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INTRODUCTION

Attainment of the University and College goals of excellence and national prominence requires the recruitment, development, and retention of an outstanding faculty. Evaluation guidelines and reward structures for faculty members to support these goals are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The goals and objectives of the University, College, departments, and individual faculty members are dynamic. Thus, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a universally applicable set of detailed or temporally bounded evaluative criteria. It is, however, both desirable and feasible to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the College.

Employment in an academic institution assumes a unique approach to professional life. This includes a commitment to excellence in a chosen field, a thirst for new knowledge, a desire to be scholarly and creative, and a commitment to organizational goals and mandates within the University and among a broader national and international community of scholars. Professional integrity and concern for the common good are hallmarks of the academician/professorate.

Each faculty member is expected to develop a scholarly and balanced approach to his or her specialty. Duty assignments will be made with full recognition of the legitimate requirements of the agencies and other administrative units that may share in salary compensation.

Policies at Texas A&M University (TAMU) are governed by Texas A&M University System (TAMUS) Policies, TAMUS Regulations, and TAMU Rules, all of which comprise the System Policy Administrative Manual. Among TAMU Rules, the TAMU Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (12.01.99.M2) is the most important for faculty evaluation. These documents are interpreted on a regular basis by the Dean of Faculties and by the Provost. The sections that follow are devoted to discussing general guidelines for career development, tenure and/or promotion, and merit compensation decisions for tenure-track and academic professional track faculty members in the College of Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (CVM).
FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS

The nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe model patterns of emphasis that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable College evaluations.

Academic Professional Track faculty appointments include the [Adjective] Professorial ranks and the Lecturer track. Within the [Adjective] Professorial Track, there are the Professional Track, which includes adjectival designations such as “Clinical,” “Instructional,” and the Research Track, which includes the adjectival designation “Research.”

I. Tenure Track

“Tenure” means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in his or her academic position unless dismissed for cause. A specific system of faculty tenure undergirds the integrity of each academic institution; it is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities, and reflects continued worth to the College in anticipated intellectual development and performance. The awarding of tenure is a means to certain ends. Specifically, it allows the tenured individual freedom of teaching and scholarship, along with a sufficient degree of economic security to make academia attractive to men and women of ability. As Clawson wrote:

> The fundamental rationale for the tenure system has been to promote the long-term development of new ideas and to challenge students’ thinking ... Tenure is needed to provide faculty the freedom to pursue long-term risky research agendas and to challenge conventional wisdom.¹

Tenure is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual’s academic citizenship, teaching, and scholarship. This document outlines the process by which the tenure-track individual attains tenure at the CVM at TAMU, along with the requirements and benchmarks by which the individual will be judged for tenure and subsequent promotions.

II. Academic Professional Track

Departments may make academic professional track faculty appointments when programmatic needs can best be met by appointing persons whose academic responsibilities would make appointments to the tenure-track inappropriate. The faculty of the College recognizes the vital contributions all faculty members make to the mission of the CVM and the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital (VMTH), and is committed to a full partnership to the extent that University policies permit. This partnership includes mechanisms for promotion, career advancement, and job stability. Decisions on promotion of academic professional track faculty members must take into account their unique job descriptions and allow for evaluation and recognition of their contributions to the College and profession.

A. Professional Track

The Professional Track is offered to accommodate the diverse contributions of the College faculty. This track includes those individuals who hold appointments in the

- Clinical Track,
- Instructional Track, or
- Other adjectival tracks (excluding Research Track).

In this document, these will be collectively referred to as “Professional Track.”

¹ Dan Clawson, Tenure and the future of the university. Science 324: 1147-1148, 2009
B. Research Track

Research Track faculty title will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to scholarly research or creative work and to contribute to teaching. These faculty members have no obligation to teach regular courses and should not have significant, reoccurring classroom teaching assignments.

Evaluation of Research Track faculty members is normally the responsibility of the faculty supervisor, and not the Department Head. University guidelines for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of Research Track faculty members are provided in a document, “Research Professor Hiring Guidelines” from the Dean of Faculties. However, the promotion procedures outlined in these CVM guidelines will apply to faculty members seeking promotion in the Research Track.

