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Introduction
The Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications (ALEC) proactively seeks tenure
and/or promotion (T&P) of faculty members who contribute significant productivity to the missions of the
Department, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Texas A&M AgriLife
Extension Service, and Texas A&M University through meritorious teaching, research, service, and extension.
To that end, ALEC follows the rules and standard operating procedures of The Texas A&M University System
components listed above.

ALEC faculty members seeking advancement should follow the guidelines associated with their appointment
and affiliated with their career track. ALEC faculty are categorized in three areas identified within this
document as:
1. Tenure-track faculty (pp 2-8);
2. Non-tenure-track faculty (pp 9-10); and
3. Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty (pp 11-19).

ALEC faculty members administratively located in the department with the rank of distinguished professor,
professor, associate professor, assistant professor, distinguished lecturer, senior lecturer, lecturer, or assistant
lecturer shall participate in discussion, evaluation, and voting during specific T&P considerations as described
in the following sections, for their respective appointment categories. Visiting or adjunct faculty shall not
participate in discussion, evaluation, or voting.

T&P Leadership:
ALEC faculty as described above elect co-chairs to serve on the T&P Committee. Two Co-chairs are ALEC
professors, and at least one of the co-chairs must be tenured. The T&P Committee shall consist of two co-
chairs. Co-chairs serve three-year terms. Terms begin on September 1 following their election. In the event
that a co-chair leaves the position for any reason, the faculty will elect a new person to complete the term.
The department head cannot be a member of any ALEC T&P review committees and should not (unless invited
by the committee) participate during T&P deliberations.

The following sections describe the policies and guidelines to be used to review, rate, and make
recommendations for the three faculty categories listed above.
I. Faculty Membership
ALEC tenured or tenure-track faculty members (as described in the Dean of Faculties “Guideline to Faculty Titles” http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/hiring/Guideline_Faculty_Titles.pdf) administratively located in the department with the rank of distinguished professor, professor, associate professor, and assistant professor shall participate in discussion, evaluation, and voting during specific tenure or promotion considerations described below. Visiting or adjunct faculty shall not participate in T&P discussion, evaluation, or voting.

II. Review Committee
Departmental faculty members with tenure who hold rank at or higher than the rank sought by the candidate seeking tenure and promotion are eligible to participate, for discussion purposes, evaluation processes, and voting decisions, on the Review Committee for tenured or tenure-track candidates. For example, tenured professors and tenured associate professors would participate on the Review Committee for tenure-track assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure; non-tenured professors or non-tenured associate professors would not participate.

III. Evaluation
A. Discussions related to T&P will be conducted in strictest confidence. Faculty members eligible to vote can participate in the committee discussion and evaluation of a candidate’s packet. In addition, the process must uphold and observe scrupulous standards of fairness. The committee discussions and recommendations regarding a candidate’s materials will be independent of the ALEC department head.
B. The review committee will consider and/or discuss confidentially a candidate’s materials and external letters of evaluation. The committee will prepare summary reports on the candidate’s teaching, research, service/outreach, and other activities. Summary reports will follow the guidelines established by the Dean of Faculties office.
C. Based on faculty comments and documentation provided to the co-chairs and committee, the T&P co-chairs may elect to write reports or assign faculty members to do so. These written reports must reflect the views and opinions of the committee and must reflect the candidate’s areas of strengths and weaknesses.
D. Tenure-track faculty members will have a midterm (3rd year) review conducted by tenured faculty members who hold rank at or higher than the rank sought by the candidate. The review will use all evaluation components, excluding external letters of evaluation.
E. The T&P packet shall be in a form consistent with the requirements and guidelines of Texas A&M University and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

IV. Voting Procedures
Following confidential discussions, a confidential and verifiable vote will be conducted. Eligible faculty may vote AYE, NAY, ABSTAIN, or RECUSE on T&P decisions. Eligible members not participating in the evaluation discussions should not vote. The committee tally and report will be sent by the T&P co-chairs in a memorandum to the department head. This document will become a part of the candidate’s packet.

V. External Letters of Evaluation
The packet must contain at least three letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments and potential. External reviewers should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate’s area of expertise. All letters received must be included in the packet. All requests for letters must be noted in the packet. (See Dean of Faculties “T&P Guidelines” (http://dof.tamu.edu/content/tp-guidelines) for specifics about this process.)
VI. Evaluation Components

Committee members will evaluate a candidate’s materials using teaching, research, service, and extension components as appropriate. Candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure are encouraged to make supporting documents readily available for committee members’ review. Candidates are expected to develop teaching, research, and/or extension programs consistent with their position descriptions and expectations. Evaluation of candidate materials will be based on such descriptions and expectations.

A. For promotion to associate professor, evidence of excellence in teaching, development of a focused line of inquiry supported by funding and peer reviewed publications, and service to the university and professional societies are expected.

B. For promotion to professor, evidence must be convincing, cumulative, and consistent. Criteria are: sustained excellence in teaching; national and international reputation in a focused line of inquiry that is supported by grant funding and publications in leading journals; excellence in graduate student mentoring; and superior service as evidenced by national and international reputation, leadership in departmental, college, and university committees, and leadership in professional societies.

C. Research faculty will be evaluated for promotion based on evaluation criteria established in the Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures 12.99.99.A1.03 “Faculty Promotion.”

