



TEXAS A&M  
UNIVERSITY

**GALVESTON CAMPUS®**

*Texas A&M University at Galveston*

# **Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for Appointment and Review**

MARITIME BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

Contact: Dr. Amulya Gurtu

Department Head and Professor

[amulya.gurtu@tamug.edu](mailto:amulya.gurtu@tamug.edu)

409-740-4441

*Created: April 2013*

*Approved by Faculty: April 18, 2018*

*Revised: June 2024*

*Approved by Chief Academic Officer: March 2021*

*Approved by Faculty Affairs: March 21, 2021 Next*

*Scheduled Review: March 2022*

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	6
TITLE.....	6
LINK .....	6
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure .....	6
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I.....	6
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review.....	6
Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review.....	6
University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually).....	6
<b>1.1. Faculty Expectations and Responsibilities</b> .....	6
<b>1.2. Departmental Expectations and Responsibilities</b> .....	8
<b>2. Faculty Ranks and Employment Expectations</b> .....	10
<b>2.1 Tenure Accruing/Tenured Faculty Positions</b> .....	10
<b>2.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure-Accruing Faculty Positions)</b> .....	11
<b>3. Areas of Faculty Performance</b> .....	14
<b>3.1 Teaching</b> .....	14
<b>3.2 Research, scholarly activity</b> .....	16
<b>3.3. Service</b> .....	17
<b>3.4. Administration</b> .....	17
<b>4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness</b> .....	19
<b>4.1. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching</b> .....	19
<b>4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching</b> .....	19
<b>4.3. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity</b> .....	20
<b>4.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in research and publication include the following examples</b> .....	21
<b>4.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service include the following examples:</b> .....	21
<b>4.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service include the following examples</b> .....	22
<b>5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure</b> .....	23
<b>5.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</b> .....	23
<b>5.1.1 Assistant Professor</b> .....	23
<b>5.1.1.A</b> .....	24
<b>5.1.2. Associate Professor</b> .....	24
<b>5.1.3. Professor</b> .....	24

**5.2. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)..... 25**

**5.2.1. Lecturers/Senior Lecturers..... 26**

**5.2.2. Instructional Assistant Professors:..... 26**

**5.2.3. Instructional Associate Professors ..... 26**

**5.2.4. Instructional Professor..... 27**

**5.2.5. Professor of the Practice ..... 28**

**5.2.6. Visiting Positions ..... 28**

**5.3 Scheduling..... 28**

**5.4. Department Review Committee ..... 29**

**5.4.1. Tenure Track and Faculty..... 29**

**5.4.2. Definitions used in Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion..... 29**

**5.4.3. Academic Professional Track Faculty ..... 33**

**5.5. Dossier Preparation..... 34**

**5.5.1. .... 34**

**5.6. Dossier Evaluation..... 34**

**5.7. Role and Responsibility of the Individual Faculty Member in the Review Process..... 35**

**5.8 The Dossier ..... 35**

**5.9. Department Head's Review ..... 36**

**5.10 TAMUG Review ..... 36**

**5.10.1. College Review Committee ..... 36**

**5.10.2 Chief Academic Officer..... 37**

**5.11 Promotion and Tenure Process beyond TAMUG..... 37**

**5.12 Appeal..... 37**

**6. Annual Review..... 38**

**6.1 Purpose..... 39**

**6.2 Focus..... 39**

---

**6.3 Time Period of Review ..... 40**

**6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance ..... 40**

**6.4.1. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are..... 40**

**6.4.2. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are ..... 41**

**6.4.3. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service are..... 41**

**6.5. Required Components ..... 42**

**6.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities.....42**

6.5.2. A written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations..... 42

6.5.3. Meeting between the department head, and the faculty member..... 44

6.5.4. Performance Assessment ..... 44

6.6. Assessment outcomes that require action..... 45

6.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance ..... 45

6.7. Timeline..... 46

6.8. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines..... 46

7. Mid Term Review..... 47

7.1. Purpose..... 47

7.2. Process..... 48

7.3. Review ..... 48

7.4. Feedback from Midterm Review ..... 48

8 Post-Tenure Review ..... 50

8.1. Purpose..... 50

8.2. Departments must have post-tenure review guidelines which will clearly state..... 50

8.3 Peer Review Committee..... 51

8.4. Process..... 51

8.5. Professional Development Review ..... 52

8.5.1 ..... 52

8.5.2 ..... 52

8.5.3 ..... 53

8.6. The Professional Development Plan ..... 54

8.6.2. Assessment ..... 54

8.6.3. Completion of the Plan..... 55

8.7. Appeal..... 55

8.8. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review ..... 56

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status ..... 57

10 Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Appointments ..... 58

10.1. APT Faculty Appointments ..... 58

11. Endowments..... 60

11.1 Endowed Chair ..... 60

11.2 Endowed Professorship ..... 60

11.3 Endowed Faculty Fellowship ..... 60

**11.4 Selection and Appointment..... 60**

**11.4.1 Selection..... 60**

**11.4.2 Appointment ..... 61**

**11.4.3 Evaluation and Reappointment.....61**

**11.4.4 Budgetary Guidelines ..... 61**

**APPENDIX I: TAMUG TT/T Faculty Promotion and Tenure Process ..... 63**

**APPENDIX II: TAMUG APT FACULTY PROMOTION PROCESS ..... 71**

**APPENDIX III: TAMUG POST TENURE REVIEW PROCESS ..... 75**

**APPENDIX IV: Qualified Faculty Status ..... 79**

**APPENDIX V: Teaching Evaluation Guidelines ..... 82**

**Appendix VI G-1 ..... 97**

**Introduction**

The mission of the Texas A&M University Maritime Business Administration Department is to develop inspirational leaders through innovative teaching, impactful research, and meaningful service to our community and maritime industry.

The expectations of the Maritime Business Administration Department 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, Maritime Business Administration; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>LINK</b>
<b>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</b>	<a href="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs</a>
<b>12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a>
<b>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a>
<b>Office of Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</b>	<a href="https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/annual-evaluation-and-mid-term-review.html">https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/annual-evaluation-and-mid-term-review.html</a>
<b>Office of Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</b>	<a href="https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/promotion-tenure.html">https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/promotion-tenure.html</a>

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

**1.1. Faculty Expectations and Responsibilities**

The expectations of the Galveston Campus for its faculty are that they continually strive 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 an independent and 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 the Faculty to maintain an active output in her/his 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, 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.

Department Heads are primarily responsible for ensuring that the university and Galveston Campus guidelines are followed so that each faculty member receives a fair and timely assessment of her/his 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 departmental practices may differ because of variations in department size, the nature of departmental faculty, the degree of inter/multidisciplinary activity, and academic mission. Departmental guidelines should be reviewed regularly to ensure compliance with System Policy, University Rules, and College Guidelines while achieving departmental objectives.

The guiding principles in setting review guidelines are presented below:

In the case of P&T and PTR reviews, only Faculty of higher rank can review the dossier (e.g., Tenured Associate and Full Professors for Assistant Professors going up to Associate with Tenure; Full Professors for promotion of Associate to Full; Tenured Faculty and Associate and Full Instructional Professors for Assistant Instructional Professors going up to Associate, etc.).

The Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (Department Review Committee) should be the same for any particular rank reviewed during a cycle. If 2 or more candidates in a Department are going through the same rank review (e.g., Assistant to Associate with tenure) then the P&T committee for these should be the same.

Reclassification of faculty from one track (e.g., tenure/tenure track) to another (e.g., academic professional track, or vice versa) requires a formal review that follows the departmental review process. The dossier needs to include:

- A full review report with majority support from the Department Review Committee,
- A supporting and justification memo from the Department Head,

- A supporting and justification memo from the CAO, and
- The dossier must then be submitted to Faculty Affairs for evaluation and potential approval.

## 1.2. Departmental Expectations and Responsibilities

### Dimensions and Indicators of Performance

The three major dimensions of faculty performance are:

- Creations and dissemination of new knowledge via research and publication
- Instruction/teaching
- Service to the department, the university, the profession, and external constituencies

The accumulation of activities alone does not constitute desirable performance. Rather, it is the quality of accomplishments that is crucial. The Department of Maritime Business Administration defines and recognizes three levels of performance in each area:

- Excellent performance: a high level of performance that meets and exceeds norms and expectations and which is reflected by substantive indicators of performance excellence as described in the next section
- Effective Performance: acceptable and satisfactory performance that meets norms and expectations and which is reflected by substantive indicators of performance effectiveness as described in the next section
- Unsatisfactory Performance: unacceptable performance that fails to meet norms and expectations and which is reflected by an absence of indicators of performance excellence or effectiveness

The Department of Maritime Business Administration also recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance, that performance indicators will vary over time for any individual, and that they will vary over time for individuals at different career stages.

By definition, a complete absence of any indicators of excellence and effectiveness for a performance dimension implies unsatisfactory performance along that dimension. Further, some indicators do not clearly fall into a single area. For instance, successfully working with graduate students has both research and teaching connotations, while involvement in assessment has both teaching and service connotations. These activities are classified into a single area, but their relation to other areas should be recognized as appropriate.

### Dimensions and Indicators of Performance (Addendum)

Consistent with the university goals, the Department of Maritime Business Administration values faculty contributions to interdisciplinary, and globalization as they relate to advancing the research, teaching, and engagement/service mission of TAMUG. The department head will ensure that the contributions in these areas are appropriately recognized and valued during the



annual performance review process. The evaluation of faculty contributions to interdisciplinary, and globalization should include:

- A revision to the performance review document that allows and encourages faculty to provide their contributions in these areas as they affect research, teaching, and engagement/service.
- An assessment of the quality of the contributions for the purposes of performance evaluations and merit increases. It is not the mere participation in these endeavors that matters; rather, it is the quality of faculty accomplishments as they influence outstanding research, teaching, and service in the college that is crucial.
- The expectation that the contributions in these areas may receive credit only when they enhance the existing mission and objectives of the department.
- Performance levels and indicators of excellence and effectiveness as described earlier in this document.

Beginning FY 14, no faculty members will be required to complete a section on safety. The purpose of this activity is not to create personal liabilities for faculty members, but rather to relieve such liabilities by making the university aware of any safety concerns in their research and teaching environments. Based on the review of the section on safety, the department head will either certify that the faculty member has made efforts to reasonably mitigate safety issues or list the remediation activities that have been enacted by the department to address the safety concerns raised by the faculty member.

## 2. Faculty Ranks and Employment Expectations

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit. In general, the department of Maritime Business Administration faculty positions can be divided into two categories: Tenure-accruing/tenured and non-tenured-accruing.

### 2.1 Tenure Accruing/Tenured Faculty Positions

All Tenure-accruing/tenured faculty members must have a terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a maritime, marine, logistics or related business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)

#### **Assistant Professor**

Assistant professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and TAMUG academic needs. Further, it is expected that assistant professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

#### **Associate Professor**

Associate professors are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate effectiveness in the service dimension. Excellence is expected in instruction/teaching or research and publication. Associate professors, relative to assistant professors, are expected to exhibit increased contributions in one or more of the areas of service effectiveness and excellence. Promotion to professor will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions. The requirements for promotion to professor are demonstration of excellence in all three dimensions.

#### **Professor**

Professors are expected to demonstrate leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence. This leadership may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as:

- Leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in service
- Leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in instruction/teaching, which includes student development
- Leadership in contributing to the body of knowledge
- Leadership in the development of junior faculty

While there may be significant variety in the nature of the contributions by professors, there is continued expectation of examples of excellence in one or more performance areas. Merit compensation will be the primary extrinsic means of recognizing such excellence. Another potential means of recognition is through consideration for appointment an endowed position

Endowed positions are discussed later in this document.

## **2.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure-Accruing Faculty Positions)**

There are two separate tracks within this category – lecturer and instructional. Advancement to a higher rank is possible only with a track.

### **Lecturer**

This is an entry-level position for part- and full-time instructors who will typically have the following profile:

- A graduate degree and/or commensurate experience
- Contributions to the department of Maritime Business Administration expected to relate primarily to instruction (broadly defined)
- May also be expected to contribute to other areas as relevant

Individuals holding this rank will have annual contracts (or less). Only those with exceptional records will be considered for promotion (See promotion guidelines below.)