C. Senior Lecturer and Lecturer.

Senior Lecturer and Lecturer are academic professional track appointments for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are not required to consistently make significant contributions in scholarship or academic citizenship. The promotion procedures outlined in this document will also apply to faculty members seeking promotion in the Lecturer Track.

III. Transfer between Tenure and Academic Professional Tracks

Individuals who received an initial tenure-track appointment may apply for an open, advertised academic professional track position should the latter be available. Faculty members initially appointed to academic professional track positions may similarly apply for open tenure-track positions. Such applications will be evaluated by the same processes as any other applicant for such a position. If an academic professional track faculty member is subsequently appointed to a tenure-track position, his or her probationary period will start at the time consistent with University regulations for tenure-track appointments. Transfer of faculty from the professional track to tenure-track should not be a routine practice. When appropriate, guidelines for reappointments are available in the Dean of Faculties Faculty Hiring Guidelines for Department Head and Deans.

FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Judgment as to a faculty member’s full worth and value requires broad consideration of the individual’s contributions. Considerations regarding tenure, promotion, and financial reward for faculty members must be made on the basis of merit and overall value added by the individual to the enterprise of the academy. Consistent with TAMU policy, it should be emphasized that evidence of excellence and impact and the potential for continued outstanding performance are of primary importance. In this document, we provide examples of effectiveness and excellence in academic citizenship, teaching, scholarship, and patient care. The impact of these efforts is likewise important. We define impact as the positive effect of a candidate’s work on the university, their profession or scientific discipline, and society.

Decisions as to tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon:

1. (I) academic citizenship,
2. (II) teaching,
3. (III) scholarship,
4. (IV) patient care,

as defined in this document, particularly in, but not necessarily limited to, one’s own discipline. Faculty members will be evaluated on accomplishments according to their appointment.
During an annual evaluation, performance in each category will be rated as most meritorious, exemplary, satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

I. Academic Citizenship

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

A. Collegiality

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

Support of the missions of the department, College, University, and of their programs is important in the practice of good academic citizenship. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, accountability, and willingness to cooperate are vital. Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators, and must work toward solutions of shared problems. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2 states that “professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University” be a requirement for promotion and tenure.

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

Evidence of collegiality may include but is not limited to:

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

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

Evidence of *effectiveness* in academic service activities may include but is not limited to:

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

Evidence of *excellence* in academic service may include but is not limited to:

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

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in academic citizenship. Such individuals may impede the function of their department/unit through their actions and behaviors.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in academic citizenship. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited local involvement with an absence of statewide or national service.

Satisfactory – strong evidence of effectiveness in academic citizenship. Those in this category will have involvement in local service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of national service.

Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in academic citizenship. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing critical committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.

Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

Those faculty members with an assigned effort to academic citizenship that is small (≤10%) because of career stage or other assignments, will not be expected to have significant service external to the university. Such individuals will be occasionally appointed to departmental or college committees/task forces and maintain appropriate professional interactions to be rated satisfactory. Those with higher assigned effort to academic citizenship will often have more substantial local service responsibilities or external service to be considered satisfactory.

II. Teaching

The University and College emphasize effective teaching in all faculty evaluations, with the exception of faculty members in the Research Track. In the CVM, teaching occurs in a wide variety of settings such as lecture halls, conference rooms, laboratories (both student labs and research labs), hospitals, and numerous off-campus venues. Teaching takes place literally 24 hours a day. For example, faculty members in the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital care for patients constantly, and many research projects call for data collection and mentoring graduate students at all hours of the day and night, as well as on weekends and holidays. Our students include undergraduates, professional (DVM) students, graduate students, interns, residents, and post-doctoral students. Thus, teaching is central to our mission, and effective teaching is required of all members of the CVM faculty, other than those in the Research Track. All faculty members are expected to contribute in the area of instruction and student development, to continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness, and to contribute to the development of the College’s instructional programs. Accomplishment in teaching is an important consideration in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evidence of effectiveness in teaching may include but is not limited to:

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

Evidence of excellence in teaching may include but is not limited to:

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

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of teaching are:

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching.
Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.

