

College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences December 17, 2021

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties December 20, 2021

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance 3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness 6
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure 12
6. Annual Review 15
7. Mid-Term Review 20
8. Post-Tenure Review 21
9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status 25

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (CVMBBS) is to enhance animal and human health through transformational learning, discovery and innovation, patient care, and public service that impacts our diverse and evolving world. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the CVMBBS for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, patient care, 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 ([University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

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

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

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). In the CVMBS, faculty are appointed to either tenure-track or academic professional track (APT) positions. Departments may make academic professional track faculty appointments when programmatic needs can best be met by appointing persons whose academic responsibilities would make appointments to the tenure-track inappropriate. The faculty of the College recognizes the vital contributions all faculty members make to the mission of the CVMBS and the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital (VMTH), and is committed to a full partnership to the extent that University policies permit. This partnership includes mechanisms for promotion, career advancement, and job stability. Decisions on the promotion of academic professional track faculty members must take into account their unique job descriptions and allow for evaluation and recognition of their contributions to the College and profession.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Section 4.4.1)

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

Department Heads will assign percent efforts (effort reporting) based on the responsibilities of the tenure-track or academic professional-track position relative to: 1) Service/Academic Citizenship; 2) Didactic and Laboratory Teaching; 3) Research and Other Scholarly Activities; and 4) Teaching Hospital and Diagnostic Service Duties. Activities when assigned to Teaching Hospital or Diagnostic Service duties include both Patient Care/Diagnostic Services and Clinical Instruction. The Department Head will specify the percent effort to each subcategory of Teaching Hospital or Diagnostic Service duties, but for most faculty, the effort associated with Teaching Hospital or Diagnostic Service Duties will be split equally between Patient Care/Diagnostic Services and Clinical Instruction. Clinical Instruction will be evaluated as part of the category Teaching. Patient Care/Diagnostic Services will be evaluated as its own category, which falls under the University's category of Other (please see below). Effort assignments for faculty with unusual duties will be clarified within the appointment letter, evaluation document, or effort report. The following is an example of how effort reports should look in annual evaluations, appointment letters, and in reports/letters associated with promotion & tenure. Example effort assignment:

1) Service/Academic Citizenship (10%); 2) Didactic and Laboratory Teaching (15%); 3) Research and Other Scholarly Activities (35%); and 4) Teaching Hospital and Diagnostic Service Duties (40%; Diagnostic Services-25%; Clinical Instruction -15%). For tenure and promotion, allocation of effort for this assignment would be: 1) Service/Academic Citizenship (10%); 2) Teaching (30% = 15% Didactic/Laboratory + 15% Clinical); 3) Research and Other Scholarly Activities (35%); and 4) Other (Patient Care/Diagnostic Service Duties 25%).

3.1 Teaching

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

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

quality, impactful classroom or clinical instruction; development of innovative, effective and engaging, student-centered curricula, new courses, and classroom or clinical education materials; effective supervision and mentoring of professional and graduate students, including chairing of dissertations; service on graduate examination and dissertation committees; one-on-one consultation with students, including supervision of independent study courses; supervision of teaching assistants in undergraduate courses; supervision of undergraduate and graduate research; serving as primary faculty advisor of students in the non-thesis Master's program; and effective mentoring and supervision of post-doctoral fellows/residents/house officers.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work

The College expects that all faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarship, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure and/or promotion. Scholarship is broadly defined; however, to be most effective, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge as well as focused, discipline-based expertise.

Scholarship Defined. Scholarship is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. To be a scholarship, the work must meet these criteria:

- The work must be made public.
- The work must be available for peer review and critique according to accepted standards.
- The work must be able to be reproduced and built on by other scholars.

For purposes of the CVMBS, it encompasses or includes the following three categories:

- **scholarship of discovery**, or the creation of new knowledge;
- **scholarship of integration**, whereby the relationships among isolated facts are compiled, elucidated, and given perspective;
- **scholarship of teaching**, which is distinct from effective or excellent teaching.

3.2.1 Scholarship of Discovery

High-quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence.

