

***PROCEDURES, PRACTICES, AND  
FACULTY PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES***

***TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE***

***DEPARTMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT  
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY***

**Approved by majority vote of the Tenure and Promotion Committee  
Department of Ecosystem Science and Management  
June 2009**

## **COMPOSITION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE DEPARTMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT**

The following approach for creating and maintaining the Tenure and Promotion Committee was created and approved by the entire Department of Ecosystem Science and Management in June 2007:

---

1. The ESSM Tenure and Promotion Committee will be created and perpetuated by annual faculty-wide elections.
2. Those eligible to vote on the composition of the T&P Committee include: (a) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences faculty holding the rank of Senior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, or Distinguished Professor; (b) Texas AgriLife Research and Texas AgriLife Extension faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor or higher; and (c) Research Assistant Professors, Research Associate Professors, and Research Professors.
3. Those eligible to serve on the T&P Committee include: (a) tenured College of Agriculture and Life Sciences faculty members; (b) Texas AgriLife Research and Texas AgriLife Extension faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor; and (c) Research Associate Professors and Research Professors. Department heads, associate department heads, unit heads, and associate unit heads are ineligible to serve on the committee.
4. New faculty members (of all ranks) will serve as guest members of the T&P Committee during their first year on the faculty. These individuals will attend all meetings and participate in discussions, but will not be eligible to vote on matters of tenure and promotion. If there is no T&P activity during their first year, new faculty may serve as guest members during their 2<sup>nd</sup> year on the faculty.
5. The chair of the T&P Committee will be elected by a vote of the T&P Committee only, and will serve for a term of three years. Only College of Agriculture and Life Sciences faculty holding the rank of Professor will be eligible to serve as committee chair. If an incumbent committee member with only one or two years remaining in his/her term is elected to be committee chair, that person will receive an automatic term extension to allow him/her to serve a full three year term as committee chair.
6. If someone is elected to the T&P Committee but is not able to serve, he/she may be excused from this service with permission from the department head. The person receiving the next-highest number of votes in the most recent election will then replace this individual. Committee members unable to complete their elected terms (e.g., due to illness, retirement, departure from the university, etc.) will be replaced in an identical manner.
7. The T&P Committee will be comprised of a total of 16 faculty members consisting of 10 College of Agriculture and Life Sciences faculty, three Texas AgriLife Research faculty and/or Research Professors, and three Texas AgriLife Extension faculty. The chair of the T&P Committee will be selected from the 10 members comprising the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences positions.

8. Those elected to the T&P Committee will serve a three-year term. Those completing their three-year terms are immediately eligible for re-election.
9. Following the first election only (in 2007), 1/3 of each group (i.e. College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas AgriLife Research, Texas AgriLife Extension) will be assigned a one year term, 1/3 will be assigned a two year term, and 1/3 will be assigned a three year term. Committee members elected in subsequent years will all serve three-year terms.
10. The department head will conduct elections for the composition of the Tenure and Promotion Committee by e-mail ballot, and the voting will be confidential. Once the committee composition has been established, the department head will also conduct the election for chair of the T&P committee by confidential e-mail vote of the committee members only.

## **STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES OF THE TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE DEPARTMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT**

---

1. This document (“Procedures, Practices, and Faculty Performance Guidelines”) will be reviewed every three years by the Tenure and Promotion Committee in the Department of Ecosystem Science and Management to ensure that it remains consistent with the policies of Texas A&M University, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas AgriLife Research, and Texas AgriLife Extension. Any substantive changes to this document that are not mandated by the University or its agencies must be approved by a majority vote of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.
2. This document (“Procedures, Practices, and Faculty Performance Guidelines”) will be distributed to all tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty within the statewide program of the Department of Ecosystem Science and Management every three years, or whenever substantive changes have been mandated by the university, its agencies, and/or the Tenure and Promotion Committee in the Department of Ecosystem Science and Management.
3. The most recent version of this document will be posted on the web site of the Dean of Faculties at Texas A&M University (<http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/tp/processes.php>)
4. Faculty required or eligible to apply for tenure and promotion, and faculty members scheduled for mandatory mid-term reviews submit their dossiers (prepared according to guidelines of the College of Agriculture and Life Science, Texas AgriLife Research, or Texas AgriLife Extension, as appropriate to the appointment of the specific candidate) to the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee at the conclusion of spring semester (early May) each year.
5. Dossiers are distributed to the members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee by mid-May, and a committee meeting is held before the end of May to review those documents. All committee members are encouraged to attend the meeting in-person, although a conference line is always available to enable off-campus committee members to participate by phone.
6. At the initial committee meeting in the academic year, each candidate’s credentials are reviewed and discussed, and a preliminary assessment of the candidate’s suitability for tenure and/or promotion is developed. Each candidate is assigned to one T&P committee member who is responsible for presenting a summary of the candidate’s achievements at the meeting. All committee members are encouraged to express their views on each candidate, various perspectives are collectively discussed, and a consensus recommendation is developed for each candidate under consideration. External reviewers are identified for candidates whose applications will be going forward to the College and University level review committees. Finally, committee members are assigned to prepare written reports on teaching, research, and service for each candidate. All committee discussions and deliberations are confidential.
7. For tenure-track and tenured faculty, the committee chair contacts 5-8 external reviewers (some recommended by candidate, some recommended by committee) qualified to evaluate the credentials of each candidate going forward for tenure and/or promotion, and ensures that the external reviewers receive copies of the candidate’s dossier (but without the committee reports on teaching, research, and service). These external reviews are distributed to the entire Tenure and Promotion Committee as they become available, usually in early August.

8. The tenure and/or promotion candidate can provide a “do not contact” list comprised of individuals who may not be able to provide a fair and objective assessment of the candidate’s dossier.
9. Tenure-track and tenured faculty members having joint appointments (if funded) in other departments or units, or having appointments with interdisciplinary (intercollegiate) faculties (such as MEPS or GENE), are to be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by the secondary unit as well as the ADLOC unit. This should be done in accordance with the guidelines from both departments/units. In the case of interdisciplinary faculty, the additional review and evaluation will be sought early enough to allow it to become part of the dossier reviewed by the departmental T&P committee. The report by the committee of an interdisciplinary faculty may consist simply of a letter including comments on teaching, research, service, and intercollegiate cooperation.
10. Tenure-track faculty members undergoing mandatory mid-term reviews are not required to have external reviews, and no letters are solicited.
11. Non-tenure track faculty (Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, Visiting Assistant and Associate Professors, and Research Assistant and Associate Professors) are not required to have external reviews as part of their promotion evaluations. However, the ESSM T&P Committee will solicit at least three external review letters for all non-tenure track promotion considerations. Two of the three external reviewers will be suggested by the candidate, and one additional reviewer will be selected by the T&P Committee.
12. Committee reports on teaching, research, and service are prepared for each candidate by T&P committee members assigned by the chair, and circulated to the entire Tenure and Promotion Committee to ensure that the reports reflect an accurate representation of the Committee consensus. The primary author of each letter is responsible for coordinating the editing and committee approval of their report. Committee reports are in near-final form by mid- to late-July.
13. When all external reviews (including those from interdisciplinary faculties and/or units involved in joint appointments, if needed) have been received and all committee reports are in near-final form, the Tenure and Promotion Committee meets again, usually in mid- to late-August. At this meeting, the external reviews are discussed, together with any other information that might require final discussion. If external review letters provide insights or opinions that differ from those of the committee, those insights are discussed, and Committee reports are modified to incorporate those new insights and opinions.
14. Within a few days following the final meeting, Committee reports on teaching, research, and service are finalized and submitted to the Committee Chair. In addition, committee members send their confidential votes by e-mail to the Committee Chair. Voting options include yes, no, abstain/recuse, or absent. Committee members should utilize the “abstain/recuse” option only when they have a strong conflict of interest with the candidate, or when they have not been able to attend committee meetings and/or not been able to review the candidate’s materials in sufficient detail to make a well-informed decision. Thus, use of the “abstain” option should be rare. It is anticipated that being “absent” for a vote should also be rare and limited to occasions when the committee member is unable to access e-mail or telephone service.
15. In the case of faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion, a vote of “yes” means the faculty member should be tenured and/or promoted, while a vote of “no” means that the faculty member should not be tenured and/or promoted. In the case of mandatory mid-term reviews, a vote of “yes” means that the candidate is on track to obtain tenure and/or promotion during their mandatory

