



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Department of Mathematics

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Approved by the Department of Mathematics Executive and APT Committees: August 18, 2020

Approved by College of Science: October 23, 2020

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance.....	5
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	9
5. Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Transition	11
6. Annual Review	26
7. Mid-Term Review	31
8. Post-Tenure Review	32
9. Granting Faculty Emeritus/Emerita Status.....	35

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Mathematics is to be a leader in research in mathematics while providing the highest quality mathematics education to Texas A&M students. The faculty of the Department of Mathematics deliver scholarly and technical expertise to the state, nation and world and prepare our students to become the next generation of leaders. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Mathematics for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their fields of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Department; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document establishes the procedures and general expectations and responsibilities regarding faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure in the Department of Mathematics. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, Department evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations. Evaluations of colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the Department depends upon the quality of these reviews.

This document articulates Department of Mathematics guidelines, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTYPromotion- and-Tenure

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

These documents are reviewed, interpreted and approved on a regular basis by the Department of Mathematics Faculty, College of Science Executive Committee, the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties and by the Provost.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

The Department of Mathematics has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities. Within the Department, faculty may be tenure track, academic professional track, or visiting. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the Department recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. 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 accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable Departmental evaluations.

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#).

2.1 Tenure Track

A specific system of faculty tenure underpins the integrity of an academic institution; it is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities, and reflects continued worth to the University, College, and Department in anticipated intellectual development and performance. Tenure is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual’s research, teaching, and service.

Tenure. Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for cause. See Sections 4 and 6 of <https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf>. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable, productive, and professional in research, teaching and service, and who have demonstrated over time they will likely continue to be especially productive. Faculty being evaluated and seeking promotion and tenure will be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements from University, College and Departmental perspectives. The Department of Mathematics conducts formal reviews of tenure track faculty on probationary status at two times: 1) near the end of the third year of service (mid-term review) and 2) during the penultimate (sixth) year of the probationary period (promotion and tenure review). In this document, the Department of Mathematics clarifies from its perspective the procedures defined in System Policy 12.01, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, and University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines.

Included in the Tenure Track are the following titles/ranks: **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor**. The categories of performance for faculty in the tenure track are research, teaching, and service. Tenure track faculty are typically assigned to teach three semester courses each academic year. Assistant Professors are not expected to make substantial contributions in service.

2.2.1 Lecturer Track

Lecturer. The position of Lecturer is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members holding the title of Lecturer will have a Master's or PhD, normally in Mathematics. They are expected to devote the entirety of their professional time to classroom instruction and closely related activities and are not expected to make contributions in the areas of service or scholarly/creative activity. Lecturers are typically assigned a four-course teaching load each semester.

Senior Lecturer. The position of Senior Lecturer is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members holding the title of Senior Lecturer will have a Master's or PhD, normally in Mathematics. They are expected to devote the entirety of their professional time to classroom instruction and closely related activities and are not expected to make contributions in the areas of service or scholarly/creative activity. They may be expected to engage in some leadership or administrative activities if these activities are required to carry out or complement their instructional duties. Senior Lecturers are typically assigned a three-course teaching load plus one leadership or administrative activity each semester.

2.2.2 Instructional Track

Instructional Assistant Professor. The position of Instructional Assistant Professor is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make contributions in service or scholarly/creative work. Faculty members holding the title of Instructional Assistant Professor will have a Master's or PhD, normally in Mathematics. A PhD in Mathematics is preferred due to the advanced training provided by a PhD program. Instructional Assistant Professors are typically assigned a three-course teaching load plus one leadership or administrative activity each semester.

Instructional Associate Professor. The position of Instructional Associate Professor is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also exhibit significant impact beyond excellence in classroom instruction, including contributions in service or scholarship. Faculty members holding the title of Instructional Associate Professor will have a Master's or PhD, normally in Mathematics. A PhD in Mathematics is preferred due to the advanced training provided by a PhD program. Instructional Associate Professors are typically assigned a three-course teaching load plus one leadership or administrative activity each semester.

Instructional Professor. The position of Instructional Professor is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also exhibit substantial impact in the Department, College, University, or broader mathematics community. Faculty members holding the title of Instructional Professor will have a Master's or PhD, normally in Mathematics. A PhD in Mathematics is preferred due to the advanced training provided by a PhD

program. Instructional Professors are typically assigned a three-course teaching load plus one leadership or administrative activity each semester.

2.2.3 APT Faculty Appointments

The Texas A&M University System policy 12.07 does not authorize rolling appointments for APT faculty, therefore following the College of Science guidelines, granting and extension of multi-year fixed term appointment have been established. Granting of the initial multi-year fixed term appointments will be made upon a peer review of the candidate's qualifications, as per the criteria stated in Departmental guidelines. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided in the penultimate year of a multi-year appointment. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.

APT faculty members appointed at the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Instructional Assistant Professor levels will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments, unless justified by the Department Head and approved by the Dean. Faculty members appointed as Instructional Associate Professor will have annual appointments. After serving continuously for five years, Instructional Associate Professors may be eligible for a three-year fixed-term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with the Dean's approval.

Upon promotion to Instructional Professor, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with the Dean's approval. The multi-year term appointment or renewal is not guaranteed but is awarded or renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the Department and College. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed term appointment, shall be given in writing in the penultimate year of the fixed term and in accord with University standards (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed term appointment cannot be appealed.

2.3 Visiting Titles

A **Visiting Assistant Professor** with a limited term appointment is usually a recent PhD graduate. Their appointment in the Department is of a postdoctoral nature with an assigned mentor and duties consisting of research and teaching. A **Visiting Professor** is usually an established scholar appointed for one or two semesters.

The Department of Mathematics may use other titles (e.g., **Senior Professor**).

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

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

The nature of a faculty member's contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, and service. APT faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in support of the department's teaching mission.

Criteria for Review

Faculty evaluations will be conducted once per year. Tenure Track faculty additionally are evaluated during the Mid- Term Review, as candidates for Tenure and Promotion, and during the Post-Tenure Review. The relevant criteria for evaluation of faculty performance in the Department of Mathematics are defined below.

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the Department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty, with the exception of those with other responsibilities in place of teaching (e.g., administrative assignments). All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the Department's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods are considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required, but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in teaching may include (in no particular order): 1) a self- reflection document; 2) peer evaluation of teaching and teaching materials; 3) peer review of webpages and resources provided for students; 4) student feedback taken from end-of-course student evaluations; 5) peer assessment of the reasonableness of end-of-course grade point averages, grade distributions, and overall student success rates.

Essential qualifications for Department of Mathematics instructors are the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. An accomplished mathematics teacher has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, skill at delivering material and presentations, respect for students, and enthusiasm for mentoring and teaching. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance include coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, effective classroom presentation, and reasonable evaluation of students' performance. Indicators of outstanding performance include peer recognition, student satisfaction, and student learning outcomes. For tenure track faculty, outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and professional development are important measures of scholarly teaching. Receipt of awards is a key indicator of teaching success, such as selection for a Department, College, University or professional society outstanding teacher award.

With regard to teaching evaluation, for mid-term review, tenure and promotion, and once every year for tenured and APT faculty, a **Teaching Evaluation Table** shall be constructed that contains the following information for the evaluation year(s): a listing by semester of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation for an appropriate selection of questions posed to the students (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F and Q grades. A definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained shall be provided.

The criteria that may be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

3.1.1 Teaching quality. The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one's discipline.

3.1.2 Essential pedagogy. The use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; effective questioning and student engagement; and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.

3.1.3 Educational innovation. Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Examples of innovations in teaching are: taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness, developing new learning experiences, or developing unique methods to evaluate student learning.

3.1.4 Teaching professionalism. Mentoring students, using appropriate methods of evaluation and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching. Additionally, being aware of students'

classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with students of all abilities are also measures of professionalism.

3.1.5 Impact upon students. A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

3.1.6 Degree of teaching responsibility. The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to Departmental teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course and evaluating student learning through course assessments.