1. Teaching Evaluation: This criterion includes classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; publication of instructional materials, including textbooks; and supervision of graduate students. The teaching evaluation will focus on both evidence of teaching effectiveness and course support/development.
   a. For those faculty seeking promotion to associate professor, excellence in teaching, as measured by student ratings of faculty and peer evaluation of teaching, is a minimum expectation.
   b. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, continued excellence in teaching is a minimum expectation.
   c. Indicators of meritorious teaching performance may include, as appropriate, the following examples.
      • Advising undergraduate students.
      • Chairing master’s and doctoral committees.
      • Receiving positive peer evaluations of teaching.
      • Developing a new course or making major revisions to an existing course that fills an identified need in the curriculum.
      • Developing and/or leading a study abroad or other high-impact educational experience.
      • Developing effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes.
      • Developing new courses or significantly revising existing courses.
      • Directing graduate student thesis or dissertation research.
      • Directing graduate student research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated.
      • Showing evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
      • Being invited to teach at domestic or international institutions of recognized excellence.
      • Publishing widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
      • Receiving competitive grant support for teaching/learning projects.
      • Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
      • Being selected for an outstanding teacher award.
      • Indicating teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student rating of teaching, and documented student outcomes.

2. Research Evaluation: This criterion includes both an analytical summary of the candidate’s research record and a qualitative judgment. The research evaluation should examine all examples of creative works including publication and granting history. The evaluation of research will focus on quality, quantity, accomplishment, and direction.
a. For faculty seeking promotion to associate professor, the development of a focused line of inquiry supported by funding and publications is warranted.
b. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, persistent funding support and leadership in scholarly publications are warranted.
c. Indicators of meritorious research performance may include, as appropriate, the following examples:
   • Citation of candidate’s publications by others.
   • Leadership on publications and grants.
   • Mentoring students on publications and grants.
   • Presentation of papers at international, national, and regional meetings.
   • Publication of research in refereed journals.
   • Publication of scholarly books or chapters.
   • Publication of non-research based, refereed publications.
   • Publications with teaching focus in refereed journals.
   • Receiving fellowships or research awards.
   • Receiving external peer-reviewed funding for research.
   • Receiving funding for scholarly activities.
   • Refereed research publications in leading journals.
   • Serving as editor or member of editorial board of journals.
   • Writing proposals for external grants.

3. Service Evaluation: This criterion includes service to students, colleagues, the department, the college, and the university—as well as service beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large. The service evaluation will focus on leadership and participation in university, state, national, and international activities that strengthen those institutions or serve as a professional development opportunity for faculty.
   a. For those seeking promotion to associate professor, participation in departmental, college, and university committees (as requested), leadership in professional societies, and evidence of an emerging national reputation are warranted.
   b. For those seeking promotion to professor, providing leadership to departmental, college, and university committees (as needed) and a strong national and international reputation are warranted.
   c. Indicators of meritorious service performance may include as appropriate the following examples:
      • Committee chair of national or international professional organization.
      • Committee involvement in national or international professional organization.
      • Officer in national or international professional organization.
      • Officer in regional or state professional organization.
      • Program chair or similar position at national or international meeting.
      • Placement of students in academia and industry.
      • Serving as a member of the faculty senate.
      • Serving as a student club advisor.
      • Serving on university, college, and department committees and tasks forces.
      • Please refer to the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension section in the document for appropriate indicators of meritorious service performance.

VII. Estimated/Anticipated Tenure and/or Promotion Timeline and Packet Components
   A. Spring Semester (specific date to be communicated in writing from the department head): Candidates wishing to be considered for tenure and/or promotion must notify, in writing, the department head, who in turn will inform the T&P co-chairs of faculty intentions.
   B. Spring Semester (specific date to be communicated in writing from department head): Those candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion will present their packets to DH and T&P co-chairs for consideration.
   C. Summer Semester: External letters, if required, will be sought.
   D. August: T&P review committees receive candidates completed packets for additional review and voting.
E. September: Department head receives review committee reports.
F. Mid-September: Candidate’s packet is due in the college dean’s or agency director’s offices respective of the candidate’s position.
G. Deadlines for department head’s notifying faculty members of promotion and/or tenure annual process, for a candidate’s notifying the department head of intent to seek promotion and/or tenure, for candidate’s informal submission of packet to T&P co-chairs for formative feedback and review, department head’s notifying candidates of list of outside reviewers, and other similar procedural deadlines will be communicated in writing to all ALEC faculty members.

VIII. Department Head’s Summary Report
The Summary Report gives the department head an opportunity, after reviewing reports and recommendations from the committee, to convey the rationale that ultimately leads to the department head’s recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. This report includes a discussion of the review committee’s evaluations and recommendations, outside letters, and any further evaluation by the department head. The report shall:
1. Explain the department head’s decision; it should not merely summarize the candidate’s achievements but rather substantiate the department head’s decision.
2. Explain why the candidate does or does not deserve endorsement by the dean or director.
3. Provide a general basis for strength and weakness of the case.
4. Provide the context of this particular case within the department.
5. Explain special consideration cases (e.g., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances).
6. Explain differing opinions, mixed votes, or other inconsistencies.