Satisfactory – strong evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.

Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

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

III. Scholarship

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

Scholarship Defined. Scholarship is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Citing Shulman, Glassick states that to be scholarship, the work must meet these criteria:

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

For purposes of CVM, it encompasses or includes the following three categories, adapted from Boyer:

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

A. Scholarship of Discovery

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

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

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

2 Weiser, C.J. The Value System of a University - Rethinking Scholarship, and Oregon State University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Office of the Provost, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 1995.
Evidence of **effectiveness** in the scholarship of discovery may include but is not limited to:

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

Evidence of **excellence** in the scholarship of discovery may include but is not limited to:

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

**B. Scholarship of Integration**

The CVM serves diverse constituencies within the University as well as locally, within Texas, nationally, and internationally. The goals of and the constituencies served by efforts in the scholarship of teaching and discovery are characterized elsewhere. Less intuitively definable, but no less crucial to the visible role and image of our College, are the goals and audiences of the scholarship of integration.

The goal of the scholarship of integration is to consider new knowledge within the context of, or in contrast to, extant concepts (so-called “current wisdom”) and to interpret, clarify, explain, and place it in new or alternative perspectives to enhance its appreciation and fruitful application by potential users and beneficiaries. Therefore, the scholarship of integration is closely related to and dependent upon that of discovery and teaching, yet transcends them individually and in their various combinations. The scholarship of integration is characterized by the synthesis and communication of novel perspectives and understandings of the relevance of current and emerging knowledge and technology.

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

Scholars whose primary efforts are those of discovery or teaching may find challenge and increased productivity through a variety of scholarly integrative activities.
Evidence of *effectiveness* in the scholarship of integration may include but is not limited to:

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

Evidence of *excellence* in the scholarship of integration may include but is not limited to:

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

### D. Scholarship of Teaching

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

Faculty engage in educational scholarship by both *drawing upon* resources and best practices in the field and by *contributing resources* to it. Documentation begins by demonstrating that an educational activity product is publicly available to the education community in a form that others can build on. The product may be available at the local level—in the department, medical school, or university—or at the regional, national, or international level. Once a product is public and in a form that others build on, peers can assess its value to the community applying accepted criteria.5

Evidence of *effectiveness* in the scholarship of teaching may include but is not limited to:

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

Evidence of *excellence* in the scholarship of teaching may include but is not limited to:

- external publication of instructional materials, e.g., case scenarios, textbooks, or electronic instructional materials.

---

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

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of scholarship are:

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in scholarship.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in scholarship. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of scholarly impact as supported by funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, and book chapters.

Satisfactory – strong evidence of effectiveness in scholarship. Effectiveness must be supported high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.

Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in scholarship. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their scholarship as supported by quality publications, funding, citations, and invited presentations.

Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing scholarship, awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

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

IV. Patient Care

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

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

Evidence of *excellence* in the patient care may include but is not limited to:

- recognition within the state, region, and nation as an authority in a particular diagnostic or therapeutic area related to veterinary medicine. (Such recognition is likely to be reflected by requests for consultation by colleagues, presentations at national specialty group meetings, and peer group recognition.)
- requests by individuals from other institutions to train with the faculty member or his/her team.
- evidence of excellent performance in veterinary patient management or diagnostic support services. (This may be documented by letters from clinical colleagues, house officers, or graduate students, by student evaluation, and by evidence of client satisfaction.)
- development of new techniques, strategies, or modes for the prevention, diagnosis, and management of disease.
- application of new techniques, strategies, or modes for the prevention, diagnosis, and management of disease.
- self-development and organizational activities (process management) leading to significantly enhanced efficiency and productivity within a clinical or diagnostic service.
- Outstanding client satisfaction based on comments or surveys.
- Outstanding referring veterinarian satisfaction as evidenced by comments or surveys.
- High caseload compared to peer institutions, caseload growth, and a strong clinical revenue stream.

