Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.

-- For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to University Rule12.01.99.M2. Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:

--Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit. The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.

--Dean of Faculties

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance 3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness 3-4
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure 4
6. Annual Review 4-9
7. Mid-Term Review 9-10
8. Post-Tenure Review 10-13
1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Architecture (ARCH) is as follows:

*The Department of Architecture educates students in the history, theory, and practice of architectural and environmental design to maximize creative impact on the global societies of the 21st century. To achieve this mission, and in keeping with the mandate of a land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant university, the department creates and disseminates new knowledge by actively engaging in teaching, research, and service to design and deploy environments that foster economic, social, and ecological responsibility at all scales.*

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 Architecture for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field 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; such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general departmental guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</td>
<td><a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</td>
<td><a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty Titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their department.

2.1. Transfer between Tenure and Academic Professional Tracks

Individuals who received an initial tenure-track appointment may apply for an open, advertised academic professional track position should the latter be available. Faculty members initially appointed to academic professional track positions may similarly apply for open tenure-track positions. Such applications will be evaluated by the same processes as any other applicant for such a position. If an academic professional track faculty member is subsequently appointed to a tenure-track position, his or her probationary period will start at the time consistent with University regulations for tenure-track appointments.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1; and TAMU 2020-2021 P&T Guidelines)

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, and/or creative work; and service). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) 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 assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College and the Department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty per their annual appointment letter. 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 College’s instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

In the Department of Architecture, teaching occurs in a wide variety of settings, such as lecture halls, conference rooms, laboratories (both student labs and research labs), design studios, online or virtual environments, and numerous off-campus venues. Our students include undergraduates, professional (M.Arch.) students, graduate students, (M.S. and Ph.D.) and post-doctoral students. Accomplishment in teaching is an important consideration in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. See section 4.1 and 4.2 for forms of evidence of Excellence and Effectiveness in teaching.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work

The Department of Architecture expects that all tenure-track faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarly activity or creative work as required by their appointment letters, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure and/or promotion. All tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge in the field through research, scholarly activity or creative work in one or
multiple areas of scholarship. Scholarship and creative activities are broadly defined. To be most effective, however, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge as well as focused, discipline-based expertise.

**Scholarship Defined.** Scholarship can be defined as creative, intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated broadly. Furthermore, the Department recognizes that in order to be considered scholarship, a work must meet three criteria:

- The work must be made public.
- The work must be peer reviewed and critiqued according to accepted standards.
- The work must be able to be reproduced or built on by other scholars.

For purposes of annual review, promotion, and tenure in the Department of Architecture, the definition of scholarship also encompasses the following four interrelated categories, adapted from Boyer, which informs the evaluation of faculty performance in research/scholarly activity/creative work:

- **Scholarship of discovery**, which focuses on the creation of new knowledge through the processes and outcomes of original investigation;
- **Scholarship of integration**, which creates connections across disciplines or across time, whereby isolated facts are synthesized, elucidated, and put into new perspective.
- **Scholarship of application (or engagement)**, which involves the application of disciplinary expertise to professional and public service with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers;
- **Scholarship of teaching and learning**, which focuses on the systematic study of teaching and learning processes, distinct from effective or excellent teaching, in a format that allows public sharing and the opportunity for application and evaluation by others.

### 3.3 Service

The Department of Architecture within a land, sea, and space grant institution must effectively serve a number of constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence; a variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution a faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the Department, College, the University, and the profession of Architecture and related disciplines. The amount and nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual’s skills, interests, and stage of career development. All faculty members, however, are expected to participate in some service activities as a responsibility of their academic citizenship and professional duties as indicated in their annual appointment letter.