### **Senior Lecturer**

This is a position for individuals who may have had previous experience or have served a minimum of five years at the rank of lecturer as a full-time instructor and are judged to be deserving of promotion. They will typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A graduate degree and/or commensurate experience
- A record of exemplary teaching effectiveness and excellence
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of the department of Maritime Business Administration beyond classroom instruction

Individuals holding this rank will have the annual contracts and must be given one – year advance notification if they are not going to be reappointed.

### **Instructional Assistant Professor**

This is an entry-level position for full time non-tenure track faculty who will typically have the following profile:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a maritime, marine logistics or related business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)
- Contributions to the department of Maritime Business Administration expected to relate primarily to instruction (broadly defined); and are expected to contribute to service in a significant way.

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts of duration of one year (contingent on

satisfactory performance). Only those with exceptional records will be considered for promotion at an appropriate time. See promotion guidelines below.

Instructional assistant professors will have the same employment protection as lecturers.

### **Instructional Associate Professor**

This is a position for individuals who have professor and are judged to be worthy of promotion. (See promotion guidelines below). It may also be appropriate for individuals who have achieved the rank of associate professor at another institution. They will typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a maritime, marine, logistics or business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)
- A record of exemplary teaching effectiveness and excellence
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of the department of Maritime Business Administration and TAMUG beyond the classroom instruction
- Additional contributions to other areas as relevant

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one to three years (contingent on satisfactory performance); they must be given on-year advance notification if they are not going to be reappointed. Those with exceptional records may be considered for promotion at an appropriate time.

### **Instructional Professor**

This is a position for individuals who are at the rank of instructional assistant professor and are judged to be worthy of promotion. It may also be appropriate for individuals who have achieved the rank of professor at another institution. They will typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a maritime, marine, logistics or business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)
- A record of exemplary teaching effectiveness and excellence
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of the Department of Maritime Business Administration and TAMUG beyond classroom instruction
- Additional contributions to other areas as relevant

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one to five years (contingent on satisfactory performance); they must be given on-year advance notification if they are not going to be reappointed.

### **Professor of the Practice**

The position of professor of the practice is for individuals who have had distinguished careers in the private sector and/or government service. Individuals holding this rank will have contracts

may range in duration from one semester to a five-year multi-year contract. Professors of the practice may have the title of assistant, associate or full commensurate on their experience and service. The promotion criteria to a higher rank is the same as the instructional track except for the requirement of a terminal degree.

**Visiting Positions**

Finally, it may periodically be useful and/or necessary to temporarily employ or appoint as a courtesy appointment faculty on a visiting basis. In such cases the appropriate title will be their current faculty title preceded by the word “visiting.”

### 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 understanding creation dissemination of new knowledge via research and publication, instruction/teaching, and service to the department, the University, the profession, and external constituencies). 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 Department Head and Dean's written approval, Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

#### 3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the Maritime Business Administration Department's mission, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are to 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness, and 3) promote and diversify the department'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 in evaluating teaching performance are stated in section 4.

A commitment to excellence in teaching is an expectation of all faculty, no matter the track. This category includes classroom instruction, courses that provide experiential learning, and new courses and teaching methods. Also, it consists of the development or expansion of electronic delivery of course content, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, and mentoring.

The following are definitions of evidence of teaching accomplishments:

"Courses Taught" covers all courses with classroom contact hours taught at Texas A&M University. 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 students' assessments in comparable courses and subject matters as one aspect of the evaluation. For example, graduate and undergraduate, required and elective, 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 class size, the access or not grading teaching assistants in large classes, and overall comparison to core curriculum if the course taught is itself in the core.

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, the 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.

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 higher learning institution. Excellence in student mentoring (as a chair or member of a student committee) can be documented by the student mentees' successes, including quality and quantity of trainee- authored publications, job placement, and time to degree.

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. If there is a funding agency, it should be identified. Documented national /international recognition or adoption of programs by a professional society, a state agency is also desirable.

Teaching innovations, such as developing 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.

Invited Lectures: include invitations to teach at outside academic institutions. Usually, an invitation from a distinguished institution would constitute a contribution. Combinations of numerous invitations are valued.

### 3.2 Research, scholarly activity

This category consists of research and publication. Faculty members must document scholarly activities, including works in progress, and identify the impact this scholarship has on their respective fields.

Experts in the same or related disciplines must decide the quality or merit of scholarly work. Peer review is essential.

Publications may 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, the 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. This section's essence is that intellectual work, and its by-products are subject to external peer review. This dimension intends that disseminating scholarly work products leads to an impact on the field, evaluated through citation and reference from members of the intellectual community and others.

Thus, the candidate must explain the quality, productivity over time, and impact of their research, or scholarly work. They must also present how the different productivity elements create a cohesive body of work that influences scholarship. In the case of multiple authorships and/or multidisciplinary work (publications, research grants, etc.), the candidate should clearly identify the level of their own contributions to the overall project (e.g., percent of total work performed/led by candidate).

Funded research includes recognizing the receipt of external resources for scholarly activities and/or evidence of completed, peer-reviewed research activities. External resources might consist of, but would not be limited to, fellowships, contracts, or research grants. The status of any research work in progress should be stated. Including the identification of funding sources is important, particularly from federal granting agencies.

Affiliations include a research center of potential activities at TAMUG/TAMU, or a similar research entity not affiliated with TAMUG/TAMU.

Other recognition may include juried peer awards by professional societies, national/international groups, refereed non-published presentations, editorship of a refereed journal, member of an editorial board, or editors of a professional journal. Also considered, lead organizer of special symposium/session at national/international conferences, invited keynote address at a 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

Service to the institution—to students, colleagues, the Maritime Business Administration Department, TAMUG, TAMU, and TAMUS—and service to the profession/field beyond the campus is included. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

A variety of service roles can contribute to attaining our pre-eminence goals through service to the institution, students, colleagues, professional societies, governmental agencies, and the public. In each case, an important consideration is a service that results in creating ideas, influencing ideas, and disseminating ideas. Quality and impactful service are expected from each member of the faculty. Service is typically the active participation in professional or community organizations 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.

### 3.4. Administration

Faculty can have a substantive and significant influence on the operations and strategic mission of the University through their contributions to administration in the following areas:

- Teamwork/Collaboration/Leadership:
  - Recognizes and responds appropriately to change;
  - establishes/maintains effective relationships;
  - gives trust to others;
  - communicates and builds credibility with others;
  - effectively partners with key leaders/organizations;
  - paints a vision aligned with strategic priorities of the institution;
  - generates excitement and commitment toward the achievement of shared goals;
  - maintains positive working relationships;
  - seeks out and understands goals and needs of other parties/partners;
- Personnel Management and Leadership Principles:
  - Recruits new employees;
  - models civility, respect, and inclusion;
  - eliminate inequities and creates an environment free of discrimination;
  - judges behavior and performance effectively;
  - clarifies expectations;
  - seeks and provides feedback;

- guides the establishment of group objectives and facilitates personal and professional development;
  - rewards those who achieve and perform at high levels;
  - seeks opportunities to introduce innovation;
  - builds win-win solutions;
  - Manages conflict.
- Programs/Outcomes:
    - Encourages innovation;
    - supports risk-taking;
    - identifies problems and opportunities;
    - effectively utilizes internal/external resources toward program accomplishments;
    - attains established programmatic goals;
    - recognizes and abolishes outdated programs that no longer contribute to organizational priorities;
    - ensures effective planning, conducting, and evaluating of programs resulting in measurable outcomes;
    - Adapts program focus to changing environment.
  - Professionalism Competency:
    - Displays energy and enthusiasm for agency/system mission, objectives, and strategic goals;
    - seeks responsibility;
    - manages time effectively;
    - focuses on appropriate priorities;
    - delivers on commitments; communicates organizational activity;
    - seeks professional development to improve needed competencies;
    - Stays current professionally, achieves professional recognition.

## 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Maritime Business Administration Department recognizes that there are multiple indicators of three levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on faculty approval.

### 4.1. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

Selection for peer-reviewed (faculty) university, TAMUG, or professional society outstanding teacher/instruction awards (such as the Association of Former Students award).

- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence through peer review.
- Outstanding teaching performance over a significant period as evidenced by exceptional student ratings, interviews with students and student leaders, and outstanding peer evaluations (including peer reviews of classroom instruction).
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials, including high quality online (distance learning) courses.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations, and the like).
- Major contributions to the development of new instructional programs.
- Invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's student(s).
- Development and/or coordination of successful new executive development programs.
- Selection of student awards for outstanding teaching/instruction.

### 4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

In combination with assessments of quality from the department head, students, faculty peer reviews, and other sources, indicators of effectiveness in instruction/teaching include the following examples:

- Development of a new course(s) or significant revisions of existing courses.
- Evidence of high-quality in-class preparation and student interaction through peer review and student evaluations.
- Supervision of independent student projects.
- Significant contributions to student development through student advising and mentoring, including service as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor.
- Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development leave that led to

increased teaching effectiveness.

- Participation in the TAMUG Honors Program and/or programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching.
- Membership and direct advising on graduate student committees.

Demonstration of Collegiality in Teaching. As a component of teaching effectiveness, collegiality is defined as a willingness to work respectfully and courteously with the University's faculty, staff, and administration of the university.

Collegiality in teaching, which fosters a healthy academic environment where students can thrive, may be demonstrated through team teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, or a willingness to teach at odd times and/or sites, and in a variety of formats (e.g., web and other distance courses, concurrent courses, honors courses)—volunteering to teach new classes, contributing to the development, maintenance, and teaching of multiple-section courses. Presenting guest lecturers when appropriate, teaching for peers when the need arises, relating to others respectfully and courteously inside and outside the classroom; cooperating in the preparation of course/teaching schedules; willingly following State and/or National standards as determined by AACSB and SACSCOC.

#### **4.3. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity**

Publication in the double-blinded refereed journals of marine, maritime, coastal, and logistics disciplines

- For example, a publication in Marine Policy or Maritime Policy and Management
- Publication in double-blinded refereed journals in business/economics related disciplines.
- Double-blinded Referred publications in proceedings of marine, maritime, logistics and business/economics related conferences and professional meetings.
- Publication of maritime, marine, logistics, or business-related scholarly book(s).
- Publication of marine, maritime, logistics, or business/economics-related practitioner book(s).
- Publications with teaching/instruction focus on refereed journals.
- Frequent citation of publications indicated by the appropriate citation index such as Cabell.
- Receipt of major fellowship, research, or publication award(s).
- Invitation to present showcase or keynote paper or address at important international and national conferences.
- Invitation to present research at peer and/or aspirant schools.
- International (or national, where appropriate) recognition or reputation of scholarship

#### 4.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in research and publication include the following examples

Publication in non-refereed journals that are recognized through the industry and the Association of Business Schools Quality Guide.

- Publication of a business-related professional book.
- Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs.
- Presentation of papers at national or international conferences and professional meetings of marine, maritime, logistics, and business/economics-related disciplines.
- Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly book(s).
- Well-documented contribution (i.e., mentorship) to the research of others.
- Significant self-development activities such as a faculty development leave.
- Consulting reports
- Book reviews
- Government research projects, including projects not generally published for national security purposes
- Grant proposals (any amount from any source)

Recognizing that collaboration in research and publication is both common and desirable, the Department of Maritime Business Administration also encourages the demonstration of research leadership. Such leadership may be evidenced by graduate student publications, single-authored works, and/or a balance of authoring order on publications or journals in disciplines where authorship order conveys information regarding relative contribution.

#### 4.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service include the following examples:

Officer or committee chair in a national/international professional organization.

- Program chair of major maritime, logistics, or business/economics –related conference
- Administrative leadership role within the department or TAMUG.
- Officer in the Faculty Senate.
- Chair of a university committee or task force.
- Other demonstrated leadership in departmental, TAMUG, TAMU, or system administrator or service roles.
- Service on a governmental commission, task force, or board.
- Attraction of significant external financial support through development /philanthropy activities
- Membership on editorial board of a peer-reviewed journal(s)
- Receipt of external or internal peer-reviewed funding for research.
- Receiving peer-reviewed external or internal funding for teaching/instruction.
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at

large.

- Editorship of a marine, maritime, logistics, or business/economics-related journal(s).
- Editorship of a scholarly book.
- Associate editorship or section editorship of a major journal(s).
- Membership on review panel(s) for national or international research organization(s).

#### **4.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service include the following examples**

Officer in regional or state professional organization.