3.1.7 Promotion of high-impact teaching strategies. Student success requires active engagement in the material. Faculty members should interact with their students to the greatest extent possible.

3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

High-quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions are critical to our academic reputation for excellence in research. Scholarly activity is creative intellectual work; it should be validated by peers as original in content and communicated in an effective manner in order to have impact.

All tenured faculty members must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality and impact of their published and other scholarly work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training students in research, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustainable research program, candidates for Full Professor are expected to be widely respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or international level.

A shared characteristic of research and scholarly activity is the production of peer-evaluated and published work. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work. The capacity for identifying, seeking and obtaining research funding is a measure of sustainable scholarly productivity. In evaluation of research funding, emphasis is placed upon extramural granting sources. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence.

The Department and College expect that all tenure-track faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarship, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure or promotion. Some APT faculty are expected to engage in scholarly/creative activity, which might involve, but is not limited to, the creation of new knowledge or investigations into teaching, pedagogy and learning. Meritorious teaching scholarship is distinct from effective or excellent teaching.

The relevant criteria that may be considered in evaluating research and scholarly activity performance are:

3.2.1 Scientific inquiry. The foundation of quality scholarly activity is identifying a topic needing study and conducting an appropriate investigation.

3.2.2 Scientific communication. Original research and scholarly activity are considered to be evidence of scientific impact once accepted for publication or communicated at a scientific conference.

3.2.3 Research funding. Financial resources, particularly external grants, to conduct impactful scientific research or other scholarly activity are indicators of excellence.

3.2.4 Collaborative approach. Although individuals are encouraged to develop an independent research portfolio and balanced publication record, collaborative, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research are all valued.

3.2.5 Educational contributions. Educating the next generation of mathematical leaders and researchers is an important mission of the Department, and depends on the research skills of the faculty.

3.2.6 Contributions to the field. Research related activities, such as editorial board or panel membership, that benefit mathematics and science outside of the University are important criteria for evaluation.

3.2.7 Acknowledgments of impact. For tenure and promotion, assessments from eminent scholars in the field are of great importance. Other factors considered in assessing impact include awards, citations, journal quality, funding and speaking invitations and these also apply to internal decisions on merit compensation. Care is taken to consider these various metrics within the context of what is appropriate in a given researcher's subfield.

3.3 Service

Faculty service is central to the mission of the Department. The Department must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence and a variety of roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution a faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the Department, the College, and the University. The amount and nature of a faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, stage of career, and career track. Some APT faculty are expected to engage in service, and the leadership or administrative activities assigned to APT faculty (i.e., course coordination, hiring graders, advising, etc.) are duties essential to the overall operations of the department and are categorized as service for evaluation and promotion purposes.

All faculty members are expected to be professional in carrying out their service, that is to exhibit a consistent commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the Department, College, University, and profession. Key dimensions are collegiality and teamwork, that is, positive, interactive relationships between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research and service.

The Department will not discourage debate or disagreement; 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. 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" is a requirement for promotion and tenure.

Academic service contributes to the Department mission of advancing mathematics locally, statewide, nationally and internationally. All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the Department, College and the University. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving academic programs and services, the growth of their profession, and the continuing education of the public at large. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve in a professional capacity that enhances the stature and reputation of the Department of Mathematics.

The scope of Department activities makes it appropriate for faculty members to engage in many activities outside of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, advising, special training or professional development programs. The Department also encourages its faculty members to render extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens, executing minor administrative tasks competently. Full Professors are expected to possess a much broader service portfolio and to provide considerable leadership in the Department, College and/or the scholarly community at large.

Criteria that may be considered in evaluating service performance are:

3.3.1 Personal integrity and accountability. A faculty member's professionalism and fairness in the performance of required duties is essential to the function of a department. This includes, but is not limited to, timeliness and willingness to cooperate with colleagues.

3.3.2 Professional communication. Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators, and must work toward solutions of problems.

3.3.3 Departmental engagement. It is important that faculty members engage in activities that benefit others apart from themselves. This includes accepting appropriate amounts of committee work commensurate with academic rank.

3.3.4 Colleague/student mentoring. Developing mentoring relationships with colleagues and students, including those of diverse cultures, beliefs and backgrounds, is critical for program success. Additionally, serving as an advisor to student organizations is valued.

3.3.5 Academic leadership. Serving on departmental, college or university task forces, major committees or in administrative roles (e.g., assistant/associate department head or director titles) exemplifies a commitment to the academic whole.

3.3.6 Service to the field. Citizenship and service activities, such as society leadership, editorial boards or panel memberships, that benefit mathematics outside of the University, are important criteria for evaluation.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Mathematics recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for use in evaluating faculty performance. These indicators are a compilation of items typically viewed favorably by evaluation and promotion committees and should not be viewed as a checklist of requirements nor as a complete list.

All of the following indicators will be judged with respect to quality and impact.

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

- outstanding evaluations based on classroom visitation by departmental administrators, peers, or external evaluators,
- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- selection for Department, College, University, or professional association outstanding teacher awards,
- substantial involvement in undergraduate or graduate research,
- significant leadership of existing instructional programs, or the creation of new programs,
- development of a significant new course,
- the creation of new pedagogy which is adopted by others, both internal and external to the university,
- internal or external grant support for classroom teaching or course development.

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

- teaching a variety of service mathematics courses that contribute to academic success of students majoring in another department or college,
- teaching mathematics courses that contribute to the success of mathematics majors,
- development of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes,

- routinely practicing rigorous, meaningful, and equitable grading of student work (as shown by, e.g., DFQ rates and course GPAs that reflect departmental norms for similar courses after accounting for the context within which specific sections are taught),
- serving as a course coordinator,
- mentoring colleagues in teaching methodologies that aim to improve teaching methods,
- completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods,
- engagement in professional development activities that lead to enhanced instructional effectiveness, and
- development of instructional materials or pedagogical strategies (e.g., active learning or flipped classrooms) that lead to improved educational experience.

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity include, but are not limited to:

- peer-reviewed publications in highly ranked journals,
- external grant support,
- invitations to speak at conferences, workshops, and colloquia that represent clear evidence of national and international impact, as appropriate for the faculty member's rank,
- directing graduate or undergraduate students in research with documented impact,
- recognition from peers in the field (e.g., national or international awards, honors, invitations to give plenary lectures),
- favorable citations of research publications, with respect to research area,
- publication of monographs or books,
- leadership of successful collaborative research/scholarly activities,
- creation of innovative technical approaches adopted by others, and
- patents, copyrights or royalty/licensing agreements.

4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity include, but are not limited to:

- presentation of original research or other scholarly work at professional meetings,
- publication of original research or other scholarly work in proceedings of professional meetings,
- effective contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project,
- key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry,
- contribution of expertise to the scholarship/education of others, and
- creation of teaching materials or pedagogical strategies that are adopted by other institutions.

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

- chairing a major committee with demonstrable impact at the university, state, national, or international level,
- effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards,
- attraction of significant development support,
- consultation with state, national or international government offices or programs,
- selection for Departmental, College, University, or professional association outstanding service or mentoring awards,
- service as an editor or associate editor for a highly rated journal,
- service as a grant/contract reviewer for research organizations, institutions or foundations,
- leadership of outreach activities,
- leadership of a major program which has demonstrable impact within the university or beyond,
- excelling in a major departmental administrative role, and
- serving as a course coordinator for multiple semesters.

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

- serving as an effective member of a committee within the Department, College, University, or professional society,
- 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 goals,
- significant contributions to the promotion of diversity, inclusion and climate,
- mentoring early career faculty,
- leadership and organization of seminars, workshops, or conferences,
- promoting significant teaching, research or service experiences for students,
- promoting national and/or international experiences for students,
- serving as an advisor to student organizations,
- serving in administrative roles (e.g., assistant/associate department head or director title) within the Department, College or University, and
- actively participating in K-12 or other public outreach.

5. Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Transition

For promotion, tenure, and transition in the faculty ranks, faculty members shall be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance.