### 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Architecture recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and the 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 each performance area (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

4.1 Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** can include, but is not limited to:
- Outstanding evaluations based on classroom visitation by department heads, peers, or external evaluators.
- Outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students.
- Selection for University or professional association outstanding teacher awards.
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Participation in development of questions for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) or other specialty board examinations in the faculty member’s discipline.
- Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum of the Department, College, or University.
- Contribution to new instructional program development.
- Serving as a chair of Master’s theses and Doctoral dissertation committees.
- Receiving external grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching, course development, or other teaching/learning or service learning projects.
- Invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member’s student.
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions.
- Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g., working with the University Honors program).
- Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).
- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Effective direction of graduate or undergraduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award.
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses.
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation.
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research.
- Member of graduate student advisory committees.
- Evidence of high quality in-class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments.
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course.
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching.
• Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
• Positive evaluations in exit interviews with graduating students and feedback from employers of former students.
• Positive evaluations in results of postgraduate questionnaires to evaluate knowledge and preparation through the curriculum.
• Teaching in a course that involves students from two or more departments or colleges or coordination of multi-disciplinary courses.
• Development of assessment tools to measure student learning outcomes.
• Development of new course(s), Honors courses, or major revisions of existing courses.
• Direction of independent student research.
• Promotion and mentoring of colleagues in innovative and evidence-based teaching methodologies and teaching quality.
• Introduction of outcomes assessments for course or program evaluation in the Environmental Design or Architecture curriculum.
• Mentoring and training graduate and undergraduate students who pass certifying examinations, e.g., LEED, EDAC.
• Development or Introduction of innovative and evidence-based instructional methodologies and technologies to the professional, undergraduate, and graduate curricula to optimize student outcomes.

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

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but are not limited to:
• Publication of peer-reviewed, scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s), which are reviewed, in press, or published.
• Publications in leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines.
• Receiving a major fellowship or research award.
• Frequent citation of publications.
• Recognition of creative works in professional publications of appropriate disciplines.
• Juried works and exhibitions of creative activities.
• Awards for peer-reviewed creative activities.
• Peer-reviewed publication of creative activities.
• Presentation of peer-reviewed and invited papers at international and national meetings.
• Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research.
• Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research.
• Evidence of excellence in creative professional practice.
• Recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards, invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings.
• Significant contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention (as demonstrated by funding, publications, or other special national recognition) in which investigators from multiple TAMU colleges or outside universities are involved.
• Significant contribution to forming collaborative research arrangements with industry.
• Significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements.
• Authorship of a textbook, or major textbook chapters for appropriate disciplines.
• Recognition/acceptance/adoption of creative processes in peer reviewed settings.
• Recognition of success in peer reviewed regional/national/international design and/or art competitions.
• Publication of creative works in peer reviewed media.
• External publication of instructional materials, e.g., case scenarios, textbooks, or electronic instructional materials.
• Dissemination of teaching materials at national workshops, with the materials cited by other programs.

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

- Publications in refereed journals.
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book.
- Editing a scholarly book.
- Publications in refereed conference proceedings.
- Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines.
- Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals or other professional venues.
- Continued public activity in plastic, performing or diverse arts.
- Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.
- Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields.
- Publication of publicly available technical reports or monographs.
- Active participation in a University landmark area of research, a College or Department of Architecture Signature Program.
- Active participation in research within a University-recognized center or institute (can be a TAMUS component center or institute if the University is a recognized partner) that is either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary.

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

- Serving as an officer, committee chair, or board member in a national or international professional organization.
- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board.
- Service as a grant/contract/proposal/award reviewer (panel member) for major professional organizations, institutions or foundations.
- Serving as a consultant for national or international government offices or programs.
- Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting.
- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major, scholarly, refereed journal. (This activity per se is considered service; however, being selected as editor or member of an editorial board can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.)
- Significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards.
- Serving as a member of review panel for a national or international research organization. (This activity per se is considered service; however, being selected as editor or member of review panel can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.)
- Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University.
- Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate.
- Serving as a chair of a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee.
- Serving as a director of a College or University-sponsored research center or institute.
- Serving as an effective member of one of the College’s important and time-consuming committees, such as search, curriculum, or promotion and tenure committees.
- Serving as an effective chair of a committee within the department, College, or University.
- Significant and effective mentorship of junior faculty members.
- Selection for University, College, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards.
- Attraction of significant external development support for service-related activities.
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Evidence of excellent performance in community project management or specialty support services.
- Significant service to community, state, national, or international service organizations.
- Evidence of significant self-development and organizational activities leading to enhanced efficiency and productivity within a community or public outreach service.
- Outstanding client or referring party satisfaction based on comments or surveys.