- The program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organization meetings.
- Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate.
- Service on TAMU, TAMUG, and department committees and task forces.
- Contribution to external development efforts.
- Advisor to student organizations.
- Administrative roles within the department.
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups.
- Service as a consultant to a business organization(s) and/or governmental agencies.
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
- Ad hoc reviewer for double-blind refereed journals and/or national or international organizations.
- Textbook supplemental materials or published instructional software

## **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 faculty performance areas (teaching, research/scholarly activity, 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.

#### **Expectations for Tenure and Promotion**

Tenure is granted to recognize demonstrated leadership and impact in a research field nationally and demonstrate a commitment to teaching excellence and outreach/service. The professor's promotion is awarded for national/international leadership and impact in a research field and demonstrates a commitment to teaching excellence and service. In exceptional and rare cases, national/international leadership and impact on 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, as well as teaching activities. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a statement of impact. The Department Review Committee's responsibility is 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.

For tenure and/or promotion, in addition to meritorious achievements, a high potential for continued excellence is expected.

Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

#### **5.1.1 Assistant Professor**

During their probationary period, assistant professors are expected to display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

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 activities and publications.

The consideration of promotion to associate professor and tenure decisions is always linked. The probationary period for an assistant professor will be addressed in the initial offer of employment. The maximum probationary period for tenure is seven years, with up to three years credit given for tenure track experience at another university

Assistant professors should expect to complete their full probationary period at their entry rank. (The actual review and decision process, of course, begins the preceding year.) An individual who compiles an unusually strong and distinguished record of achievement may request early consideration.

#### **5.1.1.A**

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 publications.

Assistant Professor are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research and publication. Service contributions, while usually limited, should generally be focused on departmental and TAMUG academic needs. Further, it is expected that assistant professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

#### **5.1.2. Associate Professor**

Associate professors are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate continues effectiveness on all three performance dimensions. In addition, excellence is expected in research. Associate professors relative to assistant professors are expected to exhibit increased contributions in one or more of the areas of service.

#### **5.1.3. Professor**

Promotion to professor will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions. The minimum requirements for Department of Maritime Business Administration include the following:

- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of the Department of Maritime Business Administration and TAMUG.
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of excellence in research and publication during the time as associate professor.
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of excellence in instruction and teaching.



- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of excellence in service.

Promotion to professor will be based on cumulative contributions, with special attention given to accomplishments since promotion to the rank of associate professor. A minimum of five years at the associate level is generally required to establish eligibility for consideration of promotion to the rank of professor; typically, a faculty member will require a longer period to compile a record sufficient to warrant consideration for promotion to the rank of professor. At the same time, an individual who compiles an unusually strong and distinguished record of achievement may request early consideration. An individual contemplating asking for early consideration is strongly encouraged to consult with the department head, senior members of the departmental faculty, and the CAO before making a formal request for consideration.

Further, professors are expected to demonstrate leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence. This leadership may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as: (1) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in service; (2) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in instruction/teaching, which includes student development; (3) leadership in contributing to the body of knowledge; (4) leadership in the development of junior faculty.

**Note:** In truly exceptional cases, an individual may be recommended for promotion to professor on the basis of outstanding instruction and teaching and/or service. In such cases, however, thorough, and rigorous documentation (evidence of outstanding teaching and service contributions) will be required to justify consideration of an exception to the normal research standards. Further, such an individual should expect to spend substantially more time at the rank of associate professor before consideration will be given for promotion to the rank of professor. It is also important to recognize that any such case must be truly exceptional in nature. For instance, achieving positive student ratings over a period of several years, and in the absence of numerous other indicators, does not by itself constitute an exceptional case on the basis of instruction and teaching.

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

For promotion, in addition to excellent 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 the Department Review Committee's responsibility to evaluate the candidate's impact statement and discuss it in the context of the department's stated expectations and standards of impact.

TAMUG subscribes to the position that although quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, performance excellence is of primary importance; that is, quality, significance, and

impact of accomplishments are much more significant than numbers. For promotion, in addition to excellent achievements, a high potential for continued excellence is expected.

### **5.2.1. Lecturers/Senior Lecturers**

Lecturers are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and make service contributions related to departmental and TAMUG academic needs. Promotion to senior lecturer will be based on an assessment of performance in teaching. The minimum requirements for promotion to senior lecturer in the Department of Maritime Business Administration include the following:

- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Department of Maritime Business Administration and TAMUG
- Pattern over time of excellence in teaching
- Potential for continued excellence in teaching and potential effectiveness in service

In general, lecturer should expect to complete a minimum of five years before seeking promotion. An individual who compiles an unusually strong and exceptional record of accomplishment may request early consideration.

### **5.2.2. Instructional Assistant Professors:**

This is an entry-level position for full time non-tenure track faculty who will typically have the following profile:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a maritime, marine logistics or related business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.); working on a terminal degree will be considered in compliance
- Contributions to the Department of maritime Business Administration expected to relate primarily to instruction (broadly defined); and are expected to contribute in at least one of the two other areas of research or service in a significant way.

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts of duration of one year (contingent on satisfactory performance). Only those with exceptional records will be considered for promotion at an appropriate time. See promotion guidelines below.

Instructional assistant professor will have the same employment protection as lecturers.

### **5.2.3. Instructional Associate Professors**

The granting of promotion to Instructional 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 and a pattern over time of effectiveness in service (or research in some cases when the faculty's second responsibility is in this dimension). Instructional Associate Professors are expected to be highly effective in instruction/teaching and establish a significant service contribution pattern to the University and/or national professional organizations. The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible.

This is a position for individuals who have served as an instructional assistant professor and are judged to be worthy of promotion. (See promotion guidelines below). It may also be appropriate for individuals who have achieved the rank of associate professor at another institution. They will typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a maritime, marine, logistics or business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)
- A record of exemplary teaching effectiveness and excellence
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of the Department of Maritime Business Administration and TAMUG beyond classroom instruction
- Additional contributions to other areas as relevant

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one to three years (contingent on satisfactory performance); they must be given on-year advance notification if they are not going to be reappointed. Those with exceptional records may be considered for promotion at an appropriate time.

#### **5.2.4. Instructional Professor**

The granting of promotion to Instructional 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 and 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.

This is a position for individuals who have served as an instructional associate professor and are judged worthy of promotion. It may also be appropriate for individuals who have achieved the rank of professor at another institution. They will typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a maritime, marine, logistics or business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)
- A record of exemplary teaching effectiveness and excellence
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of the department of Maritime

Business Administration and TAMUG beyond classroom instruction

- Additional contributions to other areas as relevant

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one to five years (Contingent on satisfactory performance); they must be given one-year advance notification if they are not reappointed.

### **5.2.5. Professor of the Practice**

The position of professor of practice is for individual who have had distinguished careers in the private sector and/or government service. Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one semester to a five-year multiyear contract. Professors of the practice may have the title of assistant, associate or full commensurate on their experience and service. The promotion criteria to a higher rank is the same as the instructional track except for the requirement of a terminal degree.

### **5.2.6. Visiting Positions**

Finally, it may periodically be useful and/or necessary to temporarily employ or appoint a courtesy appointment faculty on a visiting basis. In such cases, the appropriate title will be their current faculty title, preceded by the word "visiting."

## **5.3 Scheduling**

Timelines and schedules of activities are determined by guidelines issued by the Office of Faculty Affairs. For details, consult the Faculty Affairs website.

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.

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 Faculty

The faculty and administration of the Department of Maritime Business Administration believe that a clear statement of tenure expectations is valuable to current faculty who must evaluate those requesting tenure and promotion and new faculty who must navigate this process. Therefore, some general guidance and assumptions are provided about faculty expectations in the Department of Maritime Business Administration at TAMUG.

There is a realization that requirements and expectations may change with time and may require modification. Consequently, the faculty will review the statement of tenure expectations with major changes in accreditation and mission of the department or TAMUG and suggest changes as necessary. At a minimum, the expectations should be reviewed by the faculty at three-year intervals.

These expectations are based on the assumption that AQ faculty (those who attain Academic Qualification designation considered for tenure and promotion will be on a maximum undergraduate "3-3" teaching load in each of the years before the application. This equates to no more than 9 undergraduate hours in the fall and spring semesters. Graduate courses are substantially more time-intensive and are considered to be a sound basis for a course release.

It is recognized that excellent teaching alone will not merit tenure and promotion. In no case will outstanding performance in the research and/or service areas compensate for consistently poor teaching performances.

### 5.4.2. Definitions used in Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion

**Academic Qualification (AQ)** - In the Maritime Business Administration department, the faculty accepts and affirms that delivering quality educational programs requires an ongoing commitment from the faculty to maintain intellectual currency in their field of expertise. To this end, faculty in the department must maintain Academic Qualification (AQ) status to be considered AQ. A faculty member must fulfill Qualified Faculty Status's requirements in four categories described in AACSB Standards. **See Appendix II for more details.**

**Peer-reviewed journal or proceedings articles (PRJ)** - For this policy, PRJ's should have a documented formal review process and be available for public scrutiny. They should be pertinent to the faculty member's teaching area or related to the Department of Maritime Business Administration's mission. In situations where there are questions regarding the peer review process, it is the faculty member's responsibility to document the review process for consideration. In general, double-blinded reviewed proceedings from the major academic society of the field and journals listed in Cabell's Citation Index (for Economics), the Association of

Business Schools (<http://associationofbusinessschools.org/>), and the Australian Business Deans Council (<http://www.abdc.edu.au/3.43.0.0.1.0.htm>) are presumed to meet the burden of proof regarding a formal review process to qualify as a PRJ.

Other intellectual contributions (OIC) - The department recognizes that not all scholarly contributions will, or even should, take the form of a PRJ. As with PRJ's, OIC's must be available for public scrutiny, i.e., proprietary, and confidential research and consulting reports do not qualify as intellectual contributions.

However, the nature of the maritime industry, regulation, and security may result in faculty being called upon by the U.S. government to assist in the research necessary to the national defense of strategic assets such as ports and ships. If the U.S. government provides such research documentation without revealing its content due to national security, faculty member/s will have met the other intellectual contributions (OIC). OIC may include, but are not limited to:

- Scholarly books
- Publicly available research monographs
- Chapters in scholarly books
- Other proceedings from scholarly meetings
- Research presentation at academic or professional meetings
- Publications in non-refereed journals
- Consulting and technical reports
- Government research projects
- Grant proposals

It is expected that the department will provide support to the faculty to maintain their AQ status. To this end, AQ faculty should prioritize summer teaching assignments, on and off-campus program development, travel, and other forms of research support, subject to programmatic needs.

### **Performance expectations for tenure (Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure)**

Assistant professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and TAMUG academic needs. Promotion to associate professor with tenure will be based on an assessment of all the performance dimensions, with research and publication carrying the heaviest weight. The minimum requirements for tenure in the Department of Maritime Business Administration include the following:

- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Department of Maritime Business Administration and TAMUG.

- Pattern over time of some indication of effectiveness in service (defined above).
- Pattern over time of effectiveness in instruction/teaching (defined above).
- Pattern over time of excellence (and effectiveness) in research and publication (defined above with specificity below).
- High potential for continued excellence.

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must possess sufficient years of service in academia as denoted in TAMU 12.01. In addition, probationary faculty members must maintain AQ status at all times during the probationary period.

### **Excellence in Research and Publication for the Department of Maritime Business Administration**

Proof of a pattern of excellence (and effectiveness) in research and publication to award tenure in the Department of Maritime Business Administration should include at least minimum of 5 intellectual contributions as defined under Academic Qualifications of which 2 must be Peer-reviewed journal or proceedings articles (PRJ). However, this minimum requirement does not guarantee an award of tenure as the impact of the research will contribute to the evaluation of excellence.

#### **5.4.2.1**

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 and perform promotional reviews of academic, professional track faculty. The Committee of the Whole consists of all tenured faculty at or above the rank sought by the individual seeking promotion. It is referred to as the "Department Review Committee" in these evaluation guidelines. If 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.

#### **5.4.2.2**

Faculty on a Professional Development Plan is 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).

#### **5.4.2.3**

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 subcommittee's responsibility is to prepare and review the individual(s) dossiers 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 the candidate(s), prepare the reports on teaching; research, scholarly activities; and service, and make sure the dossier is properly assembled. The sub-committee Chair will lead the report's writing and forward the report to the Committee of the Whole for review. The sub-committee Chair will revise the report based on the Committee of the Whole comments to reflect all voting members' views and opinions. 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.

#### **5.4.2.4**

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.

#### **5.4.2.5**

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.