IX. Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee, Annual Review, and Post Tenure Review
A. Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee:
1. ALEC departmental faculty will establish a faculty peer evaluation committee of three tenured professors to advise the department head regarding the annual reviews of each of the following categories of faculty: tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure-track faculty.
2. This faculty peer evaluation committee comprises the tenured T&P committee chair(s) and other tenured professor(s) elected by departmental tenured and tenure-track faculty as needed.
3. The faculty peer evaluation committee will conduct a post tenure review (for tenured faculty) independent of the department head once every six years. The results of this review will be communicated in writing to the department head.
4. Each year before the annual review process, the committee will meet with the department head to review, confirm, revise, and communicate to faculty the criteria used in annual evaluation of faculty performance including teaching, research, service, and extension components when appropriate with respect to their position description and expectations.
B. Annual Review:
1. An annual review of faculty members in the department of ALEC will be conducted by the department head. The purpose of the annual review is to provide a mechanism to facilitate dialogue between the department head and faculty. The review will typically take place during spring semester and will include, at a minimum, accomplishments from the previous calendar year. The timeline and procedures for this annual review will be communicated in writing to the faculty at least 60 days in advance of the review. Three days prior to the annual review, each faculty member must submit an annual activity report as described in the following sections.
2. An annual review provides valuable information to the department head about faculty members' accomplishments and to the faculty members with regard to the department head's assessment of their progress in the discipline and in the context of department goals. Annual reviews are to be conducted in an environment of openness and collegiality, with an emphasis on constructive development of the individual faculty member and the institution.
3. The focus of the annual review process will vary by rank and should be conducted in recognition of the different stages of a faculty member’s career. For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the period of evaluation examined during the annual review will consist of the previous year, and may take into
account the fact that progress in a scholarly career is a long-term venture; therefore, a three- to five-year horizon may be necessary to evaluate scholarly progress. For *tenure-track assistant professors and instructors*, the annual review process must also provide an indication of their progress toward tenure and promotion. For *tenured associate professors*, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For *professors*, annual review should be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated, and the development of the faculty member and the university is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

4. In preparation for the annual review, each faculty member will prepare and submit an annual activity report that shall at a minimum consist of a faculty member’s merit report that verifies the AIMS data and granting activities.

5. Other examples of activities a faculty member may wish to report include: Statement of goals and objectives; supporting documentation, i.e., copies of published materials, grants, attestations, and artifacts; and a curriculum vitae.

6. The primary basis of evaluation for the annual review shall include an analysis of the merit report and granting activities.

7. Any additional information used by the department head in the evaluation must be specified in writing by the department head.

8. Items included in the primary basis of evaluation include publication in journals and other outlets, granting activities, weighted student credit hours generated, compliance load, teaching evaluations, awards and recognition, graduate student committee work, club advisorieship, and leadership and service to the department, college, university, professional, and public. *Note: standard, end-of-semester, student evaluations of teaching must not be the only instrument used in determining teaching quality and effectiveness.*
   a. Operationally these items are referred to as the merit matrix.
   b. The merit matrix is used to calculate a faculty merit score that is used primarily for awarding merit raises.
   c. The merit matrix is weighted 70% research, 20% teaching, and 10% service.
   d. As described subsequently, a faculty member’s merit score cannot be used as the sole criterion to determine the category of review assigned to a faculty member.

9. In assessing performance and determining salary increases, the department head shall give weights to teaching, research, service, and extension consistent with a faculty member’s position description and expectations.

10. The department head will prepare a written report stating his/her evaluation of the faculty member. This report will be transmitted to the faculty member who indicates receipt by signing a copy of the report.
    a. In this report, the department head shall categorize each faculty member as “most meritorious,” “meritorious,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory.”
    b. If the department head reviews a faculty member as “meritorious” or “satisfactory,” the faculty member may request that the appropriate faculty review committee review performance of the faculty and provide written advice to the department head regarding the rating.

11. There will be an annual opportunity for faculty to meet and discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.

12. Faculty with complaints about the annual review process should attempt to resolve such issues informally with the department head or the department ombudsman. If an informal resolution is not possible, then the faculty member may bring their concern to the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee for review and recommendations. If the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee cannot resolve the issue, then the faculty member should follow TAMU System guidelines.

13. To ensure consistency over time, the department shall publish its annual review procedure on paper or by electronic means.
C. Post Tenure Review

1. The department head will prepare a written report stating his/her evaluation of all faculty members during the annual review. This report will be transmitted to the faculty member who indicates receipt by signing a copy of the report. In this report, the department head shall categorize each faculty member as "most meritorious," "meritorious," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory."
   a. A faculty member will be deemed to be at least satisfactory in research if the faculty member maintains status/membership on the graduate faculty through the conduct and communication of research, teaching of graduate courses, and mentoring of graduate students.
   b. A faculty member will be deemed to be at least satisfactory in teaching if the faculty member is compliant with Faculty Teaching Workload Policy (University Rule 12.03.99.M1) and maintains student evaluations of teaching within two standard deviations of the college mean.
   c. A faculty member will be deemed to be at least satisfactory in service if the faculty member is appointed, elected, or carries out service that directly contributes to the mission of the department or college. Such service may include administrative appointments; undergraduate, graduate, or student club advising; appointment/election and service to a department, college, or university committee; or leadership roles in a professional society.

2. A faculty member would be deemed unsatisfactory, and subject to a professional review plan under University Rule 12.06.99.M1, if the faculty member fails to attain at least one satisfactory rating in the area of teaching, research, or service for any period of three consecutive years.

3. If the department head reviews a faculty member as "unsatisfactory," the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee will review the performance of the faculty member and provide written advice to the department head; this advice will conclude with substantiation of the review as "unsatisfactory" or suggest that the review category be changed to "satisfactory," "meritorious," or "most meritorious."

4. The department head shall then either change the review or append the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee findings to the administrative review. For tenured faculty who receive three consecutive and substantiated reviews of "unsatisfactory," University Rule 12.06.99M1 will be followed.

X. Appointment

A. Guided by the “Guideline to Faculty Titles,” faculty is defined for the purpose of this policy as any appointment in the department that includes in the position title the word “professor,” “instructor,” or “lecturer” regardless of other rank of appointment qualifiers associated with the title.