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service appropriate to career stage), with primary emphasis on the **quality**, **significance**, and **impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Mathematics are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor. Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching and research. Assistant professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship and research support and building their teaching skills and portfolio.

5.1.2 Associate Professor. Emphasis for tenure-track faculty should be placed on further development of scholarship as indicated earlier in this document. This personal and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments in the faculty member's specialty area. Associate Professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of service, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen areas of research and scholarly activity. Associate Professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must have documented effectiveness in instruction, as well as research and service. A tenure-track faculty member 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.

5.1.3 Professor. Continued excellence, leadership, and national/international recognition are required. 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; evidence of collegiality and professionalism; and excellence in instruction and mentoring students. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of professors, sustained excellence in scholarship is expected for the tenured Professor.

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

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

Faculty members in the APT ranks other than Instructional Professor will typically be considered for promotion or transition after five years in rank. Considerations for promotion or transition will include the quality, significance, effectiveness, and impact of the faculty member's teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities. Excellence in teaching is a core consideration in all evaluations of APT faculty in the Department of Mathematics, but it is also recognized that APT faculty carry out a wide range of duties depending on Departmental needs. For this reason, the criteria listed below should be considered in the context of the particular duties assigned to the APT faculty member being evaluated or considered for promotion. These criteria should not be viewed as a checklist of requirements, but rather as a guide to items typically viewed favorably by promotion committees.

5.2.1 Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Foundational criteria include, but are not limited to:

- mastery of mathematics content needed for teaching,
- at least a three-year consecutive trend of high ratings on annual evaluations of teaching performance while in rank of Lecturer,
- continued professional growth in teaching,
- outstanding performance in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- experience of at least five years as a Lecturer or agreed upon equivalent experience.

Candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer should additionally exhibit some of the following:

- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- service or supervisory role in program activities,
- implementation of instructional and pedagogical strategies that lead to improved student learning or students' educational experience,
- successful teaching across a variety of service-level courses or to a variety of student audiences,
- successful teaching of courses with challenging or non-traditional formats, such as online or very large lecture sizes,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the Department.

5.2.2 Criteria for Transition to Instructional Assistant Professor

Foundational criteria include but are not limited to:

- mastery of mathematics content needed for teaching,
- consecutive trend of high ratings on annual evaluations of teaching performance while in rank of Senior Lecturer,
- continued professional growth in teaching,
- outstanding performance in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism.

In addition to these foundational criteria, candidates for transition to Instructional Assistant Professor should exhibit additional accomplishments beyond excellence in classroom teaching, including additional contributions in service or scholarly/creative activities. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- participation in program or curriculum development or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- contributions to outreach activities,
- contributions to the scholarship of learning, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations,
- contributions to mathematical research, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations.

5.2.3 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

Foundational criteria include but are not limited to:

- mastery of mathematics content needed for teaching,
- at least a three-year consecutive trend of high ratings on annual evaluations of teaching performance while in rank of Instructional Assistant Professor,
- continued professional growth in teaching,
- outstanding performance in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- experience of at least five years as an Instructional Assistant Professor (or equivalent).

In addition to these foundational requirements, candidates for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor should exhibit substantial accomplishments beyond excellence in classroom teaching, including significant contributions in service or scholarly/creative activities. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- creation of teaching materials or pedagogical strategies that have enhanced the teaching function of the Department,
- participation in program or curriculum development or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- contributions to outreach activities,
- contributions to the scholarship of learning, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations,
- contributions to mathematical research, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations.

5.2.4 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor

Foundational criteria include but are not limited to:

- mastery of mathematics content needed for teaching,
- consecutive trend of outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance while in rank of Instructional Associate Professor,
- continued professional growth in teaching,
- outstanding performance in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- experience as an Instructional Associate Professor (or equivalent).

In addition to these foundational requirements, candidates for promotion to Instructional Professor should exhibit substantial accomplishments beyond excellence in classroom teaching, including significant contributions in service or scholarly/creative activities. While the general range of activities considered is similar to that for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, candidates for promotion to Instructional Professor should exhibit substantial impact

outside of the University or leadership of programs within the University. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- creation of teaching materials or pedagogical strategies that have enhanced the teaching function of the Department,
- participation in program or curriculum development or similar activities,
- leadership in outreach activities,
- program leadership,
- internal or external grant funding to support teaching or scholarly activities,
- invitations to speak or teach outside of the University,
- contributions to the scholarship of learning, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations,
- contributions to mathematical research, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations,
- awards at the College, University, state, or national level for outstanding teaching,
- actively assisting students in the search for academic or professional positions,
- significant service to the Department, College, University, or community,
- significant service to state, national, or international organizations.

5.3 Timing of Tenure and Promotion Review for Tenure Track Faculty

The timing of the tenure and promotion review is mandated by University regulations. Specifically, the review is conducted during the year determined as follows: calendar year hired plus the probationary period and minus 2 years equals the tenure consideration year. Normally in the Department of Mathematics, the tenure review will be conducted during the fall of an Assistant Professor's sixth year of service. An early review for tenure and promotion can be conducted when requested. While a candidate can choose to withdraw from the review process, doing so during the mandatory review also requires the submission of a written resignation letter to the Department Head.

Extension of the probationary period may be granted in special circumstances, pending approval of the Department Head, Dean, and Dean of Faculties. Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances and with approval by the Provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases: taken leave without pay or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year (provided the leave is not taken solely to enhance the faculty member's qualifications for promotion and tenure), encountered circumstances that seriously impede progress (e.g., serious illness or injury; primary care of a child or disabled or elderly relative), or serious disruption of the probationary period beyond the candidate's control.

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the Department Head and with the agreement of the Dean and the Provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a Department Head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration.

Complete promotion and tenure packets, including dossiers, external letters and departmental recommendations, are due to the Dean of the College of Science in late fall each year, **approximately the first day of November**.

5.4 Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In cases involving tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, the Dean will receive the advice of the faculty in the form of a vote and report from the Committee of Tenured Faculty (Committee T) as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee T comprises all tenured faculty of the Department of Mathematics, with the title/rank of Associate Professor, Professor, or Distinguished Professor at the time a tenure or promotion recommendation is required, with the following exceptions: any tenured faculty member excluded by the guidelines of the Dean of Faculties (e.g. faculty members who participate in the tenure process beyond the initial level,

including the Head of Department); visiting faculty of all ranks, and faculty in other departments whose courtesy or joint appointments in Mathematics were given without the vote of Committee T. All members of Committee T as defined above, including those not in residence, are eligible to vote, with the exception of any member voting at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a member of Committee T serving on a promotion advisory committee with voting privileges). All members of Committee T may attend meetings even if ineligible to vote, and the Head of Department may also attend.

The exclusions listed above may be found in the Guidelines of the Dean of Faculties at <https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Tenure%20and%20Promotion/TAMU-Guidelines-P-T-2020-21.pdf>

It is noted in the guidelines that the role of the Department Head in discussions of candidates by Committee T is restricted to procedural questions, if called upon.

Committee T shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure (Subcommittee P&T) having four members who serve two-year terms. Each year before March 1, Committee T shall elect two of the four members from a list of candidates nominated as follows. Three or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the Executive Committee; any number of others may be nominated at large by members of Committee T. The chair of Subcommittee P&T shall be appointed by the Head together with the Executive Committee. In the event of a vacancy on Subcommittee P&T, the Head shall appoint a suitable replacement.

Duties of Subcommittee P&T include conducting a third-year review of assistant professors with probationary periods of seven years or more (pursuant to University Rule 12.01.99.M2 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), assisting in the identification of candidates meriting early promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, and documenting cases for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. The third- year review shall be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. The Head shall inform Subcommittee P&T of all tenure- track faculty for whom either a third-year review is mandatory or for whom tenure review is mandatory.

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are linked for faculty members hired as Assistant Professors. Each spring, after its new members have been determined, Subcommittee P&T will begin the preparation of files documenting each candidate's teaching, research, and service records. Files will be available for inspection by all members of Committee T.