#### **5.4.2.6**

Selection of external reviewers' letters should be performed according to the University guidelines outlined in Section IV of the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (available on the Faculty Affairs 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. The stature of an institution, program, or individual is not obvious, including explaining 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. An individual may be a thought leader in the field (usually identified with prestigious awards or other clear intellectual leadership indicators). Although may request letters from outstanding individuals outside academia, the file should include at least three letters from individuals in peer programs/universities. External reviewers should come from different institutions. **IMPORTANT:** Include a list of the department's peer and aspiring institutions other than AAU-level institutions and the selection basis. It is recommended that an equal number of letters be solicited for all candidates. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers.

#### **5.4.2.7**

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 contact the external reviewers (after CAO approval under item 5.4.1.9. below). The committee should ensure that a mix of letters is solicited - some suggested by the candidate and some by the Department. Clearly indicated 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.

#### **5.4.2.8**

Prior to moving forward contacting the external reviewers, the Department Head will seek approval for the CAO's selected list 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 Faculty Affairs and Associate Provost.

### **5.4.3. 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 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. If 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 evaluated. All guidelines are cited in Section 5.4.2. above apply, except for requiring evaluation letters from external reviewers.

### **5.5. Dossier Preparation**

All Faculty candidates must submit a dossier for promotion according to the provisions and schedule determined by University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines issued by the Office of Faculty Affairs. Except for 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 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 per 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 Faculty Affairs, to assist them in developing the supporting documentation for their dossier, their vitae, and their statements concerning teaching; research, scholarly activity; and service.

#### **5.5.1.**

The university's Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure indicates that in "rare cases the probationary period may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the Department Head, Dean, and Faculty Affairs." However, such extensions are almost never given in the year of mandatory consideration for tenure. The university guidelines specify the special and unique circumstances for considering an extension of the probationary period.

Consideration for early promotion must be coupled with consideration for early tenure and vice versa. An individual contemplating asking for early consideration is strongly encouraged to consult with the department head, senior members of the departmental faculty, and the TAMUG CAO before making a formal request for consideration.

### **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 and scholarly 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 in the tenure and/or promotion dossier is mandated in University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and the Faculty Affairs 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, and scholarly activity, and service contributions.

Candidates should consult with their Department Head and review the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and the Faculty Affairs website for the materials they should collect. Candidates should also be considering potential external reviewers, persons 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 5.4.2.7. Above and the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Section IV).

Documents important to the candidate for review, promotion, and tenure are teaching research, and scholarly activities, 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 includes 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 Faculty Affairs 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, etc.; however, these supporting documents will not be included in the final dossier submitted to Faculty Affairs. The Department Review

Committee reviews the curriculum vitae, the candidate's statement concerning teaching; research, and scholarly activity; and service, course listings, etc., and makes suggestions and corrections to improve the dossier. As defined in the Department's evaluation guidelines, appropriate materials 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 activities; and service, drawing from the candidate's materials and information extracted from external reviewer's letters. The Department Review Committee report 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 of the review stage.

### **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 in external letters are to be addressed by the Department Head and 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. The Department Head's responsibility is 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 and Engineering faculty on the Galveston Campus who holds 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 is responsible for serving the entire campus with a spirit of inclusion and equity, thus affirming their commitment to offering 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 its 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 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 Faculty Affairs 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 Faculty Affairs for TAMU review. For the TAMU policies and procedures, consult University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and the Faculty Affairs website.

### **5.12 Appeal**

Faculty members whose appointment is not renewed due to a decision not to grant tenure may appeal 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

The performance of all Department of Maritime Business Administration faculty will be evaluated on an annual basis. This annual review will typically occur in the spring of each year to coincide with the University deadlines for such activities.

However, occasions when an individual's overall record may be assessed at another time, the most obvious situations being third-year reviews and promotion and/or tenure reviews, all of which are normally performed in the fall.

When an individual has been reviewed in this manner, the subsequent annual process can be compressed by referencing the earlier review.

The purposes of the annual performance review include:

- Creating a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations
- Providing evaluative feedback regarding how well the individual is currently performing relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position
- Providing developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved in the future
- Providing feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant

Each year the department head will request information from each faculty member in his/her department on faculty performance activities and indicators for the preceding year. All tenure-accruing/tenured faculty will use a common reporting mechanism developed and approved by the department faculty and department head. The department head has the discretion to request additional information for her/his own internal use. The department head also has the discretion to use the same mechanism to request information from faculty in non-tenure-accruing positions or to use an alternative method to request their performance-related information.

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted per 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 are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads will need to collaborate with the heads 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 department heads 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 with faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head 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 with input from the administrative appointment supervisor. 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 individual's faculty position expectations and norms.

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 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 communication process between the faculty member and the institution. Both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated. The development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluating job performance in assigned responsibility areas and for merit salary increases.

Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

### **6.2 Focus**

The annual review process's focus will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the review time. The annual review for tenured faculty 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. It serves as an 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.

### 6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 3.) 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.

In each department, stated criteria for rating faculty performance in an annual evaluation will be established by departmental faculty and approved by the Department Head, the Chief Academic Officer (“CAO”) of Texas A&M University at Galveston, and the Office of Faculty Affairs. These criteria will be published and disseminated in advance of the academic year in which they are to be used. These criteria should define discipline-appropriate expectations for impact and provide a rubric for impact and productivity scores of “Most Meritorious”, “Exemplary”, “Meets Expectations/Satisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” and “Unsatisfactory.” Departmental criteria should also define expected levels of post tenure productivity at each rank.

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

## 6.5. Required Components

Faculty members are to be evaluated on the quality and scope of their work in fulfillment of Texas A&M University's multiple missions in the context of the individual faculty member's particular roles and responsibilities. Typically, the report will address the following activities:

Section A. Teaching

Section B. Research or Scholarly Activities

Section C. Service

Section D. Department Specific Activities

Section E. Prospectus

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

All faculty will use a common reporting mechanism developed and approved by the department faculty and department head. The department head has the discretion to request additional information for her/his own internal use.

- Be focused on the immediately previous calendar
- The report should incorporate teaching, research 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)

### 6.5.2. A written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations.

The department head will write an evaluation for the year the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges the receipt by signing a copy of the document and providing written comments for the file if they so choose. The department head will provide each faculty member with written assessment (with appropriate department faculty input) of that individual

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. If desired, a faculty member may submit a written response

and request that it also be placed in the file.

All tenured faculty who maintain the academically qualified designation and instructional associate and instructional professor faculty in the department will be given an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the performance of instructional assistant professors and all tenured faculty who maintain the academically qualified designation and instructional professors will be given an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the performance of instructional associate professors. The department head will provide each faculty member with written assessment (with appropriate department faculty input) of that individual's performance. This document will be discussed with the individual by the department head; both individuals will also sign the document and a copy placed in the individual's personnel file. If desired, a faculty member may submit a written response and request that it also be placed in the file.

The review of faculty in non-tenure-accruing lecturer and adjunct faculty positions will be the sole responsibility of the department head. The department head will review measures of faculty performance relevant to the contractual expectations of each individual faculty in such positions. An assessment of performance will then be made and discussed with the faculty member. A performance feedback letter will also be prepared, signed by both the faculty member and the department head, and a copy placed in the individual's personnel file.

This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed guidelines judgment by the department head 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 end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements, the following acknowledgments must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the department head's written evaluation, and the faculty member must initial:

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

Signatures by the faculty member and the Department Head at the end of the Annual Evaluation Form (e.g., G2) signify that the annual evaluation process took place. The faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation. The Department Head will complete a written evaluation in each area and an overall evaluation and return a copy to the faculty member before May 31st of that academic year.

Additionally, and consistent with [Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), the annual evaluation process will vary by title and rank (see sections 2.4.2). For academic, professional track faculty, the annual review

process will serve primarily as an evaluation focusing on performance and potential for reappointment and promotion. For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the annual review must consider that progress in a scholarly career is a long-term venture; therefore, a three to five-year horizon may be necessary to evaluate scholarly progress accurately. Furthermore, an annual review process should be conducted differently depending upon the different faculty members' career stages.

For all faculty below the Full Professor (tenure-track or non-tenure track) rank, the annual review process must also provide an explicit indication of progress toward tenure and/or promotion (see [Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), section 4.3.5). For tenured associate professors, the process should identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, annual evaluation should be part of the ongoing communication process 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. The development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual evaluation shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluating job performance in assigned responsibility and merit salary increases.

### **6.5.3. Meeting between the department head, and the faculty member.**

The department head may meet with the faculty member to discuss the coming year's written review and expectations. There may be a need for more frequent meetings at the department head or faculty member.

The Department Head will invite each faculty member to schedule an in-person conference to review the materials submitted, discuss performance, and agree on the next year's goals. The full review (including, if necessary, needs for improvements and mitigation plan) will be completed by May 31st of the academic year.

### **6.5.4. Performance Assessment.**

In assessing performance, the weights are given to teaching, research/scholarly activity, 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.

Annual evaluations should include an informed judgment by the Department Head of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and guidelines. No faculty member may receive an overall meets expectation rating and merit raises if they are out of compliance with System Regulation 33.05.02, which addresses required training. Furthermore, faculty who supervise employees must have completed the annual evaluations of their direct reports by May 31st each year to be eligible for merit.

## 6.6. Assessment outcomes that require action

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

### 6.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall "Unsatisfactory" rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching; research/scholarship; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration).

An annual evaluation resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the rating's basis under the criteria. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the CAO. The CAO report of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and Department Head for near-term improvement. Due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the Department Head may request a "Periodic Peer Review" of the faculty member if deemed necessary.

The plan should include:

- Specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- Specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies.
- An outline of the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes.
- Timeliness for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes
- Specific criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan
- Resources to be committed by the department in support of the plan

When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member, the chief academic officer, and the CAO. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed.

It should also be noted that assistant professors have annual contracts until such time as they successfully achieve promotion to associate professor with tenure. This employment contract takes precedence over time frames specified in their probationary agreements and other contextual communication. If it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is unlikely to meet the expectations for promotion with tenure, that individual will not be recommended for any further appointment beyond the period for which the university is already committed.

A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" for three

consecutive annual reviews or who receives an "Unsatisfactory" periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

### **6.7. Timeline**

The annual review process is set to conclude before the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Faculty Affairs' Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, "These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than May 31st of each year."

The Department Head performs the annual evaluation, and the process must be completed to support her/his recommendations of merit pay increases for faculty. Merit raises will only be considered for faculty who received a satisfactory or higher rating in at least one area of performance and who will have completed all their System mandated training (System Regulation 33.05.02). Also, faculty who supervise employees must have completed the annual evaluation of their direct reports by May 31st each year to be eligible for merit.

During the merit salary review period, the department head will submit salary recommendations to the Chief Academic Officer of TAMUG. Such recommendations must be accompanied by (1) a copy of the most recent reporting form completed by the faculty member, (2) a current vita for the faculty member, (3) a copy of the feedback document provided to the faculty member, and (4) a form developed and approved by the faculty on which the department head provides his/her own specific assessment of the individual's performance along each of the three dimensions plus an assessment of the individual's performance along each of the three dimensions plus an assessment of overall performance

### **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 college dean with a copy to the Faculty Affairs. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to Faculty Affairs. 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

Following Section (4.3.5.2.) of University SAP 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years) must be conducted (usually 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 assessment 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 those expectations that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decisions.

This review will ensure that 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 a review by the unit's P&T committee, department head, 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, and service to date and 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 tenure requirements, action not to renew the individual's contract may be appropriate.

An explicit statement of whether the individual is on, above, or below trajectory for a positive tenure decision at the appropriate time

An explicit statement of what area(s) of performance, if any, is/are of concern

**7.2. Process**

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year before 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 the below example for faculty members hired in the 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**

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 preparing those materials, generally during the spring of the preceding academic year. Materials will be prepared in a manner consistent with the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines issued by the Faculty Affairs 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. The four tenured department faculty who maintain the academically qualified designation (or if the number of tenured faculty in the department does not number four or more, then tenured faculty from related TAMUG or TAMU departments may be asked to participate) who comprise the promotion and tenure committee will first review the individual’s dossier. A feedback memorandum with teaching, research and service report will be prepared by a representative of the tenured department faculty. The vote will be recorded. The department head after reviewing the recommendations of the tenured department faculty. A tenured department faculty representative will prepare a feedback memorandum with teaching, research, and service response. This memorandum and the recommendations will be voted upon by the committee.