---

year of consideration, while a vote of “no” means that the candidate is not on track to achieve tenure and/or promotion during their mandatory year for consideration.

16. The committee chair works with the candidates and support staff to collate all materials and prepare the final dossier. These materials are submitted to the department head (who adds his/her written review to the dossier) and then submitted to the Agriculture Program Tenure and Promotion Committee by the deadline in late September. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion do not view the committee reports, the department head’s letter, or the external review letters. However, faculty members undergoing mid-term review are provided with copies of all four committee reports (teaching, research, service, overall committee report), as well as the review from the department head.

## **FACULTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES DEPARTMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT:**

### **ON-CAMPUS FACULTY: NON-TENURE TRACK, TENURE-TRACK, AND TENURED**

---

The T&P Committee follows all of the most recently published T&P requirements and guidelines issued by the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas AgriLife Research, and Texas AgriLife Extension. The guidelines, recommendations, and practices outlined below are specific to the Department of Ecosystem Science and Management, but consistent with the regulations of all higher authorities in the Texas A&M University System.

The guidelines outlined below are intended to direct faculty towards achievements in the areas of teaching, research, and service commensurate with faculty rank. The aim of these guidelines is to contribute to the development of scholarly credentials that will lead to successful tenure and/or promotion applications at Departmental, College, and University levels of review. In addition, the intent of the guidelines below is to cultivate a successful and thriving departmental faculty that will further enable the Department of Ecosystem Science and Management to become nationally and internationally recognized for scholarship in ecology and management of ecosystems.

The guidelines outlined below pertain to tenure-track and tenured faculty members. In addition, these same guidelines and expectations will be utilized during considerations involving the promotion of non-tenure track faculty (such as Research or Visiting Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors). However, the weighting of teaching, research, and service for non-tenure track faculty may differ slightly from what is expected of tenured and tenure-track faculty, depending on the individual's responsibilities. For example, a Research Assistant or Associate Professor may not have any teaching responsibilities, in which case the expectations for research and service activities may be somewhat greater. Conversely, a Visiting Assistant or Associate Professor may not have any research responsibilities, and expectations in the areas of teaching and service may be greater. Guidelines for Lecturers are provided later in this document as a separate section.

#### ***Performance Areas Evaluated for Tenure and Promotion***

Texas A&M University aspires to become a national and international center of academic excellence, as reflected in Vision 2020. The goal of Vision 2020 is to establish TAMU as a consensus "top 10" public university by the year 2020. To accomplish this goal, the scholarly performance of the faculty must be commensurate with that of faculty at other "top 10" public universities. Consequently, pursuit of this goal over the past two decades has raised the standards of performance expected from all faculty. It seems likely that these rising expectations will continue in the future and that they will be reflected in performance standards for tenure and promotion as well as annual reviews.

Seven areas of performance are evaluated in ESSM for tenure and for promotion decisions at both the associate and full professor ranks, they are:

1. A high standard of scholarship manifested through publications
2. Acquisition of funds (i.e., grants and contracts) from sources external to the department

3. A high standard of teaching as manifested through evaluations and a teaching portfolio
4. Service to constituents external to the university
5. Establishment and effective mentoring of a cadre of graduate students
6. National/international reputation
7. Professional integrity and responsibility

The first four standards are core performance areas (scholarship manifested through publications, grantsmanship, teaching, and service) which must be met before tenure, and promotion can be considered. It is unlikely that performance which does not meet expectations in any of these areas can be compensated for by a high level of performance in another area. While attainment of the expected standards of excellence in these four areas is a necessary condition, it is not necessarily sufficient for an individual to be recommended for tenure and promotion. Evidence of very good or good performance in each of the three remaining performance areas (items 5-7 above) is also expected for tenure and promotion to associate professor, but it is recognized that individuals have different strengths so there are likely to be some compensatory weightings within these three areas. That is, exceptional performance in one or more of the latter three areas could potentially compensate to some extent for lower performance than the expected standard in another area.

### ***Benchmark Guidelines for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor***

For tenure-track faculty, the decision regarding promotion from assistant professor to associate professor is tied to the tenure decision. Therefore, if an individual is deemed promotable, he/she must also be qualified for tenure. In the case of non-tenure track faculty (e.g. Visiting or Research Assistant Professors, the decision involved promotion only.

**1. Scholarship through Publication.** The expectation for most faculty, is that the record will show 15-20 papers in refereed, peer-reviewed journal articles by the end of their fifth year of the probationary period when documentation is submitted to initiate the tenure and promotion process. It is emphasized that this quantification range is a guideline and not a norm, since it is recognized that quantity of publications is not the only indicator of scholarship contributions.

Faculty should be aware that journal impact factors, numbers of citations generated by their work, *h*-index, and other metrics will likely be utilized by the departmental and college-level T&P Committees, and by external reviewers as an objective means to evaluate quantitative and qualitative characteristics of their publication record.

It is highly recommended that faculty should strive to publish their work in leading Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) listed journals with the highest possible journal Impact Factors to maximize their impact on their disciplines and professions. Faculty are encouraged to publish their papers in the top ranked journals in their particular ISI category (e.g. ecology, forestry, soil science, remote sensing, agricultural economics).

Given the diversity of specializations and disciplinary backgrounds of ESSM faculty, it is recognized that some faculty members will publish in peer-reviewed interdisciplinary/cross-disciplinary journals, and in peer-reviewed journals in a wide range of fields, including disciplines that may not be specifically categorized by ISI. Peer-reviewed publications are considered to be equally meritorious regardless of discipline. In cases where needed, the ranking of journals (ISI Impact Factors, etc.) will be that used by the department on the Texas A&M campus most closely associated with the candidate's discipline.

Faculty should also recognize that publications in editor-reviewed and non-reviewed outlets (conference proceedings, book chapters, etc.) will be recognized as scholarly achievements, but are not a substitute for and will not be counted in lieu of refereed, peer-reviewed journal articles.