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

- Service as a reviewer for refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national or international research organizations. (This activity per se is considered service; however, being asked to serve as reviewer can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.)
- Serving as a chair or member of a committee in a national or international professional organization.
- Serving as an officer in regional or state professional organization.
- Serving as a program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting.
- Service as a grant/contract/proposal/award reviewer (panel member) for professional organizations, institutions or foundations.
- Serving as an editor or member of the editorial board of a scholarly, refereed journal.
- Serving as a manuscript reviewer for a scholarly, refereed journal.
- Serving as an external referee for P&T candidates at other universities.
- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate.
- Serving on University, College, and department committees and task forces.
- Serving as a consultant to industry, client, or community groups.
- Serving as an advisor to student organizations.
- Serving in administrative roles within the department (e.g., coordinator, assistant/associate department head titles).
- Serving as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations.
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
- Contributing to external developmental efforts.
- Serving as a mentor for junior faculty.
- Participation in K-12 outreach and research especially at the local, state, or national level.
- Participation in partnerships initiated with corporate/community organizations, including funded research, training programs, and development of coursework.
- Evidence of satisfactory performance in service projects.
- Active participation in publications describing community-based projects.
- Serving as a consultant to industry and client groups.

5. **Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure**

5.1 **Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty**

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their assigned areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service), 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 are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor:

Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence and effectiveness in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service. Assistant Professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves, first, developing a clear vision and record of scholarship, and second, building their teaching skills and
portfolio, taking on the role of mentor to students, and third, exploring select service roles that complement their other activities. Individuals employed with the future completion of professional license and/or completion of advanced degrees as a stipulation of continued employment will be expected to satisfy these goals prior to promotion to Associate Professor.

5.1.2 Associate Professor:

Emphasis for the tenure-track individual should be placed on further development of scholarship within categories recognized by the department, i.e., the scholarship of discovery, integration, application/engagement, and teaching. This personal and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments in the individual’s specialty area. For those with major practice roles, in addition to their teaching and research roles, continued professional excellence is expected, along with the continued development of leadership in a specialty area. Associate Professors will be expected to exhibit excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen area(s) of research/scholarly activity/creative work. Associate Professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must document continued effectiveness in teaching and service (and professional contributions as appropriate). Faculty are expected to integrate and contribute to their research and teaching from their service areas and develop recognized excellence in their field. Tenure-track individuals must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record.

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

(1) an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field;

(2) professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;

(3) an area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and

(4) evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

5.1.3 Professor:

Continued excellence and national/international recognition are required in the areas of research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work. Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence are also required of Professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; excellence in public service; and excellence in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of Professors, sustained excellence in research/scholarly activity/creative work 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:

(1) continuing accomplishment in teaching;

(2) continuing accomplishment and some measure of national/international recognition in research or another form of creative activity; and
(3) evidence of valuable professional service.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (APT, Non-Tenure Track)

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. For the Academic Professional Track (APT) individual who begins at the Instructional Assistant Professor rank, emphasis should be placed on further accomplishments in their assigned roles. Faculty members in non-tenure track positions may normally be considered for promotion after five years, however time in rank is never a sufficient criterion for promotion. A faculty member may seek promotion at an earlier time (https://policies.tamus.edu/12-07.pdf) All requests for promotion from eligible candidates must be considered. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

In general, non-tenure track (APT) faculty are evaluated in two areas - teaching, and research or service, according to the terms of the hiring letter. Based on University Rule 12.01.99.M2:4.4.4.2, non-tenure track Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor should demonstrate excellence in their primary area (teaching, research, or service) and demonstrate significant contributions in a secondary responsibility.

[Further elaboration is pending until the Department gets feedback/advice from University and Department APT Faculty Task Force/Committees]

For promotion to Associate Professor in the APT track, the criteria are outlined below:

(1) an excellent level of accomplishment in their primary area as measured against the contributions of others in the field;

(2) professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;

(3) must possess an area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and

(4) evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching, research or service according to the terms of the hiring letter.

For promotion to non-tenure track Professor/Senior Professional Track Faculty, the evaluation should be in the faculty member’s primary areas of responsibility:

(1) continuing accomplishment in teaching, research, or service;

(2) some measure of national/international recognition in the scholarship of teaching and learning or other area of assignment;

(3) evidence of excellence in academic or professional service.