The vote will be recorded. After reviewing the tenured faculty's recommendations, the department head will prepare an additional feedback memorandum, concurring with the faculty and/or providing additional recommendations. These memoranda should directly address the five points identified above.



The department head will be responsible for meeting with the individual and reviewing and discussing both the promotion and tenure committee and department head feedback memoranda, which will then be added to the dossier. The dossier will be forwarded to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) of TAMUG. The CAO will then meet with each individual. During this meeting, he/she will provide his/her own feedback to the individual and answer questions/address concerns/issues raised by the individual. A summary memorandum of this meeting will subsequently be added to the dossier and returned to the individual. Complete copies of the dossier will also be retained by the department head and the TAMUG CAO.

## 8 Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members. It 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 productivity levels. Post-tenure review comprises:

- Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head.
- Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 5.4.), not less frequently than once every six years.

### 8.1. Purpose

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

The purpose of the periodic peer review is to assess whether the individual is contributing 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; and refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

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

How peer evaluation of performance is incorporated in the Post Tenure Review process. The process should mimic the P&T process (without the 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 before a final review by the CAO;

Criteria for the rating of faculty performance, which must agree with those established for annual evaluation and clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty. Review guidelines and timelines. 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. The process by which peer-review committees are selected.

### 8.3 Peer Review Committee

The evaluation, of the tenured faculty, should be based on the faculty member's professional responsibilities in teaching, research, and service, and must include a peer review of the faculty member.

### 8.4. Process

Materials to be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee:

- Research and Publication
- Instruction/Teaching
- Service
- Assigned responsibilities
- Scholarship
- Journals or proceeding articles
- Updated CV
- Statements of research, teaching, and service identify each dimension's contributions since the last peer review and the impact in each dimension.

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 and an overall evaluation. The individual and overall performance rating criteria follow the unit guidelines' criteria and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory. In that case, 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, whichever is earlier.

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

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

By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide the dean and Faculty Affairs, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year

when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

The CAO will report all Periodic Peer Reviews conducted in the annual cycle to Faculty Affairs 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 6) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.8). A post-tenure review of a faculty member within the department of Maritime Business Administration may be prompted by one or more of the following conditions/outcomes as applicable:

- Unsatisfactory performance of the individual's specific instructional/teaching responsibilities/expectations as determined through the annual performance review process during three consecutive years; and/or
- Unsatisfactory performance of the individual's specific research and publication responsibilities/expectations as determined through the annual performance review process during three consecutive years; and/or
- Unsatisfactory performance of the individual's specific service responsibilities/expectations is determined through the three successive years' annual performance review process.
- Unsatisfactory overall performance as determined through the annual review process during three consecutive years.

For more information on the Professional Development Review process, 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 CAO. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see Section 8.6.) acceptable to the dean.

#### **8.5.1**

The purposes of the Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance, develop a specific professional development plan 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 the department head conduct it. The CAO will appoint the three-member ad hoc faculty review committee to consult the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee members may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

### **8.5.3**

The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee.

### **8.5.4**

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 consist of a minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research.

### **8.5.5**

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

### **8.5.6**

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

#### **8.5.6.1**

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

### 8.5.6.2

Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee elaborates explicitly on the deficiencies in writing. A copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the CAO to inform the near-term improvement plan.

### 8.5.6.3

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 8.6.) acceptable to the CAO.

## 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 this procedure's provision) be remedied. Will develop the plan with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, and the CAO. It should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. Will the plan formulate with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty members' 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:

- Identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
- Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the required outcomes;
- Set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate results;
- Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual evaluations of progress in the plan;
- Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

### 8.6.2. Assessment

The faculty member and Department Head will regularly review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and 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 plan's objective 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 Professional Development Review committee's composition due to a specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to Faculty Affairs and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head, and the CAO, Faculty Affairs and Associate Provost's decision 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 substantial or chronic deficiencies. In that case, the faculty member may appeal to the CAO, whose decision on such an appeal is final (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the CAO, the plan will determine through mediation directed by Faculty Affairs 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 peers' counsel, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by requesting the department head (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 ten 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 ten years, may also be considered.

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than ten years, see Institutional Rule 31.08.01, which indicates this situation's process.

See Faculty Affairs website for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

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

Galveston Campus Guidance: Emeriti Faculty Status

## **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 substantial contributions to either the area of service or the area of scholarly research.

Faculty with "Instructional" will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to teaching and must contribute to service as well.

Faculty with "Executive" in the title has 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 had or maintained 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 and must contribute to teaching as well.

### **10.1. APT Faculty Appointments**

Following 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, will have an annual appointment for the first year but will always receive 12-months' notice if they are not to be reappointed. They will receive a 5 year (multi-year contract) after a successful first year upon affirmation of the CAO. Newly hired faculty Associate Executive professor, Associate Professor of the Practice, Instructional Associate Professor, and Senior lecturer will have an annual appointment but will always receive 12 month notice if they are not to be reappointed. They will receive a 3 year (multi-year contract) after a successful first year.

#### **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 generally have annual appointments until promotion. 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 the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year's 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 is 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 the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year's TAMU budget.

## **11. Endowments**

### **11.1 Endowed Chair**

The holder of an endowed chair should be considered as receiving one of the highest honors that can be bestowed on a faculty member. The highest level of performance, and national and international recognition of that performance, are inherent guidelines for appointment of a chair holder. The institutional expectation of unquestionable excellence in at least one of the three professional performance dimensions (research, teaching, and service) must be met in addition to any specific criteria associated with a particular endowed position. Gift agreements with donors may specify the criteria for a position; however, in the absence of such specification research and publication will be given primary consideration. The appointment to an endowed chair may recognize a current member of the faculty or it may be associated with recruitment of a new faculty member. In all appointments, excellence should be evidenced by several years of outstanding performance based on national and international standards.

### **11.2 Endowed Professorship**

The holder of an endowed professorship should be considered as receiving a high honor as well as recognition of consistently outstanding performance and ability. The institutional expectation of a distinguished record of performance in one of the three professional performance dimensions must be met in addition to any specific selection criteria associated with a particular endowed position. Again, research will generally take precedence. The appointment to an endowed professorship may recognize a current member of the faculty or it may be associated with recruitment of a new faculty member.

### **11.3 Endowed Faculty Fellowship**

The awarding of an endowed faculty fellowship generally is to recognize and encourage a current member of the faculty who has achieved distinction or who has displayed significant promise for future eminence in instruction/teaching and/or research. The institutional expectation of the promise of higher performance must be met as well as any criteria stated in the donor document.

### **11.4 Selection and Appointment**

#### **11.4.1 Selection**

The selection process will be initiated by the CAO (for non-department specific positions) or the department head (for department specific positions). In every instance, this selection process shall include the advice and counsel from an appropriate faculty committee appointed or

recognized by the CAO.

#### **11.4.2 Appointment**

Once a candidate has been selected for appointment, the CAO shall initiate a request for appointment that includes sufficient information and justification for review and evaluation by the administration. (Recommendations of the faculty committee and the department head should accompany the request for approval at subsequent steps in the in the approval process.)

Appointments to endowed chairs and professorships require the approval of the Provost and Executive Vice President, and appointments to endowed faculty fellowships require the approval of the TAMUG CAO.

Initial appointments shall be consistent with all applicable University policies. Appointment letters need to include specific reference to the Rule on periodic review and reappointment and on the management of endowment related funds. While special conditions may be established by mutual consent and with the approval of the Provost and Executive Vice President, unusual and extraordinary conditions are discouraged and shall in no case be in conflict with University Rules or System Policies.

#### **11.4.3 Evaluation and Reappointment**

Every five years (or more often if a review cycle of fewer years is established at the time of initial appointment or a reappointment) the CAO will recommend to the Provost either that a reappointment review take place or that a reappointment review not take place. (The decision should be based on objective internal data.) In either case the Provost may agree or not agree to the CAO's recommendation. In cases in which the holder is maintaining high standards in his or her work and continues to make positive contributions to the academic mission of the University no review would take place.

In the case that the Provost decides that a review is not required, an appointment will be made. In the case that the Provost decides that a review is required, a small ad hoc faculty committee will be appointed with the concurrence of the Provost to review the appointment. The holder of the endowed position will be informed of the review and specific focus of the review. Further, the holder of the endowed position will be consulted for suggestions of individuals knowledgeable of the academic field of study that is the focus of the endowed position. After consideration of the ad hoc committee report and any response to the report by the endowed position holder, the provost will, after consultation with the CAO, decide on reappointment.

#### **11.4.4 Budgetary Guidelines**

All expenditures of income generated by chair, professorship, and faculty fellowship

endowments must be in accordance with the original gift agreement and applicable University policies. A portion of the annual income generated by the position endowments will be available for the discretionary use of the chair/professorship holder, and it is also expected that some salary expenses normally will be covered if sufficient funds are available.

Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, the CAO shall designate the amount of funding which will be transferred to an expenditure account in the name of the holder. It is intended that the position holder have as much flexibility as possible with these funds, but with appropriate administrative oversight and approval.

**APPENDIX I: TAMUG TT/T Faculty Promotion and Tenure Process**

This timeline outlines the documents and actions required. Always refer to the following for complete information and details.

Home department’s by-laws and/or tenure and promotion procedures (if applicable)

TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

<https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html>

University Promotion and Tenure Submission Guidelines

<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/promotion-tenure.html>

<u>Action / Documentation</u>	<u>Calendar</u> (Approximate timeline)
Departments: Form the Department Review Committee	March
Department Heads: Meet individually with department faculty who seek tenure and/or promotion Inform the CAO of the dossiers being prepared College: CAO to form College Review Committee (bi-annually) Department Administrative Review: Create cases in Interfolio using the <a href="#">Candidate’s TAMU email address</a> Create the dossier coversheet (fillable form in Interfolio) and update as case proceeds Upload the <a href="#">External Reviewers Chart</a> in Excel; for promotion with tenure cases only, also upload the <a href="#">Faculty Tenure Table</a> in Word	April

<p>Promotion and Tenure / Tenured Promotion / Mid Term Review Candidates:</p> <p>Impact Statement</p> <p>3 typed pages maximum; single-spaced; 10pt font minimum; 1-inch margins</p> <p>Explains the quality, productivity overtime and impact within each area of responsibility (i.e.: teaching, research/scholarly work, and service accomplishments)</p> <p>Curriculum Vitae</p> <p>Concise overview of academic accomplishments; reflecting experiences and development in career as a teacher and scholar</p> <p>Include signed/ dated statement: "This CV submitted is most current and correct as of the date of this signature."; may be appended onto the end of the CV</p> <p>Grants Summary Chart</p> <p>Upload Grants Summary Chart as an Excel file*</p> <p>Accurately list grant information; may include career long awards</p> <p>Be sure grants chart and associated details listed in CV are congruent</p> <p>Verification of Contents Statement</p> <p>Fillable form within Interfolio</p> <p>Statement that accurately describes a list of all materials the candidate is submitting to the department review committee</p> <p>Faculty Data Table</p>	<p>Mid-Late May</p> <p>Actual Due Date set by Department Head</p>
--	---



<p><u>Action / Documentation</u></p>	<p><u>Calendar</u> (Approximate timeline)</p>
<p>Department Review Committee: Department External Checklist Complete the Department External Reviewer Checklist for tenure track and tenured cases Arm's length full professors from peer or aspiring institutions who do not have a vested interest in the outcome and therefore can provide an objective and unbiased review</p>	<p>Early June</p>
<p>Department Head: External Reviewers Request Excel spreadsheet (outside of Interfolio) Complete the with the names provided by the candidate and the department review committee Provide to CAO to approve peer or aspiring institutions before sending the external review solicitation requests</p>	<p>Mid-October</p>
<p>Department Review Committee or Department Head: External Reviewer Solicitation Letter Request From the two lists, a group of at least 7 are to be selected and contacted by the Department Head or Dept. Review Committee Chair per departmental by-laws or evaluation procedures Must use the University Standard External Review Template (refer to Appendix I in University Guidelines) sent via email and in subject line state "Candidate Name Tenure and Promotion External Review Official Request" Alternatively, letters from external reviewers can be submitted via Interfolio</p>	<p>First Week of November</p>
<p>Department Review Committee: Unless the departmental artifact requirements were preloaded into the Interfolio case template for the Candidate to provide under Other Documents, the committee will need to: Collect and review materials related to evaluation of teaching effectiveness Collect and review materials related to evaluation of research, or scholarly Collect and review materials related to evaluation of service</p>	<p>August - Early September</p>