Original research should normally be considered as evidence only after acceptance for publication. A given achievement should not be counted as an accomplishment justifying advancement of a faculty member if it has been employed in earlier justifications, except in the obvious sense of counting as part of a cumulative record. One permissible exception to this general rule is the occasional instance in which a scholarly or creative work increases considerably in stature and importance after its initial publication. In such instances, the increase in stature must be shown through such evidence as reviews and significant citations.

Individual contributions as well as collaborative, interdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary research and publication are all valued; however, individuals are encouraged to develop a balanced publication record. External funding of research will be an indicator of excellence when such research contributes to the body of knowledge and/or to student development and not as an end in itself.

Accomplishment in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

3.2.2 Scholarship of Integration

The CVMBS serves diverse constituencies within the University as well as locally, within Texas, nationally, and internationally. The scholarship of integration is crucial to the visible role and image of our College.

The goal of the scholarship of integration is to consider new knowledge within the context of, or in contrast to, extant concepts (so-called "current wisdom") and to interpret, clarify, explain, and place it in new or alternative perspectives to enhance its appreciation and fruitful application by potential users and

beneficiaries. Therefore, the scholarship of integration is closely related to and dependent upon that of discovery and teaching, yet transcends them individually and in their various combinations. The scholarship of integration is characterized by the synthesis and communication of novel perspectives and understandings of the relevance of current and emerging knowledge and technology.

The target public or audiences of the scholarship of integration vary widely and are expectedly more diverse and eclectic than those of the other categories of scholarship. They may include, but are not limited to: veterinary practitioners; research scientists; teachers; specialists in clinical and non-clinical disciplines; students in the various medical and related fields; affiliated health-care workers; patrons and agencies which provide grants to support research, teaching, and clinical institutions and projects; and various broadly or narrowly defined subsets of the animal owners or client pool.

Scholars whose primary efforts are those of discovery or teaching may find challenge and increased productivity through a variety of scholarly integrative activities.

3.2.3 Scholarship of Teaching

The importance of high-quality teaching is explicitly recognized in the College goals of excellence and national prominence. In addition to the demonstration of effectiveness or excellence in teaching, faculty members may elect to pursue the scholarship of teaching as his/her area of scholarly achievement. Scholarship of teaching may involve research to assess existing or new pedagogical methodologies or the creation and sharing of new pedagogical methodologies or materials.

Faculty engage in educational scholarship by both *drawing upon* resources and best practices in the field and by *contributing resources* to it. Documentation begins by demonstrating that an educational activity product is publicly available to the education community in a form that others can build on. The product may be available at the local level—in the department, veterinary/medical school, or university—or at the regional, national, or international level. Once a product is public and in a form that others build on, peers can assess its value to the community applying accepted criteria.

The criteria that shall be considered in evaluating research and scholarly performance are: establishment and continued growth of an independent or collaborative research program; active participation in interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary research; securing financial and other resources to support research program or scholarly activities; generation and dissemination of new knowledge; impact of the research discoveries on advancing the discipline; generation of intellectual property through research innovations; publication of review articles in peer-reviewed journals; delivery of continuing education programs (including organizing, chairing, and hosting events; authorship of books and book chapters; and publication of instructional materials.

3.3 Service (Academic Citizenship)

Academic Citizenship is defined as a measure of one's commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the department, College, University, and profession through service. The two dimensions of Academic Citizenship are (1) collegiality and (2) academic and professional service.

3.3.1 Collegiality

Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues. Colleagues are those explicitly united in a common purpose and respecting each other's abilities to work toward that purpose. A colleague is an associate in a profession or in a civil or ecclesiastical office.

Support of the missions of the department, College, University, and of their programs is important in the practice of good academic citizenship. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, accountability, and willingness to cooperate are vital. Faculty members must seek to maintain open

communications with diverse colleagues and administrators, and must work toward solutions of shared problems. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2 states that “professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University” be a requirement for promotion and tenure.

There should be no effort by the College to discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks and promoting resolution of differences.

3.3.2 Academic and Professional Service

The CVMBS must effectively serve a number of constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence; a variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution a faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the Department, the College, the University, and the profession of veterinary medicine. The amount and nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual’s skills, interests, and stage of career development; however, all faculty members are expected to participate in some service activities as a responsibility of their academic citizenship.

