Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
Texas A&M University at Qatar (TAMUQ)

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
Texas A&M University at Qatar (TAMUQ)

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University, Qatar (TAMUQ) is to: Educate exemplary engineers and develop world-class leaders through internationally recognized undergraduate and graduate degree programs; Generate new knowledge and intellectual capital through innovative research and collaborative partnerships that yield sustainable impact, and advance the development goals of the State of Qatar and the region through expertise and engagement that expand human capital.

Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document articulates general guidelines for faculty annual review, and promotion review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

- University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion
- Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Review
- Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)

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.

The expectations of TAMUQ 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. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

The Program Chairs (PCs) of the Engineering programs and the Director of the Division of Arts and Sciences (DAS Director) are primarily responsible for ensuring that the University procedures are followed so that each faculty member receives a fair and timely assessment of their accomplishments and performance. The overall purpose of these guidelines is to ensure the integrity of the annual review, and promotion process in order to retain and promote the best faculty possible. Within these overall procedures, it is specifically noted that program practices may differ because of variations in program size, the nature of program faculty, the degree of inter/multidisciplinary activity, and academic mission. The procedures for each review process are included in this document. Throughout this document, College refers to TAMUQ collectively, unless otherwise specified.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

- Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion and University Guidelines to Faculty Titles. Rolling and tenured (tenured in TAMU on joint appointment with TAMUQ) faculty titles are Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. **Existing rolling appointments will end on August 31, 2026**. TAMUQ faculty titles, summarized below, are as described in section 3 of the University Guidelines to Faculty Titles, "Academic Professional Track Faculty Titles," and section 5, "Working Title Options."
- **Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor** will make significant contributions to teaching activity. At TAMUQ, Instructional faculty will also make significant contributions to service activity.

Instructional faculty will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity, and service activity incident to the context of instruction and program/curricular development.

- **Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor** will make significant contributions to research activity, and their appointment is often associated with substantial research funding or work on a particular project. At TAMUQ, teaching is the second substantial area of responsibility for research faculty. With the approval of the dean, a research faculty member's second substantial area of responsibility may be service. This adjustment must be stated clearly in the appointment letter. They can also be assigned a non-substantial percentage in a third area. **Engineering Assistant Professor, Engineering Associate Professor, Engineering Professor** are the approved **Working Titles**, that are unofficial titles associated with the official research faculty titles above.
- **Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer** will make significant contributions to teaching activity. At TAMUQ, Lecturer faculty may also be assigned to service activity but would not be expected to consistently make significant contributions in service. Lecturer faculty will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity.
- **Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice** will make significant contributions to education in an area where they have substantial professional credentials or experience. Faculty of practice typically have teaching as their primary focus. The secondary area can be research or service, as stated in the appointment letter.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

(Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1)

Areas of faculty performance are the categories within which a faculty member is expected to work and be evaluated. Areas of performance must correspond to the faculty job title. Any modifications must be temporary and clearly explained in the annual appointment letter. Administration is an area of responsibility that applies only to faculty who have leadership roles, e.g., Program Chair (PC), Division of Arts and Sciences (DAS) Director, associate/assistant dean. Appointment letters should clearly indicate the percentage effort for the administrative appointment.

Decisions on promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance: teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service; administration.

Every Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty member is expected to perform in the areas designated in their appointment letter in accordance with Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles. Current rolling appointment faculty, for whom research is no longer the primary area of focus, will develop a phased plan to progress to a two-area responsibility, with teaching as the primary focus.

Criteria that underscore the expectations for performance in assigned categories play very important roles in faculty evaluations. It is expected that the respective programs and DAS will have specific criteria based on their disciplines. The criteria listed in this unified College evaluations document serve as guiding criteria.