<p>Fillable form within Interfolio; include career totals</p> <p>Leave table cells blank if they do not apply</p> <p>External Reviewer’s Checklist</p> <p>Upload Candidate External Reviewer Checklist</p> <p>Arm's length full professors from peer or aspiring institutions who do not have a vested interest in the outcome and therefore can provide an objective and unbiased review</p> <p>Other Documents</p> <p>May include supporting documentation demonstrating/evidencing impact in teaching, research, and service</p> <p>Departmental by-laws or evaluation guidelines may require specific documentation to be provided in this section (i.e.: annual evaluations, student evaluations, teaching portfolio, etc.)</p>	
--	--

<u>Action/ Documentation</u>	<u>Calendar</u> (Approximate timeline)
<p>Department Review Committee:</p> <p>Department External Checklist</p> <p>Complete the Department External Reviewer Checklist for tenure track and tenured cases</p> <p>Arm's length full professors from peer or aspiring institutions who do not have a vested interest in the outcome and therefore can provide an objective and unbiased review</p>	<p>Early June</p>
<p>Department Head:</p>	<p>Mid-June</p>

<p>External Reviewers Request Excel spreadsheet (outside of Interfolio)</p> <p>Complete the with the names provided by the candidate and the department review committee</p> <p>Provide to CAO to approve peer or aspiring institutions before sending the external review solicitation requests</p>	
<p>Department Review Committee or Department Head:</p> <p>External Reviewer Solicitation Letter Request</p> <p>From the two lists, a group of at least 7 are to be selected and contacted by the Department Head or Dept. Review Committee Chair per departmental by-laws or evaluation procedures</p> <p>Must use the University Standard External Review Template (refer to Appendix I in University Guidelines) sent via email and in subject line state "Candidate Name Tenure and Promotion External Review Official Request"</p> <p>Alternatively, letters from external reviewers can be submitted via Interfolio</p>	<p>Late June</p>
<p>Department Review Committee:</p> <p>Unless the departmental artifact requirements were preloaded into the Interfolio case template for the Candidate to provide under Other Documents, the committee will need to:</p> <p>Collect and review materials related to evaluation of teaching effectiveness</p> <p>Collect and review materials related to evaluation of research, or scholarly</p> <p>Collect and review materials related to evaluation of service</p>	<p>August - Early September</p>

<p>Department Review Committee or Department Head:</p> <p>External Evaluations</p> <p>Compile as received for placement in the dossier</p> <p>Must include a minimum of 5 arm's length letters, although 7 is preferred with at least 4 letters from individuals in peer or aspiring programs/universities</p> <p>A minimum of 3 letters from the department's suggested list must be included</p> <p>External Reviewers Biographies / Justifications</p> <p>Provide a separate document listing the name, title, affiliation, contact information and a half a page (maximum) biography highlighting specific qualifications and credentials for each of the reviewers listed on the External Reviewers Chart.</p> <p>Information to be provided by the department head or department review committee chair; support staff may compile the information for submission</p> <p>External Reviewers Chart</p> <p>Complete the External Reviewers Chart*, listed alphabetically by last name</p> <p>Indicate which reviewers were suggested by the candidate versus the department</p> <p>Include all external reviewers contacted; specify which letters were received</p>	<p>Early September</p>
--	------------------------

<p><u>Action / Documentation</u></p>	<p><u>Calendar</u></p> <p>(Approximate timeline)</p>
--------------------------------------	--

<p>Department Review Committee:</p> <p>Writes well-substantiated analyses of the scope (quality, productivity overtime) and IMPACT of candidate's performance in each of the three areas of responsibility.</p> <p>Teaching Report</p> <p>To include evaluation of course materials; Synthetic analysis of student evaluations of teaching; Evaluation of other valuable teaching contributions</p> <p>Research and/or Other Scholarly Activities Report</p> <p>Place the candidate's impact of research or other scholarship contributions in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations, and criteria</p> <p>Service Report</p> <p>Explain the candidate involvement, contributions, quality, and impact of their service activities</p> <p>Department Review Committee Discussion Report &amp; Recommendation</p> <p>Convey the essence of the department review committee's discussion and vote regarding the candidate's performance and impact of their work as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure</p> <p>Address any negative comments made by external reviewers</p> <p>Include voting table; a mixed vote requires further explanation of both the candidate's demonstrated abilities and the committee's concerns</p>	<p>September Actual Due Date set by Department Head</p>
<p>Department Head:</p> <p>Recommendation from Department Head added to Interfolio Dossier</p> <p>Dossier forwarded to College Administrative Review, who in turn forwards the dossier to the College Review Committee</p>	<p>Mid-October</p>
<p>College Review Committee:</p> <p>College Review Committee recommendation added to dossier</p> <p>Dossier forwarded to "Dean" (CAO) for review</p>	<p>First Week of November</p>
<p>TAMUG CAO:</p> <p>Recommendations added to the dossiers</p>	<p>End of November</p>

Mid Term Reviews stop here and a meeting with the Candidate, Dept. Head and CAO will be scheduled during the spring semester	
TAMUG CAO: Forwards all dossiers to “Faculty Affairs Staff Review”	Early December
Board of Regents BOR reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases.	April/May



<p><b>Academic Professional Track Promotion Candidates:</b></p> <p><b>Impact Statement</b></p> <p>3 typed pages maximum; single-spaced; 10pt font minimum; 1-inch margins</p> <p>Explains the quality, productivity overtime and impact within each area of responsibility (i.e.: teaching, research/scholarly work, and service accomplishments)</p> <p><b>Curriculum Vitae</b></p> <p>Concise overview of academic accomplishments; reflecting experiences and development in career as a teacher and scholar</p> <p>Include signed/ dated statement: "This CV submitted is most current and correct as of the date of this signature."; may be appended onto the end of the CV</p> <p><b>Grants Summary Chart</b></p> <p>Upload Grants Summary Chart as an Excel file*; if not applicable, upload chart with N/A</p> <p>Accurately list grant information; may include career long awards</p> <p>Be sure grants chart and associated details listed in CV are congruent</p> <p><b>Verification of Contents Statement</b></p> <p>Fillable form within Interfolio</p> <p>Statement that accurately describes a list of all materials the candidate is submitting to the department review committee</p> <p><b>Faculty Data Table</b></p> <p>Fillable form within Interfolio; include career totals</p> <p>Leave table cells blank if they do not apply</p> <p><b>Other Documents</b></p> <p>May include supporting documentation demonstrating/evidencing impact in teaching, research, and service</p> <p>Departmental by-laws or evaluation guidelines may require specific documentation to be provided in this section (i.e.: annual evaluations, student evaluations, teaching portfolio, etc.)</p>	<p><b>August</b></p> <p>Actual Due Date set by Department Head</p>
---	--



<b>Action</b> <u>MARA Department Faculty Evaluation Guidelines</u>	<b>Calendar</b> (Approximate)
<p><b>Department Review Committee:</b></p> <p>Unless the departmental artifact requirements were preloaded into the Interfolio case template for the Candidate to provide under Other Documents, the committee will need to:</p> <p>Collect and review materials related to evaluation of teaching effectiveness and Collect, and review materials related to evaluation of service <u>or</u> Collect and review materials related to evaluation of research, scholarly activities</p>	<b>August - Early September</b>
<p><b>Department Review Committee:</b></p> <p>Writes well-substantiated analyses of the scope (quality, productivity overtime) and IMPACT of candidate's performance in each of the two areas of responsibility. Upload blank document if area does not apply.</p> <p><b>Teaching Report</b></p> <p>To include evaluation of course materials; Synthetic analysis of student evaluations of teaching; Evaluation of other valuable teaching contributions</p> <p><b>Research and/or Other Scholarly Activities Report</b></p> <p>Place the candidate's impact of research or other scholarship contributions in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations, and criteria</p> <p><b>Service Report</b></p> <p>Explain the candidate involvement, contributions, quality, and impact of their service activities</p> <p><b>Department Review Committee Discussion Report &amp; Recommendation</b></p> <p>Convey the essence of the department review committee's discussion and vote regarding the candidate's performance and impact of their work as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure</p> <p>Address any negative comments made by external reviewers</p> <p>Include voting table; a mixed vote requires further explanation of both the candidate's</p>	<b>September</b> Actual Due Date set by Department Head

<p><b>Department Head:</b>                  Recommendation from Department Head added to dossier                  Dossier forwarded to College Administrative Review, who in turn forwards the dossier to the College Review Committee</p>	<p><b>Mid October</b></p>
<p><b>College Review Committee:</b>                  College Review Committee recommendation added to dossier                  Dossier forwarded to “Dean” (CAO) for review</p>	<p><b>First week of November</b></p>
<p><b>TAMUG CAO:</b>                  Recommendations added to the dossiers</p>	<p><b>End of November</b></p>
<p><b>TAMUG CAO:</b>                  Forwards all dossiers to “Faculty Affairs Staff Review”</p>	<p><b>Early December</b></p>
<p><b>Provost:</b>                  Meets with the CAO to discuss TAMUG recommendations</p>	<p><b>January</b></p>
<p><b>Provost:</b>                  Forwards recommendations to the University President</p>	<p><b>January/February</b></p>
<p><b>University President:</b>                  Makes a final decision on recommendations</p>	<p><b>January/February</b></p>
<p><b>Promotions Effective</b></p>	<p><b>September 1st</b></p>

**APPENDIX III: TAMUG POST TENURE REVIEW PROCESS**

This timeline outlines the documents and actions required. Always refer to the following for complete information and details.

Home department’s by-laws and/or tenure and promotion procedures (if applicable)

TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

<https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html>

University Promotion and Tenure Submission Guidelines

<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/promotion-tenure.html> - may help with writing impact statements

Action / Documentation	Calendar (Approximate timeline)
Departments: Form the Department Review Committee	March
Department Heads: Meet individually with department faculty who will undergo post tenure review Inform the CAO of the dossiers being prepared TAMUG CAO: Forms College Review Committee (bi-annually) Department Administrative Review:	Spring
Create cases in Interfolio using the <u>Candidate’s TAMU email address</u> Create the dossier coversheet (fillable form in Interfolio) and update as case proceeds	Spring-Summer

<p>Post Tenure Review Candidates:</p> <p>Impact Statement</p> <p>3 typed pages maximum; single-spaced; 10pt font minimum; 1-inch margins</p> <p>Explains the quality, productivity overtime and impact within each area of responsibility (i.e.: teaching, research/scholarly work, and service accomplishments)</p> <p>Curriculum Vitae</p> <p>Concise overview of academic accomplishments; reflecting experiences and development in career as a teacher and scholar</p> <p>Include signed/ dated statement: "This CV submitted is most current and correct as of the date of this signature."; may be appended onto the end of the CV</p> <p>Grants Summary Chart</p> <p>Upload Grants Summary Chart as an Excel file*</p> <p>Accurately list grant information; may include career long awards</p> <p>Be sure grants chart and associated details listed in CV are congruent</p> <p>Verification of Contents Statement</p> <p>Fillable form within Interfolio</p> <p>Statement that accurately describes a list of all materials the candidate is submitting to the department review committee</p> <p>Other Documents</p> <p>May include supporting documentation demonstrating/evidencing impact in teaching, research and/or service</p> <p>Departmental by-laws or evaluation guidelines may require specific documentation to be provided in this section (i.e.: annual evaluations, student evaluations, teaching portfolio, etc.)</p>	<p>August</p> <p>Actual Due Date set by Department Head</p>
---	---

<p>Action / Documentation</p>	<p>Calendar</p> <p>(Approximate timeline)</p>
-------------------------------	---

<p>Department Review Committee:</p> <p>Unless the departmental artifact requirements were preloaded into the Interfolio case template for the Candidate to provide under Other Documents, the committee will need to:</p> <p>Collect and review materials related to evaluation of teaching effectiveness</p> <p>Collect and review materials related to evaluation of research, scholarly activities, if applicable</p> <p>Collect and review materials related to evaluation of service, if applicable</p>	<p>August - Early September</p>
<p>Department Review Committee:</p> <p>Writes well-substantiated analyses of the scope (quality, productivity overtime) and IMPACT of candidate's performance in each of the three areas of responsibility.</p> <p>Teaching Report</p> <p>To include evaluation of course materials; Synthetic analysis of student evaluations of teaching; Evaluation of other valuable teaching contributions</p> <p>Research and/or Other Scholarly Activities Report</p> <p>Place the candidate's impact of research or other scholarship contributions in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations, and criteria</p> <p>Service Report</p> <p>Explain the candidate involvement, contributions, quality, and impact of their service activities</p> <p>Department Review Committee Discussion Report &amp; Recommendation</p> <p>Convey the essence of the department review committee's discussion and vote regarding the candidate's performance and impact of their work as it relates to their post tenure productivity</p> <p>Include voting table; a mixed vote requires further explanation of both the candidate's demonstrated abilities and the committee's concerns</p>	<p>September Actual Due Date set by Department Head</p>
<p>Department Head:</p> <p>Recommendation from Department Head added to Interfolio Dossier</p> <p>Dossier forwarded to College Administrative Review, who in turn forwards the dossier to the College Review Committee</p>	<p>Mid-October</p>

College Review Committee: College Review Committee recommendation added to dossier Dossier forwarded to CAO for review	End of November
TAMUG CAO: Recommendations added to the dossiers	Early December

## APPENDIX IV: Qualified Faculty Status

### Guidelines

(Proposal amended by faculty vote on 11/28/18, approved by unanimous vote by full-time faculty and two votes for and four abstentions from adjunct faculty, 11/30/2018)

Faculty who meet Qualified Faculty Status as defined by Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation by AACSB (adopted April 8, 2013, and updated September 22, 2017) will be considered to be Academically Qualified (AQ) by the Maritime Business Administration Department. Qualified faculty status will be determined by meeting the minimum qualifications for one of four categories based on initial academic preparation or professional experience and sustained academic and professional engagement.