It is anticipated that a portion of the published work will emanate from a Ph.D. dissertation and postdoctoral research that predate appointment to the ESSM faculty. Such publications are considered to be equally meritorious. It is understood that a move to a new context and different culture at Texas A&M may result in a shift in research focus and some exploration in developing a program of research. Thus, the CV at the end of the five-year probationary period may show some diversity of subject matter, as well as a mix of publications originating from past and present research. However, there must be evidence in the publication record that a coherent research program based on work accomplished at Texas A&M University is emerging by the end of the fifth year.

**2. Acquisition of Research Funds from Sources External to the Department.** The acquisition of research funds is an integral part of an individual's scholarship contribution. Funds may be from competitive fellowships, grants or contracts, and should be used to support research operating costs as well as graduate student stipends and tuition. A faculty member's transition to Texas A&M University may make it difficult to acquire external funds in the first two years. This is a period in which networks are created or expanded, a research program defined, and an understanding of the state and university culture is nurtured. However, by the end of the fifth year, an emerging and growing record of external funds is expected. As a guideline, the expectation is that the faculty member will be a principal investigator (PI) or Co-PI on 3-4 successful external funding submissions worth a total of approximately \$500,000, with approximately 20-40% of this amount under the candidates direct control. At least one of these grants should be from a competitive program administered by a federal agency such as NSF, USDA, NASA, EPA, DOE, or other nationally recognized public or private competitive funding programs or foundations. Successful grant applications to competitive funding programs administered by these agencies or foundations provides strong evidence of a successful, state-of-the-art research program that is addressing important scientific and societal issues because proposals to these agencies receive intense peer scrutiny. In the case of a project involving multiple principal investigators, the proportion of the project funds for which the candidate is responsible should be identified. It is recognized that external funding may be more accessible to those working in some disciplines more so than in others. It is also recognized that funding levels in terms of the average size and number of grants and contracts differ widely among disciplines. Consequently, these metrics should be regarded as guidelines and not as norms.

**3. Teaching.** Excellence in teaching is expected in the formal setting of the undergraduate and graduate classroom. Two criteria are used to measure teaching quality. A third, optional criteria recognizes that some faculty may choose to demonstrate excellence in teaching by contributing to the scholarship of teaching.

(i) Student Evaluations. By the end of the five-year period, the expectation is that student evaluation scores in each course taught by the candidate should attain a minimum average of 4.0 on the 5-point scales used to measure teaching effectiveness on the Department's standardized online or written evaluation form. Some faculty may have had relatively little teaching experience before being hired by Texas A&M, so their scores may be lower than 4.0 in the early years. It is expected that all faculty at the assistant professor level will take advantage of the assistance the university offers (e.g., the Center for Teaching Excellence) to improve their teaching performance. This assistance, and five years of experience in the classroom, are the vehicles through which low performance may be raised to meet the minimum expected standard of 4.0 in each course for which the faculty member is the primary instructor. It is also expected that a faculty member will teach courses in their specialty and

contribute consistently and regularly to both undergraduate and graduate teaching programs in a manner consistent with their job descriptions.

(ii) Teaching Portfolio. The portfolio should be developed with the assistance of the Center for Teaching Excellence (or other appropriate mentors or resources), and will include the outlines, structures, and proceedings of each course taught. The teaching portfolio should include an evaluation from the TAMU Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) based on an in-class review by a CTE professional staff member. These materials will be evaluated by the T&P Committee and will be sent to external reviewers with expertise in the content area to evaluate the appropriateness and relevance of what is being taught. The teaching portfolio will not be forwarded to the Dean's office with the tenure and promotion package.

(iii) Scholarship in the Art and Science of Teaching. In addition to the three essential criteria and guidelines discussed above, it is recognized that some faculty members may choose to demonstrate scholarship in teaching. This may take a variety of forms, including the development of innovative classroom materials, publication in peer-reviewed journals with a focus on pedagogy, or other means. The candidate may choose to develop creative materials that contribute to academic programs beyond the context of an individual's teaching. These may include textbooks if their quality is demonstrated to be superior to that of other available materials. An award/grant for curriculum development, student development, or academic programming may be another example that extends the teaching contribution beyond the specific teaching program of the individual. Development of teacher and student workshops on teaching in one's discipline is another example.

**4. Service to Constituents External to the University.** External service refers to responsively serving the needs of constituents external to the university. Examples of service activities would include: (a) service on editorial boards of professional journals, (b) officer positions in professional societies, (c) providing ad hoc reviews for journals and granting agencies, (d) organizing workshops or symposia at professional meetings, (e) publications in popular outlets (magazines, newspapers, etc.), and (f) providing educational opportunities for general citizen groups. It does not include service to a community in a citizen, rather than in a professional, role. For example, personal (as opposed to professional) involvement with political, commercial, religious, non-profit, and other similar institutions is not relevant to the evaluation of service performance.

Although service is an important area of evaluation, faculty members should recognize that research and teaching accomplishments will receive greater scrutiny and will be weighted more heavily than service activities during tenure and promotion evaluations. Faculty should therefore not become overly committed to service activities at the expense of research and teaching activities while they are working towards tenure and promotion to associate professor.

**5. Establishment and Effective Mentoring of a Cadre of Graduate Students.** The university's guidelines indicate that outstanding direction of graduate research, mentoring, and chairing graduate research committees are key criteria that should be used to evaluate teaching performance. Accordingly, there should be evidence that graduate students are attracted to the candidate's research program and recognize his/her mentoring talents. Thus, by the end of the fifth year, the guideline expectation is that a candidate will be chairing, or have successfully chaired or co-chaired approximately 4-5 graduate student committees (preferably a mix of M.S. and Ph.D. students), and will be a member of at least two or three others. While the number of graduate students advised may vary widely among faculty, evidence of high quality of students and mentoring is expected. Metrics of student excellence include GRE scores and grade-point ratios of new students, and more importantly, scholarly achievements in publication, presentations to professional conferences, honors and awards, and placement in subsequent careers. Faculty are also encouraged to take advantage of Graduate Merit Fellowships, Graduate Diversity Fellowships, Regents Fellowships, and national

fellowship programs administered by federal agencies (such as NSF, DOE, EPA) to recruit and retain high quality graduate students.

**6. Reputation.** An emerging national reputation in an area of expertise is expected. Examples of evidence for a scholarly reputation might include: (a) invitations to speak at symposia or other professional meetings, (b) publications of review or synthesis papers in peer-reviewed journals, (c) service as an ad hoc reviewer for journals and granting agencies, and/or (d) service as a review panel member for a nationally competitive granting agency. Evidence for a national reputation might also be exemplified by involvement in professional societies, beyond simply being a member of the group or presenting papers at meetings. Evidence of a scientific reputation might also be evident in the number of times ones papers are cited in the scientific literature, h-index, and impact factor of journals.

**7. Professional Integrity and Responsibility.** These qualities are demonstrated by showing respect for colleagues; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity; and being a "good citizen" of the department, college, and university by serving on committees, task forces etc. Section 3 of the University's "Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion" offers an expanded, more detailed description of the expectations associated with this criterion.