3.1 Teaching

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

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

- **Teaching Quality:** The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject and its didactics, including keeping abreast of current developments in the subject.
- **Essential Pedagogy:** The use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.
- **Educational innovation.** Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort, which can be in all aspects of teaching, including but not limited to technology use, assessment methods, and the development of learning experiences.
- **Teaching professionalism**. Mentoring students, using appropriate methods of evaluation, and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching, as is upholding academic integrity as mandated by the Aggie Honor Code. Additionally, being aware of students' classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with all students are also measures of professionalism.
- **Impact upon students**. A positive impact, such as increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values, of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member and constitute another characteristic of effective instruction, as is enthusiasm for teaching.
- **Pedagogical scholarship**. Contributions to pedagogical conferences and authorship of textbooks and other pertinent instructional material.
- **Recognition of pedagogical accomplishments**. Awards and runner-up mentions for teaching.

3.2 <u>Research, scholarly activity or creative work</u> (Applicable to faculty in the engineering programs):

The College offers the following major guiding criteria:
- Demonstrable scholarly/research productivity (underscored by publications, grants, and other related scholarly activities). Publication portfolio, the quality of publications venues (e.g., journals or highly selective conferences), as appropriate for the discipline.
- Active research grants, proposals submitted, and other evidence of active and strategic engagement in pursuing funding opportunities.
- Research expenditures.
- Portfolio of patents, licenses, and other evidence of commercial adoption of research products.
- Contributions to the success of the TAMUQ Strategic Impact Research Initiative within the program.
- External expert review of quality and impact of scholarly work.
- Leadership position in grants and publications.
- Influential research that is highly regarded in sub/specialized fields and main disciplines.
- Awards and runner-up mention for research.
- Research impact from transfer of methods and inventions to real life applications.

3.3 Service

Service contributions include service to the program/division, the College, the University, the profession, and the community.

The College offers the following guiding criteria for assessing effectiveness and excellence in service:

- Active participation in the operation of the program/division.
- Productive contributions to College and University initiatives and activities.
- Contributions to initiatives and activities.
- Contributions to student development outside assigned teaching responsibilities.
- Demonstrable contributions to the mission and activities of professional organizations and scholarly communities, as is appropriate for track and rank (Membership on committees, editorial boards, and peer review panels, boards, and study groups for governmental agencies and foundations at national and international levels).
- Demonstrable contributions to non-scholarly local and regional communities.

3.4 Administration, if applicable

Faculty-administrators in the College —PCs, DAS Director, Assistant and Associate Deans— will be evaluated for effectiveness and excellence in the performance of their administrative duties based on criteria and standards as specified in individual appointment (and renewal) letters.

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

TAMUQ recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on input from DAS and the engineering programs, and in accordance with the examples of criteria in Section 4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1: https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M1.pdf. While many of the indicators are broad/general and can be applied to faculty evaluation in DAS and the engineering programs, some are specific and should be applied only as pertinent.

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:

- Outstanding evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visits by PC/Division Director, peers, or external evaluators.
- Outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students.
- Selection for program/division, College, University, or professional association teaching awards.
- Publications with authorship by undergraduate researchers or trainees.
- Supervision and mentoring of graduate students to complete theses or dissertations within appropriate timelines for the discipline.
- Successful supervision of student projects of high visibility (e.g., project-based in national competitions, deliverables in sponsored research).
- Successful career mentoring of graduate students, including job placement.
- Internal and external awards to students under mentorship.
- Obtaining grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching, course development, or other teaching innovation.
- Development of or teaching and sustaining a study-abroad program.
- Development of major transformative project-based learning experiences for students.

- Outstanding contributions to the advancement of non-traditional course delivery (e.g., study abroad, online courses).
- Publication of academic article, chapter, or book, or conference presentation derived from the pedagogical/didactical practice in a visible venue.
- Grants that support innovation in engineering education.
- Outstanding contributions to industry, academic, or government partnerships that impact student learning.
- Development of textbook, course materials, educational software, etc., that are adopted at other institutions.
- Development of or consistent and sustained use of high-impact educational experiences.
- Development of or teaching and sustaining cross-disciplinary courses and collaborations.
- Development of a new course, or major revision of an existing course.
- Organization of programs/workshops for educational purposes.
- Development of a sustained educational activity with other partner Universities in Education City.