The four categories are Scholarly Academics (SA), Practice Academics (PA), Scholarly Practitioners (SP), or Instructional Practitioner (IP). See the Eligibility Procedures at [www.AACSB.com](http://www.AACSB.com) for more information. The descriptions below include the codes to be used in the G1 form submitted for yearly evaluation.

**Scholarly Academic (SA)** status initially requires a terminally qualifying degree. It will be maintained by meeting one of the following in the previous five-year period:

1. Receipt of a terminally qualifying degree in the past five years (SA1)
2. Or a minimum of two (2) peer-reviewed journal or proceedings articles (PRJ) accepted for publication. (See acceptable PRJ descriptions in the “Definitions used in evaluation of faculty for promotion” section.) (SA2)
3. Or a minimum of two (2) other intellectual contributions (OIC) as specified below.
4. One peer-reviewed journal or proceedings articles (PRJ) accepted for publication (SA3)
5. Authorship of scholarly textbooks or chapter in scholarly textbooks (SA4)
6. Receipt of significant externally funded research grants (SA5)

Receipt of research awards from and/or academic fellow status at major professional organizations (SA6)

Invited presentations at leading or aspirant peer universities or conferences (SA7)

Faculty who held significant administrative positions (such as accreditation or assessment) and were scholarly academics at the initial appointment to an administrative role. (SA8)

Other OICs as described in the “Definitions used in evaluation of faculty for promotion” section (SA9)

**Practice Academics (PA)** status initially requires a terminally qualifying degree. It will be

maintained by meeting one of the following in the previous five-year period:

1. Receipt of a terminally qualifying degree in the past five years (PA1)

2. Or a minimum of two of the following OIC:

Extensive engagement in consulting activities related to their current teaching assignments (PA2)

Authorship of a practitioner book or chapter. (PA3)

Significant involvement/development in executive education and or online programs (PA4)

Significant involvement in the MMAL program (PA5)

Documented self-development activities, including continuing professional education that led to increased teaching effectiveness. (PA6)

Receipt of peer-reviewed external funding for teaching/instruction (PA7)

Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials (PA8)

Practice-oriented intellectual contributions (PA9)

Authorship of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases readings, simulations) (PA10)

**Scholarly Practitioner (SP)** status is for those faculty who do not have a terminal degree. The status will be maintained by completing two of the following in the previous five-year period:

1. Publication in relevant academic or professional journals (SP1)

2. Development and presentation of professional educational activities or executive education programs (SP2)

3. Receipt of significant externally funded research grants (SP3)

4. Receipt of research awards from and/or academic fellow status a major professional organization (SP4)

5. Invited presentation at leading or aspirant peer universities or conferences (SP5)

**Instructional Practitioner (IP)** status is for those faculty who do not have a terminal degree. The status will be maintained by completing two of the following in the previous five-year period:

1. Documented self-development activities, including continuing professional education that led to increased teaching effectiveness (IP1)

2. Professional education to maintain license or certification (IP2)



3. Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups (IP3)
4. Service as a consultant to business organizations and/or governmental agencies (IP4)
5. Receipt of peer-reviewed external funding for teaching instruction (IP5)
6. Development of executive programs/online graduate courses or presentation of executive programs (IP6)
7. Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials (IP7)
8. Significant involvement in the graduate MMAL program (IP8)
9. Sustained professional work experiences (IP9)
10. Profession certifications in the area of teaching (IP10)
11. Participants in professional events that focus on practice and other activities that place faculty in direct contact with business leaders (IP11)

**Other (O)** status is for those who do not meet the minimum requirements for any four categories. AACSB standards require that no more than 10% of the full-time equivalent faculty be allocated to this category. Full-time equivalent faculty status counts adjuncts based on the percentage of time allocated to the department.

## APPENDIX V: Teaching Evaluation Guidelines

Defining teaching within the institution TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines:

This category includes, among other things, classroom instruction, 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

TAMU Tenure and Promotion Guidelines:

The category of “teaching” includes, among other things:

- Classroom instruction
- Development of new courses and teaching methods
- Publication of instructional materials including textbooks
- Supervision of graduate students

In the report on the evaluation of teaching, the following must be included for each candidate:

Peer evaluation of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods, as part of the determination of the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate’s course offerings.

Student ratings of teaching, with comments on these evaluations by peers: Complete longitudinal summaries (chronological and tabular form) of the student ratings must be presented, with numerical data set in departmental standards and norms.

Peer evaluation of other teaching contributions of value to the department, such as the direction of graduate students and undergraduate researchers, participation in student development programs, curriculum development, development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses, pedagogical publications, textbook, and other instructional materials, participation in honors programs, awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, and other teaching-related activities.

Institutional evaluation guidelines

## TAMU Tenure and Promotion Guidelines:

i. Peer reports of structured classroom observations are helpful but are not required. If such a report is provided, it should indicate the frequency of observations and criteria for assessing performance. If a department has engaged in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of a candidate's service for the purpose of developing teaching ability, these evaluations would be a natural addition to this section of the dossiers.

## B. TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines:

ii. The Teaching section will document the faculty member's teaching accomplishments for the review year. Teaching is an important mission of the University, but more than acceptable teaching is expected. 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 in course evaluation forms.

Teaching evaluation categories & descriptions

Five Proposed Categories-Candidates must select two categories for evaluation in addition to the required Classroom Teaching Observation category. Each candidate may choose her preferred evaluation tool within the Classroom Teaching Observation category. Each of the three selected categories will be evaluated as "outstanding," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory" and will mirror the rubric utilized in annual evaluations.

i. Classroom Management/Teaching Artifacts - Indicates course materials provided to and utilized by students, in or outside the classroom, that employ and document the course learning objectives. Also, demonstrate "the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate's course offerings" (TAMU Promotion 13). Artifacts might include: unit or lesson plans, in-class workshop prompts, syllabi, assignment prompts, evaluation rubrics, Blackboard/eCampus or Canvas course shells, student diagnostics, Aggie Experience activities, classroom assessment techniques, peer instruction techniques, evaluated exams, journals, homework exercises, papers, or other student projects submitted with the student's consent.

ii. Student Mentorship-indicates instruction that offers students insight on and hand-on experiences within their field of study. Such opportunities might include supervision of student research as a thesis advisor or in another capacity, supervision of fieldwork, one on-one consultation with students including independent study courses or readings courses, participation in student development programs, supervision of teaching assistants in undergraduate or graduate courses, advising students in the major, and supervision of clinical or practicum experiences.

iii. Classroom Teaching Observation (required)-Provides summative feedback on the instructor's teaching practice and evaluates its effectiveness to meet administrative requirements. Observations must include one of the following: Student End-of-Term Evaluations, Classroom Teaching Observation (in-class observation conducted by a departmental or external peer-i.e., Center for Teaching Excellence or conducted using a video recording, departmental peer, external peer) Student Focus Group Interviews, Alumni/Former student evaluation on effective preparation for the field, Classroom Teaching appraisal using a video recording.

Teaching Pedagogy-Demonstrates the impact of teaching practice by placing pedagogical research in a variety of venues. Examples include publishing syllabi or other course management documents in teaching pedagogy journals, websites, and other outlets. Publishing teaching/instructional pedagogy in monographs, edited volumes, journals, websites, etc. Presenting teaching/instructional pedagogy at institutional, state, regional, and national teaching conferences, authoring or editing a textbook or other teaching materials, internal or external funding for instructional initiatives and/or research, among others.

iv. Professional Development-Demonstrates awareness of and engagement with best instructional practices. This may be illustrated through enrollment in or instruction at workshops such as those offered by the Center for Teaching Excellence, the Learning Commons, or TAMU Instructional Technology Certificate Program, presentation or attendance at conferences or workshops including the TAMU Transformational Teaching and Learning Conference, and other professional development opportunities focusing on instructional training and development.

#### 4. Submission mode

A. Teaching Dossier-Provides an overview of teaching across a range of courses (no fewer than two) during the evaluation period. It should include:

##### 1. Description of Courses Taught-two pages maximum

A two-page description of the courses taught. It should include the time, date, number of students enrolled, and a short paragraph that describes course goals and objectives.

##### 2. Student Mentorship-two pages maximum

This document describes undergraduate and/or graduate student supervision and membership on

supervisory committees and honors thesis/independent study course supervision. It identifies how the instructor has mentored students beyond his/her/their classroom instruction. Other examples of student mentorship include supervision of fieldwork, one-on-one consultation with students, including independent study courses or readings courses, participation in student development programs, supervision of teaching assistants in undergraduate or graduate courses.

### 3. Teaching Philosophy-two pages maximum

The teaching philosophy should outline your beliefs and about teaching and learning and explain your teaching practices. Claims made in the teaching philosophy should be linked to specific criteria demonstrated in the syllabi and other course artifacts submitted in the dossier.

### 4. Classroom Teaching Observation

Results from PICA evaluations or other evaluation modes including Classroom Teaching Observation (in-class observation conducted by a departmental or external peer-i.e., Center for Teaching Excellence, or conducted using a video recording, departmental peer, external peer) Student Focus Group Interviews, Alumni/Former student evaluation on effective preparation for the field, Classroom Teaching appraisal using a video recording

### 5. Syllabi and other course artifacts

Syllabi for each course taught must be included in this section of the teaching dossier. It might also include assignment prompts, in-class exercises or workshops, and other materials provided to students in a class and sample student work provided the student gives written consent. This consent should be submitted with the materials.

### 6. Teaching Awards & Recognition

Evidence of any teaching-related awards, grants, or other internal or external recognition should be provided here.

## 7. Course Development and Innovation

A short description of any developments or innovations should be provided in this section and supporting documents. These may include course materials, course handbooks, course outlines, assignments for courses you have developed, forms of assessment, web pages, etc.

## 8. Teaching Related Service

Service might include committee service for teaching awards, teaching-related consultation, participation in program reviews, facilitating workshops, teaching & learning coordinating a series, conference, etc., on teaching & learning.

## 9. Teaching Scholarship

Examples might include published articles related to teaching and learning, presentations at teaching and learning conferences, grants, or other awards for teaching-related activities.

## 10. Teaching Development (Professional Development)

Examples might include enrollment in and attending teaching workshops, presenting on teaching topics at conferences, and collaborating with colleagues on teaching materials.

## 11. Experiential/High Impact Learning

This includes a narrative detailing such practices as well as evidence of these practices. Documentation of experiential and/or high-impact exercises might consist of a capstone project, internships, service-learning, or community-based learning. Completing ePortfolios, Global learning, undergraduate research, collaborative assignments or projects, writing-intensive courses, learning communities, common intellectual experiences, and first-year seminars and experiences are among the high impact and experiential practices that might be documented.

Single Course Teaching Dossier-this model emphasizes developing a single course over a specific period using at least three semesters of teaching the selected course. It traces the course's development over time and illustrates how the instructor has responded to teaching evaluations and other course feedback by significantly reworking and revising course content.