Necessary qualifications for a candidate's being promoted and given tenure are described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion) and in the Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation of the College of Science. In addition to these qualifications, a candidate's research shall be evaluated with the following in mind: 1) the quality of a candidate's research publications, judged with the help of letters from outside reviewers; 2) outside recognition; 3) research funding.

An investigation of the quality of a candidate's teaching shall include some of these: 1) examining reports of the teaching committee; 2) examining the student evaluations from a representative sample of a candidate's classes, and comparing them with both the candidate's grade distributions and the average grade distributions for the corresponding courses; 3) visiting a candidate's classes; 4) reviewing any other pertinent information.

Subcommittee P&T will select the names of experts in the candidate's field and contact them for letters of evaluation. In order to develop a balanced list of referees, Subcommittee P&T will invite the candidates, the Head, and the tenured faculty to suggest referees, and may contact outside people for suggestions. The candidate may suggest at most five referees, and may also suggest persons who should *not* be consulted. Ideally, most reviewers will be full professors at leading and/or peer institutions. Consistent with University guidelines, all letters for P&T candidates must be "arm's length." Letters from previous collaborators, former supervisors or other colleagues who are not arm's length will not be considered. Subcommittee P&T will also arrange for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching and service records.

It is the responsibility of Subcommittee P&T to monitor the receipt of materials for each candidate's file in order to ascertain that the documents requested are being received in a timely manner.

When completed a candidate's file shall contain the following items:

1. Candidate's statement on teaching, research and service; limited to 3 pages in total.
2. A curriculum vitae containing professional information that includes a complete publication list; the list of publication shall be divided into works appearing in *refereed* journals and works appearing elsewhere; work that has been accepted but not yet published should be so labeled; work that has been submitted but not yet accepted can be included provided it appears in a separate list; the candidate must sign a statement that the CV is current.
3. Verification of Contents Letter - a statement by the candidate verifying what materials he or she is submitting (as distinct from the other items in the dossier, such as committee reports etc.).
4. Departmental Reports evaluating Teaching, Research, Service and Other Activities - written by Subcommittee P&T (revised, as appropriate, after Committee T deliberations and vote - see below); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations and reports of classroom visits, and a Teaching Evaluation Table (see Section 3.1) which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate while in rank as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Mathematics.
5. Outside Reviewer's Letters - should include a list of all referees contacted; those suggested by the candidate should be designated as such; referee qualifications should also be included; letters to the referees and all communications received from the referees should be included.
6. Overall Departmental Report - written by Subcommittee P&T after deliberations and vote (see below) on overall recommendations regarding the candidate's promotion case.
7. Department Head Recommendation - written after deliberations and vote (see below).
8. Copies of all published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works.
9. Any statement or materials the candidate may wish to submit.

Additional details on these items are given in the University Tenure and Promotion Submission Guidelines.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee P&T shall report to Committee T on each candidate at a meeting, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Teaching reports and annual evaluations by the Head will also be made available to Committee T. Committee T shall discuss the reports and the candidates' cases. After the deliberations of Committee T are completed, Subcommittee P&T shall poll the members of Committee T in a de-identified ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is *two-thirds* or more of the ballots cast for or against and at least *half* of the number of eligible voters, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee T to grant tenure and promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee T to grant neither tenure nor promotion. The Department Head will notify each candidate of the committee recommendation.

Subcommittee P&T shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee T. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee T who will indicate by signature or by e-mail message that they are accurate accounts of the discussions held by Committee T. Any member (or group of members) of Committee T who feels that a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee T may append a signed letter to the report in question. These reports and any appended letters shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee T on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, except in the following instance. Regardless of the positive or negative vote, the dossier shall be forwarded to the Dean unless the candidate makes a written request to the Head that the file be withdrawn.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.

5.5 Procedures for Promotion to Professor

In a case of promotion to the rank of Professor, the Dean will receive the advice of the faculty through an advisory vote by the Committee of Professors (Committee P) and a written report on each candidate as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee P comprises all tenured faculty of the Department of Mathematics, with the title/rank of Professor or Distinguished Professor at the time a promotion recommendation is required, with the following exceptions: any tenured faculty member excluded by the guidelines of the Dean of Faculties (e.g. faculty members who participate in the promotion process beyond the initial level, including the Head of Department); visiting faculty of all ranks, and faculty in other departments whose courtesy or joint appointments in Mathematics were given without the vote of Committee P. All members of Committee P as defined above, including those not in residence, are eligible to vote, with the exception of any member voting at a level beyond the Department (e.g. a member of Committee P serving on a promotion advisory committee with voting privileges). All members of Committee P may attend meetings even if ineligible to vote, and the Head of Department may also attend.

The exclusions listed above may be found in the Guidelines of the Dean of Faculties at <https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Tenure%20and%20Promotion/TAMU-Guidelines-P-T-2020-21.pdf>

It is noted in the guidelines that the role of the Department Head in discussions of candidates by Committee P is restricted to procedural questions, if called upon.

Committee P shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion (Subcommittee P) having four members who serve two-year terms. Each year before March 1, Committee P shall elect two of the four members from a list of candidates nominated as follows. Three or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the Executive Committee; any number of others may be nominated at large by members of Committee P. The chair of Subcommittee P shall be appointed by the Head and the Executive Committee. In the event of a vacancy on Subcommittee P, the Head shall appoint a suitable replacement.

Duties of Subcommittee P include assisting in the identification of candidates meriting promotion to Professor and documenting cases for promotion to Professor.

Candidates recommended for promotion to Professor shall be selected in the following way. In a scheduled meeting of Committee P, Subcommittee P shall report on possible candidates for promotion to Professor. Additional candidates may be suggested by Committee P. Any members of Committee P unable to attend may communicate suggestions and concerns in writing to the whole committee. In its deliberations, Committee P shall have full access to the *curriculum vitae* of all associate professors, Annual Reports from the past three years, and Annual Reviews from the department. Should no consensus emerge at this meeting, Subcommittee P shall issue a written ballot to Committee P to obtain an advisory vote. Faculty members recommended by the committee will be contacted and given the choice to be a promotion candidate. According to university rules, a faculty member not recommended must also be considered if requested by the faculty member, unless they were considered as a promotion candidate the previous year with recommendation letters solicited by the subcommittee. Such requests must be made by the end of the spring semester. Requests by faculty members for whom promotion materials were developed during the previous year will be granted at the discretion of the Dean of Faculties, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department, and will typically only be granted if substantial new evidence of excellence has been established in at least one area of faculty performance.

Subcommittee P will then begin the preparation of files documenting each promotion candidate's teaching, research, and service records. Subcommittee P will select the names of experts in the candidate's field and contact them for letters of evaluation. In order to develop a balanced list of referees, Subcommittee P will invite the candidates, the Head, and Committee P to suggest referees, and may contact outside people for suggestions. A candidate may suggest at most five referees, and may also suggest persons who should *not* be consulted. Consistent with University guidelines, all letters for P&T candidates must be "arm's length." Letters from previous collaborators, former supervisors or other colleagues who are not arm's length will not be considered. Subcommittee P will also arrange for

evaluation of the candidate's teaching and service records. Files developed during the review process will be kept in a central place and will be available for inspection by all members of Committee P.

It is the responsibility of Subcommittee P to monitor the receipt of materials for each candidate's file in order to ascertain that the documents requested are being received in a timely manner.