### ***Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Professor***

The average time-in-rank between appointment to Associate Professor and submission for promotion to Professor is approximately 6-7 years. It is recognized that some outstanding individuals may meet the guidelines for promotion to Professor (outlined below) in a time frame shorter than this average. This may occur when an individual has demonstrated accelerated development of an original and independent research program, scholarly accomplishments, grantsmanship, graduate student training, teaching, and service.

The benchmarks listed for promotion to the full professor rank are *in addition* to those listed for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor.

**1. Scholarship through Publication.** Faculty applying for promotion to professor should have 35-40 refereed journal articles. These publications should be in ISI-listed journals, and faculty should have published approximately 50% of their papers in journals that rank near the top of their ISI category (e.g. ecology, forestry, soil science, remote sensing, agricultural economics). Faculty members applying for promotion to professor should also have at least one publication (peer-reviewed journal article, book, or book chapter) that represents a review or synthesis of their research program that advances scholarship in their particular field or profession.

In the case of faculty members from disciplines where the convention is to publish good scholarship in other types of outlets (e.g., books), counsel will be solicited from senior scholars in those disciplines to ascertain guidelines for the quality and quantity of published scholarship expected for promotion to the full professor rank.

The publication record will reflect a coherent, long-term research program. It will be the manifestation of major accomplishment in enhancing the state of knowledge in a defined research area in which the candidate has earned a national/international reputation.

The candidate will be a senior author on most of the publications. This does not necessarily mean he/she will always be the first author listed. Often the first author will be a graduate student or postdoctoral fellow (as is expected), and when cross-disciplinary faculty teams are involved credits

have to be shared appropriately. Senior authorship means that an individual played a central role in conceptualizing, funding, guiding, implementing, interpreting and writing-up the work.

Faculty should be aware that journal impact factors, numbers of citations generated by their work, h-factors, and other metrics may be utilized by the departmental T&P Committee and by external reviewers as an objective means to evaluate quantitative and qualitative characteristics of their publication record. An h-factor of 8-12 (i.e. 8-12 papers cited at least 8-12 times) is a reasonable guideline for a scholar applying for promotion to professor.

**2. Acquisition of Funds from Sources External to the Department.** A consistent on-going record of grantsmanship from multiple funding sources is essential. These efforts should be adequate to sustain the operating costs of a vigorous research program, and to sustain a viable graduate student program. As a general rule it is expected that a faculty member seeking promotion to professor will have been PI or Co-PI on research funding of approximately \$1,000,000 during their careers with approximately 25-40% of this amount under the candidate's direct control. Approximately 33% of this amount should be from competitive national funding agencies such as NSF, NASA, USDA, DOE, and EPA. Success in obtaining funding from these agencies provides a strong indication of a research program that addresses major scientific and societal issues using innovative, state-of-the-art approaches.

**3. Teaching.** The high standard of teaching exemplified at the time of promotion to associate professor should be continued, as manifested by average student review scores exceeding 4.0 (good) on the 5-point scales used to measure teaching effectiveness on the department's standardized online or written evaluation form. These ratings should be achieved in all classes for which the faculty member has primary responsibility. Continued evidence for teaching improvement activities (such as participation in Center for Teaching Excellence workshops) is expected. It is expected that a faculty member will teach courses in their specialty and contribute consistently and regularly to both undergraduate and graduate teaching programs in a manner consistent with their job descriptions. In addition to advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, a hallmark excellence includes advising post-doctoral and visiting scholars.

**4. Service to Constituents External to the University.** External service refers to responsively serving the needs of constituents external to the university. Examples of service activities would include: (a) service on editorial boards of professional journals, (b) officer positions in professional societies, (c) providing ad hoc reviews for journals and granting agencies, (d) organizing workshops or symposia at professional meetings, (e) publications in popular outlets (magazines, newspapers, etc.), and (f) providing educational opportunities for general citizen groups. It does not include service to a community in a citizen, rather than in a professional, role. For example, personal (as opposed to professional) involvement with political, commercial, religious, non-profit, and other similar institutions is not relevant to the evaluation of service performance.

Research and teaching accomplishments remain more important than service activities at this level and faculty should not become overly involved in service to the detriment of scholarship. However, there is a general expectation that service activities at this level will generally be of a nature that will have a significant impact on science and society.

**5. Establishment and Effective Mentoring of a Cadre of Graduate Students.** Faculty should remember that the universal hallmark of a Tier I research university is a successful Ph.D. program.

The guideline expectation is that the candidate would have successfully chaired or co-chaired a minimum of six graduate students to completion, at least two of which were Ph.D. students. Faculty are also encouraged to take advantage of Graduate Merit Fellowships, Graduate Diversity Fellowships, Regents Fellowships, and national fellowship programs administered by federal

agencies (such as NSF, DOE, EPA) to recruit and retain high quality graduate students. While the number of graduate students advised may vary widely among faculty, evidence of high quality of students and mentoring is expected. Metrics of student excellence include GRE scores and grade-point ratios of new students, and more importantly, scholarly achievements in publication, presentations to professional conferences, and honors and awards.

Evidence for the success of current and former graduate students is important. Faculty members must cultivate a culture of excellence within their graduate student group in which presentations at meetings, publications, and other manifestations of scholarly accomplishment are highly regarded.

Former M.S. students should be placed in good research or managerial positions (e.g., state and federal agencies, consulting firms, etc.), while the preponderance of former Ph.D. students should hold postdoctoral fellowships, university faculty positions, or government research positions (e.g. USDA, EPA, USGS). The quality of former students' research work will be evident through publications in peer-reviewed journals.

**6. Reputation.** A national/international reputation in the candidate's area of expertise is expected. This is likely to be exemplified by leadership roles in professional associations, journal editorships, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak at professional meetings and symposia in the USA and abroad, invitations to submit review and synthesis papers to journals, invitations to serve on grant review panels, and by senior faculty at other institutions holding the faculty members work in high esteem. Evidence of a scientific reputation might also be evident in the number of times ones papers are cited in the scientific literature, h-index, and impact factor of journals.

**7. Professional Integrity and Responsibility.** Performance in this area is exemplified by showing respect for colleagues, and this respect being reciprocated; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity; and being a "good citizen" of the department, college, and university by serving on committees, task forces etc.

### ***Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Distinguished Professor***

The Distinguished Professor rank at Texas A&M University is reserved for those who have made extraordinary contributions. At present only 54 faculty among the university's 2,900 faculty have been recognized with this distinction. To be eligible, the candidate must meet the following **three critical criteria**:

1. Be considered **Pre-eminent** in his or her own field (specifically, we believe that, at a minimum, this is indicated when the candidate is among the top 5% of active researchers in his or her area of research or scholarship on an international basis.
2. Have made at least one **Seminal Contribution** (i.e. the work caused a *substantial* intellectual leap forward in the discipline rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge).
3. Have had a **Major Impact** (i.e. his/her work is central in any narrative of the field, and he/she is widely recognized to have redirected scholarship in the field).