1. Course Description-two pages maximum

A two-page description of the submitted course includes time, date, number of students enrolled, and a short paragraph describing course goals and objectives. The description should also provide an overview of how the course's development has been influenced by teaching evaluations and other course feedback.

2. Student Mentorship-two pages maximum

This document describes undergraduate and/or graduate student supervision and membership on supervisory committees and honors thesis/independent study course supervision. It identifies how the instructor has mentored students beyond his/her/their classroom instruction. Other examples of student mentorship include supervision of fieldwork, one-on-one consultation with students, including independent study courses or readings courses, participation in student development programs, supervision of teaching assistants in undergraduate or graduate courses.

3. Teaching Philosophy-two pages maximum

The teaching philosophy should outline your beliefs and about teaching and learning and explain your teaching practices. Claims made in the teaching philosophy should be linked to specific criteria demonstrated in the syllabi and other course artifacts submitted in the dossier.

4. Classroom Teaching Observation

Results from PICA evaluations or other evaluation modes including Classroom Teaching Observation (in-class observation conducted by a departmental or external peer-i.e., Center for Teaching Excellence, or conducted using a video recording, departmental peer, external peer) Student Focus Group Interviews, Alumni/Former student evaluation on effective preparation for the field, Classroom Teaching appraisal using a video recording

### 5. Syllabi and other course artifacts

Syllabi for each semester the course was taught within the evaluation period must be included in the dossier. It should also include assignment prompts, class exercises or workshops, and other materials provided to students in a class and sample student work provided the student gives written consent. This consent should be submitted with the materials.

### 6. Teaching Awards & Recognition

Evidence of any teaching-related awards, grants, or other internal or external recognition should be provided.

### 7. Course Development and Innovation

A short description of any developments or innovations should be provided in this section and supporting documents. These may include course materials, course handbooks, course outlines, assignments for courses you have developed, forms of assessment, web pages, etc.

### 8. Teaching Related Service

Any service activities directly linked to the course should include committee service for teaching awards, teaching-related consultation, participation in program reviews, facilitating workshops, teaching & learning, coordinating a series, conference, etc., on teaching & learning.

### 9. Teaching Scholarship

Examples might include published articles related to teaching and learning, presentations at teaching and learning conferences, grants, or other awards for teaching-related activities.

### 10. Teaching Development (Professional Development)

Examples might include enrollment in and attending teaching workshops, presenting on teaching topics at conferences, and collaborating with colleagues on teaching materials.



## 11. Experiential/High Impact Learning

This includes a narrative detailing such practices as well as evidence of these practices. Documentation of experiential and/or high impact practices might consist of: a capstone project, internships, service learning or community-based learning, ePortfolios, Global learning, undergraduate research, collaborative assignments or projects, writing-intensive courses, learning communities, common intellectual experiences, and first-year seminars and experiences are among the high impact and experiential practices that might be documented.

### Student Focus Group Feedback Instructions

The student focus group analysis is a method of course assessment by soliciting anonymous feedback from students. The assessment has three components:

Pre-analysis consultation, in which the reviewer meets with the instructor before conducting the focus groups to review course materials (e.g., syllabus, assignments, assessments, etc.) and (i.e., optionally) develop questions for the students beyond those in the accompanying student focus group questionnaire.

Data gathering and analysis, in which the reviewer conducts the student focus groups and analyzes resultant data. On the day of the assessment, the instructor leaves the room; the reviewer asks students to get into small groups of four to five, depending on the number of students in the class. Each group works together to complete the accompanying questionnaire. The reviewer then leads a class-wide discussion, asking students for their responses to the questions. The reviewer asks clarifying questions, as needed, identifying areas of consensus and disagreement, and eliciting further feedback by encouraging students to consider each other's input. The reviewer is then to analyze by completing the accompanying assessment form.

Post-analysis consultation, in which the reviewer meets with the instructor to share findings. The reviewer will share the student questionnaires and the assessment form. Together, they will interpret student comments. The assessment form will help decipher the sometimes-confusing comments students make on the written questionnaires and highlight the significant points students made during the assessment. Together, the reviewer and instructor will identify successes and areas for improvement and develop a course of action to make use of student feedback, as seen fit.

Student focus group analysis may be used for formative or summative assessments.

Feedback at the end of the semester can help improve teaching and the course the next time it is taught. Soliciting mid-semester feedback has the additional benefit of permitting appropriate changes before the course conclusion.

## Student Focus Group Questionnaire

Instructor:	Course:
Location:	Date:

1. Identify what your group sees as the primary learning objectives in the course. Please explain the importance of each objective.

*Learning Objective*

*Explanation*

a.

b.

c.

2. List the major strengths in the course (i.e., what is helping you learn). Please explain or give an example for each strength.

*Strength*

*Explanation or Example*

a.

b.

c.

3. List changes that could be made in the course to assist you in learning. Please explain how suggested changes could be made.

*Changes*

*Ways to make changes*

a.

b.

c.

4. Other comments?

## Student Focus Group Assessment Form

Instructor:	Course:
Location:	Date:
Reviewer:	Department/College:

Learning Objectives	Yes	No	N/A	Comments/Descriptions
<p>In pre-analysis consultation review of course materials</p> <p><i>Examples may include but are not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Objectives are clearly defined</i></li> <li>• <i>Course material is challenging and aligned with objectives</i></li> <li>• <i>Assignments, assessments aimed at meeting objectives</i></li> </ul>				
<p>In analysis of student feedback</p> <p><i>Examples may include but are not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Student-identified objectives align with those identified by instructor</i></li> <li>• <i>Students demonstrated understanding of importance of objectives</i></li> <li>• <i>Students felt material, assignments, assessments align with objectives</i></li> <li>• <i>Students felt objectives were being met</i></li> </ul>				

Strengths/Weaknesses	Yes	No	N/A	Comments/Descriptions
<p>Content expertise- in disciplinary knowledge/skills and incorporates current/relevant research/events</p> <p><i>Examples may include but are not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Comfortable with subject</i></li> <li>• <i>Minimal reliance on notes or slides when lecturing</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognizes aspects of the content that are challenging for learners</i></li> <li>• <i>Shares current related research/events to engage students</i></li> </ul>				
<p>Course/Classroom management- provided students access to materials</p> <p><i>Examples may include but are not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Course information/material are clearly listed in syllabus</i></li> <li>• <i>Course materials are available via eCampus</i></li> <li>• <i>Course materials are available via library</i></li> <li>• <i>Extra learning materials are offered</i></li> </ul>				
<p>Instructional delivery- effectively planning class time, good communication, and fosters safe learning environment</p> <p><i>Examples may include but are not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Full class time used</i></li> <li>• <i>Summarizes material from previous class, reviews material at end of class, previews next class's material</i></li> </ul>				



### Peer Feedback on Syllabus

Instructor:	Course:
Reviewer:	Date:

Categories	Yes	No	N/A	Comments/Descriptions
<b>Currency of Content</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Portrays current state of field</i></li> <li>● <i>Readings and materials reflect latest scholarship</i></li> </ul>				
<b>Fit within Curriculum</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Fulfills expectations for content and skills needed for subsequent courses</i></li> <li>● <i>Matches catalog description</i></li> <li>● <i>Course goals and objectives clearly stated</i></li> <li>● <i>All relevant information is clearly displayed</i></li> </ul>				
<b>Level of Challenge</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Requires students to do an appropriate amount of work</i></li> <li>● <i>Readings and assignments are at appropriate level of challenge</i></li> </ul>				
<b>Pacing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Course calendar is realistic</i></li> <li>● <i>Amount of content covered is reasonable</i></li> <li>● <i>Due dates for readings and assignments are well distributed</i></li> </ul>				

<p><b>Assessments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Align with course goals</i></li> <li>• <i>Employs variety of assignments that reflect diverse learning preferences</i></li> <li>• <i>Students receive frequent feedback</i></li> <li>• <i>Grading policies are fair and appropriate for goals</i></li> </ul>				
<p><b>Student-Centeredness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Other resources available to students</i></li> <li>• <i>Activities show concern for active student engagement</i></li> <li>• <i>Course encourages inclusion with respect to culture and ability</i></li> </ul>				
<p><b>Other</b></p>				

Summary Comments:

1. Major strengths of the syllabus.
  
2. Suggestions for improving the syllabus.
  
3. Other comments.



Appendix VI G-1

**FORM G1: FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION**

**NAME:**

**RANK:**

**DEPT: Maritime Business Administration**

**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2020-2021**

**TEACHING**

**COURSES TAUGHT:**

Semester	Subject	Course	Section	Hours	# of Students

**UNDERGRADUATE AND/ OR GRADUATE STUDENTS SUPERVISED:**

Name	Degree Sought	Faculty Role

**OTHER COURSES TAUGHT:**

Include recognized programs for continuing education, short courses, or special workshops

--

**TEACHING PEDAGOGIES USED IN CLASSROOM:**

Include active learning activities used in your courses, experiential learning; or activities involving student/faculty or student/student interactions. List guest speakers and affiliations, field trip destinations and number of students in attendance

Learning Activities


Guest Speakers

Name	Affiliation

Field Trips

Destination	Number of students in attendance

**OTHER: Include development of new courses, programs, online courses, etc.**

**What technology did you use or teach in the classroom, other than Microsoft Office?**



2.3. EXTERNAL UNFUNDED RESEARCH			
Title	Date Initiated	Completion Date	Reviewers

**INTERNAL RESEARCH GRANTS**

3.1 INTERNAL FUNDED RESEARCH					
AQ Code	Title	Funding source	(PI)	Budget	Grant Length

3.2 INTERNAL RESEARCH PROPOSALS							
AQ Code	Title	Funding Source	PI	Budget	Date submitted	Completion Date	Status

**INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

Did you apply for a TCRF or other internal (to TAMU/G) development program (PESCA, Conacyt, etc.) to conduct your research?     YES     NO

If you were successful, what were the outcomes?

If you were not successful, what is your plan to elevate your scholarship through funded research?

**PRESENTATIONS:**

Include papers or long abstracts, peer reviewed and presented at conferences or meetings. Indicate Academic Qualifications Code (AQ Code), paper title, co-authors names, conference/meeting and location and date.

AQ Code	Title	Co-Authors	Conference or Meeting	Location	Date

**PROFESSIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE:**

Including consulting related to teaching assignments, invited speaker at leading or peer universities or conferences, or professional events that focus on practice

**TEACHING PEDAGOGIES DEVELOPED:**

Include any teaching materials, innovative pedagogical methods, or technology developed and distributed

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCES SEMINARS/ WORKSHOPS:**

Include any seminars attended to advance your discipline or teaching effectiveness, or professional certifications.

Location	Name	Date

**OTHER ACTIVITIES NOT INCLUDED ABOVE:**

AQ Code	Description	Status

**SERVICE**

**1. SERVICE ACTIVITIES**

**1.1 ADVISING, NON-TEACHING:**

Include any extra-curricular activities such as organization advisor or service to students provided in an ongoing activity

--

**1.2 COMMITTEE SERVICE:**

Indicate your role: Member, chair, or other leadership position name

**1.2.1 TAMU System Committees**

Role	Committee Name	Purpose

**1.2.2 TAMU Committees**

Role	Committee Name	Purpose

**1.2.3 TAMUG Committees**

Role	Committee Name	Purpose



1.2.4 Department Committees

Role	Committee Name	Purpose

1.2.5 Other Service Not Included Above

Role	Committee Name	Purpose

1.3 ADMINISTRATION:

Position held (an appointment beyond normal faculty responsibilities), and short description of responsibilities.

1.4 INTERNAL SERVICE:

Recurring campus service activities such as The BIG Event, Midnight Breakfast, Etc.

1.5 EXTERNAL SERVICE:

To professional organizations, industry, or community service, indicate membership or leadership role

AQ Code	Member/ Chair	Name of Organization

1.6 Consulting Activities Related to Teaching Assignments

AQ Code	Dates	Description

1.7 OTHER:

2. SPECIFIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES:

Provide a detailed response for each

2.1 INTERDISCIPLINARY/MULTIDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION



**AWARDS**

Date	Name of Award

**PROSPECTUS**

What are your plans for teaching, research, and service (or other) as they relate to the strategic initiative for student success?

TEACHING

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

SERVICE

OTHER

**ENGAGEMENT, INNOVATION & IMPACT MATRIX**

		AACSB Themes		
MARA Strategic Priority	Example	Engagement	Innovation	Impact
Research				
Teaching				
Service				