The criteria that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are: effectively serving on department, college, and university committees; positive contributions in administrative roles within the department, college, or university; proactively responding to the needs of colleagues and/or the department; positive contributions to mentoring of junior faculty, participation in peer-review of teaching; outreach to the veterinary and non-veterinary community; organization and chairing of continuing education events; impactful contributions to advance the college’s diversity, equity, and inclusion mission; fostering a safe and respectful work environment; and impactfully contributing to national and international professional organizations, scientific journals, and funding agencies.

3.4 Other: Patient Care/Diagnostic Services

The responsibility of promoting animal health, public health, and food safety gives the CVMBS a unique and visible role relative to other colleges within TAMU. There may be no other area within the College that offers such diverse and far-reaching public relations opportunities for the University and for the profession of veterinary medicine as does excellent and compassionate patient care as well as dependable diagnostic services. The term “patient care” is here defined to mean all activities related to the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of animal disease. This includes not only the direct management of the patient, but also the management of materials collected from patients, i.e., those activities commonly carried out by such professionals as diagnostic pathologists, microbiologists, radiologists, and parasitologists. The professional who renders patient care serves as a role model for students entering the veterinary profession; therefore, patient care is closely entwined with clinical teaching but may be measured by different parameters.

The criteria that shall be considered in evaluating patient care performance are: competence in clinical/diagnostic knowledge and skills; quality and timeliness of services provided; application of new techniques or strategies to enhance patient care; achieving and maintaining specialty board certification (as applicable); strong client and referring veterinarian evaluations; and increasing efficiency and productivity within the patient care unit.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The college recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance, and respective indicators of performance, 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 describes accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations for faculty. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of effectiveness and excellence for each performance area.

4.1 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching*** include, but are not limited to:

- positive evaluations in exit interviews with graduating students.
- positive evaluations in feedback evaluations from employers of former students.
- positive evaluations in results of postgraduate questionnaires to evaluate knowledge and preparation through the curriculum.
- teaching in a course within one's discipline that involves students from two or more colleges.
- evidence of rigorous and equitable grading.
- development of assessment tools to measure student learning outcomes.
- coordination of multi-disciplinary courses.
- development of new course(s), Honors courses, or major revisions of existing courses.
- teaching in interdepartmental and/or interdisciplinary program courses.
- teaching in freshman seminar courses with UGST (Undergraduate Studies) prefix.
- serving as a member of thesis/dissertation committees.
- serving as the primary faculty advisor to students in non-thesis MS program.
- direction of independent student research.
- direction and mentorship of residents and interns in research.
- promotion of mentoring of colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality.
- introduction of outcomes assessments for course or program evaluation in the veterinary or graduate curriculum.
- mentoring and training residents or other trainees who pass certifying examinations.
- completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods.
- significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness.
- introduction of current and emerging instructional methodologies and technologies to the professional, undergraduate, and graduate curricula of the CVM.
- development of innovative pedagogical materials, strategies for active learning, peer-to-peer learning, and collaborative approaches in teaching into the curriculum at the CVM.
- development of pedagogical approaches to enhance student engagement and to optimize student learning outcomes.
- introduction of practices to evaluate the engagement of students in a critical analysis of course material or which evaluate their involvement in research or scholarly activity.
- promotion of the engagement of members of the teaching community in the collaborative, scholarly examination of their practice as teachers.
- assistance in development of a campus and veterinary school-wide culture of evidence-based approaches to evaluation and improvement of academic programs

4.2 Indicators of ***Excellence in Teaching*** include, but are not limited to:

- outstanding evaluations based on classroom, clinical or laboratory visitation by Department Heads, peers, or external evaluators.

- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students.
- selection for University, College, or professional association outstanding teacher awards.
- participation in development of questions for NAVLE or specialty board examination.
- contribution to new instructional program development.
- serving as a chair of Master's thesis and Doctoral dissertation committees.
- publications with authorship by trainees (undergraduate, graduate, professional, or post-doctoral).
- evidence of successful career paths of former graduate students, interns, residents and post-doctoral fellows.
- obtaining external grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching or course development.

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

Scholarship of Discovery

- ☐ active participation in a University landmark area of research or CVM Signature Program.
- ☐ active participation in research within a University-recognized center or institute (can be a TAMUS component center or institute if the University is a recognized partner) that is either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary.
- ☐ publication of technical reports or monographs.
- ☐ presentation of original research or case reports at professional meetings.
- ☐ publication of original research or case reports in proceedings of regional professional meetings.
- ☐ contribution of area of expertise to scholarship of others.
- ☐ publication of original papers or case reports in refereed journals.