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
- Positive student evaluations; mitigation of prior concerns raised in student evaluations.
- Demonstrated competence in the classroom in instructional design and teaching activities.
- Evidence of rigorous and equitable grading.
- Adherence to standard departmental and university requirements, policies, and procedures regarding teaching and classes (e.g., student absence, posting syllabi, upholding Honor code, etc.).
- Development and use of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes.
- Satisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by DAS or Program.
- Participation in curriculum planning and review.
- Supervision and mentoring of undergraduate students to complete their independent student research/design projects or theses.
- Supervision of extracurricular student projects that enhance student learning (e.g., in the context of student organizations).
- Publications in venues in engineering or computer science education.
- Promotion of mentoring of colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality.
- Completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods.
- Contributions to maintaining industry, academic, or government partnerships that impact student learning.
- Participation in workshop or program designed to improve teaching (if possible, identify outcomes or impact on candidate's instructional effectiveness).

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:
- Publications in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings pre-identified by program faculty as highly selective forums.
- Evidence of substantial impact in the field, as demonstrated by citations, patent licenses, technology commercialization, licensing technologies, and start-ups.
- Participation in major professional society conferences as a keynote speaker and other significant invited presentations.
- Delivery of seminars or similar invited talks at prominent institutions.

- Continuous, substantial external funding that supports a large research program including support of faculty salary, graduate students, undergraduate students, and post-doctoral fellows.
- Leadership role in pursuing/obtaining large multi-PI grant funding that involves local collaborators as well as external partners.
- Election to the rank of Fellow in the leading international society in the field.
- Funded research grant proposals.
- Competitive external fellowships.
- Leadership positions in committees within award-granting organizations that influence research directions and funding decisions.
- Leadership positions in scholarly or industry publications.
- Real life applications of research outputs.
- New (and productive) collaborations with industry and government entities.
- Active (and outcomes-based) contributions to public debate in research activity.

4.4 <u>Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:</u>
- Publications in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings in which the faculty member is a key contributor.
- Participation in conferences through contributed presentations by the faculty or their students.
- Delivery of seminars or similar invited talks at AAU institutions or highly reputable R-1 institutions.
- Research funding that sustains a vibrant research program and financially supports graduate students.
- Contributions to improving methods, processes, devices, or technologies which advance the state-of-the-art for industry, government, or military applications.

4.5 <u>Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:</u>
- Outstanding leadership demonstrated in DAS/Program, College or university committees.
- Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate.
- Sustained service as an effective advisor to student organizations.
- Election to officer or equivalent significant leadership positions in professional society pre-identified by faculty as highly selective organizations.
- Professional editorial assignment for prestigious national and international refereed journals or for scholarly publishers.
- Position as Associate or Assistant Director (or equivalent) of an archival journal or similar prime academic outlet.
- Serving in major planning role or similar leadership position at a national or international research or teaching professional meeting (Position as conference chair, technical program chair, and/or track chair for well-regarded conference).
- Position as chair or appointment to a significant role in standing grant proposal review panel/study section or government boards/study groups/task forces.
- Significant service to the profession and professional societies.
- Leadership and commitment to excellence demonstrated by identifying needs at the program/division or higher level and developing a plan to address them, including setting up new initiatives, building sustainable programs, establishing new practices.
- Leadership of mentorship and outreach efforts.

4.6 <u>Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:</u>
- Serving actively on DAS/Program, College or university committee or task force.
- Positive/productive contribution through participation in faculty meetings and DAS/Program, College, or University initiatives and activities.
- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate.
- Contributions to student organizations or initiatives.