When completed a candidate's file shall contain the following items:

1. Candidate's statement on teaching, research and service; limited to 3 pages in total.
2. A curriculum vitae containing professional information that includes a complete publication list; the list of publications shall be divided into works appearing in refereed journals and works appearing elsewhere; work that has been accepted but not yet published should be so labeled; work that has been submitted but not yet accepted can be included provided it appears in a separate list; the candidate must sign a statement that the CV is current.
3. Verification of contents letter - a statement by the candidate verifying what materials he or she is submitting (as distinct from the other items in the dossier, such as committee reports, etc.).
4. Departmental Reports evaluating the Teaching, Research, Service and Other Activities - written by Subcommittee P (revised, as appropriate, after Committee P deliberations and vote - see below); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations during the candidate's tenure as an associate professor, reports of classroom visits, and a Teaching Evaluation Table (see Section 3.1) which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate during tenure.
5. Outside Reviewer's Letters - should include a list of all referees contacted; those suggested by the candidate should be designated as such; referee qualifications should also be included; letters to the referees and all communications received from the referees should be included.
6. Overall Departmental Report - written by Subcommittee P after deliberations and vote (see below) on overall recommendations regarding the candidate's promotion case.
7. Department Head Recommendation - written after deliberations and vote (see below).
8. Copies of selected published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works.
9. Any statement or materials the candidate may wish to submit.

Additional details on these items are given in the University Tenure and Promotion Submission Guidelines.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee P shall report to Committee P on each candidate at a meeting, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Teaching reports and annual evaluations by the Head will also be made available to Committee P. Committee P shall discuss the reports and the candidates' cases. After the deliberations of Committee P are completed, Subcommittee P shall poll the members of Committee P in a de-identified ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is two-thirds of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee P to grant promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee P not to promote. The Department Head will notify each candidate of the committee recommendation.

Subcommittee P shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee P. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee P, who will indicate by signature or by e-mail message that they are accurate accounts of the discussions held by Committee P. Any member (or group of members) of Committee P who feels that a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee P may append a signed letter to the report in question. These reports and any appended letters shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee P on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, unless the candidate makes a written request to the Head that the file be withdrawn. A candidate has the right, regardless of a positive or negative vote, to withdraw their dossier at any time in the promotion process.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.

5.6 Procedures for Tenured Appointments

In the case of an applicant being considered for a tenured appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, it shall be the responsibility of the Head and the Executive Committee to prepare an appropriate file and present the case for tenure to Committee T. The members of Committee T shall be polled in a de-identified ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to grant a tenured appointment to a candidate is two-thirds or more of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee T to grant a tenured appointment. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee T not to grant a tenured appointment.

5.7 Appeals

University policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.1 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If the faculty member alleges such a violation, he/she should discuss the matter with the Department Head and, if necessary, the Dean. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

5.8 Procedures for Promotion and Transition for APT Faculty

The promotion process for APT faculty is very similar to that of tenured and tenure-track faculty and is on the same timeline as all other promotions. The process is unique, however, in several ways, as stated in the Dean of Faculties guidelines. Importantly, the University does not require support letters for APT faculty promotions. However, the College does require, at a minimum, three internal letters of support for promotions to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor. The Department may request external letters when appropriate for evaluation of a candidate's contributions. APT promotion dossiers are evaluated as described in sections 5.8.1-5.8.4 below.

5.8.1 Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

In cases involving promotion to Senior Lecturer, the Dean will receive the advice of the APT faculty in the form of a vote and report from Committee L&I, as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee L&I comprises all Senior Lecturers and all Instructional Assistant, Instructional Associate, and Instructional Professors in the Department, with the exception of any individuals who will serve as evaluators of the candidate at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a voting member of the College of Science committee on promotions). Although the Head is not a member of Committee L&I, the chair of Committee L&I has the discretion to invite the Head to attend Committee L&I meetings. Committee L&I shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion (Subcommittee L&I) comprised of four members of Committee L&I, along with one tenured faculty member, with all members serving two-year terms. Each year, before March 1, Committee L&I shall elect two of four Subcommittee members from a list of candidates nominated as follows: three or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the APTC; any number of additional candidates may be nominated at large by members of Committee L&I. The tenured faculty member shall be appointed by the Head. The chair of Subcommittee L&I shall be appointed by the Head, together with the APTC. In the event of a vacancy on Subcommittee L&I, the Head shall appoint a suitable replacement. The appointed tenured faculty member will not vote on any promotions to Senior Lecturer.

Duties of Subcommittee L&I include assisting in the identification of candidates meriting promotion to Senior Lecturer, overseeing the discussions of promotion candidates in Committee L&I, and documenting the promotion cases for candidates who are put forward. Each spring, after its new members have been determined, Subcommittee L&I will compile data related to the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity record of each Lecturer in the Department and will present a list of candidates recommended for promotion to Committee L&I. In addition, any member of Committee L&I may suggest additional candidates for discussion. After the discussions of Committee L&I are complete, Subcommittee L&I shall poll the members of Committee L&I in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to put the candidate forward for promotion is at least two-thirds the

ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee L&I to put the candidate forward. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee L&I not to put the candidate forward. In addition, any APT faculty member in the rank of Lecturer for whom the Department did not develop promotion materials during the previous year must be considered for promotion upon request. Such requests must be made by the end of the spring semester. Consideration of faculty members for whom promotion materials were developed during the previous year is up to the discretion of the Dean of Faculties, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department, and will typically only be granted if substantial new evidence of excellence has been established in at least one area of faculty performance.

Necessary qualifications for a candidate's being promoted are described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), available from the Dean of Faculties web pages, <http://dof.tamu.edu/>. Consistent with these guidelines and the criteria described in Section 5, candidates will be evaluated solely in the category of teaching. A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's teaching shall include some of these: examining a candidate's teaching folder; observing a candidate's teaching; examining the student evaluations from a representative sample of a candidate's classes, and comparing them with both the candidate's grade distributions and the average grade distributions for the corresponding courses; noting any awards for teaching the candidate may have received; reviewing any other pertinent information.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the candidate: Candidate's statement on teaching and, if applicable, a statement on research and service (limited to a total of 3 pages); a curriculum vitae that includes a list of courses taught, service activities, and scholarly/creative activities; a teaching portfolio, including samples of course materials such as syllabi, notes, assignments, and exams, along with documentation of any special teaching assignments such as weekly reviews and instruction of extremely large sections, and any teaching techniques or technologies; any other relevant materials the faculty member wishes to provide; copies of all published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works (if applicable). Additional required documentation, as described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), is available from the Dean of Faculties website, <http://dof.tamu.edu/>.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the Department:

1. Departmental reports evaluating the teaching, research (if applicable), service and other activities, written by Subcommittee L&I (revised, as appropriate, after Committee L&I deliberations and vote (see below)); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations and reports of mathematics faculty evaluation of teaching.
2. The overall Departmental report, written by Subcommittee L&I after deliberations and vote (see below), along with an overall recommendation regarding the candidate's promotion case; the Department Head recommendation, written after deliberations and vote (see below).

In addition to submitting materials, a candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer will make a presentation to all faculty that addresses specific techniques or aspects of their teaching that showcase their efforts to extend student learning of and interest in mathematics. This may include techniques used to (a) deepen their students' understanding of the mathematical content they teach, (b) improve their students' outlook about doing and learning mathematics, (c) inspire or encourage students to be curious and investigate mathematics at a deeper level, (d) encourage students to engage in mathematical discussions with peers, and (e) broaden their students' understanding of how mathematics is used in various industries and professions. The presentation should also address unique aspects of their teaching style, evidence of their overall impact on students they taught, and any other items related to teaching that may not be adequately captured within their teaching statement and curriculum vitae.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee L&I shall submit a preliminary report to Committee L&I on each candidate, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Committee L&I shall meet and discuss the reports and each candidate's case. After the deliberations of Committee L&I are complete,

Subcommittee L&I shall poll the members of Committee L&I in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is at least two-thirds of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee L&I to grant promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee L&I not to promote.

Subcommittee L&I shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee L&I. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee L&I. Members of Committee L&I will be asked to verify, by signature, they agree the final report accurately reflects the deliberations of Committee L&I. Any member of Committee L&I who feels a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee L&I may, in lieu of signing, append a letter to the report in question. These reports, any appended letters, and the results of the vote shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee L&I on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, unless the candidate makes a written request that the file be withdrawn. A candidate has the right, regardless of a positive or negative vote, to withdraw their dossier at any time in the promotion process.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.