5.3 Process for Evaluation

5.3.1 Candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be provided with at least two mentors, for content and process, at least one of whom is on the Committee.
5.3.2 The process for tenure track faculty includes annual Committee reports, classroom observations, mentor reports, a significant 3rd-year review, and a tenure & promotion package in the 5th year which is submitted to external reviewers.

5.3.2.1 The process for APT faculty does not include the 3rd-year review or the submission to external reviewers.

5.3.3 Candidates for tenure and/or promotion prepare and update a three-page Teaching, Research, and Service (TRS) statement along with an annotated CV.

5.3.4 Candidates collect evidence of impact in the field, including preparation of portfolios documenting teaching and research and service. Candidates should be able to show that they have made effective contributions to the teaching mission of the department, are productive and known in their respective fields of research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work, and have participated in service activities appropriate to their stage of career development.

5.3.5 The department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the teaching, research/creative activities, and service portfolios of the candidate and submit a report with its evaluation.

5.3.6 The Committee report goes to the department head, who adds a letter with a recommendation before sending the package on to the College P&T Committee. The College Committee also writes a report and recommendation before submitting it to the Dean, who also adds a letter with a recommendation. From there, it goes to the Provost, the President, and ultimately the Board of Regents.

6. Annual Review
Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or academic professional track, must have an annual written review, for which the department head is responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the Heads, Directors, or supervisors of the appropriate departments to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews 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. 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.

All Professional Track academic faculty will be reviewed on an annual basis by their department head or supervisor. Such review will include all requirements established in the initial letter of appointment and any additional requirements added during annual reviews (https://policies.tamus.edu/12-07.pdf).

When available, merit compensation will be the primary means of recognizing excellence in annual reviews.

6.1 Purpose of Annual Reviews
Annual reviews shall
● Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
● Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
● Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  o See University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Item 2.4.2

For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

For all non-tenured faculty (tenure-track and non-tenure track), the annual review process must also provide indication as to progress toward tenure or promotion (see 4.3.5). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

● Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

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 academic professional track faculty, the annual review evaluates 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
Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. The review window for the Department of Architecture is the immediately previous calendar year.

6.3.1 Process for Annual Review
Annual reviews will be conducted by the department head early in the spring semester each year. Faculty members will submit an annual report on their activities and any other materials requested by the department head, e.g., a current CV.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance
During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on at least three categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Meets Expectations/Satisfactory,” “Exceeds Expectations.” Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

6.4.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:
- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- **Meets Expectations/Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching courses and content as assigned by the department. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

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

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Works are:
- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly or creative works activity.
- **Meets expectations/Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly or creative works activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly or creative works activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations or exhibitions.

6.4.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service are:
- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- **Meets expectations** – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have evidence of involvement in service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment.
- **Exceeds expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and 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 form of the faculty member’s report of previous activities must include the following:
● The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but should 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. Where appropriate the reports may include professional practice.

● Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives. 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, program director’s, or supervisor’s evaluation and expectations.

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to 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 memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member’s department personnel file. Moreover, this annual review shall include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and professional practice, as appropriate. The annual review should include an informed judgment by the department head of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

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 “ACKNOWLEDGMENT” portion of the department head’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 and the faculty member.

The department head shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and professional practice, as appropriate, shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual’s appointment letter, 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

Annual evaluation ratings of “Unsatisfactory” require further action:

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance
An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, professional practice).

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the department’s established criteria (see Section 7.4.). 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 for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member.

6.6.2 A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.7 Time-Line
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. Annual reviews must be completed to comply with the dates prescribed in The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews.

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:
A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2.

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2.

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 to determine the progress towards tenure.

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.
● This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the department’s P&T committee, department head, the college P&T committee, and dean.

● This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

● If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

The mid-term review should be conducted in March of the third academic year. Feedback is required for faculty candidates. After the college committee and dean have performed their independent review, the department head and committee will provide feedback to the candidate.

8. Post-Tenure and Post Promotion 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. Periodic review is conducted at least every six years by a subcommittee of the departmental P&T committee. (see Section 8.2.).