Scholarship of Integration

- ☐ authorship of review articles.
- ☐ preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs.
- ☐ preparation and presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of medicine-, public health-, animal disease-, or other health-related topics.

Scholarship of Teaching

- sharing of knowledge about teaching within departmental or College-wide faculty groups.
- introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted by other faculty members within the College.
- introduction of outcomes assessments for course or program evaluation in the veterinary or graduate curriculum that are disseminated or used at the department or College level.

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

Scholarship of Discovery

- ☐ recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards, invitations

- to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings.
- ☐ publications of original research in the leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines.
- ☐ favorable citation index listing of research publications.
- ☐ significant competitive external funding for research.
- ☐ effective contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention (as demonstrated by funding, publications, or other special national recognition) in which investigators from multiple TAMU colleges or outside universities are involved.
- ☐ key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry.
- ☐ significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements.

Scholarship of Integration

- ☐ coordination of or participation in interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary investigations and projects, including a variety of international programs.
- ☐ publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s).
- ☐ authorship of a textbook or major textbook chapters.
- ☐ recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative contributions by others, e.g., use or review of electronic media by other institutions or scholars.
- ☐ evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the interface with multiple medical or other academic disciplines.
- ☐ originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication of new understanding of, perspectives on, and uses of information.

Scholarship of Teaching

- external publication of instructional materials, e.g., case scenarios, textbooks, or electronic instructional materials.
- publication in leading peer-reviewed journals about appropriate educational modalities and techniques and their evaluation.
- favorable citation index listing in teaching research publications.
- extra-mural recognition for contributions to the advancement of teaching, such as presentations at national or international conferences, invitations to serve as a consultant, and invitations to present keynote or plenary national and international meetings concerning education.
- faculty appointment in non-CVM departments that have a strong program in the chosen area of teaching scholarship.
- recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships and awards.
- significant extra-mural funding for research on issues of importance in teaching.
- publication of critically-acclaimed chapters, books, or comparable electronic materials about education.
- dissemination of teaching materials at national workshops, with the materials cited by other programs.
- introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the College.

4.5 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Service (Academic Citizenship)* include, but are not limited to:

Collegiality:

- recognizing and responding to the needs of colleagues, the department, college and/or the university, and assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs.
- actively and effectively striving to achieve departmental and College goals and mandates
- engaging in activities that foster national and international collaboration.
- engaging in activities that benefit others apart from oneself (e.g., accepting reasonable amounts of committee work commensurate with one's academic rank, engaging in or initiating activities that benefit others, and making reasonable adjustments that accommodate others or enhance the greater good of the group.).
- engaging in the creation of a University culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance.
- voicing dissenting views in a manner and setting that tend to lead toward resolution; balancing skepticism and opposition with willingness to compromise and to work toward satisfactory solutions; the individual avoids engaging in personal attacks as a means of dealing with colleagues.
- making personal contributions to the public mission of the University to forward its programs for the public good.
- engaging in activities that foster diversity and interaction among students and colleagues from different cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds.

Academic Citizenship:

- actively serving on departmental, College, and University committees and task forces.
- recruitment and/or mentoring students of diverse cultures, beliefs and backgrounds.
- actively serving as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations.
- contributing to external developmental efforts.
- promoting national and/or international experiences for students.
- serving as an advisor to student organizations.
- serving in administrative roles (e.g., section chief, Assistant/Associate Department Head, or director titles) within the department or College.
- consulting with industry and client groups.
- actively participating in K-12 outreach and research especially at the local, state, or national level.
- actively participating in publications describing the effectiveness of community-based projects.
- actively participating in partnerships initiated with corporate/community organizations, including funded research, training programs, and development of coursework.
- serving on a mentoring committee for junior faculty
- service as an ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals.
- service as an ad hoc grant/contract reviewer for research organizations, institutions or foundations (e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA).
- service on editorial and manuscript review boards of scholarly, refereed journals.

