Associate Professor, faculty may be eligible for a three-year fixed term appointment. Similarly, upon promotion to [Adjective] Professor, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment.
- In the event of a bona fide financial exigency or the reduction or discontinuance of institutional programs at TAMUG, faculty multi-year appointment terminations will be carried out in accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Section 7 “*Reduction or Discontinuance of Institutional Programs*”.

10.3. Non-Reappointment of APT Faculty

10.3.1. **Lecturers and Assistant APT Faculty:** An unsatisfactory annual evaluation in any one year may lead to a non-reappointment for the following academic year or a 12-months’ notice of non-reappointment for faculty members who have continuously been in one of these ranks for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven-year period. If a Lecturer and Assistant APT faculty with an unsatisfactory annual evaluation is reappointed, a report of unsatisfactory performance will be submitted to the Dean of Faculties and accompanied by a written plan for near term improvement established by the faculty and the Department Head (see following sections).

10.3.2. **Associate and Full APT Faculty:** An unsatisfactory annual evaluation in any one year will lead to a report of unsatisfactory performance to be submitted to the Dean of Faculties and accompanied by a written plan for near term improvement established by the faculty member and the Department Head.

10.3.3. If within a five-year period, a faculty member receives two annual evaluations with an overall unsatisfactory rating (does not meet expectations) after being placed on a near term improvement plan, the faculty member will be notified that her/his appointment will not be renewed and will be given a notice of non-reappointment, following TAMU’s established guidelines which state:

A decision not to renew the appointment of a non-tenure-track faculty member shall be based upon adequate consideration (see [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) section 4.5.2) of the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.

The appeal procedures to be followed are outlined in Section 8 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#).

Contact Office

Department of Foundational Sciences, Office of Dr. Melanie Moser, e-mail moserm@tamug.edu 409-740-4517
 Ms. Glenda Nelson, email gnelson@tamu.edu 409-740-4745