- Participation as elected or appointed member of a professional or technical committee within a professional society.
- Key role on program committee of well-regarded conferences.
- Significant portfolio of mentorship and outreach efforts.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty:

A faculty member in the tenure stream (tenured or tenure-track) at TAMU with a joint appointment at TAMUQ, will be evaluated for tenure or promotion by TAMU following the standards and procedures of that faculty member's department and college.

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

Promotion in the APT track is discretionary. Typically, it is expected that an APT faculty will be eligible for promotion after five years in a rank. However, if a faculty member's record of accomplishments is congruent with the next rank, then that faculty member, after consultation with the DAS Director/PC, may apply for promotion prior to five years in their rank. For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (APT), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. TAMUQ faculty members shall be evaluated for promotion on accomplishments in teaching (lecturer; senior lecturer) or in two areas (three for TAMU tenured faculty on joint appointment with TAMUQ) aligned with their title. TAMUQ faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. They will also be evaluated in a secondary area (teaching or service), as incident to the context of their research and as specified in their letter of appointment. Faculty with Lecturer in their title will be evaluated on the quality and impact of their teaching performance. Faculty with Instructional in their title will be evaluated primarily on the impact of their teaching performance. They will also be evaluated on the quality and impact of their service performance as determined by their academic unit and specified in their appointment letter. Faculty with Practice in their title will be evaluated on two areas of performance, typically, teaching and service, with emphasis on each area determined by the level of effort as specified in their appointment letters. Evaluations will be based on the criteria and indicators outlined in **sections 3 and 4** of this document. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

5.3 Promotion Review Process:

The process starts in January with a memo sent to faculty members from the Academic Affairs Office (AAO) calling for prospective promotion candidates to be identified. Identification of candidates should be completed by March 15. PCs and DAS Director and mentors should meet individually with the candidates to discuss the process.

5.4 Required Materials:

The following is a list of materials for the dossier. Candidates, PCs, DAS director, and promotion committee members must refer to the **current year** of the Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for updated information.

All materials included in the dossier should be reviewed by mentors and the PC/DAS director before they are uploaded. The PC/DAS director and mentors should provide feedback. Although feedback is useful, the candidate is responsible for the content and submission of the dossier.

- **Candidate Impact Statement**. This is a concise statement that explains the quality, productivity over time, and impact of the areas under review (teaching, research, service) as applicable to the candidate's title.
- **The Curriculum Vitae**. Up-to-date CV with a signed statement that the CV being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature. Candidates must use the vita template on the Faculty Affairs site. They have the option also to use the vita template created in Interfolio Faculty 180 (drawing on data already entered during annual review). Candidates should not alter the order or structure of items in the template.
- **Verification of Contents Statement**
  This statement, by the candidate, accurately describes the materials they have submitted for review for the purpose of promotion consideration. The list of materials might include such things as: the impact statement, curriculum vitae, articles, books, portfolios (teaching, research, service, other), student evaluations, list of suggested reviewers, list of do not contact reviewers, and any other materials submitted by the candidate.
- **Candidate External/Internal Reviewer Checklist**
  Six (6) external letters are required for research faculty. Four (4) letters, which could be internal or external, are required for non-research faculty. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers and if desired a "do not contact" list. list of possible reviewers, the candidate must also provide a signed checklist attesting to the qualification of the external reviewers as "arm's length", appropriate rank and track, and from appropriate institutions.
- **Unit/Program Specific Required Documents**
  - **Portfolio highlights**. Items that demonstrate significant contributions to be forwarded to reviewers and for review by the unit promotion committee, the college promotion committee, and the dean. Representative items for research faculty may include publications, patents, and other artifacts describing impactful innovation. Representative items for teaching-focused faculty may include publications in education/pedagogy and artifacts that represent successful educational innovation and practice. DAS Director, PCs and promotion committee chairs may discuss with candidates the limits on the number of items to be submitted.
  - **Peer teaching review**. At least two peer-evaluations of teaching. It is recommended that the observers be colleagues who are in a rank higher than the candidate's rank. Observations should be done in the semester in which the candidate is being reviewed or the previous academic year. Observations from earlier in the candidate's career may be included if available, but the teaching report should not assess teaching solely on observations that were made several years prior to the time at which the candidate is being considered for promotion.
  - **Course syllabi**. Candidates should include copies of syllabi for courses taught within the period since the beginning of their appointment, if this is their first promotion review, or since their last promotion review.
  - **Representative sample of course assignments and exams**. The selected samples should provide insights into the scope and standard of written and other expectations, including class activities.
  - **List of courses taught** per the link.
  - **Other materials** may be requested. A candidate may upload additional materials to the dossier during the review following the process stipulated in the Faculty Affairs *Guidelines*.
- **Candidate's Supplemental Documents (if applicable)**
  Candidates might choose to include supplemental documents, including an optional COVID-19 impact statement, and these can be uploaded in the "Candidates supplemental documents" section.