4.6 Indicators of **Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- serving as an officer, committee chairman, or board member in a national or international professional organization in one's discipline.
- serving as an effective chair of a committee within the department, College, or University.
- serving as an effective member of one of the College's important and time-consuming committees, such as Selections, Curriculum, or Promotion and tenure committees.
- effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards.
- attraction of significant external development support.
- significant community or national service in an organization with programmatic importance to the veterinary profession or biomedical sciences.
- consultation with national or international government offices or programs.
- significant and effective mentorship of house officers, graduate students, and young faculty members.
- selection for University, College, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards.
- service as an editor or associate editor of a major journal.
- service as a grant/contract reviewer (panel member) for research organizations, institutions or foundations (e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA).

4.7 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Patient Care/Diagnostic Service** include, but are not limited to:

- an ability to receive and manage an appropriate number of cases to balance the needs of teaching students with the referral needs of veterinarians and the general public within the State of Texas.
- evidence of satisfactory performance in veterinary patient management or diagnostic support services, (This may be documented by letters from clinical colleagues, house officers or graduate students, student evaluation, and by evidence of client satisfaction.)
- an ability to communicate information about a patient effectively and in a timely fashion to animal owners and referring veterinarians.
- continuing education to gain additional clinical knowledge and skills.
- fulfillment of requirements to maintain credentials for certification by specialty college or to achieve recertification.

4.8 Indicators of **Excellence in Patient Care/Diagnostic Service** include, but are not limited to:

- recognition within the state, region, and nation as an authority in a particular diagnostic or therapeutic area related to veterinary medicine, (Such recognition is likely to be reflected by requests for consultation by colleagues, presentations at national specialty group meetings, and peer group recognition.)
- requests by individuals from other institutions to train with the faculty member or his/her team.
- evidence of excellent performance in veterinary patient management or diagnostic support services (This may be documented by letters from clinical colleagues, house officers, or graduate students, by student evaluation, and by evidence of client satisfaction.)
- development of new techniques, strategies, or modes for the prevention, diagnosis, and management of disease.

- application of new techniques, strategies, or modes for the prevention, diagnosis, and management of disease.
- self-development and organizational activities (process management) leading to significantly enhanced efficiency and productivity within a clinical or diagnostic service.
- Outstanding client satisfaction based on comments or surveys.
- Outstanding referring veterinarian satisfaction as evidenced by comments or surveys.
- High caseload compared to peer institutions, caseload growth, and a strong clinical revenue stream.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (i.e., teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required.

Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the college are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor:

Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching, scholarship and patient care (if applicable), with attention to academic citizenship. Assistant professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship, building their teaching skills and portfolio, taking on the role of mentor, and exploring select service roles that complement their other activities. Clinicians are expected to integrate and contribute to their service areas, and develop excellence in patient care. Individuals employed with the future completion of board certification in a specialty and/or completion of advanced degrees as a stipulation of continued employment will be expected to satisfy these goals prior to promotion to Associate Professor.

5.1.2 Associate Professor:

Emphasis for the tenure-track individual should be placed on further development of scholarship within categories recognized by the College, i.e., the scholarship of discovery, integration, and teaching. For the great majority of tenure-track faculty, the main focus will be on the scholarship of discovery. For those with major clinical roles, continued clinical excellence is expected, along with the continued development of leadership in a specialty area. Associate professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship and collegiality, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen area(s) of scholarship (i.e., teaching, discovery, and integration). Associate professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must document effectiveness in instruction (and clinical contributions as appropriate). Tenure-track individuals must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record.

For promotion to Associate Professor in the tenure track, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

- (1) an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field;
- (2) professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;

- (3) an area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and
- (4) evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

5.1.3 Professor:

Continued excellence and national/international recognition are required in at least one of the areas of scholarship: discovery, integration, and teaching. Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence are required of professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; excellence in patient care/diagnostic medicine; evidence of academic citizenship and collegiality; and excellence in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of professors, sustained excellence in scholarship is expected for the tenured Professor.

For promotion to Professor, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.3 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

- (1) continuing accomplishment in teaching;
- (2) continuing accomplishment and some measure of national/international recognition in research or another form of creative activity; and
- (3) evidence of valuable professional service.