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of patient care are:

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in patient care.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in patient care. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in management of cases and medical records.

Satisfactory – strong evidence of effectiveness in patient care. Effectiveness can be supported by case load, peer review, and timely management of medical records.

Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in patient care. Faculty in this category will be leaders in patient care through such factors as leadership in professional societies, external recognition by trainees, awards, and invited presentations.

Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally recognized as clinicians through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in veterinary medical societies.
Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s patient care assignment, evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance.

EFFORT REPORTING

Department heads will assign percent efforts based on the responsibilities of the tenure track or professional track position relative to Scholarship, Didactic and Laboratory Teaching, Teaching Hospital or Diagnostic Service Duties, and Academic Citizenship. Clinical activities will be referred to as Teaching Hospital or Diagnostic Service Duties and the percent effort will reflect the amount of time assigned to the teaching hospital or diagnostic services. Teaching Hospital or Diagnostic Service Duties will include the evaluation categories Patient Care and Clinical Instruction. Patient care will be evaluated within the independent category Patient Care as explained above. Clinical Instruction will be evaluated within the category Teaching. For the majority of faculty, the effort associated with Teaching Hospital or Diagnostic Service Duties will be split equally between Patient Care and Clinical Instruction. Effort assignments for faculty with unusual duties will be clarified within the appointment letter, evaluation document, or effort report.

The following is an example of how effort reports should look in annual evaluations, appointment letters, and in reports/letters associated with P&T. Example effort assignment: Academic Citizenship (10%), Teaching Hospital Duties (40%), Didactic and Laboratory Teaching (15%), and Scholarship (35%).

PERSONNEL POLICIES

TAMU Rules and Guidelines relevant to faculty evaluation and promotion are contained in University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (“University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion”) and in the “Tenure and Promotion Packages: Submission Guidelines”, issued annually by the Dean of Faculties.

Strengths of the tenure and promotion policies and procedures as presented here lie in the involvement of faculty and other peer groups for counsel and advice. This is a vital part of the process. Tenure and promotion decisions, however, cannot be made solely by majority rule; thus, department heads and the Dean are charged with making independent decisions and recommendations that may differ from faculty recommendations, stating clear reasons for such variances if they exist.

I. Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion in the CVM

Criteria for effectiveness and excellence in academic citizenship, teaching, and scholarship apply to all faculty members. The weighting of the criteria will be based on the faculty member’s appointment and effort of assignment. Assessments regarding promotion and tenure should be holistic and must include thorough consideration of materials submitted by candidates (e.g., candidate statement, CV, supporting documents) and reviewer letters. Components of packets need to be weighed judiciously, clearly considering evidence of excellence and effectiveness as outlined in the criteria for evaluation in previous sections of this document. Impact, which we define as the positive effect of a candidate’s work on the university, their profession or scientific discipline, and society, must also be considered.

A. Criteria by Rank

1. Assistant Professor or [Adjective] Assistant Professor

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

2. Associate Professor or [Adjective] Associate Professor

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

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

(1) an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field;
(2) professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;
(3) an area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and
(4) evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

For promotion to [Adjective] Associate Professor, criteria 1-3 apply, with the exception that for criterion (1) the level of scholarly accomplishment need not rise to the level required for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. In addition, there should be evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in the faculty member’s areas of assignment: teaching, scholarship, and/or patient care.

3. Professor or [Adjective] Professor

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

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

(1) continuing accomplishment in teaching;
(2) continuing accomplishment and some measure of national/international recognition in research or another form of creative activity; and
(3) evidence of valuable professional service.
For promotion to [Adjective] Professor, these criteria apply, with the exception that for criterion (2) the recognition should be in the faculty member’s assigned responsibilities and need not rise to the level of scholarly accomplishment required of a tenured Professor.