5.5 Program/ Division Review:

Committees:

Promotion Committee of the Division of Arts and Sciences:
In order to ensure proper representation and a working committee, the DAS promotion committee shall consist of 7 members, 5 elected by the faculty and 2 are appointed by the DAS director.

The members of the DAS committee shall be DAS faculty members, except for circumstances where the DAS director determines that additional external expertise is required or that DAS does not have enough faculty members of appropriate rank; in that case, external members (either from engineering programs or main campus departments) can be appointed to the committee after consultation with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and approval by the Dean and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

If more than two members who the DAS director appoints are to be externally appointed, these appointments also need majority consent from the DAS faculty.

Promotion Committees of the Engineering Programs:
Each committee of the engineering programs will consist of 5 members. One member will be a tenured full professor from the appropriate department in the College of Engineering on the main campus. Of the four members from TAMUQ, three members will be elected by the faculty; one member will be appointed by the PC. The TAMU faculty member will be nominated for appointment by the TAMU department head.

If sufficient eligible members from the TAMUQ program cannot be identified, with the approval of the TAMUQ dean, the PC will request appointment of faculty from other engineering programs or from DAS, as appropriate. The PC may also request that the TAMU department head appoint additional tenured full professors (as needed) from the appropriate department. PCs must ensure that arrangements are made for the member/s in College Station to communicate effectively with the committee throughout the review and to participate remotely in the meeting.

For the DAS and engineering committees, each member is eligible to serve a three-year term. With the member's request and approval of the PC/DAS director, a member may serve less than three years or be considered for renewal after a three-year term. Each committee should aim to have no more than three members rotate off on an annual basis. Each committee will select its chair at the first meeting of each promotion cycle.
The associate professors on the committee will participate in reviews of cases for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer or associate professor. They will be recused from cases for promotion to the rank of principal lecturer or professor. For such cases, the PC/DAS director will request approval from the Dean to appoint full professors (internally, from other TAMUQ academic units or externally, from TAMU) as replacement on the committee on a special temporary basis. DAS may not need to appoint replacement members if 5 of its 7-member committee are full professors and none of them is recused.

Process:

Every member of a promotion committee is expected to participate fully and regularly in every cycle during the duration of their term and every case for which she/he is eligible to review. Non-participation due to valid circumstances like recusals, and justifiable absences should be documented.

Members who for valid and documented reasons cannot attend the committee meeting are allowed to vote in absentia.

A fair and thorough evaluation of a candidate's promotion case by members of the program/division promotion committee is essential. Evaluation of a case must be based on the dossier—its contents at initial submission and materials added during the review. The committee will review and evaluate the candidate's dossier; prepare the report on the area or areas being assessed (teaching, research, service, as applicable); and prepare a report following the discussion of the case, with recommendations and the recorded votes. The report should also include information regarding the faculty member's contributions to multidisciplinary collaborations, technology commercialization and enhancing excellence and internationalization climate and experiences (at the university and/or college levels), as applicable. The committee must summarize its conclusions concerning each candidate with sufficient information for the PC/Division Director, dean, and upper administration to understand the reasoning behind their recorded vote. A mixed vote would require further explanation of the candidate's demonstrated abilities and the committee's concerns.