B. When any faculty vacancy occurs or is imminent, or a faculty position becomes available, a search committee should be formed by the department head.
   1. The search committee will develop a position description and advertise the position.
   2. The search committee, with input from departmental faculty, will recommend candidates to interview.
   3. Members of the faculty will have an opportunity to meet with the candidates and, after all candidates have been interviewed, vote on the acceptability of each candidate. Such a vote may also include a ranking of candidates.
      a. Tenure-track and tenured faculty votes will be kept separate from the non-tenure/non-tenure-track faculty votes.
      b. Faculty will be given at least one week to vote.
      c. Voting will be by secret ballot.
      d. No faculty member may vote more than once. Members of the search committee, who are faculty, may not vote during this acceptability vote balloting, unless they recuse themselves from voting as a member of the search committee.
      e. The ballots shall be collected [and tabulated?] by a person chosen by the search committee.
      f. The person chosen may not be a member of the search committee.
      g. After votes are tabulated, faculty will be informed of the ballot results.
      h. Those candidates receiving a positive acceptability vote by the faculty who participated in the balloting are the only candidates who will be considered by the search committee.
   4. The search committee will then rate the remaining candidates as either acceptable or unacceptable to the search committee, and provide a written recommendation to the department head.
   5. This written recommendation may include a ranking of candidates.
6. The search committee shall take into account the rights of the applicants and the Texas Public Information Act, Chapter 552, Texas Government Code.

C. The curriculum vitae and all other non-confidential materials the search committee has pertaining to each candidate shall be made available for examination by the faculty. This includes all written reports of the search committee. A departmental request for waiver of a faculty search should be processed only with approval of a majority of the faculty at the rank of the candidate being considered.

D. A tenure-upon-hire request must be voted on by faculty with tenure at or above the rank of the candidate. This is a separate procedure from that described above and is coordinated by the T&P co-chairs. For example, a faculty member being hired as an associate professor with tenure would be voted on by all tenured professors and tenured associate professors.

E. Any faculty appointment, including adjunct and visiting, in the department not covered by the guidelines provided above will be vetted and voted on by those faculty at or above the rank being sought. This would include, for example, changes in appointment, open positions, new positions, changes in administrative location, and changes in title.
ALEC Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Texas A&M University
and Texas A&M AgriLife Research

I. Faculty Membership
All ALEC faculty members (as described in the Dean of Faculties “Guideline to Faculty Titles”
http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/hiring/Guideline_Faculty_Titles.pdf) administratively located in the
department with the rank of distinguished professor, professor, associate professor, assistant professor,
distinguished lecturer, senior lecturer, lecturer, or assistant lecturer shall participate in discussion, evaluation,
and voting during specific promotion considerations described below. Visiting or Adjunct faculty shall not
participate in promotion discussion, evaluation, or voting.

II. Review Committee
Departmental faculty members who hold rank at or higher than the rank sought by the candidate are eligible
to participate, for discussion purposes, evaluation processes, and voting decisions, on non-tenured candidates.
For example, a non-tenured senior lecturer would serve on the Review Committee for a candidate seeking
lecturer or assistant lecturer; a professor whether tenured or not, would serve on the non-tenure track Review
Committee for non-tenured candidates seeking promotion to professor, associate professor, assistant
professor, senior lecturer, lecturer, or assistant lecturer.

III. Evaluation
A. Discussions related to promotion will be conducted in strictest confidence. Faculty members eligible to
vote can participate in the committee discussion and evaluation of a candidate’s packet. In addition, the
process must uphold and observe scrupulous standards of fairness. The committee discussions and
recommendations regarding a candidate’s materials will be independent of the ALEC department head.
B. The Review Committee will consider and/or discuss confidentially a candidate’s materials and external
letters of evaluation (for assistant and associate professors), when provided. The committee will prepare
summary reports on the candidate’s teaching, research, service/outreach, and other activities as they
relate to their position descriptions and expectations. Summary reports will follow the guidelines
established by the Dean of Faculties office.
C. Based on faculty comments and documentation provided to the co-chairs and committee, the T&P co-
chairs may elect to write reports or assign faculty members to do so. These written reports must reflect
the views and opinions of the committee and must reflect the candidate’s areas of strengths and
weaknesses.
D. A midterm (3rd year) review is optional, but strongly encouraged. External letters are not required.
E. The promotion packet shall be in a form consistent with the requirements and guidelines of Texas A&M
University and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

IV. Voting Procedures
Following confidential discussions, a confidential and verifiable vote will be conducted. Eligible faculty may
vote AYE, NAY, ABSTAIN, or RECUSE on promotion decisions. Eligible members not participating in the
evaluation discussion should not vote. When applicable, tenure-track and tenured faculty votes will be kept
separate from the non-tenured/non-tenure track faculty votes. The committee tally and report will be sent by
the T&P co-chairs in a memorandum to the department head. This document will become a part of the
candidate’s packet.

V. External Letters of Evaluation
The packet for assistant and associate professors must contain at least three letters from external reviewers
who have been asked to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments and potential. External reviewers should
be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. All
letters received must be included in the packet. All requests for letters must be noted in the packet. (See Dean of Faculties “T&P Guidelines” (http://dof.tamu.edu/content/tp-guidelines) for specifics about this process.)

VI. Evaluation Components
Committee members will evaluate a candidate’s materials using teaching, research, and service components as appropriate. Candidates seeking promotion are encouraged to make supporting documents readily available for committee members’ review. Candidates are expected to develop teaching, research, and/or service programs consistent with their position descriptions and expectations. Evaluation of candidate materials will be based subsequently on such descriptions and expectations. Please see the teaching, research, and service indicator examples list in the “tenure track” portion of this document (pp 2-7).

Please refer to the “tenure track” portion of this document for the following sections:
VII. Estimated/Anticipated Tenure and/or Promotion Timeline and Packet Components
VIII. Department Head’s Summary Report
IX. Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee, and Annual Review
X. Appointment
I. Introduction
A. Faculty in the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service perform a vital role in the triad of functions--teaching, research, and extension/outreach--which form the basis of the land-grant university system. Extension faculty are responsible for extending the university system to the people of Texas through a variety of research based educational programs.