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

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

5.3 Promotion and/or Tenure (P&T) Review Process

Each year, the Dean of Faculties distributes "University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines" that spells out the timeline, documents and process required of each candidate, department and college. In the CVMBS, except for Research Track faculty, external review letters are not required for the promotion of all other Academic Professional Track faculty.

The college will develop and disseminate a P&T calendar for candidates, administrators, staff, and committee members. This document will ensure alignment with Dean of Faculties deadlines, that committee meetings are being held in a timely manner, and that documents are distributed and completed on schedule. Meeting times and certain materials may vary between departments. Additionally, both the departmental and college P&T committees are responsible for understanding these guidelines and university policies regarding promotion and tenure. Committee members will be charged prior to their initial meeting by a Department Head, Dean, or Associate Dean. The charge will highlight criteria for P&T, the need for confidentiality, and commitment to attend all required meetings.

5.4 Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee

Each department is required to establish a single P&T committee and written policies regarding selection of committee members and chair. Departmental guidelines are available as addenda to this document. The

chair of the departmental promotion and tenure committee must be a tenured Professor and does not vote on candidates at the departmental level. The departmental committee is advisory to the Department Head. University rules regarding recommendations on tenure-track or tenured faculty are:

- Only tenured TAMU faculty members are eligible to vote in cases where tenure is being considered for the candidate, or when the candidate already holds tenure and is seeking promotion.
- To be eligible to vote on tenure or promotion, the voting TAMU faculty member must also hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate.

If possible, departmental committees should include academic professional-track faculty members at the Professor and/or Associate Professor ranks to participate in recommendations on promotion of more junior academic professional-track faculty members. These members may be present during discussion of tenure track faculty and are permitted to review dossiers and make relevant comments to their discipline, but cannot vote on tenure track faculty. The departmental P&T committee and chair will be charged by the Department Head prior to conducting meetings.

The departmental committee chair shall not vote on any candidates at the departmental level. All other committee members must vote by electronic or paper ballot, without identifiers. Votes may be “yes” or “no.” Members may recuse themselves from voting, as needed, for reasons such as conflict of interest. In cases of recusal at the departmental committee level, members agree not to participate in or influence discussions or outcomes.

5.5 College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The college P&T committee is charged with reviewing the candidate’s dossier and the P&T recommendations of the departmental committee and Department Head and advising the Dean of the College. The College Committee will either concur or not concur with these recommendations and will communicate its decision to the Dean.

The college P&T committee chair will be non-voting and will hold the rank of Professor (with tenure) and may not be chair of a departmental P&T committee. The chair is expected to serve a minimum of three years. The chair will be selected through a process where eligible faculty may be nominated or self-nominated, and nominees will be voted upon by the entire faculty, with the individual receiving the highest number of votes being elected.

Voting committee members will have a three-year term and there will be 3 voting members from each department.

- The chair of each departmental P&T committee will be a voting member of the college committee. Inclusion of departmental P&T chairs is meant to ensure dissemination of information with respect to departmental process, committee reports, and candidate packets. Typically, the departmental P&T chair will present packets for consideration at the college committee level.
- Each department will have two additional members, who will be appointed by the Department Head. The Department Head may use a faculty vote to guide appointments. One member should be at the rank of Clinical Professor and one at the rank of Professor (with tenure). If a Clinical Professor is not eligible or available, a second tenured Professor shall serve. These additional members will broaden the college committee with respect to perspective, diversity, and fairness. Departments will make an effort to stagger terms of these members to minimize committee turnover.

The college P&T committee and chair will be charged by the Dean or a designate prior to meeting. The departmental P&T chairs vote on ALL candidates at the college level. Those college committee members who serve on their departmental P&T committee must recuse themselves from voting on candidates from their department at the college level. Academic professional track faculty members must recuse themselves from voting on tenure track faculty dossiers, but as is the case in the departmental committee may review dossiers and make relevant comments related to their discipline. Committee members must vote by electronic or paper ballot, without identifiers. Votes may be “yes” or “no.” Members may recuse themselves from voting, as needed, for reasons such as conflict of interest. Those

recusing themselves for reasons other than being in the clinical track or having voted in the departmental committee, should leave the room during discussion of the candidate being considered.

