

Appendix IV: Evidence Supporting Performance in Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities

Purpose: This guidance suggests a variety of elements appropriate for consideration for faculty performance evaluations in research, scholarship or creative activities at Texas A&M University. These example questions, as applicable to the faculty member's department, college and or discipline, are appropriate for use in annual evaluations and in the research, scholarship or other creative activities report for mid-term review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those reports.

Use only those bullets that apply, or develop your own lists of evidence and questions to prompt relevant evaluation within your discipline.

Evidence Related to Publications/Creative work	Questions for Consideration
<p data-bbox="201 602 657 670">Quality and quantity of publications or creative works</p> <p data-bbox="201 719 558 787">Review of selected publications/work expected</p> <p data-bbox="201 1027 552 1096">Scholarship of teaching and learning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="678 602 1854 662">• In what way do the publications/creative work represent a cohesive body of work building toward a unique expertise or perspective contributing to the discipline? <li data-bbox="678 670 1854 870">• Describe the authorship protocols within the discipline, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor. In that context, describe whether the candidate publication record is congruent with a productive and independent research program for that career stage. (This analysis should take into account, not only the numbers of publications, the quality of the journals, and the citation indexes for each, but also, the contribution by the candidate, and the degree of difficulty, or complexity of the work). <li data-bbox="678 878 1629 906">• What is the quality of the journals, publishers (for books), other venues (for art)? <li data-bbox="678 914 1797 974">• What evidence is there that the research/scholarship is published completely and transparently regardless of results? <li data-bbox="678 982 1451 1010">• How would you describe the quality and impact of the research? <li data-bbox="678 1018 1843 1114">• Does the research seem congruent with the quality and impact of journal? E.g. some types of work are more impactful if published in a subdiscipline journal with lower impact factor than in a broader audience journal with higher impact factor because it reaches the proper audience. <li data-bbox="678 1122 1822 1182">• In cases where the candidate publishes scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), does the work advance understanding in a primary discipline? <li data-bbox="678 1190 1780 1218">• In what ways does the SoTL act to translate the specifics of a discipline to a broader audience?
<p data-bbox="201 1243 611 1312">Evidence Related to Funding (as appropriate to the discipline)</p>	<p data-bbox="678 1243 1035 1271">Questions for Consideration</p>
<p data-bbox="201 1325 548 1352">Consistency and Trajectory</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="678 1325 1860 1385">• Does the candidate have a funding record consistent with the capacity necessary to support students and personnel for a productive research program in this discipline? <li data-bbox="678 1393 1692 1421">• How has the grantsmanship of the candidate aligned with departmental expectations?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have there been extenuating circumstances outside the candidate’s control associated with the period under consideration? • Has funding improved with recognition of the candidate in the field? • Has the candidate been successful garnering grant renewals?
Granting agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the candidate secured funds from the premier funding sources in that discipline? • Describe the quality of funding sources, and address whether or not the sources are congruent with department and disciplinary expectations.
Variety of funding sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways has the candidate secured funding from a variety of sources (if appropriate to the discipline)?
Evidence of Overall Impact	Questions for Consideration
Contribution to societal need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the whole, in which ways does the scholarship/creative work benefit society? • What is the evidence for broader significance of the work, either now or in the near future wherein the candidate pursues plans described within their statement? • How well does the scholarship contribute to the vision, mission, and strategic initiatives for the unit, college, and university?
Appropriate dissemination of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the evidence that the candidate shares the research/scholarship results and expertise appropriately, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ datasets ○ software ○ research tools and approaches developed ○ indicators of openness and transparency conducive to advancing the field and cultivating an excellent reputation within the scholarship community
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the bulk of the candidate’s research/scholarship is done jointly (especially if it is done with senior and more established scholars), does the record provide evidence of the candidate’s important original contributions to the work? • Explain whether authorship consistent is with the contribution? • In what ways do others value the quality of the candidate’s expertise as indicated by a clear record of collaboration? • What impact has involvement in collaborations had on the productivity of the candidate? • Do you expect collaborations will improve the productivity of candidate in the long run?
Degree of risk/reward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence is there that the candidate is a creative scholar and/or an intellectual risk-taker? • In which ways might this approach be beneficial within their field?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How might this strength, nonetheless, be responsible for the rate or stage of advancement of the research, scholarship or creative activities relative to adopting a purely “safe” approach? • Are there aspects of the research, scholarship or creative activities portfolio that demonstrate originality?
Upward trajectory for research progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the research quality improve over time? • In what way is the scholarly or artistic work perceived as outstanding? • Does the candidate have a strong reputation in his or her field?
Invitations, Honors, Awards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What noteworthy aspects of the candidate’s service record indicate they are recognized in their field of scholarship? • Do invitations (e.g. speaking, consulting, appearances, or participation in committees, taskforces, or advisory bodies) indicate the candidate is recognized in their field of scholarship? • Has the candidate received honors or awards for their scholarship? • How exclusive are the awards? • How are the winners selected?
Overall research, scholarship or creative activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on their overall research, scholarship or creative activities, has the candidate distinguished themselves as a leader or influencer within the discipline, unit, college, university? • Based on management of their research program and collaborations, has the candidate distinguished themselves as a leader or influencer within the discipline, unit, college, university?

References:

- Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2018-2019, TAMU Dean of Faculties.
- University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion Appendix I.
- Moher D, Naudet F, Cristea IA, Miedema F, Ioannidis JPA, Goodman SN (2018) [Assessing scientists for hiring, promotion, and tenure](#).