B. Faculty are encouraged to work collaboratively in developing linkages with all parts of The Texas A&M University System. Extension faculty develop opportunities for increased collaboration with faculty and scientists in the Texas A&M College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and the Texas A&M College of Veterinary Medicine. Increased opportunities for collaboration exist with faculty in the various colleges of Texas A&M University and other institutions both within and outside of the A&M System. Extension faculty also are encouraged to pursue linkages with other key educational and health institutions in the state and nation, as well as develop associations at the international level and with private-sector research and development.

C. In furthering the mission of Texas A&M Agrilife Extension, Extension faculty perform in the total arena of teaching, research, and extension education and are expected to be innovative and progressive in their programmatic efforts. Applied and adaptive research must often be conducted to obtain specific information that can be used by clientele in technology and knowledge transfer. The unique role of program development through local needs assessment and program implementation through a network of county Extension agents often distinguishes the Extension faculty from the resident instructor and the research scientist. In educating adults and providing youth with leadership development programs, Extension faculty have a direct and often immediate impact on individuals and their quality of life.

II. Titles and Evaluation Criteria
A. Titles
   1. Incremental non-tenured ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor will be assigned to each qualified Extension faculty member. The professorial title will include the rank (e.g., Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor) and "Extension Specialist" and may be followed by a subject matter subtitle. Examples include the following:
      a. Professor and Extension Poultry Specialist
      b. Associate Professor and Extension Nutrition Specialist
      c. Assistant Professor and Extension Forage Specialist

B. Evaluation Criteria
   1. Extension faculty will be evaluated for promotion based on evaluation criteria as established in this policy. Evaluation of an individual’s effectiveness will be based on various diverse activities that represent overall contributions in educational programming and translating technology for effective delivery to targeted audiences. A combination of critical professional endeavors forms the basis for an accurate evaluation of Extension faculty members:
      a. Program Development Activities and Planning
         i. A variety of peer and clientele inputs should be used to determine the content, quality, priority, and emphasis of the Extension faculty member’s programmatic leadership.
         ii. This should reflect the assimilation and synthesis of information from county and regional program development committees, clientele organizations, and key industry leaders relative to the strategic plans of the department, college, and agency.
      b. Teaching Effectiveness and Quality
         i. Teaching quality involves command of the subject discipline, progressive assimilation and delivery of new knowledge, and an ability to present information through logic and effective communication.
ii. Quality and effectiveness should be represented through clientele and peer evaluation. Faculty should utilize state-of-the-art communications technology when appropriate.

c. Quality of Program and Organizational Support
   i. Faculty are expected to participate in disciplinary, multidisciplinary, and interdisciplinary programming efforts as appropriate to adequately address the priority issues of the clientele.
   ii. Financial and material support should be sought through grants and contracts or innovative linkages with other agencies, industry, or organizational groups. The evaluation should assess both grant and contract proposals or solicitations submitted and awarded.

d. Cooperative and Coordinative Efforts
   i. Each Extension faculty member is expected to establish and enhance mutual support among colleagues within and across disciplines at the agency, college and university level.
   ii. Timely and effective coordination, cooperation, and scheduling of activities with District Extension Administrators, Regional Program Directors, county staff, and other agencies/organizations are required for programs and responsibilities with mutual audiences.

e. Scholarly Contributions and Professionalism
   i. The faculty member should demonstrate evidence of contributions to professional and total Extension programs.
   ii. The development of creative educational programs and/or materials which are widely accepted and used are examples of professional contributions.
   iii. Applied or translational research and comprehensive and intensive program evaluations are important components for Extension faculty.
   iv. Publication of creative and scholarly work is expected.

f. For purposes of promotion, all of these indicators of performance should be reviewed by departmental or Extension program unit evaluation committees. Specific materials to be included are program objective statements, program evaluations, plans of work, and the faculty achievement reports. Additional supporting materials provided in the faculty achievement report such as public and institutional service, research, teaching, and other non-extension activities shall be included in the overall assessment. A qualitative assessment performed by a peer committee evaluation at the department or program unit level will be conducted.

g. Educational materials that have been developed for Extension bulletins, fact sheets, production videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, and computer software programs will also be included in the evaluation. Similarly, written and visual support materials (including PowerPoint presentations, video tapes, and film) used in educational settings such as field days, seminars, workshops, and interactive video productions also should be evaluated. The overall evaluation should not be limited to traditional materials, but should consider the quality and originality of thought and the integration of educational concepts that will lead to increased awareness and appropriate change and/or adoption. Additional attention should be given to the development of techniques or new modes of educational delivery (e.g., interactive video, e-learning systems) and the revision and/or development of new educational approaches in the base program areas of the discipline.

h. The development and publication of comprehensive handbooks, training manuals, and textbooks may also be considered in evaluating the faculty members’ contributions to the entire educational program. In such cases, the committee should assess the quality of the work in addition to determining the value and acceptance of the work in other states and by other universities. Educational grants for the development of new and creative Extension programs may also be considered as instances in which prepared materials extend beyond the limits of the university or state.

i. Appendix 1 provides categories of criteria which may be considered in promoting Extension faculty in the Professorial rank system. Other evidence of recognition by colleagues, Extension clientele, and other professionals includes the following examples:

j. Receipt of awards for outstanding programs or service.
k. Peer recognition by other faculty within the discipline, particularly those who have direct evaluative experience, and have attended Extension programs or presentations before professional groups or societies.
l. Comprehensive program evaluations that attest to program effectiveness (awareness, adoption, etc.) through pre- and post-survey evaluations and/or other evidence of productive change or mastery by clientele.
m. Evidence that the faculty member has been a catalyst for the initiation of new programming approaches within and/or across disciplines to include developing interactions with new faculty, scientists, and clientele.
n. Contributions to professional societies.
o. Leadership in networking with other faculties, research scientists, societies, and professional groups leading to integrated interdisciplinary programming.
p. Solicited evaluations by outside faculty within the discipline of national reputation as to assessment of creative professional accomplishments.