5.8.2 Procedures for Transition to Instructional Assistant Professor

In cases involving the transition from Lecturer or Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor, the Dean will receive a recommendation from the Head and documents from the candidate. This transition does not constitute a promotion, but rather should be viewed as a re-hiring into a different academic track, with pay commensurate with the new track. The process is initiated by the Head.

Each Spring semester, the Head, in consultation with APT faculty in the Instructional ranks who sit on the Academic Professional Track Committee (APTC), will evaluate the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities of all Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and will create a list of all candidates recommended for transition to Instructional Assistant Professor. The Head will formally invite each recommended candidate to submit a curriculum vitae that includes a list of courses taught, service activities, and scholarly/creative activities; a statement of their teaching philosophy; and a description of all their contributions to the Department, both past and envisioned, that go beyond the Department's standard teaching mission. These documents are submitted to the Assistant Head for APT Faculty Affairs who then writes a one-page report of the candidate's accomplishments and potential as an Instructional Assistant Professor. This report, and all of the candidate's documents, are submitted for further review to all ranks of the instructional faculty and all ranks of the tenure-track faculty, and these groups will provide feedback to the Head on the candidate's suitability for transition. After considering the Assistant Head's report, feedback from the faculty, and the documents submitted to the Assistant Head by the candidate, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. The recommendations and reports shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head.

5.8.3 Procedures for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

In cases involving promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, the Dean will receive the advice of the faculty in the form of a vote and report from Committee I&T, as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee I&T comprises all Associate Professors and Professors in the Department, excluding the Head (Committee P&T), along with all Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors in the Department (Committee I), with the exception of any individuals who will serve as an evaluator of the candidate at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a voting member of the College of Science committee on promotions, the Dean of Faculties, the Provost and the President), should those people hold appointments in Mathematics, visiting faculty of all ranks, and faculty in other departments whose courtesy or joint appointments in Mathematics were given without the vote of Committee I or Committee T. Although the Head is not a member of Committee I&T, the chair of Committee I&T has the discretion to

invite the Head to attend Committee I&T meetings. Committee I&T shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion (Subcommittee I&T) comprising the four members of Subcommittee P&T, along with two faculty members holding the rank of Instructional Associate Professor or Instructional Professor. Each year, before March 1, Committee I&T shall elect one of its APT members from a list of candidates nominated as follows: two or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the APTC; any number of additional candidates may be nominated at large by members of Committee I&T. Each APT member will serve a two-year term.

Duties of Subcommittee I&T include assisting in the identification of candidates meriting promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, overseeing the discussions of promotion candidates in Committee I&T, and documenting the promotion cases for candidates who are put forward. Each spring, after its new members have been determined, Subcommittee I&T will evaluate the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity record of each Instructional Assistant Professor in the Department and will present to Committee I&T a list of candidates recommended for promotion. In addition, any member of Committee I&T can suggest additional candidates for discussion. After the discussions of Committee I&T are complete, Subcommittee I&T shall poll the members of Committee I&T in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to put the candidate forward for promotion is at least two-thirds the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee I&T to put the candidate forward. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee I&T not to put the candidate forward. In addition, any APT faculty member in the rank of Instructional Assistant Professor for whom the Department did not develop promotion materials during the previous year must be considered for promotion upon request. Such requests must be made by the end of the spring semester. Consideration of faculty members for whom promotion materials were developed during the previous year is up to the discretion of the Dean of Faculties, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department, and will typically only be granted if substantial new evidence of excellence has been established in at least one area of faculty performance.

Necessary qualifications for a candidate's being promoted are described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), available from the Dean of Faculties web pages, <http://dof.tamu.edu/>. Consistent with these guidelines and the criteria described in Section 5, candidates will be evaluated in the categories of teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities, with the following items in mind.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's teaching shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's teaching folder; examining the student evaluations from a representative sample of a candidate's classes, and comparing them with both the candidate's grade distributions and the average grade distributions for the corresponding courses; visiting a candidate's classes; noting any awards for teaching the candidate may have received; reviewing any other pertinent information.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's service shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's performance in assigned leadership duties such as course coordination, week-in- reviews, make-up exam coordination, and help session oversight; evaluating a candidate's contributions in curriculum development; service on Departmental or University committees; service as a Department advisor; service as a faculty advisor for a student organization; participation in outreach activities; awards for service.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's scholarly/creative activities shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's record in activities such as publication of scholarly articles, publication of books, conference presentations; textbook reviews; consulting; and leadership in professional organizations.

Subcommittee I&T will select the names of three or more suitable references for each candidate and contact these references for letters of evaluation. In order to develop a balanced list of references, Subcommittee I&T will compile an internal list of candidates, possibly in consultation with other members of the broader Committee I&T, and will also invite the candidate to submit a list of proposed references. The candidate may suggest at most three references and

may also suggest persons who should not be consulted. However, the final choice of references should include at least two individuals from Subcommittee I&T's internal list. Letters are allowed from members of Committee I&T, and members of Committee I&T who write letters on behalf of the promotion candidate are allowed to vote on the candidate's promotion. It is the responsibility of Subcommittee I&T to monitor the receipt of materials for each candidate's file in order to ascertain that the documents requested are being received in a timely manner. A total of at least three letters will be required for each candidate, and at least two letters should address teaching or pedagogy, either by directly addressing the teaching or pedagogy of the candidate or by addressing impact the candidate has had on teaching or pedagogy.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the candidate: Candidate's statement on teaching, research (if applicable), and service (limited to 3 pages total); a curriculum vitae that includes a list of courses taught, service activities, and scholarly/creative activities; a teaching portfolio, including samples of course materials such as syllabi, notes, assignments, and exams, along with documentation of any special teaching assignments such as weekly reviews and instruction of extremely large sections, and any teaching techniques or technologies that lead to improved student learning or students' educational experience; any other relevant materials the faculty member wishes to provide; copies of all published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works (if applicable). Additional required documentation, as described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), is available from the Dean of Faculties website, <http://dof.tamu.edu/>.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the Department:

1. Departmental Reports evaluating the teaching, research (if applicable), service and other activities, written by Subcommittee I&T (revised, as appropriate, after Committee I&T deliberations and vote (see below)); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations and reports of mathematics faculty evaluation of teaching. A list of all references contacted should be provided, along with a copy of the solicitation letter; references suggested by the candidate should be designated as such and reference qualifications should also be included.
2. The Overall Departmental Report, written by Subcommittee I&T after deliberations and vote (see below), along with an overall recommendation regarding the candidate's promotion case; the Department Head Recommendation, written after deliberations and vote (see below).

In addition to submitting materials, a candidate for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor will make a presentation to all faculty that addresses specific techniques or aspects of their teaching that showcase their efforts to extend student learning of and interest in mathematics. This presentation should include techniques or aspects used while in the rank of Instructional Assistant Professor. Candidates may include techniques used to (a) deepen their students' understanding of the mathematical content they teach; (b) improve their students' outlook about doing and learning mathematics; (c) inspire or encourage their students to be curious and investigate mathematics at a deeper level; (d) encourage their students to engage in mathematical discussions with peers; and (e) broaden their students' understanding of how mathematics is used in various industries and professions. The presentation should also address unique aspects of their teaching style, evidence of their overall impact on students they taught, and any other items related to teaching that may not be adequately captured within their teaching statement and curriculum vitae.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee I&T shall submit a preliminary report to Committee I&T on each candidate, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Committee I&T shall meet and discuss the reports and the candidates' cases. After the deliberations of Committee I&T are complete, Subcommittee I&T shall poll the members of Committee I&T in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is at least two-thirds of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee I&T to grant promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee I&T not to promote.

Subcommittee I&T shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee I&T. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee I&T. Members of Committee I&T will be asked to verify, by signature, they agree the final report accurately reflects the deliberations of Committee I&T. Any member of Committee I&T who feels a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee I&T may, in lieu of signing, append a letter to the report in question. These reports, any appended letters, and the results of the vote shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee I&T on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, unless the candidate makes a written request that the file be withdrawn. A candidate has the right, regardless of the positive or negative vote, to withdraw their dossier at any time in the promotion process.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.