Among the potential indicators of such quality and impact are: (1) Receipt of peer reviewed national and international scientific awards, (2) Election to fellowship in prestigious learned societies, (3) Selection for prestigious visiting lectureships, (4) Receipt of Honorary Degrees based on scientific accomplishment, (5) Appointment to important scientific governing and advising committees at the national and international level, (6) Selection for a major leadership role in national and international

scientific societies and/or scientific meetings, and (7) Appointment to editorial boards of major scientific journals. It is expected that candidates for Distinguished Professor will have a continuing productive scholarly program.

Procedures for preparing the candidate's dossier differ somewhat from those for other academic ranks. One difference is that the T&P Committee prepares a single letter that evaluates the candidate's academic accomplishments rather than three separate letters. In addition, 10 letters from external reviewers are required, with four of these letters from preeminent scholars in other countries, and six letters from preeminent scholars within the USA. Additional details regarding procedures for nomination to this rank are detailed in documents accessible on-line through the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost Office web site at: <http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/distinguished/>

# **FACULTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES DEPARTMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT:**

## **ON-CAMPUS FACULTY: LECTURERS**

---

Lecturers make a unique contribution to the educational and training mission of the Department of Ecosystem Science and Management. Lecturers are non-tenure accruing but are generally full-time faculty who are not only engaged in teaching, but also are engaged in various aspects of graduate and undergraduate student training, program development, and/or other areas of practical application. In addition, lecturers may also participate in research, publication, grantsmanship, serve on various committees, participate in service activities external to the university, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate.

For purposes of promotion, Visiting Lecturers are generally part-time or short-time employees and are not involved in the promotion process. Visiting Lectures will generally have a M.S. or Ph.D. degree, but a B.S. degree and evidence of exceptional accomplishment in a field may be acceptable.

Longer-term entry-level Lecturer appointments are generally made at the Assistant Lecturer level. Individuals appointed as Assistant Lecturers should have a M.S. or Ph.D. degree, but a B.S. degree and evidence of exceptional accomplishment in a field may be acceptable. Assistant Lecturers will typically have relevant professional experience, evidence of superior teaching skills, and an interest in and commitment to engage in professional leadership activities.

### ***Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Lecturer***

Assistant Lecturers seeking promotion to the rank of Lecturer must show consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, must have made contributions to program/curriculum development, and must show evidence of continued professional development and professional activities.

### ***Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Senior Lecturer***

The title of Senior Lecturer is generally intended for an individual who has rendered outstanding teaching and service while holding the rank of Lecturer. Prior to appointment as a Senior Lecturer, a faculty member will, normally have held the rank of Lecturer for a minimum of five years and will have earned promotion based on performance while holding this position. An essential criterion for appointment as Senior Lecturer is highly effective teaching of proven quality. Senior Lecturers are also expected to make significant contributions to departmental objectives. Criteria used in consideration for promotion to Senior Lecturer include: (1) A teaching portfolio demonstrating outstanding teaching, (2) Teaching evaluations from students, (3) Evidence of outstanding teaching abilities provided by review(s) from the Center for Teaching Excellence, (4) Evidence for a regional or national reputation as a scholar within his or her discipline, or within the art/science of teaching, (5) Evidence of service to constituents external to the university, and (6) Personnel needs of the department.

Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer must show evidence of excellence and leadership in teaching, graduate and undergraduate student supervision, program/curriculum development, and/or other academic activities. He she must also show evidence of excellence in professional development and professional experiences, and evidence of excellence and leadership in professional activities (e.g., presentations at professional conferences, committee involvement in professional organizations, service as a program reviewer or on a journal editorial review board, grant activity, scholarly publications).

### ***Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Distinguished Lecturer***

Senior Lecturers with exceptional credentials may be considered for promotion to Distinguished Lecturer. Accomplishments for promotion to this rank must include: (1) Evidence for leadership in the excellence of teaching, (2) Evidence of participation in program development, (3) Numerous presentations at regional, national, and international professional conferences related to the candidates primary area of expertise or to the field of teaching, (4) Delivery of formal and informal seminars and workshops to University faculty, students, and/or community groups, and (5) Significant national and international recognition of professional accomplishments that have impacted the direction of the field.

## **FACULTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES DEPARTMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT**

### **TEXAS AGRILIFE RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS**

---

Off-campus Texas AgriLife Research appointments are not tenure-accruing for promotion. There are six primary areas of performance evaluated for promotion of Texas AgriLife Research faculty members:

1. A high standard of scholarship through publication;
2. Professional integrity and responsibility;
3. Acquisition of funds from sources external to Texas AgriLife and the department;
4. Mentoring and training of graduate students in cooperation with on-campus faculty;
5. International, national, regional, and local reputation; and
6. Service to profession and constituents external to the university.

There are four main differences in the expectations of off-campus Texas AgriLife research faculty compared to departmental faculty:

1. A high standard of research scholarship is expected, and the expected outlet is primarily through refereed publications. Some proportion of these publications will represent fundamental contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline. However, it is anticipated that this scholarship will also relate in some way to local and regional problems, as defined by the original mission and motivation of the land grant university to establish off-campus research facilities and as reflected in the candidate's position description. As such, scholarship is expected to be both applied and theoretical and some publications are likely to be in professional journals with a more applied focus.
2. It is expected that levels of external financial support will be similar to those of on campus faculty. Although research grants from national scientific funding agencies are expected as the basis for successful grantsmanship, off-campus faculty may also have opportunities to take advantage of funding from more regional sources (commodity groups, private ranches, etc).
3. Texas AgriLife Research faculty members are expected to mentor and train graduate students. However, because they are unable to serve the sole committee chair for a TAMU graduate student advisory committee, the expectations associated with mentoring graduate students are somewhat lower than those for on-campus faculty.
4. Service to constituents external to the university should include not only activities with professional organizations, but also interactions with regional interest groups such private landowners, agribusiness, natural resource agencies, and environmental interest groups.

## ***Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor***

**1. Scholarship through Publication.** The expectation for most faculty, is that the record will show 15-20 papers in refereed, peer-reviewed journal articles by the end of their fifth year of the probationary period when documentation is submitted to initiate the promotion process. It is emphasized that this quantification range is a guideline and not a norm, since it is recognized that quantity of publications is not the only indicator of scholarship contributions.

It is recommended that faculty should strive to publish their work in Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) journals with the highest possible journal Impact Factors to maximize their impact on their disciplines and professions

Faculty should be aware that journal impact factors, numbers of citations generated by their work, h-factors, and other metrics may be utilized by the departmental T&P Committee and by external reviewers as an objective means to evaluate quantitative and qualitative characteristics of their publication record.

Given the diversity of specializations and disciplinary backgrounds of Texas AgriLife Research ESSM faculty, it is recognized that some faculty members will publish in interdisciplinary/cross-disciplinary journals, and in journals in other fields and disciplines. Publications recognized in those disciplines are considered to be equally as meritorious as those in the "mainline" ESSM journals.

Faculty should also recognize that publications in editor-reviewed and non-reviewed outlets (conference proceedings, book chapters, etc.) will be recognized as scholarly achievements, but are not a substitute for refereed, peer-reviewed journal articles.