PCs and DAS Director should not attend the unit promotion committee meeting. However, they should be available during the meeting to consult with the committee on matters pertaining to procedure, if necessary. The committee will add its report to the dossier. The committee's assessment and recommendation are advisory to the PC/DAS Director.

Reviewer Letters:

- Six (6) <u>external</u> letters are required for research faculty. Four (4) letters are required for non-research faculty.
- For faculty with lecturer, instructional, and practice in their titles, the letters can be internal or external. Whether internal or external, the letters will be solicited by the PC or DAS Director using the TAMUQ letter solicitation template.
- PCs and DAS Director should work with the candidates and their promotion committees to consult and follow the university stipulations on selecting external reviewers, soliciting letters, and using the external assessments in promotion reviews (https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Promotion-Tenure/External-Reviewer-Letters). The letters, whether internal or external, are expected to provide an evaluative professional assessment of the performance and impact of the candidate's activities.

Program Chair/DAS Director Review:

The PC/DAS Director will review the complete dossier, including the promotion committee's report, to conduct their independent assessment and prepare their report, which includes their recommendation. The PC/DAS Director will add their report to the dossier for the college-level review.

See the Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for more guidance on the promotion review at the program/DAS level (https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Promotion-Tenure/Department-Process).

5.6 <u>College Review:</u>

The Dean's Advisory Committee on Promotion comprises of nine members:
- One faculty in the full professor rank from each of the four engineering programs and DAS. Each PC and DAS Director will nominate two eligible members from their unit, and the dean will select one member from each unit's two nominations.

  If a unit does not have enough faculty members in the rank of professor, and to ensure that the committee is diverse and equitably representative of the programs and DAS, the PCs and DAS Director may nominate a faculty member

in the rank of associate professor (note: this includes all APT faculty in that rank—instructional, practice, research). In adhering to University rule on participation and voting eligibility, members who are associate professors are ineligible to participate in cases for promotion to professor.

- Two members nominated by TAMUQ Dean (at least one from the College of Engineering);
- Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies, (non-voting member); and
- Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development (non-voting member).

The senior associate deans are ex-officio, non-voting members. Chairing the committee will rotate yearly between the senior associate deans.

Each voting member will serve a two-year term that is eligible for renewal.

The Dean's Advisory Committee will read the dossiers and discuss and vote on the cases. Members with valid and documented reasons for not attending the committee's meeting, but have read and reviewed the dossiers, are allowed to vote in absentia. The committee will communicate its assessment, vote, and recommendation on each case to the Dean in a report that will be added to the dossier. The committee's assessments and recommendations are advisory to the Dean.

The Dean's Advisory Committee will refer to the Faculty Affairs Guidelines for further guidance on its deliberations (https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Promotion-Tenure/College-School-Process).

5.7 Dean Review:

The Dean will conduct their independent evaluation of the case after reviewing the candidate's dossier and the reports generated by the external review, the program/DAS review, and the review of the college promotion committee. The dean will make his/her recommendation in a report that is included in the dossier. The complete dossier (containing the candidate's submissions, internal and external letters as applicable, the program/DAS committee reports, the PC/DAS Director's report, the dean's advisory committee's report, and the dean's report) is submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

All communication regarding promotion cases must be kept strictly confidential. Individual members of promotion committees may NOT discuss the ongoing review with the candidate by sharing with the candidate their individual assessment or that of other members of the committee. The PC/DAS Director is responsible for notifying each candidate of the outcome at every level, including the vote of the Program/Division committee, the PC/DAS Director vote, the college committee vote, the dean's vote, the recommendation of the Vice president for Faculty Affairs, the recommendation of the Provost, and, ultimately, the President's decision. The dean will notify the PCs/DAS director of decisions at the college, and university levels so that they can relay the information to the candidate.