C. Standards of Achievement of Professorial Ranks (as follows on pages 14 - 20)
1. Assistant Professor and Extension Specialist
   a. Degree Requirements
      i. Terminal degree in appropriate subject matter discipline (exceptions may be granted for outstanding service and distinguished achievements)
   b. Duties and Responsibilities
      i. Program Development Activities and Planning
         (i) Perceived ability and evidence of competence necessary to:
            1. Determine and understand the type of programmatic approaches needed to meet the variable educational capabilities of different audiences for effective program planning and execution.
            2. Assist County Extension Agents and Program Area Committee members to effectively use the Extension’s program development process.
      ii. Teaching Effectiveness and Quality
         (i) Satisfactory indication of personal and professional traits necessary to:
            1. Train Extension personnel to use appropriate educational methods and techniques for communicating with specific audiences.
            2. Determine and understand the variable needs and interests of audiences for effective program delivery.
            3. Develop effective learning environments for adult and/or youth audiences.
            4. Select suitable methods and techniques for solving problems and achieving objectives within subject matter discipline.
            5. Identify, train, and support volunteer leaders to enhance effective adult and/or youth education programs.
      iii. Quality of Program and Organizational Support
         (i) Evidence of a high standard of scholarship and promise of growth and development sufficient to:
            1. Function effectively on program planning committees and in various service capacities at the university, agency, and clientele level.
            2. Utilize appropriate media to effectively disseminate subject matter information.
            3. Prepare effective newsletters, news articles, technical fact sheets, and educational materials.
            4. Maintain effective working relationships with sponsors and donors in securing and maintaining support and resources for Extension educational programs.
            5. Develop proposals for grants or contracts.
   iv. Cooperative and Coordinative Efforts
      (i) Professional and personal attributes necessary to:
         1. Interact positively with diverse populations including teaching, research, and extension faculty and the general public, especially those participating in the faculty member’s discipline.
2. Function effectively with clientele, academic faculty, research scientists, and associates.

v. Scholarly Contributions and Professionalism
   (i) Evidence indicating a commitment to:
      1. Maintain continued competency in discipline.
      2. Desire to improve knowledge and subject matter competence.
      3. Gain recognition in professional organization as a contributor in the field.

2. Associate Professor and Extension Specialist
   a. Degree Requirements
      i. Terminal degree in appropriate subject matter discipline and at least six years of professional experience (exceptions may be granted for outstanding service and distinguished achievements)
   b. Duties and Responsibilities (in addition to those of the lower rank)
      i. Program Development Activities and Planning
         (i) Effectively plan and implement quality educational programs needed to meet the informational expectations of the clientele.
         (ii) Work through Extension’s program development process in planning, carrying out, and evaluating Extension educational programs in assigned program area.
         (iii) Be recognized by peers and county personnel for expertise and ability to develop and plan highly effective programs.
      ii. Teaching Effectiveness and Quality
         (i) Lead Extension faculty in determining and understanding the clientele’s needs and interests including the development of effective educational programs to address relevant issues.
         (ii) Develop and conduct appropriate learning experiences for adult and/or youth audiences.
         (iii) Present effective educational information through formal and informal programs including in-depth education for adult and/or youth audiences.
      iii. Quality of Program and Organizational Support
         (i) Effectively utilize appropriate communication tools to disseminate subject matter information.
         (ii) Provide evidence of effective ability to write newsletters, news articles, technical fact sheets, and educational materials.
         (iii) Demonstrate effective working relationships with sponsors and donors in securing and maintaining support and resources for Extension educational programs.
         (iv) Demonstrate success in obtaining grants and contracts to support the faculty member’s educational program.
      iv. Cooperative and Coordinative Efforts
         (i) Assist in directing and coordinating efforts of teaching, research, and Extension faculty to create an effective and synergistic working relationship.
         (ii) Cooperate effectively with external organizations important to the Agency and educational programs.
   v. Scholarly Contributions and Professionalism
      (i) Maintain expanded competency in discipline.
      (ii) Demonstrate knowledge of the current advances and developments within the profession and provide evidence of the ability to apply such knowledge.
      (iii) Be recognized for service and leadership in professional organizations.
      (iv) Be recognized by peers for scholarly contributions and professionalism.

3. Professor and Extension Specialist
   a. Degree Requirements
      i. Terminal degree in appropriate subject matter discipline and at least ten years of professional experience (exceptions may be granted for outstanding service and distinguished achievements)
   b. Duties and Responsibilities (in addition to those of lower ranks)
i. Program Development Activities and Planning
   (i) Plan comprehensive and effective educational programs and develop procedures and methods that meet program outcome objectives.
   (ii) Plan, implement, and evaluate programs developed through Extension's program development process; adjust program based on evaluation input.
   (iii) Develop broad objectives, programs, and plans for strengthening Extension efforts in an assigned program or subject matter area related to the Agency Strategic Plan.
   (iv) Demonstrate ability to be creative in seeking solutions to complex educational problems and issues.

c. Teaching Effectiveness and Quality
   i. Provide comprehensive technical assistance and expert guidance to administrators, Extension faculty members, and county Extension agents.
   ii. Develop and implement relevant, in-depth programs in subject matter responsibility.
   iii. Develop educational programs and techniques that are innovative, comprehensive, and appropriate for the audience.