B. Tenure

Academic tenure is granted to those individuals who, as a result of thorough evaluation, are believed capable of earning the rank of Professor in accordance with these guidelines. Academic citizenship, professional knowledge and competence, and standards of professional integrity are important factors. The individual must give promise of a continuing high level of productivity and scholarly activity.

The basic, but not the only, questions to be asked when the record of an individual is reviewed prior to the granting of tenure are:

- Does this person have the highest level of competence that can be obtained for the position at hand?
- Is this an individual whose academic citizenship, professional knowledge and competence, and standards of professional integrity measure up to the level desired for TAMU?
- Does the individual offer an area of specialization not currently represented on the tenured faculty or provide desired reinforcement in an area of significance? Is the field of specialization germane to the programs of TAMU?

C. Time Perspective

All initial appointments to TAMU faculty positions, except for those faculty members who were granted tenure on arrival, are one-year appointments (unless an exception is requested by the Department Head and approved by the College Dean and the Dean of Faculties). Tenure and promotion evaluations will be based on cumulative contributions and expected continued contributions. Considerable additional contributions should be accumulated following promotion prior to being considered for additional promotion. A record of sustained, consistent excellence is essential. There is no required minimum time in one rank before promotion to the next rank may occur.

- **Tenure Track.** The usual probationary period for tenure is seven years. Expectations will be stipulated in the agreement of employment. Recommendation for tenure will normally be made during the mandatory tenure consideration year, as defined in the “Tenure and Promotion Packages: Submission Guidelines” published annually by the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

  Tenure and promotion are linked for persons hired as assistant professors. Thus, a recommendation for early promotion must be coupled with a recommendation for early tenure and vice versa.

  Faculty members must be advised of a decision not to award tenure at least one year before the termination of their employment. In rare cases, the probationary period may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the department head, Dean, and the Dean of Faculties.

- **Academic Professional Track.** Faculty members with Professional Track, Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments will be reviewed annually by their department head or, in the case of Research Track faculty members, by their immediate supervisor.

  Professional-Track faculty members at the Associate Professor and Professor level and Senior Lecturers will have annual appointments for at least the first three years. Following this initial period, faculty members in these ranks may be considered for multi-year rolling appointments (see Section V). Professional-Track faculty members at the Assistant Professor level and Lecturers will have annual appointments.
Research-Track faculty members may receive appointments of no more than three years at a time. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint a faculty member, will be given in writing in accord with the University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (http://rules.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf). Faculty members in Academic Professional Tracks will normally be considered for promotion after five years. However, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates must be considered. Each annual faculty-performance evaluation must address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current rank, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion. Failure to receive promotion does not affect reappointment consideration.

**Mid-Term Review.** A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period. Similar formative review is provided to professional track faculty in the third year of their appointment. For both tenure-track and professional-track faculty members, a mid-term review following appointment is mandatory. Individuals hired as Assistant or Associate Professor in Tenure or Clinical Track positions will undergo mid-term review. Individuals hired as Full Professor or Associate Professor with Tenure will not undergo mid-term review but will have Peer Review every six years whether in the Tenure or Clinical Track. This evaluation will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and/or promotion decision. This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible; a minimal mid-term review would include dossier items contributed by the candidate and internal letters of recommendation, and would be reviewed at the department and College levels by appropriate faculty committees as well as the department head and Dean.

**II. Annual Review by Department Head**

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

Each year department heads will meet individually with each faculty member to review that member’s performance and, as appropriate, his or her progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The department head will provide each faculty member a written document that includes an evaluation for the year and expectations for the next year.

A faculty member in the Research Track will be evaluated by the faculty member who is responsible for generating his/her salary. If necessary, a subsequent meeting and evaluation with the department head will be arranged.

Based on the evaluation, a rating of “unsatisfactory”, “needs improvement”, “satisfactory”, “exemplary”, or “most meritorious” will be determined for each relevant category as well as an overall performance rating.

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single category: teaching, research, scholarship, or creative work; service; patient care and other assigned responsibilities (e.g. extension, administration), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories.

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean.

The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation shall be accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Peer Review” (section VI) of the faculty member.