Published work is likely to emanate from a dissertation. Also, the move to a new context and different culture at Texas AgriLife Research may result in a shift in research focus and exploration in developing a program of research which likely includes significant collaboration with other scientists. Thus, the CV at the end of the five-year period may show some diversity of topic areas. However, there should be evidence in the publication record that a coherent research program based on work accomplished at Texas AgriLife Research is emerging by the end of the fifth year. A candidate should not be promoted strictly on the basis of publications resulting from research prior to joining Texas AgriLife Research.

**2. Professional Integrity and Responsibility.** These qualities are demonstrated by showing respect for colleagues; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic and scientific integrity; and by being a "good citizen" of AgriLife Research, ESSM, and the Texas A&M System by serving on committees, task forces etc. Texas AgriLife Research faculty are also expected to demonstrate the same level of integrity and responsibility during all interactions with local clientele.

**3. Acquisition of Research Funds.** The acquisition of research funds is an integral part of an individual's scholarship contribution. Funds may be from competitive fellowships, grants or contracts, and should be used to support research operating costs as well as graduate students and their research needs. A faculty member's transition to Texas AgriLife Research may make it difficult to acquire external funds in the first two years. This is a period in which networks must be created, a research program defined, and an understanding of the state and university culture has to be nurtured. However, by the end of the fifth year, an emerging and growing record of external funds is expected. As a guideline, the expectation is that the faculty member will be a PI or Co-PI on 1-3 successful external funding submissions worth a total of approximately \$500,000, with approximately 25-40% of this amount under the candidate's direct control. At least one of these grants should be from a competitive program administered by a federal agency such as NSF, USDA, NASA, EPA, or DOE. A successful grant application to competitive funding programs administered by these agencies

provides strong evidence of a successful, state-of-the-art research program that is addressing important scientific and societal issues because proposals to these agencies receive intense peer scrutiny. In the case of a project involving multiple principal investigators, the proportion of the project for which the candidate is responsible should be identified. It is recognized that external funding may be more accessible to those working in some areas of the field than in others, so these metrics should be regarded as guidelines and not as norms. It should be recognized that off-campus faculty may also have opportunities for funding from more regional sources (commodity groups, private ranches, etc) that can facilitate the development and maintenance of a strong research infrastructure.

**4. Mentoring of Students and Post-Graduate Fellows.** There should be evidence that undergraduate, graduate students and post-graduate fellows are attracted to the candidate's research program and recognize his/her mentoring talents. It is recognized that Texas AgriLife Faculty can only mentor students as a graduate committee co-chair (in cooperation with on-campus faculty members); nonetheless, AgriLife Research Faculty still have considerable potential to mentor students through this pathway. By the end of the fifth year, the guideline expectation is that a candidate will have served on 2-4 graduate student committees as a Co- Chair or committee member. Faculty are also encouraged to take advantage of Graduate Merit Fellowships, Graduate Diversity Fellowships, Regents Fellowships, and national fellowship programs administered by federal agencies (such as NSF, DOE, EPA) to recruit and retain high quality graduate students.

**5. Reputation.** An emerging regional/national reputation in an area of expertise is expected. Examples of evidence for a scholarly reputation might include invitations to: (a) speak at symposia or other professional meetings, (b) prepare review or synthesis papers for journals, (c) serve as an ad hoc reviewer for journals and granting agencies, and/or (d) serve as a review panel member for a granting agency. Evidence for a national reputation might also be exemplified by involvement in professional societies, beyond simply being a member of the group or presenting papers at meetings. Evidence of a scientific reputation might also be evident in the number of times ones papers are cited in the scientific literature. Successful off-campus faculty are often asked to speak at local and regional venues, and these should be recognized as evidence of recognition from clientele who often directly benefit from the research findings.

**6. External Service.** External service refers to responsively serving the needs of constituents external to the university. Examples of service activities would include: (a) service on editorial boards of professional journals, (b) officer positions in professional societies, (c) providing ad hoc reviews for journals and granting agencies, (d) organizing workshops or symposia at professional meetings, (e) publications in popular outlets (magazines, newspapers, etc.), and (f) providing educational opportunities for general citizen groups. It does not include service to a community in a citizen, rather than in a professional, role. For example, personal (as opposed to professional) involvement with political, commercial, religious, non-profit, and other similar institutions is not relevant to the evaluation of service performance.

Although service is an important area of evaluation, Texas AgriLife faculty members should recognize that accomplishments in research and grantsmanship will receive greater scrutiny and will be weighted more heavily than service activities during tenure and promotion evaluations. Faculty should therefore not become overly committed to service activities at the expense of research and grantsmanship activities while they are working towards promotion to associate professor.

## ***Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Professor***

The average time-in-rank between appointment to Associate Professor and submission for promotion to Professor is approximately 6-7 years. It is recognized that some outstanding individuals may meet the guidelines for promotion to Professor (outlined below) in a time frame shorter than this average. This may occur when an individual has demonstrated accelerated development of an original and independent research program, scholarly accomplishments, grantsmanship, graduate student training, and service.

Many of the benchmarks listed in this subsection as criteria for promotion to the full professor rank are in addition to those listed in the section above as criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Thus, the above section must be reviewed first in order to fully comprehend the benchmarks listed in this section.

**1. Scholarship through Publication.** Faculty applying for promotion to professor should have 35-40 refereed journal articles. These publications should be in refereed journals and faculty should aim to publish approximately 50% of the papers in journals that rank in the top of their ISI category (e.g. ecology, remote sensing, agricultural economics). Faculty members applying for promotion to professor should also have at least one publication (journal article or book chapter) that represents a review or synthesis of their research program.

Faculty should be aware that journal impact factors, numbers of citations generated by their work, h-factors, and other metrics may be utilized by the departmental T&P Committee and by external reviewers as an objective means to evaluate quantitative and qualitative characteristics of their publication record.

However, it should also be recognized that applied and/or regional journals might sometimes be the most appropriate outlet for some of the research conducted by off-campus scientists, and these publications will generally not have as high an ISI ranking as journals that publish more fundamental science. Texas AgriLife scientists should not be penalized for publishing peer-reviewed research that is aimed at improving the sustainability of our agricultural production systems and enhancing ecosystem services at the local and regional scales served by the Texas AgriLife Research program.

In the case of faculty members from disciplines where the convention is to publish good scholarship in other types of outlets (e.g., books), counsel will be solicited from senior scholars in those disciplines to ascertain guidelines for the quality and quantity of published scholarship expected for promotion to the full professor rank.

The publication record will reflect a productive, long-term research program. It will be the manifestation of major accomplishment in enhancing the state of knowledge in a defined research area(s) in which the candidate has earned a national/international reputation.

The candidate will be a senior author on most of the publications. This does not necessarily mean he/she will be the first author listed. Often the first author will be a graduate student or postdoctoral fellow, and when cross-disciplinary faculty teams are involved credits have to be shared appropriately. Senior authorship means that an individual played a central role in conceptualizing, funding, guiding, implementing, interpreting and writing-up the work.

**2. Professional Integrity and Responsibility.** These qualities are demonstrated by showing respect for colleagues; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity; and being a "good citizen" of Texas AgriLife Research, ESSM, and the Texas AA&M System by serving on committees, task forces etc.