d. Quality of Program and Organizational Support
   i. Exemplary competence in developing and writing newsletters, news articles, technical fact sheets, and educational materials.
   ii. Demonstrate leadership roles on faculty, agency, and college committees.
   iii. Identify, secure, and maintain support and resources for educational programs. Successful in attracting grants and contracts.
   iv. Utilize electronic technology to effectively reach clientele.

e. Cooperative and Coordinative Efforts
   i. Motivate and contribute significantly to program unit, task forces, faculty committees, etc., and create effective working relationships across departments, agencies, and colleges.
   ii. Demonstrate cooperation with leadership of key organizations that are relevant to program delivery strategies.

f. Scholarly Contributions and Professionalism
   i. Maintain and possess a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the discipline.
   ii. Have an established regional or national reputation as having contributed significantly to one's field of expertise.
   iii. Serve in leadership positions in professional organizations.
   iv. Recognized by colleagues within the discipline for scholarship and professional understanding of subject area.

III. Extension Professorial Career Ladder
A. Professorial Progression
   1. Annual reviews of each Extension faculty member by the unit head are required to provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his/her department head and associate department head or program unit leader. (Appendix 2)
   2. Following appointment to the initial professorial rank, an Extension faculty member will annually be eligible for consideration at the next higher rank based on recommendations of the designated unit head. Comments will be solicited from a peer review committee based on the criteria as stated in this policy. The Extension faculty member will be informed of the decisions of the peer review committee and the unit head pertaining to promotion recommendations.

IV. Peer Review Committee
A. Departments/units are responsible for reviewing all Extension Specialists who hold a disciplinary appointment through an academic department/unit. Department heads will consult a promotion committee (peer review committee) on promotion recommendations for on- and off-campus extension specialist faculty before transmitting the promotion recommendation to the Director of the Agency. This advisory mechanism should be well-structured and effectively communicated within the unit. This committee should be composed of appropriate senior teaching, research, and extension faculty members who can evaluate the quality and breadth of the overall performance of the junior faculty.
relative to the role of Extension faculty in a land-grant university system. Department/Unit heads will work with their departmental/unit peer review committees to ensure that the following guidelines are followed:

1. Only faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor will be named to serve on a peer review committee, and only faculty members with rank higher than the candidate being considered should serve on peer review committees for promotion. Departmental/unit peer review committees should include on- and off-campus faculty where possible. (Note: The promotion candidate’s dossier cover sheet must include the total number of faculty eligible to vote.)

2. Committee recommendations should be based on a written and widely circulated promotion document which specifies criteria and procedural guidelines, promulgated by the department and agency.

3. Committee deliberations must be conducted in confidence.

4. Committee recommendations are advisory in nature.

5. A preponderance of outside letters should be from peer institutions. Departments and units will be responsible for determining their respective peers. All letters requested and received are to be included in the candidate’s promotion dossier.

B. In consideration of requests for promotion from nondepartmentalized faculty who do not have a clear disciplinary department, the Director of the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, in consultation with the Vice Chancellor and Dean of Agriculture, will be responsible for defining the committee membership for nondepartmentalized faculty. These committees should be composed of faculty who possess the appropriate disciplinary expertise necessary to evaluate the quality and breadth of the performance of the nondepartmentalized Extension faculty member(s). Where possible and appropriate, members from various departmental review committees will be included in the nondepartmental review committees to assure consistency of the review process.

C. During the review process, if both the department head and the peer review committee do not recommend promotion, then the candidate's promotion file will not be forwarded to the Director for further consideration unless the candidate so requests. If a person is under final review for promotion from assistant to associate professor, the candidate’s promotion file must be forwarded to the Director for review and action regardless of whether the recommendation is positive or negative.

D. If the department head or the review committee does not agree on a recommendation, then the matter will be forwarded to the Director for evaluation and further consultation with the Vice Chancellor.

E. At any point in the process, a candidate for promotion may elect to withdraw his/her name from further consideration by written request.

V. Agency Review by the Texas AgriLife Peer Review Committee

A. The Director will use the AgriLife Peer Review Committee to review all requests for promotion in rank of all Extension specialists. The committee will review all promotion recommendations and ensure equitable review and evaluation of teaching, research and extension promotion candidates, relative to the position description for each candidate.

B. The AgriLife Peer Review Committee will be composed of 16 senior faculty members appointed by the Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Dean of the Texas A&M College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; Director, Texas Agrilife Research; and Director, Texas AgriLife Extension. The makeup of the committee will reflect the composition of the faculty within the College, Texas AgriLife Research and Texas AgriLife Extension, and will be reviewed every three years to ensure it continues to represent the demographics of the faculty. Committee members shall serve two-year terms, with approximately one-half of the committee rotating each year. As with the departmental peer review committees, all members of the AgriLife Peer Review Committee may vote on promotion and tenure decisions; however, the vote of the tenured faculty must be kept separate. The results of the committee’s anonymous vote and the overall perspective of the committee relative to each faculty member under consideration shall be explained by the Chair of the Committee in a statement to the Vice Chancellor on each candidate.

C. The AgriLife Peer Review Committee shall review all promotion and tenure recommendations in accordance with the following:
1. Review completeness of promotion candidate’s file submitted by the department/unit, requesting additional information, if necessary, particularly if the candidate’s department is not represented on the committee.