If a faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single category, he or she must work with
his or her department head immediately to develop an improvement plan. For teaching and patient care, this plan should take 1 year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g. research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may take up to 3 years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”.

For faculty with budgeted joint appointments, department heads or program directors of the appropriate units will collaborate to develop accurate annual reports (12.01.99.M2).

A. Process for the Annual Review

In accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, which describes the process and suggested documentation for annual faculty reviews, department heads will conduct annual reviews with all faculty. For faculty undergoing mid-term review, the departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee reports will be incorporated in the annual review. Each department will establish guidelines that outline the process and documentation for annual reviews of departmental faculty.

B. Compliance with Safety Standards and Mandated Training

To ensure that basic safety and health issues in the faculty member’s area of responsibility are properly addressed, the faculty member will confirm the following statements during the Annual Review:

- Safety inspections have been completed (include dates and confirmation that concerns raised in the inspection have been fully addressed).
- All laboratory and teaching personnel in the laboratory or classes for which the faculty member is responsible have completed their required safety training for this year.

At the annual review, the department head and faculty member will list the activities to be conducted during the following year that may generate any other anticipated safety concerns in the teaching and research environments. At the subsequent annual review, the effectiveness and usefulness of the previously-listed safety mitigations will be evaluated, and any necessary modifications will be made if the activity is to be continued the following year. No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if he or she has not complied with all University-mandated training programs. In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the end of the evaluation period, an additional 30 days shall be given to complete the requirement.

It is important to point out that the CVM environment, by definition, involves a very wide range of animals (patient care, teaching, and research), and thus the risk of injury and exposure to zoonotic diseases is an everyday concern. To ensure that basic safety and health issues in the faculty member's area of responsibility are properly addressed, the faculty member confirms the use of and provides training for support personnel in the use of best practices based on the expectation that all exposures to live animals present varying levels of potential safety and health risks and that all reasonable measures to insure safety are in place.

III. Tenure and Promotion Review

Procedural guidelines and schedules for tenure and promotion review are issued annually by the Dean of Faculties. This document further defines the framework in which evaluations for renewal of contract (non-tenured faculty members), tenure, and promotion are undertaken. Specific documentation required is identified. The college will develop and disseminate a P&T calendar for candidates, administrators, staff, and committee members. This document will ensure alignment with Dean of Faculties deadlines, committee meetings are being held, and that documents are distributed and completed on schedule. Meeting times and certain materials may vary between departments.
Additionally, both the departmental and college committees are responsible for understanding these guidelines and university policies regarding promotion and tenure. Committee members will be charged prior to their initial meeting by a department head, dean, or associate dean. The charge will highlight criteria for promotion and tenure, the need for confidentiality, and commitment to attend meetings.

A. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee

Each department is required to establish a single promotion and tenure committee and policies regarding selection of committee members and chair. Departmental guidelines are available as addenda to this document, through the Dean of Faculties. The chair of the departmental promotion and tenure committee must be a tenured Professor and does not vote on candidates at the departmental level. The departmental committee is advisory to the department head. University rules regarding recommendations on tenure-track or tenured faculty are:

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

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

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

B. College Promotion and Tenure Committee

This Committee is charged with reviewing the candidate’s dossier and the tenure and promotion recommendations of the departmental committee and department head and advising the Dean of the College. The College Committee will either concur or not concur with these recommendations and will communicate its decision to the Dean.

Membership.

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

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

- The chair of each departmental P&T committee will be a voting member of the college committee. Inclusion of departmental P&T chairs is meant to ensure dissemination of information with respect to departmental process, committee reports, and candidate packets. Typically, the departmental P&T chair will present packets for consideration at the college committee level.
Each department will have two additional members, which will be appointed by the department head. The department head will use a faculty vote (without personal identifiers) to guide appointments. One member should be at the rank of Clinical Professor and one at the rank of Professor (with tenure). If a Clinical Professor is not eligible or available, a second tenured Professor shall serve. These additional members will broaden the college committee with respect to perspective, diversity, and fairness. Departments will make an effort to stagger terms of these members to minimize committee turnover.