**3. Acquisition of Funds from Sources External to the Department.** A consistent on-going record is expected in acquiring external funding from multiple sources. These efforts should be adequate to

sustain the operating costs of a vigorous research program. As a general rule it is expected that a faculty member seeking promotion to professor will have been PI or Co-PI on research funding of approximately \$1,000,000 during their careers, with approximately 25-40% of this amount under the candidate's direct control. Approximately 33% of this amount should be from competitive national funding agencies such as NSF, NASA, USDA, DOE, and EPA. Success in obtaining funding from these agencies provides a strong indication of a research program that addresses major scientific and societal issues using innovative, state-of-the-art approaches.

#### **4. Establishment and Effective Mentoring of Students and Post-Graduate Fellows.**

There should be evidence that undergraduate, graduate students and post-graduate fellows are attracted to the candidate's research program and recognize his/her mentoring talents. Thus, the guideline expectation is that a candidate will have served on 5-10 graduate student committees as a Co-Chair or member, 3-5 undergraduate interns and 2-4 post-graduate research associates. Faculty are also encouraged to take advantage of Graduate Merit Fellowships, Graduate Diversity Fellowships, Regents Fellowships, and national fellowship programs administered by federal agencies (such as NSF, DOE, EPA) to recruit and retain high quality graduate students.

Evidence for the success of former graduate students is important. Former M.S. students should be placed in good research or managerial positions (e.g., state and federal agencies, consulting firms, etc.), while the preponderance of former Ph.D. students should hold postdoctoral fellowships, university faculty positions, government research positions (e.g. USDA, EPA, USGS) or industry leadership positions. The quality of former students' research work will be evident through publications in peer-reviewed journals and/or contribution to an industry.

**5. Reputation.** A national/international reputation in an area of expertise is expected. This is likely to be exemplified by being in leadership roles in professional associations, journal editorships, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak at professional meetings and symposia, invitations to submit review and synthesis papers to journals, invitations to serve on grant review panels, and by senior faculty at other institutions holding the faculty members work in high esteem. Evidence of a scientific reputation might also be evident in the number of times ones papers are cited in the scientific literature.

**6. External Service.** External service refers to responsively serving the needs of constituents external to the university. Examples of service activities would include: (a) service on editorial boards of professional journals, (b) officer positions in professional societies, (c) providing ad hoc reviews for journals and granting agencies, (d) organizing workshops or symposia at professional meetings, (e) publications in popular outlets (magazines, newspapers, etc.), and (f) providing educational opportunities for general citizen groups. It does not include service to a community in a citizen, rather than in a professional, role. For example, personal (as opposed to professional) involvement with political, commercial, religious, non-profit, and other similar institutions is not relevant to the evaluation of service performance.

Research accomplishments remain more important than service activities at this level and faculty should not become overly involved in service to the detriment of scholarship. However, there is a general expectation that service activities at this level will generally be of a nature that will have a significant impact on science and society.

# FACULTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES DEPARTMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT

## TEXAS AGRILIFE EXTENSION SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

---

Extension appointments are not tenure accruing for promotion. There are five primary areas of performance evaluated for promotion of Texas AgriLife Extension faculty members:

- (1) Scholarship through publication
- (2) Teaching
- (3) Program support
- (4) Service
- (5) Reputation and professionalism

There are four main differences in the expectations for faculty whose primary responsibilities are associated with the Texas AgriLife Extension Service versus faculty in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Texas AgriLife Research:

- (1) A core requirement is that there will be a strong record of service to constituents external to the university. This service should have a long-term impact on programs or clientele groups that can be documented and explained.
- (2) Scholarship is likely to be more applied than theoretical, with greater emphasis on Extension publications, and development of resource materials as compared to refereed journal articles. Educational materials which have been developed for Extension bulletins, fact-sheets, production videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, web pages and computer software programs will be considered in the evaluation of those with a Texas AgriLife Extension appointment. The evaluation is not limited to traditional materials, but also will consider the quality and originality of thought and the integration of educational concepts that have led to demonstrable increases in awareness, changes and/or adoption.
- (3) External program support is broader in definition to include not only financial support but also donations of materials, and volunteerism.
- (4) The expectations associated with mentoring graduate students are lower.

### *Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor*

**1. Scholarship through Publication.** The expectation for most Extension Specialists is that the record will show a minimum of 15-20 extension publications by the end of their 5<sup>th</sup> year. Extension

publications are defined but not limited to numbered bulletins, fact sheets, production videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, web pages and computer software programs. Similarly, peer reviewed applied research reports (Goldmine reports) should be considered.

A minimum 1-2 refereed journal articles are expected, as well as a documented history of writing for mass media (newspapers, magazines, web sites, etc.). Symposium papers and abstracts should also be taken into consideration.

It is emphasized that this quantification range is a guideline and not a norm, since it is recognized that quantity of publications is not the only indication of scholarship contributions.

An Extension Specialist applying for promotion to associate professor may show considerable diversity of topic areas. However, there should be some evidence in the publication record that a coherent Extension program is emerging by the end of the fifth year.

**2. Teaching.** One of the core teaching responsibilities of an Extension Specialist is to support county programs. It normally takes a couple of years for a new specialist to be accepted and trusted by County Extension Agents in his or her assigned area. However, by the end of the fifth year, the faculty member should show an emerging record of use by County Extension Agents in support of their county field days, tours, and educational programs.

Extension Specialists should also exhibit the capability of expanding their program efforts beyond the county level. By the fifth year they should have developed effective programming at the district or regional level, at a minimum. Examples of broader programming would include but not be limited to symposia, seminars, web based programming, or workshops.

A second core teaching responsibility of Extension Specialists is agent training. Access to agents is restricted by county and state budgets, district, regional or state priorities, and agents time away from their assigned counties. Although a specialist's face to face time with agents is limited, by the 5<sup>th</sup> year a faculty member should show an emerging record of training agents in his assigned area through formal training meetings, newsletters, or other vehicles.

**3. Program Support.** The acquisition of external support is an integral part of an individual's scholarship contribution. External support can be in the form of grants or contracts, materials, and volunteerism. A faculty member's transition to Texas AgriLife Extension may make it difficult to acquire external funds in the first few years. This is a period in which networks have to be created, a extension program defined, and an understanding of the state and university culture to be learned. However, by the end of the fifth year, an emerging and growing record of obtaining external support should be visible.

It is recognized that external funding may be more accessible to those working in some subject matter fields as compared to others, thus discrete guidelines are difficult to define. However, partnering or networking with other agencies, Universities, NGO's, and businesses is indispensable to an extension specialist when leveraging available resources to produce broad, effective extension programs. Partnering or networking should be considered when evaluating an extension specialist in terms of program support.

**4. Service.** Service refers to responsively serving the needs of the university and of external constituents. Examples of service activities would include but not be limited to: (a) service on

department, agency, and university committees, (b) leadership positions in professional societies, (c) serving on external agency boards, taskforces, and committees, (d) serving on graduate student committees, and (e) serving in adjunct positions for other universities. It does not include service to the community in a citizen, rather than a professional role. For example, personal (as opposed to professional) involvement with political, commercial, religious, non-profit, and other similar institutions is not relevant to the evaluation of service performance.