2. Review recommendations of the departmental/unit peer review committee, department/unit head, and AgriLife Extension nondepartmental program leader, as appropriate. The AgriLife Peer Review Committee should focus on nominations of a marginal nature. Specifically:
   a. If the departmental peer review committee and the unit administration strongly recommend a decision and the AgriLife Peer Review Committee does not concur, then the AgriLife Peer Review Committee may request further input prior to a final recommendation. Detailed comments should accompany all AgriLife Peer Review Committee recommendations, which are in opposition to the recommendations of the departmental/unit peer review committee or unit administration.
   b. If the departmental peer review committee and the unit administration are in direct conflict, the AgriLife Peer Review Committee should carefully review the entire file, including external letters, to determine the merits of the file. If necessary, the AgriLife Peer Review Committee may invite the appropriate department/unit head and chair of the departmental peer review committee to the meeting to gain further information.

3. The Chair of the AgriLife Peer Review Committee will be responsible for transmitting written results of the committee’s deliberations and make recommendations regarding desired changes to the process.

D. When the Director does not concur with the recommendation of the department/unit head and/or department peer review recommendation, the Director will inform the appropriate unit leader of the reasons for that decision. The departmental peer review committee shall then have the opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials have in fact been properly enclosed with the promotion dossier and that all relevant arguments have been put forward. In the event that germane new evidence is introduced or new, quite different arguments are applied, the departmental peer review committee may submit a newly organized document for reconsideration.

E. If the Director recommends against promotion and that recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of the department head/program leader, then the Director shall inform the appropriate unit leader and the candidate of the reasons for the decision. The faculty member shall then have the opportunity to offer any new evidence in support of the request for promotion, and that evidence shall be reviewed by the Director and the AgriLife Peer Review Committee before a final recommendation concerning promotion is made.

F. In the event of a negative promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. If requested by the faculty member, a statement of reasons will be provided by the department head or AgriLife Extension nondepartmental program leader, as appropriate.

VI. Appeals Procedure for Professorial Progression

A. Extension specialist faculty have the right to present grievances concerning progression through the Professorial Career Ladder (http://agrilife.org/hrfaculty/files/2011/04/faculty-promotion-extension-professorial-career-ladder.pdf). Basis for an appeal regarding progression in rank exists when, in the opinion of the Extension faculty member, one or more of the following has occurred:
   1. There was a failure to follow the prescribed procedures
   2. There was a failure to adhere to the established criteria for determining progression in rank.
   3. There was a discovery of significant new evidence in support of the Extension faculty member related to academic credentials, length of professional service, performance appraisal information and overall achievement, productivity, and/or effectiveness.

B. Extension faculty having concerns or grievances regarding other aspects of the Professorial Career Ladder are encouraged to seek resolution of those concerns through established supervisory channels prior to filing a written appeal. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by an appeals committee.
C. The written appeal shall include the basis for the appeal committee and must contain any supporting evidence and/or documentation to be considered. Written appeals concerning denial of progression in rank must be filed within 20 working days of notification of denial.

D. A seven-member Appeals Committee shall be appointed by the Director to review and/or hear individual appeals regarding progression in rank.

E. The appellant may request to meet with the Appeals Committee to present his/her case. Such a request shall be included in the written appeal. If the appellant elects to be represented by an attorney, the appellant will notify the Director's Office at least five working days before the date the appeal is to be heard. The appellant will be solely responsible for any legal expenses incurred in such representation.

F. The Appeals Committee shall judge the merits of the case and forward its written recommendation with supporting documentation to the Director for final action within 20 working days from the end of the appeal hearing.

G. The Director shall notify the appellant in writing of acceptance or rejection of the Appeals Committee recommendation. Such notification shall be made within 60 working days of receipt of the written appeal.

VII. Estimated/Anticipated Tenure and/or Promotion Timeline and Packet Components (see Section VII pp 4-5)
Appendix 1

CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION OF PROMOTION IN THE EXTENSION PROFESSORIAL RANK SYSTEM

Categories

A. Contributions to assigned Extension duties*
   1. Presentations
   2. Program initiation, development, evaluation, and interpretation
   3. Workshops, seminars, field days, etc.
   4. Extension publications
   5. Demonstrations (result/method, field trials/applied research)
   6. Agent training sessions
   7. Mass media work
   8. Grants and contracts
   9. Interagency activities
   10. Clientele commodity support groups
   11. Extension planning activities
   12. Leadership and volunteer training
   13. Consultation/technical assistance
   14. Other Extension contributions

B. State/regional/national/international contributions
   1. Publications (including peer reviewed journal publications)
   2. Presentations (professional organizations and peer audiences included)
   3. Committee assignments
   4. Membership in professional organizations (including offices held)
   5. Other Extension contributions

C. Contributions to major Agency missions
   1. Teaching
   2. Research (basic and applied)
   3. Service

D. Service to university/Extension/community (committee assignments, leadership positions, etc.)

E. Awards and honors, including membership in honorary societies

*Because of the wide variation in position descriptions, not every Extension faculty member is expected to contribute in all categories listed. Specific position descriptions and plan of work dictate which categories are most appropriate.
Appendix 2

GROUPS ELIGIBLE FOR PROFESSORIAL CAREER LADDER

A. Departmentalized Groups
   1. Agricultural Economics
   2. Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication
   3. Biological and Agricultural Engineering
   4. Animal Science
   5. Biochemistry and Biophysics
   6. Ecosystem Science and Management
   7. Entomology
   8. Horticultural Science
   9. Nutrition and Food Science
   10. Plant Pathology and Microbiology
   11. Poultry Science
   12. Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences
   13. Soil and Crop Sciences
   14. Veterinary Medicine
   15. Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences

B. Nondepartmentalized Groups
   1. Agricultural Communications
   2. Agricultural Chemicals
   3. Computer Technology
   4. 4-H and Youth Development
   5. Family and Consumer Sciences
   6. V.G. Young Institute of County Government