5.8.4 Procedures for Promotion to Instructional Professor

In cases involving promotion to Instructional Professor, the Dean will receive the advice of the faculty in the form of a vote and report from Committee P&IP, as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee P&IP comprises all Professors in the Department, excluding the Head (Committee P), along with all Instructional Professors in the Department (Committee IP), with the exception of any individuals who will serve as an evaluator of the candidate at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a voting member of the College of Science committee on promotions, the Dean of Faculties, the Provost and the President), should those people hold appointments in Mathematics, visiting faculty of all ranks, and faculty in other Departments whose courtesy or joint appointments in Mathematics were given without the vote of Committee P or Committee IP. Although the Head is not a member of Committee P&IP, the chair of Committee P&IP has the discretion to invite the Head to attend Committee P&IP meetings. Committee P&IP shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion (Subcommittee P&IP) comprising the four members of Subcommittee P, along with two faculty members holding the rank of Instructional Professor. Each year, before March 1, Committee P&IP shall elect one of its APT members from a list of candidates nominated as follows: two or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the APTC; any number of additional candidates may be nominated at large by members of Committee P&IP. If the Department does not have at least two APT faculty members in the rank of Instructional Professor, then Subcommittee P&IP shall be allowed to consist of four or five members, rather than the full six. Each APT member will serve a two-year term.

Duties of Subcommittee P&IP include assisting in the identification of candidates meriting promotion to Instructional Professor, overseeing the discussions of promotion candidates in Committee P&IP, and documenting the promotion cases for candidates who are put forward. Each spring, after its new members have been determined, Subcommittee P&IP will evaluate the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity record of each Instructional Associate Professor in the Department and will present, to Committee P&IP, a list of candidates recommended for promotion. In addition, any member of Committee P&IP can suggest additional candidates for discussion. After the discussions of Committee P&IP are complete, Subcommittee P&IP shall poll the members of Committee P&IP in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to put the candidate forward for promotion is at least two-thirds the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee P&IP to put the candidate forward. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee P&IP not to put the candidate forward. In addition, any APT faculty member in the rank of Instruction Associate Professor for whom the Department did not develop promotion materials during the previous year must be considered for promotion upon request. Such requests must be made by the end of the spring semester. Consideration of faculty members for whom promotion materials were developed during the previous year is up to the discretion of the Dean of Faculties, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department, and will typically only be granted if substantial new evidence of excellence has been established in at least one area of faculty performance.

Necessary qualifications for a candidate's being promoted are described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), available from the Dean of Faculties web pages, <http://dof.tamu.edu/>. Consistent with these guidelines and the criteria described in Section 5, candidates will be evaluated in the categories of teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities, with the following items in mind.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's teaching shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's teaching folder; examining the student evaluations from a representative sample of a candidate's classes, and comparing them with both the candidate's grade distributions and the average grade distributions for the corresponding courses; visiting a candidate's classes; noting any awards for teaching the candidate may have received; reviewing any other pertinent information.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's service shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's performance in assigned leadership duties such as course coordination, week-in- reviews, make-up exam coordination, and help session oversight; evaluating a candidate's contributions in curriculum development; service on Departmental or University committees; service as a Department advisor; service as a faculty advisor for a student organization; participation in outreach activities; awards for service.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's scholarly/creative activities shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's record in activities such as publication of scholarly articles; publication of books; presentations of scholarly work at conferences; textbook reviews; consulting; and leadership in professional organizations.

Subcommittee P&IP will select the names of three or more suitable references for each candidate and contact these references for letters of evaluation. In order to develop a balanced list of references, Subcommittee P&IP will both compile an internal list of candidates, possibly in consultation with other members of the broader Committee P&IP, and will also invite the candidates to submit a list of proposed references. The candidate may suggest at most three references and may also suggest persons who should not be consulted. However, the final choice of references should include at least two individuals from Subcommittee P&IP's internal list. Letters are allowed from members of Committee P&IP, and members of Committee P&IP who write letters on behalf of the promotion candidate are allowed to vote on the candidate's promotion. It is the responsibility of Subcommittee P&IP to monitor the receipt of materials for each candidate's file in order to ascertain that the documents requested are being received in a timely manner. A total of at least three letters will be required for each candidate, and at least two letters should address teaching or pedagogy, either by directly addressing the teaching or pedagogy of the candidate or by addressing impact the candidate has had on teaching or pedagogy.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the candidate: Candidate's statement on teaching, research (if applicable) and service (limited to 3 pages total); A curriculum vitae that includes a list of courses taught, service activities, and scholarly/creative activities; a teaching portfolio, including samples of course materials such as syllabi, notes, assignments, and exams, along with documentation of any special teaching assignments such as weekly reviews and extremely large sections, and any teaching techniques or technologies that lead to improved student learning or students' educational experiences; any other relevant materials the faculty member wishes to provide; copies of all published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works (if applicable). Additional required documentation, as described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), is available from the Dean of Faculties website, <http://dof.tamu.edu/>.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the Department:

1. Departmental Reports evaluating the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities, written by Subcommittee P&IP (revised, as appropriate, after Committee P&IP deliberations and vote (see below)); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations and reports of mathematics faculty evaluation of

teaching. A list of all references contacted should be provided, along with a copy of the specific questions posed to the references; references suggested by the candidate should be designated as such; reference qualifications should also be included.

2. The Overall Departmental Report, written by Subcommittee P&IP after deliberations and vote (see below), along with an overall recommendation regarding the candidate's promotion case; the Department Head Recommendation, written after deliberations and vote (see below).

In addition to submitted materials, a candidate for promotion to Instructional Professor will make a presentation to all faculty that addresses specific techniques or aspects of their teaching that showcase their efforts to extend student learning of and interest in mathematics. This presentation should include techniques or aspects used while in the rank of Instructional Associate Professor. Candidates may include techniques used to (a) deepen their students' understanding of the mathematical content they teach; (b) improve their students' outlook about doing and learning mathematics; (c) inspire or encourage their students to be curious and investigate mathematics at a deeper level; (d) encourage their students to engage in mathematical discussions with peers; and (e) broaden their students' understanding of how mathematics is used in various industries and professions. The presentation should also address unique aspects of their teaching style, evidence of their overall impact on students they taught, and any other items related to teaching that may not be adequately captured within their teaching statement and curriculum vitae.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee P&IP shall submit a preliminary report to Committee P&IP on each candidate, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Committee P&IP shall meet and discuss the reports and the candidates' cases. After the deliberations of Committee P&IP are complete, Subcommittee P&IP shall poll the members of Committee P&IP in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is at least two-thirds of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee P&IP to grant promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee P&IP not to promote.

Subcommittee P&IP shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee P&IP. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee P&IP. Members of Committee P&IP will be asked to verify, by signature, they agree the final report accurately reflects the deliberations of Committee P&IP. Any member of Committee P&IP who feels a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee P&IP may, in lieu of signing, append a letter to the report in question. These reports, any appended letters, and the results of the vote shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee P&IP on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, unless the candidate makes a written request that the file be withdrawn. A candidate has the right, regardless of the positive or negative vote, to withdraw their dossier at any time in the promotion process.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are conducted in accordance with Section 2.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). In this section, the Department of Mathematics provides general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the Department.

All University-employed faculty members must have an annual written review.

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

The department conducts its annual evaluations of tenure track and tenured faculty as peer evaluations by the department's Executive Committee (EC), and of APT faculty as peer evaluations by the department's APT Committee (APTC). The EC, chaired by the Head, consists of six tenured faculty members, four of whom are elected and two of whom are appointed by the Head. In addition, there are two ex officio members, the Head and the Associate Head for Operations. Elected and appointed members serve two-year terms, with two elected by the Tenure Track faculty and one appointed by the Head each year. The APTC, chaired by the Assistant Head for APT Faculty, consists of four APT faculty members elected by APT faculty, each serving a two-year term, and one tenured professor appointed by the Head.