6. Annual Review

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

All faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or academic professional track, must have an annual written review, for which the PCs (for engineering programs), and the DAS director are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments or faculty with participation in multidisciplinary centers, the unit leaders (program chairs, directors, or supervisors) will need to collaborate to develop accurate reviews (Section 2.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). Supervisors of the primary appointment shall request input from other chairs and/or center directors, as appropriate, and reference this input with the annual review letter for the faculty member. Preferably, this input is in the form of a memo to the primary chair, providing an individual review of the faculty member's performance in the secondary appointment/center activities.

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

6.1 Purpose
- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual faculty's position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion as relevant. See University Rule 12.01.99.M1.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.
- Provide appraisal of progress being made towards achieving promotion for the academic professional track faculty.
- Provide feedback appraisal of progress being made towards achieving promotion by multi-year fixed-term faculty.
- Provide developmental feedback to assist current rolling faculty transitioning into the Academic Professional Track in 2026.

6.2 Focus
The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). The annual review evaluates continued effective/and or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For current rolling faculty, the annual review will also provide feedback on progress toward transitioning into Academic Professional Track appointment.

6.3 Time Period of Review
Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year (from January 1, or the date of first employment at TAMUQ in that year, through December 31 of a given year), but may also include an expanded window, for example, three years, for the

review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window, which will be stated on the unit's annual review checklist/Annual Progress Report Form.

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

Process

On or before May 1st of each year, signed copies of reviews for faculty should be forwarded by the PCs and Director of the Division of Arts and Sciences to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies, and the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development through the office of Academic Affairs.

Program chairs and the director of DAS must also provide a memo certifying that all members have been reviewed, have received feedback, and have signed, acknowledging receipt of a copy of their written review. A "Does Not Meet Expectations" performance evaluation for a faculty member must also be reported to the Dean.

6.4 Required Components

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

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

Faculty will be using Interfolio Faculty Activity Reporting (Faculty 180) and the online Faculty Information System for this year faculty evaluation.

Faculty 180 is designed to maintain up-to-date faculty CVs, faculty scholarly activities, profiles, annual reports, etc. On the other hand, the Faculty Information System will include TAMUQ specific information not currently collected on Faculty 180.

- The reporting should focus on the previous calendar year but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The reporting should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service, student adaptability, and growth efforts, as applicable.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals.

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

2. **Written evaluation**

The program chairs and the director of DAS are responsible for annual reviews. They may include other faculty members in the process if they choose.

The program chair, director of DAS, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The document will also state the expectations for the next year.

The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and providing written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This

memorandum and/or the annual review and any related documents will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review document shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research, and service as appropriate for the one (lecturer titles) or two areas designated for the faculty track and title. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgment by the program chair, director of DAS or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory or meet expectations 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. Likewise, the faculty member must certify their attentiveness to safety and compliance. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the PC's written evaluation and the faculty member must initial each:

_____ (initial) I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory university training programs.

_____ (initial) I will, on a continuing and timely basis, address any safety deficiencies, report any and all safety concerns to the PC/DAS Director, and demonstrate compliance with safety standards as defined by the Environmental Health and Safety Department.

3. **Meeting with the faculty member**
   The program chair or division director may meet with the faculty member in their unit to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. The chairs of the engineering programs may also request input/participation of the TAMU department head in the meeting, if necessary and in consultation with the TAMUQ Dean or the dean's designee. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the program chair, division director/supervisor or faculty member. A faculty member who receives a "Needs improvement" in any of their assigned areas of performance should meet with the PC/DAS Director within a month from the annual review to discuss plans for improvement to be implemented in the current calendar year. If there is no improvement at the time of the next annual review, the rating will be unsatisfactory.
   For faculty who receive a "does not meet expectations" in any of their assigned areas, the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development will oversee the implementation of a performance improvement plan (PIP) created by the PC/DAS director and monitored by an ad hoc committee comprised of senior faculty from other academic units. At the end of the PIP, a final report will be provided. For a fixed term appointment, two consecutive annual review ratings of "does not meet expectations" will result in termination of the fixed term appointment and the faculty will be given one final year of appointment with TAMUQ.