Post-promotion review applies to academic professional track (APT) 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. Periodic review is conducted at least every six years by the APT subcommittee of the departmental P&T committee. (see Section 8.10 below).

8.1 Purpose of Post-Tenure Review

● 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 Post-Tenure Peer Review Subcommittee

Each year the departmental Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will appoint a post-tenure peer review subcommittee to review tenured faculty for post-tenure review. The post-tenure peer review subcommittee shall be at least 3 members of the departmental P&T Committee. This subcommittee shall dissolve upon completion of the faculty reviews for that current year.

The post-tenure peer review subcommittee shall consist of tenured faculty members at the same rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. Those faculty members being reviewed are not eligible to be selected as part of that year’s post-tenure peer review subcommittee. One of the elected post-tenure peer review subcommittee members will serve as the Chair to coordinate the committee’s activities.
8.3 Post-Tenure Review Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by post-tenure peer review subcommittee:
● A current curriculum vitae (CV);
● The most current 3 years annual reviews by department head;
● A current impact statement on teaching, research, and service (TRS);
● And any documents the faculty member under review wishes to provide.

8.3.2 The post-tenure peer review subcommittee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in this document. The subcommittee report is provided to the full P&T committee and the department head.

8.3.3 The faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head.

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 the department guidelines. An unsatisfactory post-tenure periodic peer review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.5 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, post-tenure periodic peer review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both departments. If reviewed only by the primary department, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary department.

8.3.6 By no later than May 31st, each department will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent post-tenure periodic peer review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The post-tenure peer review subcommittee’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 three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 8.2.) 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” (see Section 8.4.) 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.

8.4.3 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 the Professional Development 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 of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3.

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” (see section 5) 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 department 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 department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. 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, or chair of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

8.8 Post Promotion Review (Academic Professional Track Faculty)

Post-promotion review applies to academic professional track (APT) 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. Periodic review is conducted at least every six years by the APT subcommittee of the departmental P&T committee (see Section 8.10 below).

8.9 Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of an APT 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.

8.10 The APT Post-Promotion Peer Review Subcommittee

The APT Post-Promotion Peer Review Subcommittee shall consist of one non-voting liaison from the P&T Committee and five APT faculty.

The APT Post-Promotion Peer Review Subcommittee for professional track faculty members will consist of academic professional track faculty members at the same rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed.

If there are an insufficient number of academic professional track faculty members of the department to form a complete committee, the balance of the committee will consist of tenured faculty members elected by the academic professional track faculty members on the committee.

Those faculty members being reviewed are not eligible to be selected as part of that year’s APT Post-Promotion Peer Review Subcommittee.

The APT Post-Promotion Peer Review Subcommittee shall provide a report to the department P&T committee which will receive and forward the report to the department head.

8.11 Process

8.11.1 Materials to be reviewed by APT Post-Promotion Peer Review Subcommittee:

● A current CV;
● The most current 3 years annual reviews by department head;
● A current impact statement on teaching, research, and service (TRS);
● Any documents the faculty member under review wishes to provide.

8.11.2 The APT Post-Promotion Peer Review Subcommittee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in this document. The subcommittee report is provided to the full P&T committee which will receive and forward the report to the department head.

8.11.3 The faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head.

8.11.4 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. An unsatisfactory post-promotion periodic peer review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (see section 8.4 above).

8.11.5 For APT faculty with budgeted joint appointments, post-promotion periodic peer review will be conducted as per the post-promotion review guidelines of the department where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both departments. If reviewed only by the primary department, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary department.
8.11.6 By no later than May 31st, each department will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent post-promotion periodic peer review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each APT faculty last underwent a review. The post-promotion peer review subcommittee’s written evaluation and the faculty member's post-promotion review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

8.11.7 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” in a post-promotion peer review process shall trigger a Professional Development Review process as described in section 8.4 of this document.

8.11.7.1 If a Professional Development Plan is required, see section 8.5 of this document.

8.11.7.2 If the faculty member wishes to appeal the Professional Development Plan process, see section 8.6 of this document.

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus 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 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.

Nominations must be approved by a simple majority vote of the department’s tenured faculty.

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 status.

Departments should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

Appendix

As of this version, 24 March 2021, no appendices are included.

Contact Office

Department of Architecture office or Chair, Promotion and Tenure committee