The college P&T committee and chair will be charged by the dean or a designate prior to meeting. In our college, departmental P&T chairs may only vote within the college committee. Those college committee members, who serve on their departmental P&T committee, must recuse themselves from voting on candidates within their department at the college level. Clinical track faculty members must recuse themselves from voting on tenure track faculty dossiers, but as is the case in the departmental committee may make relevant comments related to their discipline. Committee members must vote by electronic or paper ballot, without identifiers. Votes may be “yes” or “no.” Members may recuse themselves from voting, as needed, for reasons such as conflict of interest. Those recusing themselves for reasons other than being in the clinical track or having voted in the departmental committee, should leave the room during discussion of the packet being considered.

C. Tenure and Promotion Process

Each year, the Dean of Faculties distributes “Tenure and Promotion Packages: Submission Guidelines” that spells out the timeline, documents and process required of each candidate, department and college. In the promotion of Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor, external review letters are not required but are allowed. In the promotion of Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor, letters of external review must be included to provide perspective on national/international recognition. Modifications of the standard solicitation letter for external reviewers is allowed in the clinical track. It is important for the Department Head to emphasize to the reviewers the major area of the Clinical Faculty Member’s appointment for which comments on impact are needed.

IV. Merit Compensation

Merit compensation represents an opportunity to reward short-term contributions of excellence in academic citizenship, teaching or scholarship. The basis for this compensation will be the demonstration by the faculty member of an excellent level of performance during his/her Annual Review.

V. Post-Tenure or Periodic Review

Within the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and periodic review applies to professional track faculty members. The reviews will be conducted in accordance with University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01.

The post-tenure and periodic reviews are intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review is comprised of annual performance reviews by the department head, as well as a review by a committee of peers that occurs not less frequently than once every six years. For both tenured and professional track faculty members, a promotion in rank through a review by the departmental promotion and tenure committee is considered a successful post-tenure/periodic review.

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

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

The purpose of the Peer Review is to:

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member;
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; and
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

The following guidelines regarding post-tenure and periodic review apply to our college:

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

Faculty members being reviewed will provide the Committee with a current curriculum vitae and a statement on current academic citizenship, teaching, scholarship and patient care if applicable no later than March 1. All faculty members must submit appropriate documentation of effectiveness and excellence in teaching consistent with the portion of their effort dedicated to teaching. Each department will determine what documentation is necessary for faculty members with varying proportions of teaching responsibilities. The documentation must be submitted by the faculty member to the committee no later than March 1.

The Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s activities for the Department Head, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of academic citizenship, teaching, scholarship, and patient care if appropriate, as well as an overall evaluation. This review will be submitted to the Department Head no later than May 1. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the CVM Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to post-tenure or periodic peer review again in six years, or following an unsatisfactory annual evaluation by the Department Head, whichever is earlier.
A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the college guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the college guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.

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

By no later than May 31, each department will provide to the dean of the college and the Dean of Faculties the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review.

Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review or upon request of the faculty member. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head 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 Development Review process.

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

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

- 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, creative work and patient care if appropriate.

- The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review
The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

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

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

- 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” acceptable to the dean.

C. The Professional Development Plan

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 procedure) 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:

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

D. Assessment.

The faculty member and department head will meet regularly 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.

E. 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 Professional Development Plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the Professional Development Plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community.
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.

F. Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this procedure 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 composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final.

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final.

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 directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

G. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review (section 3) or a Professional Development Review (section 4), by making a request to the department head.

SUMMARY

Since the nature of scholarly enterprise requires both flexibility and freedom, a single formula for effective performance is undesirable. Thus, this document provides a general set of guidelines with specific examples and model patterns of emphasis as indicators of excellence and effectiveness. Within this general set of guidelines, a variety of contributions to the goals of excellence and national prominence is possible. Indeed, such heterogeneity of contributions to academic citizenship, teaching, and scholarship from faculty members with varied types of interests and job assignments will further the College’s pursuit of excellence.