4. **Performance Assessment**
   In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research, 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 Program or Division, College, and University.

If a faculty member has a complaint concerning their written evaluation, they may meet with TAMUQ Senior Associate Dean for Academic affairs and Graduate Studies (SADAAGS) or the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development, but only after providing a response

and discussing that response with the program chair or division director. The program chair or division director may be included in the meeting with the faculty member, at the discretion of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies or the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development. As stated in 2.4.3.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](): Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion, the faculty member may instead write a letter to the dean with a copy to Faculty Affairs.

Basis for Evaluation:

Per Item 2.4.5.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](), the following are examples of possible sources of information that can be used for faculty evaluation (a) annual faculty progress report (required as a source); (b) personal observation by evaluator; (c) discussions with colleagues, students, and/or others; (d) student evaluations of teaching; (e) peer evaluations of teaching. The engineering programs and DAS at TAMUQ may use some of these sources or additional ones as appropriate for specific disciplines.

6.1 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 3.) will be rated: "**Does Not Meet Expectations**," "**Needs Improvement**," "**Meets Expectations**." "**Exceeds Expectations**," based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

6.1.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Teaching** are:
- Does Not Meet Expectations – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in the indicators listed in Section 4.2.
- Meets Expectations – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of undergraduate and graduate students supervised.
- Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and other indicators listed in Section 4.1.

    Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **meets expectations performance**.

6.1.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are:
- Does Not Meet Expectations – 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 indicators listed in 4.4.
- Meets Expectations – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by the indicators listed in Section 4.4.
- Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally (internationally for full professors) recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** are listed in Section 4.3**.**

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

- Does Not Meet Expectations – 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 as supported by indicators listed in 4.6.
- Meets Expectations – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Faculty in this category will have involvement in internal (unit, college, university, community) service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of external service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- Exceeds expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful internal (unit, college, community) service demonstrating leadership and/or partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical. Examples of this evidence are listed in Section 4.5.

6.5.4 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 published annual review guidelines of their academic unit, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to 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

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

TAMUQ is committed to sustaining a stable excellent faculty in its degree-granting programs as well as in the Division of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, PCs, DAS Director, and senior faculty members and mentors are expected to support assistant professors to develop and be well positioned for successful promotion reviews. To provide a formative review of Research Assistant Professors, Instructional Assistant Professors, and Assistant Professors of Practice near the mid-point of the period toward promotion, a comprehensive review similar to the mid-term review required for assistant professors in the tenure stream will be conducted for APT Assistant Professors in the third calendar year in the rank.

Faculty undergoing this review will submit the following in addition to the standard materials for annual review: a personal impact statement; at least one teaching peer review report; at least one internal letter assessing research productivity and impact (for research faculty); and any other materials requested by the PC/DAS Director.

The program/DAS promotion committee will review the materials and evaluate the faculty member's record in the assigned areas of performance. The committee will submit its assessment to the PC/DAS Director. This assessment should contain the committee's vote

on the faculty member's progress toward promotion and any recommendations for advancement. The PC/DAS Director will conduct their own independent review based on the materials submitted and taking into consideration the assessment of the promotion committee. In addition to providing constructive oral feedback to the faculty member, the PC/DAS Director will write a report summarizing the outcome of the review. The PC's/DAS Director's report will be sent to the Dean, copying the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Studies, and the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development, and shared with the faculty member.

A positive formative assessment does not guarantee a successful promotion review in a couple of years. The PC/DAS Director and senior faculty are expected to continue to mentor the faculty member in preparation for the more extensive promotion evaluation.

8. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

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

See the Faculty Affairs website for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status. Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

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

Contact Office: Office of Academic Affairs,
Texas A&M University at Qatar, academicaffairs@qatar.tamu.edu