**5. Reputation/Professionalism.** A regional to statewide reputation in an area of expertise is expected by faculty applying for promotion to associate professor. This is likely to be exemplified by being in leadership roles in professional associations, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak or teach at professional meetings, NGO meetings or conferences, symposiums, and by awards or recognition from external groups or agencies.

Faculty are also expected to maintain professional integrity and responsibility. Performance in this area is exemplified by showing respect for colleagues, and this respect being reciprocated; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity; and, being a “good citizen” of the department, college, and university by serving on committees, task forces, etc.

### ***Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Professor***

**1. Scholarship through Publication.** Extension Specialists applying for promotion to professor should have 35-40 Extension publications. Extension publications are defined but not limited to numbered bulletins, fact sheets, production videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, web pages and computer software programs. Similarly, applied research reports (peer reviewed Goldmine reports), books or chapters should be considered.

A minimum 3-5 refereed journal articles are expected as well as a documented history of writing for mass media (newspapers, magazines, web sites, etc.). Symposium papers and abstracts should also be taken into consideration.

It is emphasized that this quantification range is a guideline and not a norm, since it is recognized that quantity of publications is not the only indication of scholarship contributions.

An Extension Specialist applying for promotion to professor should show a coherent long-term Extension program, recognizing diversity of topic is required by all Extension Specialists. Additional attention should be given to the development of techniques or new modes of educational delivery (i.e. interactive video or web design, satellite broadcasting) and the revision and/or development of new educational approaches in the base program areas of the discipline.

**2. Teaching.** An Extension Specialist applying for promotion to professor should exhibit a proven track record supporting county programs. This support may be in the form of educational programs (field days, tours, workshops, seminars, etc.) as well as support of their programming planning activities.

Extension Specialists should also exhibit the capability of expanding their program efforts beyond the county level. When applying for professor, an Extension Specialist should have developed effective programming at the district, regional and state level as a minimum. Examples of broader

programming would include but not be limited to named programs, symposiums, seminars, web based programming, or workshops.

A second core teaching responsibility of Extension Specialists is agent training. Access to agents is restricted by county and state budgets, district, regional or state priorities and agents time away from their assigned counties. Although a specialists face to face time with agents is limited, a faculty member applying for professor should show a proven record of training agents at the district, regional and state level through formal training meetings, newsletters, or other vehicles.

**3. Program Support.** The acquisition of external support is an integral part of an individual's scholarship contribution. External support can be in the form of grants or contracts, materials, and volunteerism. An Extension Specialist applying for promotion to professor should have a record of successfully obtaining external funds to support his programs as well as support in terms of materials and volunteerism when appropriate.

It is recognized that external funding may be more accessible to those working in some subject matter fields as compared to others, thus discrete guidelines are difficult to define. However, partnering or networking with other agencies, Universities, NGO's, and businesses is indispensable to an extension specialist when leveraging available resources to produce broad, effective extension programs. Partnering or networking should be considered when evaluating an Extension Specialist in terms of program support.

**4. Service.** Service refers to responsively serving the needs of the university and of external constituents. Examples of service activities would include but not be limited to: (a) service on department, agency, and university committees, (b) leadership positions in professional societies, (c) serving on external agency boards, taskforces, and committees, (d) serving on graduate student committees, and (e) serving in adjunct positions for other universities. It does not include service to the community in a citizen, rather than a professional role. For example, personal (as opposed to professional) involvement with political, commercial, religious, non-profit, and other similar institutions is not relevant to the evaluation of service performance.

**5. Reputation/Professionalism.** A state to national/international reputation in an area of expertise is expected by faculty applying for promotion to associate professor. This is likely to be exemplified by being in leadership roles in professional associations, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak or teach at professional meetings, NGO meetings or conferences, symposiums, and by awards or recognition from external groups or agencies.

Faculty are also expected to maintain professional integrity and responsibility. Performance in this area is exemplified by showing respect for colleagues, and this respect being reciprocated: professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity' and being a "good citizen" of the department, college, and university by serving on committees, task forces, etc.

## TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY RULE ON POST-TENURE REVIEW

The Department of Ecosystem Science and Management follows Texas A&M University guidelines on the conduct of post-tenure review. These guidelines are reproduced below verbatim from the most recent Texas A&M University Rules available at <http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/>

### **Rule 12.06.99.M1 Post-Tenure Review**

*Approved November 13, 2006*

*Supplements [System Policy 12.06](#)*

#### **1. GENERAL**

Post-tenure review at Texas A&M University applies to tenured faculty members and is comprised of annual performance reviews benchmarked to faculty and administrator generated standards for satisfactory performance. Post-tenure review is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected productivity.

#### **2. POST-TENURE ANNUAL REVIEW**

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted for all faculty members and must result in a written document stating the department head's evaluations of performance in scholarship, teaching, service, and other assigned responsibilities. In addition, the expectations for the ensuing evaluation period for each faculty member, commensurate with his or her rank and seniority, must also be in the document. In order for the annual review to be an integral part of post-tenure review, it will have the additional characteristics:

2.1 In each department, stated criteria for categories of performance to be assessed in annual review will be established by departmental faculty and approved by department head, dean, and Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. The categories established will range from "most meritorious" to "unsatisfactory" by departmental standards. The department process or criteria will clearly state how peer evaluations of performance are incorporated in the annual review or in a review that occurs no less frequently than once every six years. (For example, departments may have peer committees to advise the department head for annual reviews, or departments may gather specific elements of external or internal evaluations by peers of the work of the faculty member.)

2.2 An annual review in which an unsatisfactory performance is determined shall state the basis for the ranking in accordance with the criteria.

2.3 A report to the dean of unsatisfactory performance as assessed by annual review will be accompanied by a written plan for near-term improvement.

#### **3. PROFESSIONAL REVIEW PLAN**

3.1 Professional Review. A professional review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the

department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the professional review process.

3.1.1 The purposes of professional 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.

3.1.2 The professional 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.

3.1.3 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.

3.1.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant. 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.

3.1.5 The professional review will be made in a timely fashion (normally less than three months after the faculty member under review submits the initial dossier). The professional review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

3.1.5.1 no deficiencies 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,

3.1.5.2 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,

3.1.5.3 substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a professional development plan (see section 4) acceptable to the dean.

#### **4. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

4.1 The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental criteria developed under the

provision of this rule) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the department head and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, 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. Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

- 4.1.1 identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- 4.1.2 define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
- 4.1.3 outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
- 4.1.4 set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
- 4.1.5 indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
- 4.1.6 identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

#### 4.2 Assessment.

The faculty member and department head will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and to the dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the professional development plan.

#### 4.3 Completion of the Plan.

When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community. If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

### **5. APPEAL**

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4 "Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights." If the faculty member wishes to contest the professional 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. If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a

professional development plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation by the University Tenure Mediation Committee.

## **6. VOLUNTARY POST-TENURE REVIEW**

A tenured faculty member desirous of the counsel of a professional review committee in evaluating his or her career may request such counsel by making a request to the department head.

OFFICE OF RESPONSIBILITY: [Dean of Faculties](#)