Many activities of faculty contribute to more than one area of performance. For example, direction of graduate student theses contributes to research, but also to graduate teaching. Organization of a major conference and membership on editorial boards are examples of service to the mathematical community but they are also indicators of respect of the faculty member's research. The narrative explaining the evaluation will refer to all categories of performance. Where appropriate, evaluations of research, teaching, and service will incorporate interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaborations, work that enhances diversity, and international activities. A summary written evaluation statement is given to each faculty member during the summer. The components are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2. Annual reviews provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his/her departmental leadership. A follow-up evaluation meeting with the Head is mandated for all Assistant Professors. The Head communicates the evaluation results including projected progress towards tenure and promotion. Follow-up meetings with other faculty are conducted upon request of the faculty member.

Visiting Assistant Professors in continuing appointments will be reviewed by the Head in consultation with the faculty member's mentor. Service is not expected of such faculty and so the review centers mostly on progress in research and teaching.

6.1 Purpose

The annual review provides evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position. It provides developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved. It creates a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations. It provides feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.

See [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#). The annual review is part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which 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 serves as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For APT faculty, the annual review provides an evaluation of performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable. See Section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 Time Period of Review

For the annual review, each tenure track faculty member is expected to submit a report by the end of January each year that details his or her accomplishments in research, teaching, and service over the previous three calendar years. Faculty research programs require long periods of time to develop and thus cannot be sufficiently evaluated by looking only at the previous year's progress. Thus, the department strongly feels that a three-year window is best suited for the purpose of "annual reviews" of tenure track faculty. Each APT faculty member is expected to submit a report detailing accomplishments in the previous year.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation of performance, the faculty member is assigned an overall rating chosen from: "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement", "Meets Expectations/Satisfactory," "Good", and "Excellent" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**, with some finer gradations (i.e. + or -). This is determined by a careful consideration of the contributions in the areas of research, teaching and service, as appropriate for faculty track and rank. Greater emphasis is placed on research for tenure track faculty, and on teaching for APT faculty.

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

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have specific areas of teaching performance needing improvement.

Meets Expectations/Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.

Good - strong evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching.

Excellent – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category shall be outstanding classroom educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

As part of the annual evaluation of teaching, each tenure track faculty member's student evaluations will be read by the Executive Committee and each APT faculty member's student evaluations will be read by the APTC. If there are perceived deficiencies in teaching, the Teaching Committee may be asked for a further report.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**. Committees evaluating faculty will have conversations about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to conduct evaluations fairly.

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research and Scholarly Activity are:

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, for example, publications, presentations, citations, and so forth.

Meets Expectations/Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, quality publications, presentations, citations, and other factors.

Good - strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.

Excellent – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include: high quality publications, funding, citations, and invited presentations.

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

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in citizenship and service.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in citizenship and service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement in departmental service.

Meets Expectations/Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in citizenship and service. Those in this category will be involved in local service appropriate for their career stage and assignment.

Good - strong evidence of **effectiveness** in citizenship and service.

Excellent – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in citizenship and service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful service activities, administrative duties, and/or outreach efforts.

6.5 Required Components

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

6.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities

The faculty member's report of previous activities shall follow the template provided to faculty towards the end of the fall semester each year. The report will be focused on a three-year window in the case of tenure track faculty, but will allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred. The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

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

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period,

they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the department head’s, director’s, or supervisor’s written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

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

6.5.3 Meeting between the department head or supervisor and the faculty member

All Assistant Professors must meet with the Department Head to discuss their annual evaluation and expectations for the future. Each faculty member in a continuing appointment as a Visiting Assistant Professor must meet with the Head to discuss progress and determine that the faculty member is receiving proper guidance and mentoring. Follow up meetings with other faculty are conducted on request of the faculty member. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment

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

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the established criteria (see Section 6.4). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 8.2) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an “Unsatisfactory” peer review (see section 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 8), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.7 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ *Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Reviews* states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.”

7. Mid-Term Review

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

7.1 Purpose

A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period. This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision. This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress. It will mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; internal letters of recommendation are solicited from departmental experts in the assistant professor's research area, rather than external letters. The mid-term review is conducted by Subcommittee P&T, department head, the college P&T committee, and dean. This review will result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period. Expectations for service are minimal at this level.

7.2 Process

The mid-term review will be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year.

Dossiers for the mid-term review. Mid-term reviews are a very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty. These early reviews are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. Faculty members will be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period. Candidates' dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for tenure and promotion, except that external letters are not required. Additionally, work under review or in progress is of special importance in mid-term evaluations. The curriculum vitae must clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications.

Mid-term college-level reviews require copies of all annual review evaluations and letters. The mid-term dossier also includes separate reports on teaching, research, and service, and a summary report, written by Subcommittee P&T. The teaching documentation contains evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the educational mission of the department and an evaluation of teaching quality. Reports on peer review or classroom visitations are included. A summary of numerical teaching evaluations from individual courses is required by the College. The recommendation letter from the Department Head indicates overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

7.3 Feedback from Mid-Term review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through Mid-Term review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head, and departmental faculty.

8. Post-Tenure Review

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

- 1) Annual performance peer reviews (see Section 6) by the Executive Committee and the Head of the Department of Mathematics.
- 2) Periodic peer review by the Executive Committee and Department Head (see Section 8.2).

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Peer review committee

Post-tenure review of all tenured faculty in the College of Science is required. In the Department of Mathematics, the Executive Committee serves as a peer review committee in conducting annual reviews of all tenured faculty members. These annual peer reviews will be augmented and informed periodically with a comprehensive review—Periodic Peer Review—from the Executive Committee on a faculty member's contributions in all areas. This will occur prior to the sixth anniversary of the date of the awarding of tenure and at least once every six years thereafter. The Head will inform the faculty member prior to the Periodic Peer Review.

Periodic Peer Review is a more comprehensive review once every six years for tenured faculty members, and consists of the following.

8.3 Process

The annual review of tenured faculty is an evaluation of the faculty member's scholarly productivity in teaching, research and service in accordance with the criteria for categories of performance as in Section 3. This annual review shall be used to determine the merit of the faculty member's performance and accomplishments. An annual review resulting in an overall unsatisfactory performance rating shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria described above. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean of the College of Science accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement.

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by the Executive Committee for Periodic Peer Review will include the curriculum vitae, student evaluations, and the annual activity reports for the previous four years submitted by the faculty member and any additional materials the faculty member may wish to provide.

8.3.2 The Executive Committee will review the submitted materials and provide an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings will follow the criteria established and be consistent with annual evaluations.

8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to Periodic Peer Review again in six years or following an unsatisfactory annual evaluation and requested Periodic Peer Review, whichever is earlier.

8.3.4 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in these guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

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

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

8.3.7 **By no later than May 31**, the Department will provide to the Dean 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 member last underwent a review. The Executive Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives an “Unsatisfactory” annual review (see Section 6) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/ director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” acceptable to the dean.

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

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

8.4.2.1 The Dean will meet with the Department Head and the faculty member to determine the membership of the Professional Development Review committee. The committee will consist of three faculty members at rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. Membership on the review committee will depend on the specific responsibilities and assignments of the faculty member under review.

8.4.2.2 Once charged, the College of Science requires that the ad hoc Professional Development Review committee meet and evaluate all of the materials described in Section 8.4.3 below and any other documentation provided by the Department Head.

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will

differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

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

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

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

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

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

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

8.6 Appeal

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

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

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

8.8 Flexibility

Flexibility should accrue with seniority. Flexible guidelines are appropriate during post-tenure review. This faculty evaluation process should assess the contribution of a faculty member toward carrying out the university's overall missions. Thus, determination of what constitutes a satisfactory evaluation in all categories of research, teaching, and service should be guided by flexible criteria. The criteria described in the department guidelines for post-tenure review should take such flexibility into consideration.

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus/Emerita Status

[University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus/emera status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered. For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see [Institutional Rule 31.08.01](#), which indicates the process for this situation. See the Dean of Faculties website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus/emera status.