6. Annual Review

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

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads are responsible. In the CVMBS, a Research Track faculty member may be evaluated by the senior faculty member who is responsible for generating his/her salary. If necessary, a subsequent meeting and evaluation with the Department Head will be arranged.

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

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

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

6.1 Purpose

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

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or

excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable (section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#)).

6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each department will determine the appropriate review window and the specific review period will be specified in each department's review guidelines.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on five categories: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Satisfactory", "Exemplary", and "Most Meritorious" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

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

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

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

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.
- 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.

Those faculty members with a time assignment from 20% to 35% for scholarship will be expected to have strong evidence of collaborative research and/or scholarship that may or may not receive extramural funding in order to be rated satisfactory. Those faculty members with a <20% time assignment to scholarship are generally in the academic professional track and would be expected to engage in collaborative research in order to have a satisfactory rating.

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

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

6.4.4 *Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Patient Care/Diagnostic Services** are:*

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

recognized as clinicians through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in veterinary medical societies.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's patient care assignment, evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance.

6.5 Required Components

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

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

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

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

Examples of possible content for the report are:

- *A list of teaching, research, patient care and service activities, accomplishments, and awards during the evaluation period*
- *Self-reflection in the context of the assigned duties and set goals*
- *An annual plan of work for the upcoming year*

Each department will establish guidelines that outline the process and documentation for annual reviews of departmental faculty.

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

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

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

“ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the department head’s, director’s, or supervisor’s written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

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

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

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

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

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

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

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

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

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

6.7 Time-Line

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads or immediate supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining

salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties' Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, "These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year."

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

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

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

7. **Mid-Term Review**

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

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however, no external or internal letters of recommendation are required. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's P&T committee, department head/ director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.
- In the CVMBS it is mandatory for all newly appointed academic professional track faculty at the assistant or associate professor rank to undergo a formative mid-term review. This evaluation will familiarize the

academic professional track faculty member with the promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the promotion decision.

7.2 Process

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

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

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

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

8. Post-Tenure Review or Periodic Review

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

For both tenured and academic professional track faculty members, a promotion in rank through a review by the departmental promotion and tenure committee is considered a successful post-tenure/periodic review.

Academic professional track faculty members whose salary is paid by grants and contracts awarded to principal investigators are exempt from periodic review under these guidelines, and instead are evaluated annually by their direct supervisor.

Post-tenure and periodic reviews comprise:

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

8.1 Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.

- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

8.2 Peer Review Committee

Each year the Departmental Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will elect two Peer Review Committees consisting of no fewer than 3 members and no greater than 5 of the Departmental P&T Committee to review those faculty members who are due for post-tenure or periodic peer review. The Peer Review Committee for tenured faculty members will consist of tenured faculty members at the same rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. The Peer Review Committee for academic professional track faculty members will consist of academic professional track faculty members at the same rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. If there are an insufficient number of academic professional track faculty members of the department to form a complete committee, the balance of the committee will consist of tenured faculty members elected by the academic professional track faculty members on the committee. For both Peer Review Committees, one committee member may be from outside of the department. Those faculty members being reviewed are not eligible to be selected as part of that year's Peer Review Committee. All the P&T Committee members irrespective of their rank and track vote in the election of both Peer Review Committees. One of the elected Peer Review Committee members will serve as the Chair to coordinate the committee's activities.

8.3 Process

- 8.3.1 **Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:**
Faculty members being reviewed will provide the committee with a current curriculum vitae and a statement on current academic citizenship, teaching, scholarship and patient care if applicable no later than March 1. All faculty members must submit appropriate documentation of effectiveness and excellence in teaching consistent with the portion of their effort dedicated to teaching. Each department will determine what documentation is necessary for faculty members with varying proportions of teaching responsibilities. The documentation must be submitted by the faculty member to the committee no later than March 1.
- 8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
- 8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.4 A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5 A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that

finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

- 8.3.6. A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.¹ If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.8 **By no later than May 31st**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

8.4 Professional Development Review

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

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

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

¹ It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

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

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

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

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

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan.

8.4.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 8.5) acceptable to the dean.

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

8.6 Appeal

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

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

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. **Granting Faculty Emeritus Status**

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

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

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

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

Appendix

Department-specific P&T Committee Structure and Process Policies

Contact Office

College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences, Office of the Dean, e-mail j-august@tamu.edu